ADDRESSES: Public comments should be sent to: State Assistance Program (8P2–SA); Attention: NPDES Permits; U.S. EPA, Region VIII; 999 18th Street, Suite 500; Denver, CO 80202–2466.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For a copy of the draft permit and Fact Sheet, please write William Kennedy at the above address or telephone (303) 312–6285. Copies of the draft permit and Fact Sheet may also be downloaded from the EPA Region VIII web page at http://www.epa.gov/region08/html/npdes/lagoons.html. Questions regarding the specific permit requirements may be directed to Bruce Kent, telephone (303) 312–6133.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: It is proposed that general permits be issued for discharges from wastewater lagoon systems located on the following Indian Reservations:

Permit No.	Indian Reservation
Montana:	
MTG581### ..	Blackfeet Indian Reservation;
MTG582### ..	Crow Indian Reservation;
MTG583### ..	Flathead Indian Reservation;
MTG584### ..	Fort Belknap Indian Reservation;
MTG585### ..	Fort Peck Indian Reservation;
MTG586### ..	Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation; and,
MTG587### ..	Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation.
North Dakota:	
NDG581### ..	Fort Berthold Indian Reservation;
NDG582### ..	Fort Totten Indian Reservation—Also known as Devils Lake Indian Reservation;
NDG583### ..	Standing Rock Indian Reservation—Includes the entire Reservation, which is located in both North Dakota and South Dakota; and,
NDG584### ..	Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation.
South Dakota:	
SDG581### ..	Cheyenne River Indian Reservation;
SDG582### ..	Crow Creek Indian Reservation;
SDG583### ..	Flandreau Indian Reservation;
SDG584### ..	Lower Brule Indian Reservation;
SDG585### ..	Pine Ridge Indian Reservation—Includes the entire Reservation, which is located in both South Dakota and Nebraska; and,
SDG586### ..	Rosebud Indian Reservation.
Utah:	
UTG581### ..	Northern Shoshoni Indian Reservation;
UTG582### ..	Paiute Indian Reservations—several very small reservations, including Cedar City, Indian Peaks, Kanosh, Koosharem, and Shivwits, located in the southwest quarter of Utah;
UTG583### ..	Skull Valley Indian Reservation; and,
UTG584### ..	Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation.
Wyoming:	
WYG581###	Wind River Indian Reservation.

General permits are not being issued for the portions of the Navajo Indian Reservation and the Goshutes Indian Reservation in Utah since the permitting activities for these reservations are done by Region IX of EPA. Also, general permits are not being issued for the Southern Ute Indian Reservation located in the State of Colorado and the Ute Mountain Indian Reservation located in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah because of water quality concerns in the San Juan River Basin portion of the Colorado River Basin.

Coverage under the general permits will be limited to lagoon systems treating primarily domestic wastewater and will include the following three categories: (1) lagoons where no permission is required before starting to discharge; (2) permission is required before starting to discharge; and (3) the lagoon system is required to have no discharge. The effluent limitations for lagoons coming under categories 1 and 2 are based on the Federal Secondary Treatment Regulation (40 CFR part 133) and best professional judgement (BPJ). There are provisions in the general permits for adjusting the effluent limitations on total suspended solids (TSS) and pH in accordance with the provisions of the Secondary Treatment Regulation. If more stringent and/or additional effluent limitations are considered necessary to comply with applicable water quality standards, etc., those limitations may be imposed by written notification to the permittee. Lagoon systems under category 3 are required to have no discharge except in accordance with the bypass provisions of the permit. Self-monitoring requirements and routine inspection requirements are included in the permits.

With the exception of the Flathead Indian Reservation and the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, where the Tribes have Clean Water Act section 401(a)(1) certification authority, EPA intends to certify that the permit complies with the applicable provisions of the Clean Water Act so long as the permittees comply with all permit conditions. The permits will be issued for a period of five years, with the permit effective date and expiration date determined at the time of issuance.

Economic Impact (Executive Order 12866): EPA has determined that the issuance of this general permit is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under the terms of Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735 (October 4, 1993)) and is therefore not subject to formal OMB review prior to proposal.

Paperwork Reduction Act: EPA has reviewed the requirements imposed on regulated facilities in these proposed general permits under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq. The information collection requirements of these permits have already been approved by the Office of Management and Budget in submissions made for the NPDES permit program under the provisions of the Clean Water Act.

Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA): After review of the facts present in the notice printed above, I hereby certify pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that these general permits will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Authority: Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.*

Dated: June 3, 1998.

Kerrigan G. Clough,

Assistant Regional Administrator, Office of Pollution Prevention, State and Tribal Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–15446 Filed 6–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

DATE AND TIME: Thursday, June 18, 1998 at 2 p.m. (Eastern Time).

PLACE: EEOC's Baltimore District Office, Conference Room on the fourth floor of the City Crescent Building, 10 South Howard Street, Baltimore, MD 21201.

STATUS: The meeting will be open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Open Session

1. Announcement of Notation Votes,
2. Panel discussion on Charge Processing and Mediation, and
3. Panel discussion on Outreach, Education and Technical Assistance.

Note: Any matter not discussed or concluded may be carried over to a later meeting. (In addition to publishing notices on EEOC Commission meetings in the **Federal Register,** the Commission also provides a recorded announcement a full week in advance on future Commission sessions.) Please telephone (202) 663–7100 (voice) and (202) 663–4074 (TTD) at any time for information on these meetings. Contact Person for More Information: Frances M. Hart, Executive Officer on (202) 663–4070.

Dated: June 4, 1998.

Frances M. Hart,

Executive Officer, Executive Secretariat.

[FR Doc. 98–15365 Filed 6–8–98; 2:32 pm]

BILLING CODE 6750–06–M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket 96–45, 97–160; DA 98–1055; APD No. 98–1]

Forward-Looking Cost Studies for Universal Service Support; Request for Comments

Released: June 4, 1998.

1. In the *Universal Service Order,* 62 FR 32862 (June 17, 1997), the Commission determined that federal universal service high cost support should be based on forward-looking economic cost.[1] In this Public Notice, we seek comment on whether the cost studies submitted by individual states meet the Commission's specified criteria. In addition, we seek comment on Ameritech Michigan's request for waiver of the Commission's authorized ranges of economic lives and future net salvage percentages used to calculate depreciation expenses. Comments from interested parties are due on or before June 25, 1998, and reply comments are due on or before July 9, 1998.

Background

2. In the *Universal Service Order,* the Commission adopted a plan for universal service support for rural, insular, and high cost areas that will replace existing implicit federal subsidies with explicit, competitively neutral federal universal service support mechanisms.[2] The Commission determined that, beginning January 1, 1999, non-rural carriers will receive support based on the forward-looking economic cost of providing the supported services. The Commission concluded that states could submit forward-looking economic cost studies as the basis for calculating federal universal service high cost support for non-rural carriers in lieu of using the federal mechanism selected by the Commission.[3] The Commission adopted specific criteria to guide the states as they conducted those studies.[4] In a Public Notice released February 27, 1998, the Commission stated its intent to review each cost study submitted by a state, along with all applicable comments, in determining whether the state cost study complies with the criteria established in the *Universal Service Order.*[5]

Issues for Comment

3. On May 26, 1998, the following states submitted forward-looking cost studies to be used in lieu of the federal mechanism for determining federal universal service high cost support: Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, and South Carolina. We seek comment on whether these cost studies meet the criteria specified in the *Universal Service Order* and, therefore, should be approved by the Commission for use in calculating federal support for non-rural carriers in rural, insular, and high cost areas in those states. To the extent that information and data relating to the state cost studies has been provided electronically to the Commission, it will be available for review via the Internet, beginning June 8, 1998, at http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/cost_studies.

4. We also seek comment on the request for waiver filed by Ameritech Michigan relating to the cost study submitted for use in Michigan. Specifically, Ameritech Michigan requests that the Commission waive the requirement established in criterion 5 of the *Universal Service Order* that economic lives and future net salvage percentages used to calculate depreciation expenses must be within Commission authorized ranges.[6] Ameritech notes that ''11 of the 15 plant categories used in the [Michigan] universal service cost study fall outside the FCC life ranges.''[7]

Procedure for Filing

5. Comments should reference CC Docket Nos. 96–45, 97–160 and must include the DA number and APD number shown on this Public Notice. Interested parties must file an original and five copies of their comments with the Office of Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Room 222, 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, DC 20554. Parties should send three copies of their comments to Sheryl Todd, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 2100 M. St, NW, 8th Floor, Washington, DC 20554. Parties should send one copy of their comments to the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

6. Commenters may also file informal comments or an exact copy of formal comments electronically via the Internet at <bclopton@fcc.gov>. Only one copy of electronically-filed comments must be submitted. A commenter must note whether an electronic submission is an exact copy of formal comments on the subject line. A commenter also must include its full name and Postal Service mailing address in its submission.

7. Parties are also asked to submit their comments and reply comments on diskette. Such diskette submissions are in addition to and not a substitute for the formal filing requirements addressed above. Parties submitting diskettes should submit them to Bryan Clopton of the Accounting Policy Division, Common Carrier Bureau, 2100 M Street, NW, 8th floor, Washington, DC 20554. Such a submission should be on a 3.5 inch diskette formatted in an IBM compatible form using WordPerfect 5.1 for Windows or compatible software. The diskette should be submitted in ''read only'' mode. The diskette should be clearly labelled with the party's name, proceeding, type of pleading (comment or reply comments) and date of submission. Each diskette should contain only one party's comments in a single electronic file. The diskette should be accompanied by a cover letter.

---

[1] Federal State Joint Board on Universal Service, *Report & Order,* CC Docket No. 96–45, 12 FCC Rcd 8776, 8899 paras. 224–25, (1997) (*Universal Service Order*) 62 FR 32862 (June 17, 1997).

[2] *Universal Service Order,* 12 FCC Rcd at 8888–8951.

[3] *Universal Service Order,* 12 FCC Rcd at 8912 para. 248.

[4] *Universal Service Order,* 12 FCC Rcd at 8913–8916 para. 250.

[5] State Forward-Looking Cost Studies for Federal Universal Service Support, CC Docket Nos. 96–45, 97–160, DA 98–217, *Public Notice* (rel. Feb. 27, 1998) at 1.

[6] *Universal Service Order,* 12 FCC Rcd at 8914 para. 250.

[7] Ameritech Request for Waiver filed May 26, 1998 at 1–2. The Michigan Public Service Commission noted that by approving the Ameritech Michigan study, it was neither explicitly or implicitly seeking a waiver of the criterion 5 requirement on behalf of Ameritech. *In the matter of application of Ameritech Michigan, Before the Michigan Public Service Commission,* Case No. U–11635 at 5 (May 11, 1998).