

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Regina Magbie, Document Control Officer, Office of Solid Waste (5305W), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, 703-308-7909.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Transfer of Confidential Business Information

Under EPA Contract 68-W6-0053, RTI, and its subcontractors, will assist the Office of Solid Waste, Communications, Information and Resources Management Division, by providing technical support for: Cost Analyses of RCRA Waste Programs and Regulations; Analyses of Environmental and Human Health Effects, Cost and Risk Comparative Analyses; Regulatory Support; Data Collection and Management; Analysis Support Services; and Communications, Outreach, and Public Access. RTI, and its subcontractors, will need access to RCRA CBI submitted to the Office of Solid Waste to complete this work. Specifically, RTI and its subcontractors, need access to the CBI that EPA collects, under the authority of Section 3007 of RCRA, in Industry Studies Surveys and other studies of industries involved with waste management such as: organic and inorganic chemicals, pulp and paper, refuse and waste management, mining, mineral processing, wood preserving, petroleum refining, paint production, and cement kilns.

In accordance with 40 CFR 2.305(h), EPA has determined that RTI, and its subcontractors, require access to CBI submitted to EPA under the authority of RCRA to perform work satisfactorily under the above-noted contract. EPA is submitting this notice to inform all submitters of CBI of EPA's intent to transfer CBI to these firms on a need-to-know basis. Upon completing their review of materials submitted, RTI, and its subcontractors, will return all CBI to EPA.

EPA will authorize RTI, and its subcontractors, for access to CBI under the conditions and terms in EPA's "Contractor Requirements for the Control and Security of RCRA Confidential Business Information Security Manual." Prior to transferring CBI to RTI, and its subcontractors, EPA will review and approve their security plans and RTI, and its subcontractors, will sign non-disclosure agreements.

Dated: October 7, 1996.

Elliott P. Laws,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

[FR Doc. 96-27952 Filed 10-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5643-8]

Investigator-Initiated Grants: Request for Applications

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of request for applications.

SUMMARY: This notice provides information on the availability of the fiscal year 1997 investigator-initiated grants program announcement, in which the areas of research interest, eligibility and submission requirements, evaluation criteria, and implementation schedule are set forth. Grants will be competitively awarded following peer review.

DATES: Proposals must be received at the contact point on a schedule beginning January 15, 1997, through February 15, 1997, depending on the research area.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Center for Environmental Research and Quality Assurance (8703), 401 M Street SW, Washington DC 20460, telephone (800) 490-9194. The complete announcement can be accessed on the Internet from the EPA home page: <http://www.epa.gov/ncercqa>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In its Request for Applications (RFA) the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) invites research grant applications in the following areas of special interest to its mission: (1) Exploratory Research, (2) Ecosystem Indicators, (3) Issues in Human Health Risk Assessment, (4) Endocrine Disruptors, (5) Ambient Air Quality, (6) Health Effects and Exposures to Particulate Matter and Associated Air Pollutants, (7) Drinking Water, and (8) Contaminated Sediments. In cooperation with the National Science Foundation, three areas of interest to both agencies are identified:

(1) Water and Watersheds, (2) Technology for a Sustainable Environment, and (3) Decision-making and Valuation for Environmental Policy.

The RFA provides relevant background information, summarizes EPA's interest in the topic areas, and describes the application and review process. Additional programs to be announced separately will involve cooperation with other agencies.

*Contacts for Research Topics of Interest***Exploratory Research**

- Clyde Bishop, 202-260-5727, bishop.clyde@epamail.epa.gov

Ecosystem Indicators

- Barbara Levinson, 202-260-5983, levinson.barbara@epamail.epa.gov

Issues in Human Health Risk Assessment

- Chris Saint, 202-260-1093, saint.chris@epamail.epa.gov

Endocrine Disruptors

- David Reese, 202-260-7342, reese.david@epamail.epa.gov

Ambient Air Quality

- Deran Pashayan, 202-260-2606, pashayan.deran@epamail.epa.gov

Health Effects and Exposures to Particulate Matter and Associated Air Pollutants

- Deran Pashayan, 202-260-2606, pashayan.deran@epamail.epa.gov

Drinking Water

- Sheila Rosenthal, 202-260-7334, rosenthal.sheila@epamail.epa.gov

Contaminated Sediments

- David Reese, 202-260-7342, reese.david@epamail.epa.gov

Water and Watersheds

- Barbara Levinson, 202-260-5983, levinson.barbara@epamail.epa.gov

Technology for a Sustainable Environment

- Stephen Lingle, 202-260-5748, lingle.stephen@epamail.epa.gov

Decision-making and Valuation for Environmental Policy

- Deborah Hanlon, 202-260-2726, hanlon.deborah@epamail.epa.gov

Dated: October 28, 1996.

Approved for publication:

Robert J. Huggett,

Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 96-27955 Filed 10-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5644-4]

Allocation of Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Monies; Request for Comment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is seeking public comment on allocation of Drinking

Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) monies among States.

The DWSRF program was established by the reauthorized Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), signed by President Clinton on August 6, 1996. The SDWA authorizes \$9.6 billion for the DWSRF program through Fiscal Year 2003. For Fiscal Year 1997, EPA's budget includes \$1.275 billion for the DWSRF program. On a national level, EPA's Office of Water is responsible for implementing the SDWA requirements, including the DWSRF program. As intended by Congress, the DWSRF program will be implemented largely by the States.

DWSRF capitalization grants to States for FY 1997 will be allocated based on the formula used to distribute public water system supervision grant funds in fiscal year 1995 (SDWA Section 1452(a)(1)(D)). Congress has directed that capitalization grants for fiscal year 1998 and subsequent years be distributed among States based on the results of the most recent Drinking Water Needs Survey (SDWA section 1452(a)(1)(D)(ii)). The first Drinking Water Needs Survey was conducted over the last two years with the cooperation of every State. The results of the Survey are required by the reauthorized SDWA to be published by February, 1997.

For FY 1988 and subsequent years, EPA intends to establish a formula which allocates funds to States based on the need identified for each state in the most recent Needs Survey, provided that each State will be allocated a minimum share of one percent of the funds available to the States, as required by law. EPA is requesting comment on the six options for allocation explained here. Commentators may suggest other options within the scope of the law; commentators should remember that the law requires that funds be allocated based on the results of the most recent Drinking Water Needs Survey.

DATE: EPA will accept public comment on this approach until December 2, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Send written comment on these options to Comment Clerk; Water Docket MC-4101; Environmental Protection Agency; 401 M Street, SW; Washington, D.C. 20460. Commentators are requested to submit any reference cited in their comments. Commentators are also requested to submit an original and 3 copies of their written comments and enclosures. Commentators who want receipt of their comments acknowledged should include a self addressed, stamped envelope. All comments must be postmarked or delivered by hand by [insert date 30

days after comment period opens]. No facsimiles (faxes) will be accepted.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Clive Davies (202) 260-1421.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The 1996 amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) provide for a Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund (DWSRF). DWSRF funding started in fiscal year 1997 at the level of \$1.275 billion. As directed by Congress, DWSRF capitalization grants to States for 1997 will be allocated based on the formula used to distribute public water system supervision grant funds in fiscal year 1995. DWSRF funding will likely continue from fiscal year 1998 through at least fiscal year 2003 (SDWA Section 1452(m)).

Congress has directed that capitalization grants for fiscal year 1998 and subsequent years be distributed among States based on the results of the most recent Drinking Water Needs Survey (SDWA Section 1452(a)(1)(D)(ii)).

Drinking Water Needs Survey

The Drinking Water Needs Survey was conducted over the last two years with the cooperation of every State. States participated in design of the survey methodology, the questionnaire, documentation requirements, and the Report to Congress (which will be published this fall). The survey examined the needs of approximately 4,000 water systems and used this information to extrapolate needs for each State. The survey included all but ten of the 795 largest systems. Site visits were performed at about 600 small systems. The result is a very precise estimate of national need that is statistically significant on a State-by-State basis.

The Drinking Water Needs Survey includes needs for Community Water Systems (CWS) only. Both CWSs and not-for-profit non-community water systems (NCWS) are eligible to receive loans from a State's DWSRF (SDWA Section 1452(a)(2)). Unfortunately, resource constraints and limitations on the quality of inventory data made it impossible to include the estimated 19,000 not-for-profit NCWSs in the survey. However, including the not-for-profit NCWSs in a grant allocation formula would not significantly affect distribution of funds. As an exercise to show that the needs of not-for-profit NCWSs would not cause significant variance, all not-for-profit NCWSs were assigned a generous need and included in a needs analysis. The change in the

allocation formula as a result of this exercise proved to be insignificant.

The Needs Survey will present State-by-State needs in several ways. The bottom line of the Needs Survey is Total Need, which reflects capital costs for all drinking water infrastructure projects allowed for inclusion in the Survey. Total Need can be divided into Current Need (projects needed now to protect public health) and Future Need (projects needed over the next 20 years).

The Survey also provides an estimate of each State's Total SDWA Need. The Total SDWA Need is the capital expenditure required for compliance with SDWA regulations. For example, a new filtration plant needed for compliance with the Surface Water Treatment Rule would be counted in both the Total Need and the Total SDWA Need, while a storage tank needed to meet peak demands would be counted in the Total Need, but not in the Total SDWA Need. The Total SDWA Need is divided into Current SDWA Need (projects needed now for SDWA compliance) and Future SDWA Need (projects needed over the next 20 years for compliance with existing or proposed regulations). Proposed regulations included in the Future SDWA Need are for the Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (D/DBPR) and the Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (ESWTR). Distribution system improvements needed for compliance with the Total Coliform Rule are considered SDWA-related needs and are included in the Total Need, but not in the Total SDWA Need.

Options

EPA has developed options for allocating DWSRF funds among States. Preliminary options were presented to State drinking water program administrators at an October 14, 1996, meeting of the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (ASDWA), and comments from the State program administrators have been incorporated into the revised options as presented below.

It should be noted that the options outlined here are for allocation of funds among States. While the choice of an option may affect the level of funding available to each State, such a choice will not affect eligibility of individual projects for funding. Guidance for eligibility of individual projects for funding will be specified in the DWSRF Guidance.

All of the options discussed below assume that each State will receive a minimum share of one percent of the funds available to the States, as required by law. Like State grants, allocations for

the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and Washington, DC, are taken from the funds available to the States. The funds available to the States will be the level of funds appropriated by Congress, less the national set-asides, which include the allocation for Native Americans. This framework was specified by Congress in the 1996 amendments to the SDWA.

Option 1—Total Need

Option 1 is to allocate DWSRF monies to States based on each State's share of the Total Need, provided that each State receives a minimum allocation of one percent of the funds available to States, as required by the law. The Total need is the survey's bottom line and the simplest way of allocating DWSRF grant funds among States. States participating in the October 14, 1996, ASDWA meeting favored this option.

The Total Need is broad and includes all projects that were allowed for collection under the Drinking Water Needs Survey. The Total need includes projects needed now and over the next 20 years in all categories—source rehabilitation and development, storage, treatment, and transmission and distribution. Some types of need were not included in the Drinking Water Needs Survey and are therefore not included in the Total Need. Notable projects not included include those designed solely for future growth, as well as distribution system needs not associated with the Total Coliform Rule.

A formula based on the Total Need does not discriminate between categories and considers all needs equal. The Total Need includes documented projects that water systems believed were important enough to be included in the survey. Under a formula based on Total Need, projects to correct imminent public health threats (e.g., a replacement filter plant) would be given the same weight as less critical needs (e.g., replacing a storage tank that is expected to reach the end of its useful life in five years). However, a formula based on Total Need may be appropriate since the repayment stream from a DWSRF would be used to fund future projects.

Option 2—Current Need

Under Option 2, DWSRF funds would be allocated to States based on each State's share of Current Need, with each State receiving at least one percent of the funds available to States, as required by the law. Current Need is for infrastructure improvements needed now to protect public health. Current Need includes projects needed for compliance with the SDWA ("Current SDWA Needs") and the portion of

current distribution needs tied to the Total Coliform Rule.

Using Current Need as the basis for allocating DWSRF capitalization grant funds would emphasize projects needed now. Examples of Current Needs are replacement of a failing filtration plant and replacement of a storage tank that have reached the end of their useful lives. An allocation formula based on Current Need would place emphasis on Current Need, and also emphasize other important but less critical needs, such as maintenance of adequate storage.

It is impossible that using an allocation formula based on Current Need may penalize States with active enforcement or funding programs. This would be the case if such States were shown to have relatively low levels of Current Need. However, some States with active funding programs also have active capital planning processes. These States, although they may have funded many projects, have many more projects documented. They may also have had a relatively high need reflected in the Drinking Water Needs Survey (undocumented needs were not accepted) and may benefit from an allocation formula based on Current Need.

Option 3—Current SDWA Need

Under Option 3, monies would be allocated to States based on each State's share of Current SDWA Need, with each State receiving a minimum of one percent of the funds available to States, as required by the law. This approach for allocating funds deserves special attention because it deals with improvements required now to ensure compliance with drinking water regulations. Importantly, 84 percent of the Current SDWA Need is for protection against microbiological contaminants. Most of the remainder of the Current SDWA Need is for corrosion control for lead and copper, replacement of lead service lines and treatment or new sources to deal with nitrate contamination. Current SDWA Need does not include distribution need tied to the Total Coliform Rule.

Using Current SDWA Need as the basis for allocating DWSRF capitalization grant funds would emphasize the high-priority projects that fall into this category. Importantly, the 1996 amendments to the SDWA (SDWA Section 1452(b)(3)(A)) state that priority should be given to projects that address the most serious risks to human health and to projects that will ensure compliance with the SDWA.

Option 4—Total SDWA Need

Under Option 4, monies would be allocated to States based on each State's share of Total SDWA Need, with each State receiving a minimum of one percent of the funds available to States, as required by the law. This component of the need includes the Current SDWA Need and Future SDWA Need—both are for improvements required by SDWA regulations. Future SDWA need includes projects needed over the next 20 years for compliance with existing regulations. Future SDWA Need also includes projects for the proposed D/DBPR and ESWTR. Total SDWA Need does not include distribution need tied to the coliform rule.

Using Total SDWA Need as the basis for allocating DWSRF capitalization grant funds would emphasize the high priority of SDWA projects and also give emphasis to projects for compliance with proposed regulations. Please note that the capital need for future regulations is based on national regulatory impact analysis estimates. These estimates used EPA's best knowledge of existing infrastructure and the paths that water systems will likely use to attain compliance. The need for proposed regulations is divided among States based solely on the number of systems in given size categories in each State. It does not factor in geographical differences. Estimates for proposed regulations are rough and not as good as the estimates of need for existing regulations from the Drinking Water Needs Survey.

Options 1 through 4 outline the range of possibilities for use as the basis of a grant allocation formula. Because each has limitations, a hybrid option may be more suitable. The following are examples of hybrid formulas. EPA seeks comment on appropriate hybrid formulas for allocation of DWSRF funding.

Option 5—Hybrid of Current Need and Current SDWA Need

A hybrid formula using the Current Need and Current SDWA Need (e.g., a formula based on 50 percent Current Need and 50 percent Current SDWA Need) would take advantage of the positives of both approaches. The Current Need component of the hybrid formula would take into account all projects needed now that were included in the Drinking Water Needs Survey. The Current SDWA Need component would place emphasis on the projects required now for compliance. Additionally, distribution need associated with the Total Coliform Rule could be factored in.

Option 6—Hybrid to Emphasize Small System Need

Small water systems will likely have a greater need for DWSRF monies than larger systems that have better access to other sources of funding. Small water systems have a comparatively high per-household need and analysis of data shows that small water systems have more trouble than other systems in maintaining compliance with drinking water regulations.

A formula could be constructed to give extra weight to small systems, which could be defined as systems serving fewer than 10,000, or 3,300, or some other level, as appropriate. For example, 50 percent of the formula could be based on Total Need (or Current Need, or Current SDWA Need) and the other 50 percent could be based on the Total Need (or Current Need, or Current SDWA Need) of systems serving fewer than 10,000 persons. Such a formula could include or exclude distribution need tied to the coliform rule.

Dated: October 23, 1996.

Cynthia C. Dougherty,
Director, OGWDW.

[FR Doc. 96-27953 Filed 10-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5644-3]

Notice of Proposed Administrative Settlement Under Section 122(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, Regarding the Photech Superfund Site, Rochester, New York

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of proposed administrative settlement and opportunity for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Section 122(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9622(i), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") Region II announces a proposed administrative settlement pursuant to Section 122(h) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622(h), relating to the Photech Superfund Site ("Site") in Rochester, New York. This Site is not on the National Priorities List established pursuant to Section 105(a) of CERCLA. This notice is being published to inform the public of the proposed settlement and of the opportunity to comment.

The settlement, memorialized in an Administrative Cost Recovery Agreement (the "Agreement"), is being

entered into by EPA and W. Daniel Johnson ("Johnson"). EPA's past and projected response costs at or in connection with the Site do not exceed \$500,000, excluding interest. Under the Agreement, Johnson will reimburse EPA \$50,000 for its response costs at the Site.

DATES: EPA will accept written comments relating to the proposed settlement until December 2, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to the individual below. Comments should reference the Photech Superfund Site and EPA Index No. II-CERCLA-96-0203. For a copy of the Agreement, contact the individual listed below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian E. Carr, Assistant Regional Counsel, New York/Caribbean Superfund Branch, Office of Regional Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 290 Broadway, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10007-1866, telephone: (212) 637-3170.

Dated: October 18, 1996.

William J. Muszynski,
Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96-27954 Filed 10-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collections Being Reviewed by FCC for Extension Under Delegated Authority 5 CFR 1320 Authority, Comments Requested

October 25, 1996.

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 proposed and/or continuing information collections, 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 estimates; (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.

The FCC is reviewing the following information collection requirements for possible 3-year extension under delegated authority 5 CFR 1320, authority delegated to the Commission by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before December 30, 1996. 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 Dorothy Conway, Federal Communications Commission, Room 234, 1919 M St., N.W., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to dconway@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Dorothy Conway at 202-418-0217 or via internet at dconway@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval Number: 3060-0119.

Title: Section 90.145 Special

temporary authority.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of existing collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 6,000.

Estimated Time Per Response: .5 hours.

Total Annual Burden: 3,000 hours.

Total Annual Cost: 0.

Needs and Uses: The reporting requirement contained in Section 90.145 is necessary to determine if a grant of a Special temporary authorization (STA) is warranted and to allow the Commission to have certain minimum information about the radio station's characteristics should interference problems arise. In the absence of this requirement, applicants would be unable to meet their special and emergency needs for communications since they would have to go through the full written application process specified by section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

OMB Approval Number: 3060-0286.

Title: Section 80.302 Notice of discontinuance, reduction, or impairment of service involving a distress watch.