injection well. Class II wells dispose (via injection) of fluids that are brought to the surface in connection with natural gas storage operations or primary oil or natural gas development and production. These fluids may be commingled with waste waters from gas plants which are an integral part of production operations, unless these fluids are classified as a hazardous waste at the time of production. Class II wells also may inject fluids for enhanced recovery of oil or natural gas or for storage of hydrocarbons which are liquid at standard temperature and pressure. (See 40 CFR Section 144.6.)

If the application by the Fort Peck Tribes is approved, the Tribes would be responsible for regulating injection into Class II wells. The program described in the Tribes' application would require that any injection into Class II wells be done in compliance with Triballyissued permits, which will include technical requirements for the protection of USDWs. These requirements include criteria for construction, testing, operation, monitoring, and abandonment of Class II injection wells. At present, there are approximately 28 Class II injection wells on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation.

The EPA has held primary enforcement authority for the UIC program on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation in Montana since the program was implemented in 1984. If the Tribes' application is approved, the Tribes would assume primary enforcement authority (except for the authority to take criminal actions against non-Indians, which the EPA would retain) for the regulation of all Class II injection wells on all lands within the exterior boundaries of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation. The EPA would retain regulatory and enforcement authority for all other classes of injection wells. However, the Tribes would not be prevented from implementing any more stringent enforcement program of their own for any type of injection wells.

The Tribes' submission includes a proposed Tribal Code, a program description, copies of all applicable rules and forms, statements from Tribal counsel, and a proposed memorandum of agreement between the EPA and the Tribes.

Dated: September 4, 1997.

Kerrigan G. Clough,

Assistant Regional Administrator, Office of Pollution Prevention, State and Tribal Assistance, Region VIII, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

[FR Doc. 97–24146 Filed 9–11–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-5484-3]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 or (202) 564–7153. Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements filed September 2, 1997 through September 5, 1997 pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 970350, Draft EIS, COE, CA, Upper Guadalupe River Feasibility Study, Flood Control Protection, Construction, National Economic Development Plan (NED), Santa Clara Valley Water District, City of San Jose, Santa Clara County, CA, Due: October 27, 1997, Contact: William DeJager (415) 977–8670.

EIS No. 970351, Draft EIS, BLM, NV, Olinghouse Mine Project, Construction of Two Open Pits, Waste Dump, Haul Road and Cyanide Heap Leach Pads, Plan-of-Operation, Carson City, Washoe County, NV, Due: November 14, 1997, Contact: Terri Knutson (702) 885–6156.

EIS No. 970352, Draft EIS, FHW, WA, NE 8TH/I–405 Interchange Project, Construction, Funding, Right-of-Way Use Permit and NPDES Stormwater Permit, City of Bellevue, King County, WA, Due: October 27, 1997, Contact: Gene Fong (425) 452–6827.

EIS No. 970353, Draft Supplement, COE, CA, Sacramento River Bank Protection Project, Implemention of Streambank Protection for the Lower American River between RM–0 and 13.7, Updated Information, City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, CA, Due: October 27, 1997, Contact: Matt Davis (916) 557–1534.

EIS No. 970354, Final EIS, AFS, WA, Long Draw Salvage Sale, Implementation, Okanogan National Forest, Tonasket Ranger District, Okanogan County, WA, Due: October 14, 1997, Contact: John Townsley (509) 826–3568.

EIS No. 970355, Final EIS, AFS, AZ, Eastern Roosevelt Lake Watershed Analysis Area Grazing Strategy and Associated Range Improvements Management Plan, Development and Implementation, Tonto National Forest, Tonto Basin Ranger District, Gila County, AZ, Due: October 14, 1997, Contact: Linny Warren (520) 467–3200.

EIS No. 970356, Final EIS, FHW, VA, DC, MD, Woodrow Wilson Bridge Improvement, I–95 from the Telegraph Road/Capital Beltway Interchange in Alexandria, VA to the MD–210/Capital Beltway Interchange in Oxon Hill, MD, Funding, Section 10 and 404 Permits and CGD Bridge Permit, Fairfax County, VA; Prince George's County, MD, and DC, Due: October 14, 1997, Contact: David C. Lawton (410) 962–0077.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 970290, Final EIS, FHW, CO, CO–82 Highway Transportation Project, Improvements to "Entrance to Aspen", Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, City of Aspen, Pitkin County, CO, Due: October 6, 1997, Contact: Ron Speral (303) 969–6737. Published FR–09–12–97—Review Period Reestablished.

Dated: September 9, 1997.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 97-24240 Filed 9-11-97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5892-2]

National Drinking Water Advisory Council Operator Certification Working Group; Notice of Open Meeting

Under section 10(a)(2) of Public Law 92-423, "The Federal Advisory Committee Act," notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Operator Certification Working Group of the National Drinking Water Advisory Council, established under the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. S300f et seq.), will be held on September 22, 1997, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., and on September 23, 1997, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. in Meeting Room 4, at the Renaissance Washington D.C. Hotel, 999 9th Street, NW, Washington, DC. The meeting is open to the public to observe, but due to past experience, seating will be limited.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the key standards for a State operator certification program. The working group members are meeting to discuss and comment on proposed issue papers for deliberation by the advisory council. Statements from the public will

be taken at the end of the meeting if time allows.

For more information, please contact Richard Naylor, Designated Federal Officer, Operator Certification Working Group, U.S. EPA, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (4606), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. The telephone number is (202) 260–5135 and to e-mail address is naylor.richardopamail.epa.gov.

Dated: September 9, 1997.

Charlene Shaw,

Designated Federal Officer, National Drinking Water Advisory Council.

[FR Doc. 97-24238 Filed 9-11-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

September 8, 1997.

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 November 12, 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 as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, Room 234, 1919 M St., N.W., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to jboley@fcc.gov.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval No.: 3060–0704.

Title: Policy and Rules Concerning the Interstate, Interexchange Marketplace, Implementation of Section 254(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, CC Docket No. 96–61.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other forprofit entities.

Number of Respondents: 519. Estimated Hour Per Response: 146 hours per response (average).

Frequency of Response: On occasion, annual one-time reporting requirement. Cost to Respondents: \$435,000.
Estimated Total Annual Burden:

75,895 hours.

Needs and Uses: In the Order on
Reconsideration issued in CC Docket
96–61 (released 8/20/97), the
Commission amended the collections
adopted in the Second Report and Order

in this proceeding.

a. Tariff cancellation requirement: In the Order on Reconsideration, the Commission concludes that, with two exceptions, the statutory forbearance criteria in Section 10 of the Communications Act. as amended, are met for the Commission no longer to require or allow nondominant interexchange carriers to file tariffs pursuant to Section 203 for their interstate, domestic, interexchange services. The Commission further concludes that nondominant interexchange carriers are allowed to file tariffs for: (1) Their interstate, domestic, interexchange direct-dial services to which end-users obtain access by dialing a carrier's carrier access code (dial-around 1+services), and (2) interstate, domestic, interexchange services provided by a nondominant interexchange carrier for the lesser period of the initial 45 days of service or until there is a written contract between the carrier and the customer, in those limited circumstances in which a prospective customer contacts the LEC to select an interexchange carrier or to initiate a change in his or her primary carrier. See 47 CFR Section 61.20.

In order to implement the Commission's detariffing policy, the Second Report and Order requires nondominant interexchange carriers to cancel their tariffs for interstate, domestic, interexchange services on file with the Commission within nine months of the effective date of that Order. That requirement, however, was not implemented by the carriers in light of the stay of the Second Report and Order, pending judicial review, entered by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on February 13, 1997. The Order on Reconsideration provides that the Common Carrier Bureau will determine the appropriate transition period when the detariffing rules become effective. Nondominant interexchange carriers that have on file with the Commission tariff offerings that contain services subject to different tariffing requirements (e.g., tariff offerings that include dial-around 1+services and service to new customers that contact the LEC to select an interexchange carrier or to initiate a change in their primary interexchange carrier, for which carriers are permitted to file tariffs, and tariff offerings that combine international services, which still must be tariffed, with interstate, domestic, interexchange services, which are detariffed), may comply with the Order on Reconsideration either by: (1) Cancelling the entire tariff and refiling a new tariff for only those services for which tariffs are required or permitted $(519 \text{ respondents} \times 2 \text{ hours per page} =$ 2504 annual burden hours); or (2) issuing revised pages cancelling the material in the tariffs that pertain to those services subject to forbearance $(519 \text{ respondents} \times 2 \text{ hours per page} =$ 72,094 burden hours).

b. Information disclosure requirement: The Order on Reconsideration eliminates the requirement that nondominant interexchange carriers make information on current rates, terms, and conditions for all of their interstate, domestic, interexchange services available to any member of the public in an easy to understand format and in a timely manner, for purposes of enforcing Section 254(g) of the Communications Act, as amended.

c. Recordkeeping requirement: In the Order on Reconsideration, the Commission affirms its conclusion in the Second Report and Order to require nondominant interexchange carriers to maintain at their premises price and service information regarding all of their interstate, domestic, interexchange service offerings that they can submit to the Commission upon request. The