

important information gaps are filled concurrently to define identified remediation alternatives more clearly, and possibly to identify new and better ones. As part of this strategy, periodic independent scientific and technical expert reviews should be conducted so that deficiencies may be recognized and midcourse corrections be made in the operational program.

*Response 7:* DOE agrees with the Council that periodic independent scientific and technical expert reviews are essential to the success of the TWRS program. While carrying out the current decisions, DOE will continually evaluate new information relative to the tank waste remediation program. DOE also intends to conduct formal evaluations of new information relative to the tank waste remediation program at three key points over the next eight years under its NEPA regulations (10 CFR 1021.314), with an appropriate level of public involvement, to ensure that DOE will stay on a correct course for managing and remediating the waste. As remediation proceeds in the coming years, DOE will learn more about management and remediation of the tank waste and ways to protect public and worker health and the environment. Within this time frame, DOE will obtain additional information on the effectiveness of retrieval technologies, characteristics of the tank wastes, effectiveness of waste separation and immobilization techniques, and more definitive data on the costs of retrieval, separations, and immobilization of the waste. These formal reevaluations will incorporate the latest information on these topics. DOE will conduct these formal evaluations of the entire TWRS program at the following stages: (1) before proceeding into Privatization Phase I Part B (scheduled for May 1998); (2) prior to the start of hot operations of Privatization Phase I Part B (scheduled for December 2002/December 2003); and (3) before deciding to proceed with Privatization Phase II (scheduled for December 2005). In conducting these reviews, DOE will seek the advice of independent experts from the scientific and financial community, such as the National Academy of Sciences which will focus on performance criteria and the costs of waste treatment. DOE has established a TWRS Privatization Review Board consisting of Senior DOE representatives to provide on-going assistance and interactive oversight of the review of Part A deliverables and discussions with the contractors.

Informal evaluations also will be conducted as the information warrants. These formal and informal evaluations

will help DOE to determine whether previous decisions need to be changed.

#### *Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife Comment*

*Comment:* The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife recommends that the following language be included in the Record of Decision:

"The site selection of the precise location of remediation facilities for the selected alternative shall be subject to future supplemental NEPA analysis. This supplemental NEPA analysis shall commit to a supplemental Mitigation Action Plan. The Mitigation Action Plan and supplemental Mitigation Action Plan will be prepared in consultation with the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, with input from the Hanford Site's Natural Resource Trustee Council."

"Impacts to State priority shrub-steppe habitat would be one of the evaluation criteria used in site selection. The site selection process would include the following hierarchy of measures:

- Avoid priority shrub-steppe habitat to the extent feasible by locating or configuring project elements in pre-existing disturbed areas.
- Minimize project impacts to the extent feasible by modifying facility layouts and/or altering construction timing."

"Compensatory mitigation measures for the loss of shrub-steppe habitat shall be identified and implemented in the supplemental NEPA analysis and Mitigation Action Plan."

*Response:* DOE believes that the following approach satisfies the substance of these comments.

The EIS (Section 5.20) describes both mitigation measures that are integral parts of all of the alternatives (Section 5.20.1) and further mitigation measures that could be implemented when indicated or appropriate (Section 5.20.2). In selecting the preferred alternative DOE has committed to all of the mitigation measures in Section 5.20.1, which include measures to restore newly disturbed areas. As the State requested, the Record of Decision commits to conducting NEPA analysis for site selection of facilities.

DOE intends to implement those further measures described in Section 5.20.2 as may be necessary to mitigate potential impacts on priority shrub-steppe habitat, and will consider the potential for such impacts as a factor in the site selection process for TWRS facilities. The site selection process will include the following hierarchy of measures: (1) avoid undisturbed shrub-

steppe areas to the extent feasible; (2) minimize impacts to the extent feasible; (3) restore temporarily disturbed areas; (4) compensate for unavoidable impacts by replacing habitat; and (5) manage critical habitat on a Sitewide basis.

DOE believes that mitigation of impacts to habitats of special importance to the ecological health of the region is most effective when planned and implemented on a sitewide basis. Recognizing this, DOE is preparing a sitewide biological management plan to protect these resources. Under this sitewide approach, the potential impacts of all projects would be evaluated and appropriate mitigation would be developed based on the cumulative impacts to the ecosystem. Mitigation to reduce the ecological impacts from TWRS remediation would be performed in compliance with the sitewide biological management plan. Mitigation would focus on disturbance of contiguous, mature sagebrush-dominated shrub-steppe habitat. Compensation (habitat replacement) would occur where DOE deems appropriate. Specific mitigation ratios, sites, and planting strategies (e.g., plant size, number, and density) for TWRS facilities and operations would be defined in the TWRS Mitigation Action Plan, which would be revised for each specific TWRS facility siting decision. The Mitigation Action Plan would be prepared in consultation with the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Tribal Nations, with input from the Hanford Site's Natural Resources Trustee Council. DOE will make the Mitigation Action Plan publicly available before taking action that is the subject of a mitigation commitment.

[FR Doc. 97-4696 Filed 2-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

## **Energy Information Administration**

### **Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request**

**SUMMARY:** The Energy Information Administration (EIA) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed three year clearance with no changes to the forms EIA-800-804, 807, 810-814, 816, 817, 819M, and 820 of EIA's Petroleum Supply Reporting System.

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted on or before April 28, 1997. 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 of your intention to do so as soon as possible.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to Michael Conner, Energy Information Administration, EI-421, Forrestal Building, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586-1795, e-mail mconner@eia.doe.gov, and FAX (202) 586-5846.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** Requests for additional information or copies of the form and instructions should be directed to Michael Conner at the address listed above.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

- I. Background
- II. Current Actions
- III. Request for Comments

##### **I. Background**

In order to fulfill its responsibilities under the Federal Energy Information Administration Act of 1974 (Pub. L. No. 93-275) and the Department of Energy Organization Act (Pub. L. No. 95-91), the Energy Information Administration is obliged to carry out a central, comprehensive, and unified energy data and information program. As part of this program, EIA collects, evaluates, assembles, analyzes, and disseminates data and information related to energy resource reserves, production, demand, and technology, and related economic and statistical information relevant to the adequacy of energy resources to meet demands in the near and longer term future for the Nation's economic and social needs.

The Energy Information Administration, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden (required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13)), conducts a presurvey consultation program to provide the general public and other Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing reporting forms. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden is minimized, reporting forms are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Also, EIA will later seek approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for the collections under Section 3507(h) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. No. 104-13, Title 44, U.S.C. Chapter 35).

The Petroleum Supply Reporting System collects data necessary for determining the supply and disposition of crude oil, finished petroleum

products, and natural gas liquids. These data are published by the Energy Information Administration in the Weekly Petroleum Status Report, Petroleum Supply Monthly, and the Petroleum Supply Annual. Respondents to the surveys are producers of oxygenates, operators of petroleum refining facilities, blending plants, bulk terminals, crude oil and product pipelines, natural gas plant facilities, tanker and barge operators, and oil importers.

##### **II. Current Actions**

The Energy Information Administration will request a three year clearance with no changes to the existing collection forms.

##### **III. Request for Comments**

Prospective respondents and other interested parties should comment on the actions discussed in item II. The following guidelines are provided to assist in the preparation of responses. (If the notice covers more than one form, add "Please indicate to which form(s) your comments apply.")

##### *General Issues*

A. Is the proposed collection of information necessary, taking into account its accuracy, adequacy, and reliability, and the agency's ability to process the information it collects in a useful and timely fashion.

B. What enhancements can EIA make to the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

##### *As a Potential Respondent*

A. Are the instructions and definitions clear and sufficient? If not, which instructions require clarification?

B. Can data be submitted in accordance with the due date specified in the instructions?

C. EIA allows for respondents to report manually or by using the Petroleum Electronic Data Reporting Option (PEDRO) for all forms except the EIA-807, EIA-819M, and EIA-820. EIA believes that reporting using PEDRO takes less time than manual reporting. Estimated public reporting burden for the collections are listed below. For those forms that utilize PEDRO, two estimates are provided: the first is for an average report prepared manually and the second is for an average report submitted using PEDRO. The burden estimates are: EIA-800, 1 hour 15 minutes (manual submission) and 1 hour (PEDRO submission); EIA-801, 45 minutes and 30 minutes; EIA-802, 45 minutes and 30 minutes; EIA-803, 30 minutes and 15 minutes; EIA-804, 1 hour 15 minutes and 1 hour; EIA-807,

1 hour for weekly reports from October through March, and 30 minutes for monthly reports from April through September; EIA-810, 3 hours 45 minutes and 2 hours; EIA-811, 1 hour 45 minutes and 1 hour; EIA-812, 2 hours 15 minutes and 1 hour 30 minutes; EIA-813, 1 hour 30 minutes and 45 minutes; EIA-814, 2 hours and 1 hour 15 minutes; EIA-816, 45 minutes and 30 minutes; EIA-817, 1 hour 45 minutes and 1 hour; EIA-819M, 30 minutes; and EIA-820, 2 hours. Burden includes the total time, effort, or financial resources expended to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide the information including: (1) reviewing instructions; (2) developing, acquiring, installing, and utilizing technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, verifying, processing, maintaining, disclosing and providing information; (3) adjusting the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; (4) training personnel to respond to a collection of information; (5) searching data sources; (6) completing and reviewing the collection of information; and (7) transmitting, or otherwise disclosing the information.

Please comment on (1) the accuracy of our estimate and (2) how the agency could minimize the burden of the collection of information, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

D. What are the estimated (1) total dollar amount annualized for capital and start-up costs, and (2) recurring annual dollar amount of operation, maintenance, and purchase of service costs associated with this data collection? The estimates should take into account the costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information. Estimates should not include purchases of equipment or services made as part of customary and usual business practices, or the cost of any burden hours for completing the form. EIA estimates that there are no additional costs other than those that the respondent incurs in keeping the information for its own uses.

E. Do you know of any other Federal, State, or local agency that collects similar data? If you do, specify the agency, the data element(s), and the methods of collection.

##### *As a Potential User*

A. Can you use data at the levels of detail indicated on the form?

B. For what purpose would you use the data? Be specific.

C. Are there alternate sources of data and do you use them? If so, what are their deficiencies and/or strengths?

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of the form. They also will become a matter of public record.

Statutory Authority: Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. No. 104-13).

Issued in Washington, D.C. February 20, 1997.

Lynda T. Carlson,

*Director, Office of Statistical Standards,  
Energy Information Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-4694 Filed 2-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

## **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. CP97-246-000]

### **ANR Pipeline Company; Notice of Application**

February 20, 1997.

Take notice that on February 14, 1997, ANR Pipeline Company (ANR), 500 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan 48243, filed an application pursuant to Sections 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations for authorization to utilize temporary work spaces and for any other authorization deemed necessary associated with a pipeline replacement project in Kendall County, Illinois, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

ANR states, that in order to satisfy U.S. Department of Transportation safety regulations, it proposes to replace both a 0.27 mile and 0.29 mile line segment of its main line system due to increased population density in the area. ANR states that in order to make the replacement it will have to utilize work areas which may not have been included in the scope of the original authorization to construct the facilities. Therefore, ANR requests the temporary use of work space and any other authorizations deemed necessary by the Commission in order to make the replacement. ANR states that the construction will be done under the authority of Section 2.55 of the Commission's Regulations, which authorizes replacement within the existing right-of-way.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before March 13, 1997, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington,

D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) and the regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party in any proceeding herein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in any subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that permission and approval for the proposed abandonment are required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for ANR to appear or to be represented at the hearing.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-4673 Filed 2-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. ER97-1170-000]

### **Bangor Hydro Electric Company; Notice of Filing**

February 20, 1997.

Take notice that on December 31, 1996, Bangor Hydro Electric Company tendered for filing a Pro Forma Open Access Transmission Tariff. Bangor Hydro states that this submittal is to remove higher voltage network facilities from its tariff.

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, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before

February 27, 1997. 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.

Lois D. Cashell,

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-4721 Filed 2-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-408-018]

### **Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Compliance Filing**

February 20, 1997.

Take notice that on February 14, 1997, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the tariff sheets listed on Appendix A to the filing, to become effective on February 1, 1997.

On December 31, 1996, as revised on January 17, 1997, Columbia filed revised tariff sheets in Docket No. RP95-408, et al. that, inter alia, would implement lower settlement rates pending Commission action on the November 22, 1996 settlement in this docket, contingent upon customers being subject to a surcharge in the event the settlement is not approved or implemented. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) issued its order on Columbia's filings on January 29, 1997 (78 FERC ¶ 61,071), which accepted the revised tariff sheets but which required that Columbia file revised tariff sheets setting forth the existing rates which any customer that does not agree to the surcharge provision may pay until the settlement is acted upon by the Commission.

Columbia states that the instant filing is being made in compliance with that order. The revised tariff sheets herein indicate they are "Collection Rates" and contain a statement that they are applicable to customers not wanting to be subject to the surcharge condition associated with paying the Settlement Rates. These tariff sheets reflect the rates that were in effect in the billing month preceding February 1, 1997.

Columbia states that copies of its filing have been mailed to all parties in this proceeding, firm and interruptible customers, and affected state commissions.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the