Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 4164 hours per response. 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.

Respondents/Affected Entities: States, the District of Columbia, Territories, and River Basin Commissions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 59.

Frequency of Response: Reports every 2 years as required by the CWA; annual electronic updates of water quality assessment data is encouraged in 1999 and 2001 and the burden of this activity is included in this renewal request.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 245,676 hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Cost: $0.00.

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques to the following addresses. Please refer to EPA ICR No. 1560.05 and OMB Control No. 2040–0071 in any correspondence.

Ms. Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, OP Regulatory Information Division (2137), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460;

and

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: March 1, 1999.

Richard T. Westlund,

Acting Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 99–5491 Filed 3–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6238–3]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Enforcement Policy Regarding the Sale and Use of Aftermarket Catalytic Converters ICR

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that the following Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval: Enforcement Policy Regarding the Sale and Use of Aftermarket Catalytic Converters; OMB No. 2060–0135; expires 03/31/99. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden and cost; and where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before April 5, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sandy Farmer at EPA by phone at (202) 260–2740, by E-Mail at Farmer.Sandy@epamail.epa.gov or download off the Internet at *http://www.epa.gov/icr* and refer to EPA ICR No. 1292.05.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Enforcement Policy Regarding the Sale and Use of Aftermarket Catalytic Converters, (OMB Control No. 2060–0135; EPA ICR No. 1292.05.) expiring 3/31/99. This is a request for an extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: Section 203(a) of the Clean Air Act (Act), 42 U.S.C. 7522(a), prohibits removing or rendering inoperative automobile emission control devices or elements of design and prohibits the sale or installation of any device that bypasses or renders inoperative emission control elements of design. Prior to the issuance of the aftermarket catalytic converter enforcement policy (51 FR 28114–28119, 28133 (Aug. 5, 1986); 52 FR 42144 (Nov. 3, 1987)), the manufacture, sale or installation of aftermarket catalytic converters not equivalent to new original equipment (OE) converters violated § 203 of the Act. However, current EPA policy allows aftermarket converters to be manufactured and installed, under the conditions that the converters meet certain specified standards; a converter may be installed on a vehicle only if it is the appropriate type and size for that vehicle. The record keeping and testing requirements of the policy are needed to ensure the quality and installation requirements are met.

New aftermarket catalytic converter manufacturers are required, once for each converter line manufactured, to identify physical specifications of the converter and to summarize pre-production testing of the prototype. The manufacturer must report semi-annually the number of each type of converter manufactured, and provide a summary of warranty card information (or copies of the actual cards, at the manufacturer's option). In addition, the manufacturers must keep warranty cards for 5 years, since that is the length of the warranty period.

A company that reconditions used converters must, one time only, identify itself and provide information regarding its converter testing equipment and procedures. All used converters must be individually bench-tested, and the company must report semi-annually the identity of its distributors and the number of reconditioned converters of each type that are sold to the distributor.

Installers of aftermarket converters have no reporting requirements but must keep copies of installation invoices and a record that demonstrates that the installation was justified. Removed converters must be tagged with identifying information and be kept for 15 days.

EPA allows the use of computerized records and pre-printed documents.

Parties who comply with these policies are allowed to manufacture, sell and install aftermarket catalytic converters which are not identical to original equipment (OE) converters.

While the program is voluntary in that converter manufacturers could instead manufacture or install certified OE-equivalent converters, for companies choosing to manufacture converters meeting the less stringent requirements of the policy, all responses are mandatory. EPA has authority to require this information under section 203 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7522, section 114 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7414 and section 208 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7542. Confidentiality of information obtained from parties is protected under 40 CFR part 2.

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. The **Federal Register** document required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on August 5, 1998 (63 FR 41818); no comments were received.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and record keeping burden for this collection of information for new aftermarket catalytic converter manufacturers is estimated to average 4 hours per year (combined average). 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.

Respondents/Affected Entities: Aftermarket catalytic converter manufacturers and re-conditioners and aftermarket converter installers.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 12 new aftermarket catalytic converter manufacturers, 8 used catalytic converter re-conditioners and 17,000 aftermarket converter installers.

Frequency of Response: 3 reports per year for new aftermarket converter manufacturers and one prototype testing event per year; 2 reports per year for used aftermarket conditioners and 8,900 tests of individual converters; installers average 118 recordkeeping activities each year on a per sales transaction basis, with no reporting.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 65,788 hours, including startup hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Cost Burden: $756,444, including annualized startup costs.

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques to the following addresses. Please refer to EPA ICR No. 1292.05 and OMB Control No. 2060–0135 in any correspondence.

Ms. Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Policy, Regulatory Information Division (2137), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460;
and
Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: February 26, 1999.

Richard T. Westlund,

Acting Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 99–5492 Filed 3–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6240–5]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared February 8, 1999 through February 12, 1999 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 10, 1998 (63 FR 17856).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–COE–B32011–RI Rating EO2, Providence River and Harbor Maintenance Dredging Project, To Restore the Navigation Efficiency, Providence River Shipping Channel, Narragansett Bay, R.I.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections with the Corps' preferred Narragansett Bay disposal alternatives (Site 3 and the Watchemoket Cove CAD Disposal Site) and suggested that the Corps give further consideration to disposal at other alternate sites including those in Rhode Island Sound. EPA requested additional information concerning fisheries impacts, current characteristics at the disposal sites, sediment erosion modeling, water quality, compliance with Clean Water Action Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines, and time of year restrictions (dredge windows).

ERP No. D–FAA–B51016–CT Rating EC2, Sikorsky Memorial Airport, Proposed Runway 6–24 Improvements, Construction, Stratford, CT.

SUMMARY: EPA requested additional information about the runway improvements concerning wetlands, endangered species, water quality and mitigation in order to fully evaluate the environmental acceptability of the project.

ERP No. D–NOA–A91065–00 Rating LO, Atlantic Tunas, Swordfish and Sharks, Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan.

Summary: Review of the draft EIS was not deemed necessary. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. D–USA–E11043–GA Rating EC2, U.S. Army/Fort Benning and The Consolidated Government of Columbus Proposed Land Exchange, Muscogee and Chattahoochee Counties, GA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the long-term ramifications of this deed transfer on biologically important species. Additional information will be necessary to determine the actual significance of this property exchange.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–COE–J36049–00, East Grand Forks, Minnesota and Grand Forks, North Dakota Flood Control and Flood Protection, Red River Basin, MN and ND.

Summary: EPA continues to have concerns that this EIS does not take into account the potential reasonably foreseeable development of Devil Lake outlet, which could significantly affect the flow in the Red River. EPA believes the Corps should take a basin wide approach to its analysis including a discussion of the drainage of upper basin wetlands and how it could relate to the shift in flood peaks.

ERP No. F–FHW–B40081–NH

Summary: The Final EIS contains a substantial amount of new information responsive to previously stated concerns about wetlands, water supply, water quality and air quality impacts associated with the project.

ERP No. F–FRC–B03009–ME, Maritimes Phase II Project, Construct and Operate an Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Endangered Species Act (ESA) and NPDE's permits, US Canada border at Woodland (Burleyville) Maine and Westbrook Maine.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the incomplete analysis of direct and secondary impacts and tie-ins to the pipeline, impacts to vernal pools, and elements of contingency plans developed for directional drilling applications.

ERP No. F–FTA–E40774–FL, Central Florida Light Rail Transit System Transportation Improvement to the