that such accumulation is performed responsibly. EPA also requires certain universal waste handlers to track receipt of universal waste shipments as well as shipments sent off-site to ensure that universal waste is properly treated, recycled, and disposed. Finally, the submission of petitions in support of regulating other wastes or waste categories under part 273 helps EPA (1) to compile information on these wastes, and (2) to determine whether regulation as a universal waste is appropriate.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR chapter 15.

EPA would like to solicit comments to:

(I) evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Burden Statement: The estimated number of likely respondents under this collection of information is 79,510 (78,973 Small Quantity Handlers of Universal Wastes (SQHUWs), 485 LQHUWs, and 52 Destination Facilities). The bottom line annual reporting and recordkeeping burden to respondents under this collection of information is 122,674 hours. The average annual public reporting burden per response for SQHUWs under this collection of information is 0 hours. The average annual public reporting burden per response for LQHUWs is estimated to range from 0 to 2.41 hours. The average annual public reporting burden per response for destination facilities is estimated to range from 0 to 2.41 hours. The average annual recordkeeping burden per response for SQHUWs under this collection of information is estimated to range from 1.12 to 1.62 hours. The average annual recordkeeping burden per response for LQHUWs is estimated to range from 5.82 to 6.82 hours. The average annual recordkeeping burden per response for destination facilities is estimated to be 115.37 hours. The total average annual burden cost for universal waste handlers, universal waste petitioners, and destination facilities is: $5,303,419 in labor costs; $1,212 in capital costs; and $244.25 in annual O&M costs (O&M costs include a purchase of service component). Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Dated: November 20, 1997.

Elizabeth Cotsworth,

Acting Director, Office of Solid Waste.

[FR Doc. 97–31271 Filed 11–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5928–4]

Request for Nominations to North American Free Trade Agreement– and U.S.–Mexico Border–Related Environmental Advisory Committees

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of request for nominations.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is inviting nominations to fill vacancies on two national advisory committees: the Governmental Advisory Committee to the U.S. Representative to the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation and the Good Neighbor Environmental Board. The Agency is seeking qualified senior level decision makers from diverse sectors to be considered for appointments. Nominees for the Governmental Advisory Committee may come from state, local or tribal government entities anywhere in the U.S. Nominees for the Good Neighbor Environmental Board must come from governmental or nongovernmental entities in the states of Arizona, California, New Mexico or Texas.

DATES: Nominations will be accepted until close of business December 12, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit nominations to: Mr. Robert Hardaker, Team Leader for Environment and Trade, Office of Cooperative Environmental Management, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1601-F, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Hardaker, Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1601-F, Washington, DC 20460; telephone (202) 260–2477.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: These two committees are Federal advisory committees operating under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, PL 92–463.

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) advises the U.S. Government Representative to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC). The Commission on Environmental Cooperation (composed of the heads of the environmental agencies for Canada, Mexico and the U.S.; a Secretariat headquartered in Montreal, Canada; and a Joint Public Advisory Committee composed of members of the public from each country) was established to protect the North American environment and support the environmental goals of NAFTA. NAFTA also authorized each country to establish two public advisory committees to advise its representative to the CEC. The U.S. Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) is composed of 10 representatives of state, local and tribal governments. The counterpart U.S. National Advisory Committee is composed of 12 representatives of nongovernmental organizations. USEPA is not currently soliciting for membership on the National Advisory Committee.

The Good Neighbor Environmental Board, created under the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative Act of 1992, advises the President and the Congress on approaches to sustainable development for the U.S.–Mexico border region that address environmental, natural resources, health, transportation, housing, and economic development issues, and that promote coordination of governmental activities along the U.S.–Mexico border. The Board consists of representatives from nongovernmental organizations,

industry, academia, and state and local governments in the States of Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas, as well as from eight U.S. Government agencies.

Members of these committees are appointed by the Administrator of USEPA for a term of one year with the possibility of reappointment. The Committees meet at least twice annually.

Nominations for membership must include a resume and short biography describing the educational and professional qualifications of the nominee and the nominee's current business address and daytime telephone number.

Dated: November 14, 1997.

Greg Kenyon,

Acting Designated Federal Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–31276 Filed 11–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL–5486–7]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 OR (202) 564–7153.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed November 17, 1997 Through November 21, 1997 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 970452, Final EIS, DOE, NY, Disposal of the Defueled S3G and D1G Prototype Reactor Plants, Implementation, Located at the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory Kesselring Site near West Milton, Saratoga County, NY, Due: December 29, 1997, Contact: Andrew S. Baitinger (518) 884–1234.

EIS No. 970453, Final EIS, MMS, AL, LA, MS, TX, Central Planning Area, Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Lease Sales 169, 172, 175, 178 and 182, Lease Offering, Offshore Marine Environment and Coastal Counties/Parishes of AL, MS, LA and TX, Due: December 29, 1997, Contact: Archie Melancon (703) 787–1547.

EIS No. 970454, Revised Draft EIS, BLM, CA, Imperial Project, Open-Pit Precious Metal Mining Operation Utilizing Heap Leach Processes, Plan of Operations, Right-of-Way, Conditional Use Permit, US COE Permit and Reclamation Plan Approvals, El Centro Resource Area, California Area District, Imperial County, CA, Due: January 27, 1998, Contact: Douglas Romoli (909) 697–5237. The above Revised Draft EIS replaces Draft EIS #960511, filed with the US EPA on 10–25–96.

EIS No. 970455, Draft EIS, USA, NY, Seneca Army Depot Activity Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Seneca County and the City of Geneva, Ontario County, NY, Due: January 12, 1998, Contact: Ltc. Rob Dow (703) 693–9217.

EIS No. 970456, Draft EIS, AFS, AK, Indian River Timber Sale(s) Project, Implementation, Tongass National Forest, Chatham Area, Sitka and Hoonah Ranger Districts, COE Section 10 and 404 Permit, NPDES and Coast Guard Bridge Permit, Chichagof Island, AK, Due: January 12, 1998, Contact: Linn Shipley (907) 747–6671.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 970442, Draft EIS, USN, CA, Hunters Point (Former) Naval Shipyard Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, City of San Francisco, San Francisco County, CA, Due: January 05, 1998, Contact: Mary Doyle (650) 244–3024. Published FR 11–14–97—Review Period extended.

EIS No. 970444, Final Supplement, NOA, Snapper Grouper Fishery, Amendment 8 to the Fishery Management Plan, Regulatory Impact Review, South Atlantic Region, Due: December 29, 1997, Contact: Rolland A. Schmitter (301) 713–2239. Published FR 11–14–97—Review Period Reestablished.

EIS No. 970451, Draft EIS, DOE, CO, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored, Golden, CO, Due: January 05, 1998, Contact: Charles Head (202) 586–5151. Published FR 11–21–97 Correction to Title.

Dated: November 24, 1997.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 97–31249 Filed 11–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5486–8]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared November 10, 1997 Through November 14, 1997 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 564–7167.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 11, 1997 (62 FR 16154).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–FHW–K40227–CA Rating EC2, I–880 Interchange at Dixon Landing Road Reconstruction Improvements, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Fremont, Milpitas, Alameda and Santa Clara Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the lack of full disclosure of alternatives impacts due to the proposed width of the overcrossing. EPA requested clarification of these issues and mitigation involving revegetation and restoring old road beds be discussed.

ERP No. D–NOA–E70000–GA Rating LO, State of Georgia Coastal Management Program, Comprehensive Coastal Land and Water Use Activities, Approval and Implementation, GA.

Summary: EPA had lack of objections with the proposed project. EPA did not identify any potential environmental impacts requiring substantial change to the proposal, and that the alternatives and their consequences were reasonably disclosed.

ERP No. D–SCS–G36146–OK Rating LO, Middle Deep Red Run Creek Watershed Plan, Implementation, Funding and Possible COE Section 404 Permit, Central Rolling Red Plains, Tillman, Comanche and Kiowa Counties, OK.

Summary: EPA had lack of objection to the selection of the Natural Resources Conservation Service's preferred alternative as described in the Draft EIS.

ERP No. D–USN–K11082–CA Rating EC2, San Diego Naval Training Center (NTC) Disposal and Reuse of Certain Real Properties, Implementation, City of San Diego, San Diego County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding biological and water resources cumulative impacts and environmental justice. EPA requested that these issues be clarified in the Final EIS.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–BOP–E80001–KY, United States Penitentiary Martin County, Construction and Operation, Possible Sites, Bizwell and Honey Branch Sites, located in Martin and Johnson Counties, KY.

Summary: EPA had lack of objections with the proposed project. All of EPA's