Lockheed Martin Information Technologies Company (LMITCO), the management and operating contractor of the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, awarded to a construction company. In its determination, the Idaho Operations Office (Idaho) stated that it could not release the responsive material because the responsive documents were in LMITCO's possession. The DOE found that, even though in LMITCO's possession, the documents in the current request were nonetheless subject to release under the DOE regulations. Accordingly, the Appeal was granted.

Nuclear Control Institute, 4/15/98, *VFA–0395*

The DOE issued a decision granting in part a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Appeal filed by the Nuclear Control Institute (NCI). NCI sought the release of information withheld by the Oak Ridge and Oakland Operations Offices. In its decision, the DOE found that the Operations Offices failed to consider the public interest in disclosure and had not articulated any foreseeable harm that would result from the release of several documents withheld under FOIA Exemption 5. The DOE also found that the Operations Offices had not segregated releasable information. Accordingly, the Appeal was remanded to Oak Ridge and Oakland.

The National Security Archive, 4/16/98, *VFA–0196*

The National Security Archive filed an Appeal from a denial by the Department of the Air Force of a request for information that it filed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Because the withheld information was identified as classified under the Atomic Energy Act, the Air Force withheld it at the direction of the DOE under Exemption 3 of the FOIA. In considering the information that was withheld, the DOE determined on appeal that a small portion of the document must continue to be withheld under Exemption 3, but the remainder could be released. Accordingly, the Appeal was granted in part and a newly redacted version of the requested information was ordered to be released.

Whistleblower Hearing

Timothy E. Barton, 4/13/98 *VWA–0017*

A Hearing Officer issued an Initial Agency Decision concerning a whistleblower complaint. The decision found that, while the employee proved that disclosures he had made were protected under 10 C.F.R. Part 708 and contributed to his termination, the employer demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that it would have terminated the complainant in the absence of the protected disclosures.

Personnel Security Hearing

Personnel Security Hearing, 4/17/98, *VSO–0179*

A Hearing Officer found that an individual had shown that he is not currently suffering from the ''mental illness,'' dysthymia, or from any ''mental condition'' that would cause a defect in his judgment or reliability. Accordingly, the Hearing Officer recommended in the Opinion that the individual be granted an access authorization.

Refund Application

Enron Corp./Solar Gas, Inc., 4/17/98, *RF340–55*

The DOE granted an Application for Refund submitted by Solar Gas, Inc. (Solar Gas) in the Enron Corporation (Enron) special refund proceeding. The DOE excluded from Solar Gas' claim the volume of propane relating to exchange or buy/sell transactions between Solar Gas and Enron. With respect to the firm's other purchases from Enron, the DOE found that Solar Gas had demonstrated that the prices it paid to Enron for propane resulted in some economic injury to Solar Gas, but not a level of injury sufficient to qualify Solar Gas for a full volumetric refund. The DOE therefore limited this refund to the 81.5 percent of the firm's volumetric refund. Accordingly, the DOE granted Solar Gas a refund, including interest, of $521,622.

Refund Applications

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decisions and Orders concerning refund applications, which are not summarized. Copies of the full texts of the Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Imogene R. Owens	RK272–01777	4/14/98
Two F Company, L.L.C. ET AL	RK272–04788	4/15/98
Union County, NJ	RC272–00389	4/14/98

Dismissals

The following submissions were dismissed.

Name	Case No.
Personnel Security Hearing	VSO–0188

[FR Doc. 98–15954 Filed 6–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6111–1]

Revision to Addendum to Mobile Source Enforcement Memorandum 1A; Revised Tampering Enforcement Policy for Alternative Fuel Conversions

A. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to revise the tampering enforcement policy for alternative fuel conversions as currently provided in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Addendum to Memorandum 1A in response to comments and suggestions received by the regulated community and other stakeholders.

B. Background

EPA issued an Addendum to Mobile Source Enforcement Memorandum 1A (Addendum) on September 4, 1997, to address emissions increases that resulted from the conversion of gasoline powered vehicles and engines to operate on compressed natural gas (CNG) and liquefied petroleum gasoline (LPG or propane). The background and basis for the issuance of the Addendum and the contents of the new policy are fully contained in the Addendum. Since issuance of the Addendum, EPA has received a number of inquiries and recommendations that certain revisions to the policy would be in the public interest while not jeopardizing the

effectiveness of the Addendum. EPA believes some of those suggestions are appropriate and is revising the Addendum as described below.

C. Revised Policy

Effective June 1, 1998, the Addendum to Memorandum 1A is revised as follows:

1. In lieu of meeting the testing requirements under Options 1, 2 or 3 of the Addendum for model year 1997 and older motor vehicles and engines, compliance with the requirements for demonstrating a ''reasonable basis'' may be achieved by completing back-to-back I/M 240 emissions tests as contained in 40 CFR Part 51, Subpart S, for each converted vehicle using gasoline in the vehicle or engine's original configuration and with each operational fuel after conversion provided:

(a) All tests are conducted in accordance with the specified protocols under 40 CFR Part 51, Subpart S,

(b) The vehicle as tested in the original configuration with gasoline meets the applicable standards under 40 CFR 51.351,

(c) The exhaust emissions of each regulated pollutant after conversion using the alternative fuel are no greater than .90 times the emissions levels for each pollutant before conversion, except that no hydrocarbon standard shall apply for operation exclusively using CNG,

(d) If dual fuel operation is retained, the exhaust emissions of each regulated pollutant after conversion using the original certification fuel are no greater than the emissions levels for each pollutant before conversion, and

(e) No party shall convert more than 25 vehicles or engines of any single vehicle/engine family combination in any calendar year under this I/M 240 protocol.

2. The final date for both testing and installations under Option 3 of the Addendum is extended from April 24, 1998 and December 31, 1998, respectively, to June 30, 2000, for up to and including 1999 model year vehicles and engines. All alternative fuel conversions of model years 2000 and later vehicles and engines and conversions of model year 1998 and 1999 vehicles and engines after June 30, 2000, may only be performed in accordance with Options 1 or 2 of the Addendum.

3. As an alternate to engine dynamometer testing for heavy duty engine conversions under Option 3 for a specific heavy duty engine family, the manufacturer may demonstrate a ''reasonable basis'' by performing back-to-back chassis dynamometer emission tests in accordance with the Urban Dynamometer Driving Schedule for Heavy Duty Vehicles (UDDS) contained in 40 CFR Part 86 Appendix I, Paragraph (d), provided:

(a) The exhaust emissions results for THC, NO_X and CO measured during the UDDS after conversion and when operated exclusively or in combination with the alternative fuel are no greater than .90 times the baseline emissions for THC and NO_X and no greater than 1.00 times CO before conversion, except that NMHC after conversion shall be compared to the baseline THC before conversion in the case of operation exclusively with CNG, and

(b) All tests are performed in accordance with all specified protocols in 40 CFR Part 86, Subpart M, including vehicle preparation, dynamometer loading, emissions measurements and driving schedule except that commercially available fuel may be used for vehicle preconditioning and baseline testing.

4. As an alternate to engine dynamometer testing for heavy duty engine conversions under Option 3 for a specific heavy duty engine family or the alternate procedures provided in paragraph 3. above or the Addendum, any party may propose an alternate heavy duty vehicle or engine test procedure which operates the subject test engine through a range of engine speed and load conditions reasonably representative of both urban and highway driving, measures the exhaust emissions specified above on a grams per mile or grams per brake horsepower-hour basis and specifies appropriate pass/fail criteria equivalent to paragraph 3. above for the purpose of demonstrating a ''reasonable basis'' under EPA's tampering enforcement policy. Any such proposed procedures shall be submitted to the Director, Air Enforcement Division (2242A), Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460 for consideration and approval, if appropriate, under this policy prior to the initiation of any vehicle procurement, modification or testing.

5. The results of federal emissions tests conducted under Option 3 for a specific engine family may be applied as a ''reasonable basis'' for up to a maximum of three additional engine families to that tested for demonstrating compliance with the applicable Tier 1 emission standards for that class of vehicle or engine as specified in 40 CFR Part 86 provided:

(a) The engine family tested in accordance with 40 CFR Part 86 meets the applicable Tier 1 standards for that vehicle or engine class with the application of the appropriate deterioration factor as provided under Option 3,

(b) The engine family tested above represents the ''worst case'' for emissions of the applicable engine families as based on engine or vehicle parameters reasonably expected to adversely affect the emission results such as maximum gross vehicle weight, maximum engine displacement and any other reasonable engineering judgments,

(c) The determination of ''worst case'' is confirmed by conducting I/M 240 emissions tests of one vehicle or engine of each applicable engine family after conversion,

(d) The results of the I/M 240 tests of the three additional engine families are no greater than the I/M 240 emission results of the original engine family tested,

(e) The additional engine families meet the criteria specified in paragraphs 3.(b)(4)B. through D. of the Addendum, and

(f) The evaporative emission control system remains as installed by the original engine manufacturer if gasoline operation is retained.

6. For both LEV and Tier 1 vehicles or engines, any additional engine families for which emission data would be carried across under paragraph 5. above or paragraph 3.(b)(4) under Option 3 of the Addendum must be produced by the same vehicle or engine manufacturer as the original engine family tested.

7. Any party responsible for demonstrating compliance, installing, converting, selling or marketing alternative fuel conversion systems in accordance with the requirements of the Addendum and this revised policy shall retain the results of all tests, installations and sales of such systems as specified under Option 3 of the Addendum or this Revision for inspection by EPA for five (5) years following completion of the testing, installing or marketing of such systems.

8. Any provisions or requirements of the Addendum not extended or revised herein remain in effect as provided in the Addendum.

C. Conclusion

EPA believes the revisions described above will provide additional flexibility and streamlining to manufacturers, installers and marketers of alternative fuel conversion systems while not jeopardizing the emission reduction purposes of the original Addendum. EPA will continue to review the progress of the industry in developing and testing of alternative fuel systems to

ensure the emissions benefits are being achieved and to determine if any future revisions are necessary. Any questions regarding this revised policy should be directed to the Mobile Source Enforcement Branch at (202) 564–2255.

Bruce C. Buckheit,

Director, Air Enforcement Division, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance.

[FR Doc. 98–15845 Filed 6–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

June 9, 1998.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before July 16, 1998. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Les Smith, Federal Communications, Room 234, 1919 M St., NW., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to lesmith@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Les Smith at 202–418–0214 or via internet at lesmith@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval Number: 3060–0128.

Title: Application for General Mobile Radio Service and Interactive Video Data Service.

Form Number: FCC 574.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Individuals or households; Business and other for-profit entities; Not-for-profit Institutions; State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Respondents: 1,826.

Estimated Time Per Response: 0.5 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirements.

Cost to Respondents: $124,000.

Total Annual Burden: 913 hours (GMRS and IVDS filing fees and postage costs).

Needs and Uses: This form is used by General Mobile Radio Service (GMRS) and some Interactive Video Data Service (IVDS) applicants for a new or modified license. (IVDS Auction applicants use FCC 600.) Applicants my also file this form for renewal when they do not receive the automated renewal notice, FCC Form 574R, sent to them by the Commission. This form is required by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; International Radio Regulations, General Secretariat of International Telecommunications Union and FCC Rules - 47 CFR 1.922, 1.924, 95.71, and 95.73. FCC 574 is also being used by some Interactive Video Data Service licensees until the Universal Licensing System (ULS) is implemented. FCC Rules 47 CFR 95.811, 95.815, 95.817 and 95.833 identify the collection of the data for IVDS purposes.

The Wireless Telecommunications Bureau staff will use the data to determine eligibility of the applicant to hold a radio station authorization and for rulemaking proceedings. Compliance personnel will use the data in conjunction with field engineers for enforcement purposes. The data obtained from the collection is vital to maintaining an acceptable database.

This form is being revised to delete the fee payment blocks. FCC Form 159, Fee Remittance Advice, is required with any payment to the FCC. The fee payment blocks duplicated the collection of this information. A space has been added for the applicant to provide an Internet/e-mail address. The collection of ''FCC Tower Number'' has been changed to ''Antenna Structure Registration Number'' due to the FCC revising the way antennas are registered with the FCC.

When the Universal Licensing System (ULS) is implemented, GMRS applicants will use the proposed FCC form 605 and IVDS applicants will file the proposed FCC 601. At the time of implementation, the FCC will notify OMB of any change in the status of this collection of information.

Federal Communications Commission.

Willima F. Caton,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–15997 Filed 6–15–98; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Report No. 2281]

Petitions for Reconsideration and Clarification of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding

Petitions for reconsideration and clarification have been filed in the Commission's rulemaking proceedings listed in this Public Notice and published pursuant to 47 CFR Section 1.429(e). The full text of these documents are available for viewing and copying in Room 239, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, ITS, Inc., (202) 857–3800. Oppositions to these petitions must be filed July 1, 1998. See Section 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rule (47 CFR 1.4(b)(1)). Replies to an opposition must be filed within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.

Subject: Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings (GC Docket No. 97–113).

Number of Petitions filed: 1.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–15940 Filed 6–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–M

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Ocean Freight Forwarder License Applicants

Notice is hereby given that the following applicants have filed with the Federal Maritime Commission applications for licenses as ocean freight forwarders pursuant to section 19 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. app. 1718 and 46 CFR 510).

Persons knowing of any reason why any of the following applicants should not receive a license are requested to contact the Office of Freight Forwarders,