Name	Case No.	Date
Armour & Company	RC272–294	
Atlantic Richfield Company/Gordon H. Dunker	RF304–4951	05/30/95
Atlantic Richfield Company/Massillon Supersonic Car Wash et al	RF304–14144	06/01/95
Clarkson Brothers Machinery Haulers	RF272–97192	05/30/95
Farmers Union Oil Company	RF272–92111	06/01/95
Howard County Equity Coop Assn	RF272–92392	
Farmers Coop Oil Assn	RF272–92465	
Gulf Oil Corporation/Energy Supply Propane	RF300–18181	05/30/95
Gulf Oil Corporation/Henderson Clay Products	RF300–18185	05/30/95
Gulf Oil Corporation/Point Gasoline Corporation	RF300–21828	05/30/95
Roofing Wholesale Company, Inc	RF272–67965	06/01/95
Roofing Wholesale Company, Inc	RD272–67965	
Texaco Inc./Duval Corporation	RF321–7899	05/30/95
Texaco Inc./Gartin's Texaco	RF321–20154	06/01/95
Texaco Inc./Midway Texaco	RF321–10554	05/30/95
Texaco Inc./Studebaker's Texaco et al	RF321–19313	05/30/95
Tidewater Transit Co. et al	RF272–85000	06/01/95
Turkey Hill Dairy, Inc. et al	RF272–84642	06/01/95

Dismissals

The following submissions were dismissed:

Name	Case No.
Dolese Concrete Company	RF272–97227
Ethyl Corporation	RF321–19622
Gabig Texaco	RF321–7296
Patterson & Brasher Texaco.	RF321–20624
Shaffer's Texaco at Princeton.	RF321–9511
Shankles Texaco	RF321–18087

Copies of the full text of these decisions and orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room 1E–234, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., except federal holidays. They are also available in *Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines,* a commercially published loose leaf reporter system.

Dated: September 5, 1995.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc. 95–22761 Filed 9–12–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5295–7]

Agency Information Collection Activities Up for Renewal

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) listed below is coming up for renewal. Before submitting the renewal package to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the collection as described below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 13, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Indoor Air Division (6607J), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Womble, 202–233–9057/FAX 202–233–9555/womble.susan@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Affected entities: Entities affected by this action are those office buildings which voluntarily participate in the Building Assessment Survey and Evaluation (BASE) program.

Title: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Indoor Environmental Quality Survey, EPA number 1619.02, OMB #2060–0244, January 31, 1996.

Abstract: The Indoor Environmental Quality Questionnaire is a component of the EPA Building Assessment Survey and Evaluation (BASE) program. In this program, EPA is conducting a five-year indoor air quality (IAQ) study of 150–250 large commercial and public office buildings. The purpose of this study is to develop a national baseline assessment of the indoor air in such buildings. The activities EPA will conduct under this study include the Indoor Environmental Quality Questionnaire, building inspections, interviews with building maintenance workers, environmental measurements (e.g. ventilation rates, concentrations of indoor air pollutants) and other quantitative and qualitative assessments. By conducting this research, EPA will begin to be able to assess the key building parameters that affect IAQ and the incidence of certain IAQ-related health and comfort problems. The Indoor Environmental Questionnaire is a voluntary questionnaire asking for information pertaining to work station characteristics, working condition, exposure to pollutants, health and well-being, and stress. Data from the Indoor Environmental Questionnaire will be used to compare the measured building parameters and health effects.

The 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;

(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 collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Burden Statement: The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 14 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The respondents to the questionnaire are occupants of commercial facilities in a wide variety of fields and SIC codes. Over the last three years approximately 1500 questionnaires have been administered. This is a smaller number than previously projected due to the decreased budget. The total burden of an estimated 14000 persons has not changed but the length of time to

achieve that number is greater. The estimated total annual burden of respondents is a maximum of $14,720, and the frequency of collection is once. No person is 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 displayed in 40 CFR Part 9.

Send comments regarding these matters, or any other aspect of the information collection, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the address listed above.

Dated: September 7, 1995.

Susan E. Womble,

Environmental Scientist.

[FR Doc. 95–22720 Filed 9–12–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

[FRL–5295–2]

Modification of the March 21, 1988, Russo Development Corporation Section 404(c) Final Determination

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of Modification of Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404(c) Final Determination for Russo Development Corporation.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has modified the March 21, 1988, CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination concerning the Russo Development Corporation (Russo) site located in the Hackensack Meadowlands (Meadowlands), Bergen County, New Jersey. This modification allows Russo to seek authorization for the discharge of dredged or fill material into a 13.5-acre tract containing wetlands, provided Russo deeds over for preservation and enhancement a 16.3 acre property located in Ridgefield, New Jersey, and provides $700,000 for wetland enhancement activities at sites in the Meadowlands. Any discharges of dredged or fill material to wetlands on the Russo site must be authorized by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The amendment was effective on September 7, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Ettinger (EPA) at (202) 260–1190.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CWA Section 404(c) authorizes EPA to prohibit, deny, restrict, or withdraw the specification of a site for the disposal of dredged or fill material. On March 21, 1988, EPA's Assistant Administrator (AA) for Water rendered a final determination which prohibited the designation of 57.5 acres of wetlands as a disposal site for fill material. These wetlands were and are currently owned by the Russo Development Corporation (Russo), and are located in the Hackensack Meadowlands in Carlstadt, Bergen County, New Jersey. The Final Determination pertained to a proposal by Russo to maintain 52.5 acres of unauthorized fill (of which 44 acres have been built upon) and to fill a remaining five acres of wetlands of a 13.5-acre tract to complete a warehouse complex. The reason cited by the AA for Water for the 1988 404(c) determination was that the discharge of fill would have unacceptable adverse effects, both individually and cumulatively, on wildlife in the Meadowlands. The 1988 Final Determination stated that the Russo site was/is very valuable to wildlife from a site specific and cumulative standpoint and, that the compensatory mitigation proposed by Russo at that time would not adequately replace those wildlife values that had been and were anticipated to be lost. In the Final Determination, however, EPA indicated that its Section 404(c) prohibition could be reconsidered upon demonstration that the adverse effects to wildlife have been satisfactorily addressed.

Litigation was undertaken by Russo with regard to EPA's and the Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) actions regarding the site. The litigation history is summarized in the notice of proposed amendment of the 404(c) determination (See 60 FR 15913).

The Corps, EPA, and Russo have engaged in discussions to resolve issues arising under Section 404 with regard to the Russo site. As a result of these discussions, Russo agreed to provide additional mitigation. Based on this additional mitigation, EPA proposed to amend the 404(c) final determination on March 28, 1995. In particular, Russo has agreed to deed over, for preservation and enhancement, an approximately 16-acre parcel of wetlands in Ridgefield, NJ, located approximately 1.5 miles from the subject Russo sites. Russo also agreed to provide $700,000 for the purpose of enhancing wetlands both at this site and at sites contained in a Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission (HMDC) mitigation bank, as appropriate. This mitigation proposal is designed to compensate for wetlands functions lost as a result of the past and future fill activities on both Russo sites. Based on the increased mitigation, EPA proposed to amend the prohibition of the discharge of fill material on the 13.5-acre Russo site to allow for designation of the subject property as a disposal site, provided the compensatory mitigation conditions are met. After final amendment of the Final Determination, Russo would seek an after-the-fact authorization from the Corps for the past discharge of fill material into the subject wetlands for the purpose of constructing a warehouse complex, as well as authorization for the future discharge of fill material into remaining wetlands for additional development activities.

In the **Federal Register** notice proposing to amend the 404(c) prohibition, EPA requested comments on allowing for restricted use of the Russo site based on the compensatory mitigation proposal discussed above. (A more complete background on this case, as well as a detailed description of a possible compensation scenario that could be implemented under the proposed amendment can be found in the March 28, 1995, notice.) In particular, EPA was interested in comments relating to the proposed compensatory mitigation and its ability to replace the wildlife values lost as a result of past fill activities, as well as anticipated losses due to proposed discharges in the subject wetlands. EPA also mailed copies of the **Federal Register** notice to parties listed on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers mailing list for the Hackensack Meadowlands District and to recipients of an October 14, 1987, public notice scheduling a public hearing for the Russo Section 404(c) action.

EPA received three written comments in response to the March 28, 1995, **Federal Register** notice. These comments are summarized below, along with EPA's responses to these comments.

The Pleasantville Field Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) opposed the proposed action on several grounds. The Service contended that it would adversely affect fish and wildlife resources by contributing to the continuing loss of regionally significant habitat, and would be contrary to the objective of maintaining and restoring regional biodiversity. The Service emphasized that the Meadowlands is a corridor for migratory birds, as well as a large island of habitat in an intensely urbanized area that plays a critical role in maintaining the region's biodiversity.

The Service also commented that the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the proposed Special Area Management Plan (SAMP) for the Hackensack Meadowlands fails to articulate specific fish and wildlife management objectives for target species