

Texas Eastern and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before May 5, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-10996 Filed 5-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. TM95-11-29-000]

**Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.;
Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC
Gas Tariff**

April 28, 1995.

Take notice that on April 25, 1995, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (TGPL) tendered for filing to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1, First Revised Fifth Revised Sheet No. 28B to which tariff sheet is proposed to be effective April 1, 1995.

TGPL states that the purpose of the instant filing is to track a rate change attributable to storage service purchased from North Penn Gas Company (North Penn) under its Rate Schedule SS the costs of which are included in the rates and charges payable under TGPL's Rate Schedule SS-1. The tracking filing is being made pursuant to Section 5 of TGPL's Rate Schedule SS-1.

TGPL states that included in Appendix A attached to the filing is an explanation of the rate change and details regarding the computation of the revised SS-1 rates.

TGPL states that copies of the filing are being mailed to each of its SS-1 customers and interested State Commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the

Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before May 5, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-10967 Filed 5-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-254-000]

**Williams Natural Gas Co.; Notice of
Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff**

April 28, 1995.

Take notice that on April 26, 1995, Williams Natural Gas Company (WNG) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, First Revised Sheet Nos. 243 and 244. The proposed effective date of these tariff sheets is June 1, 1995.

WNG states that this filing is being made to eliminate unnecessary paperwork by not requiring service agreements on capacity releases which are: (1) For less than three months, (2) occur through the EBB, and (3) cannot generate more than \$100,000 in reservation charges and reservation surcharges, calculated at 100% load factor for the duration of the release. Section 11.4(d) is modified to remove the requirement that earnest money must be paid on releases. First Revised Sheet No. 244 is being filed for pagination purposes. These changes will make it easier for Shippers to utilize capacity release on WNG's system.

WNG states that a copy of its filing was served on all jurisdictional customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before May 5, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to

intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-10968 Filed 5-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY**

[FRL-5202-6]

**Agency Information Collection
Activities Under OMB Review**

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before June 5, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information, or a copy of this ICR, contact Sandy Farmer at (202) 260-2740, please refer to ICR #1488.03.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response

Title: Superfund Site Evaluation and Hazard Ranking System, EPA ICR #1488.03. This ICR requests renewal of a currently approved collection (OMB #2050-0095).

Abstract: Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, 1980 and 1986) amends the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan (NCP) to include criteria prioritizing releases throughout the U.S. before undertaking remedial action at uncontrolled hazardous waste before undertaking remedial action at uncontrolled hazardous waste sites. The Hazard Ranking System (HRS) is a model that is used to evaluate the relative threats to human health and the environment posed by actual or potential releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants. The HRS criteria take into account the population at risk, the

hazard potential of the substances, as well as the potential for contamination of drinking water supplies, direct human contact, destruction of sensitive ecosystems, damage to natural resources affecting the human food chain, contamination of surface water used for recreation or potable water consumption, and contamination of ambient air.

Under this ICR the States will apply the HRS by identifying and classifying those releases that warrant further investigation. The HRS score is crucial since it is the primary mechanism used to determine whether a site is eligible to be included on the National Priorities List (NPL). Only sites on the NPL are eligible for Superfund-financed remedial actions.

HRS scores are derived from the sources described in this information collection, including field reconnaissance, taking samples at the site, and reviewing available reports and documents. States record the collected information on HRS documentation worksheets and include this in the supporting reference package. States then send the package to the EPA region for a completeness and accuracy review, and the Region then sends it to EPA Headquarters for a final quality assurance review. If the site scores above the NPL designated cutoff value, and if it meets the other criteria for listing, it is then eligible to be proposed on the NPL.

Burden Statement: Depending on the number and type of activities performed, burden for the collection of site assessment information is estimated to range from 130 to 2,170 hours per site. The number of hours required to assess a particular site depends on how far a site progresses through the site assessment process. Sites where only a Preliminary Assessment is performed will typically require approximately 130 hours, while sites that progress to NPL listing will require approximately 2,170 hours. The burden estimates include reporting activities and minimal recordkeeping activities. The States are reimbursed 100% of their costs, except for record maintenance. The ICR does not impose burden for HRS activities on local governments or private businesses.

Respondents: State agencies requesting oversight of the site.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 50 States.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 363,000 hours.

Frequency of Collection: one time; section 116(b) requires an HRS evaluation within four years of the site's entry into the EPA CERCLIS database.

Send comments regarding the burden estimate, or any other aspect of this information collection, including suggestions for reducing the burden, (please refer to EPA ICR #1488.03 and OMB #2050-0095) to:

Sandy Farmer, EPA ICR #1488.03, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Regulatory Information Division (2136), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460 and Jonathan Gledhill, OMB #2050-0095, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: April 28, 1995.

Joseph Retzer,

Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 95-11034 Filed 5-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[Docket No. 95F-00 FRL-5202-8]

Interim Revised Clean Water Act Settlement Penalty Policy Issued

AGENCY: Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Assistant Administrator Steve Herman of the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance issued an "Interim Revised Clean Water Act Settlement Penalty Policy" on February 28, 1995. This Interim Policy supersedes the 1986 Clean Water Act Penalty Policy and six subsequent guidances.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Hindin, 202-564-6004 or Kenneth Keith, 202-564-4031, Office of Regulatory Enforcement, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 309 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), (33 U.S.C. 1319) authorizes the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "Agency") to bring civil judicial and administrative actions against persons who violates various Federal water pollution control standards and requirements in the CWA. In such actions the Administrator may seek civil penalties.

EPA brings enforcement actions to require alleged violators to promptly correct the violations and remedy any harm caused by the violations. As part of an enforcement action, EPA also seeks monetary penalties. Penalties promote environmental compliance and help protect public health by deterring future violations by the same violator

and deterring violations by other members of the regulated community. Penalties also help ensure a national level playing field by ensuring that violators do not obtain an unfair economic advantage over competitors who have done whatever was necessary to comply on time. Penalties also encourage companies to adopt pollution prevention and recycling techniques, so that they minimize their pollutant discharges and reduce their potential liabilities.

This Policy guides EPA in establishing appropriate penalties in settlement of civil judicial and administrative actions. Subject to the circumstances of a particular case, this Policy provides the lowest penalty figure which the Federal Government should accept in a settlement. This Policy is drafted so that violators whose actions, or inactions, resulted in a significant economic benefit and/or harmed or threatened public health or the environment will pay the highest penalties.

The purpose of this Policy is to further four important environmental goals. First, penalties should be large enough to deter noncompliance. Second, penalties should help ensure a level playing field by ensuring that violators do not obtain an economic advantage over their competitors. These two goals generally require that penalties recover the economic benefit of noncompliance, plus an appropriate amount reflective of the gravity or seriousness of the violations. Third, CWA penalties should be generally consistent across the country. This provides fair and equitable treatment to the regulated community wherever they may operate. Fourth, settlement penalties should be based on a logical calculation methodology to promote swift resolution of enforcement actions and the underlying violations.

This interim revision of the Clean Water Act Penalty Policy provides numerous improvements to the 1986 Policy. First, this revision establishes an alternative approach to use in appropriate cases to determine penalties against municipalities. This approach, called the national municipal litigation consideration, is based in part on the penalties obtained in prior case settlements and on an evaluation of four factors: size of the facility (as measured by service population), duration of violations, environmental impact and economic benefit. Second, the methodology for evaluating the gravity of violations has been revised to reduce redundancy, improve national consistency, and provided broader coverage for all types of violations.