water systems associated with soil particles carried by erosion, however, paraquat is immobile in most soils, and at very high application rates (50–1,000X), there was no desorption of paraquat from soils. Therefore, based on paraquat's normal use patterns and unique environmental fate characteristics, exposures to paraquat in drinking water are not expected to be obtained from surface water sources.

4. *Non-dietary exposure.* Paraquat dichloride has no residential or other non-occupational uses that might result in non-occupational, non-dietary exposure for the general population. Paraquat products are Restricted Use, for use by Certified Applicators only, which means the general public cannot buy or use paraquat products.

D. Cumulative Effects

In assessing the potential risk from cumulative effects of paraquat and other chemical substances, the Agency has considered structural similarities that exist between paraquat and other bipyridylium compounds such as diquat dibromide. Examination of the toxicology databases of paraquat and diquat dibromide, indicates that the two compounds have clearly different target organs. Based on available data, the Agency does not believe that the toxic effects produced by paraquat would be cumulative with those of diquat dibromide.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population.* Based on the information provided in this notice, EPA has determined that for the aggregate exposure assessment the only exposure route of concern for paraquat is chronic dietary. The toxicology database for paraquat is considered by EPA to be complete and reliable. Using the conservative assumptions presented earlier, EPA has established an RfD of 0.0045 mg/kg/day. This was based on the NOAEL for the 1-year dog study of 0.45 mg/kg/day and employed a 100-fold uncertainty factor. Results of this aggregate exposure assessment, which includes EPA's reassessment of tolerances for existing crops and the addition of corn harvest aid, utilize a maximum of 22% of the RfD. Generally, exposures below 100% of the RfD are of no concern because it represents the level at or below which daily aggregate dietary exposure over a lifetime will not pose appreciable risk to human health. Thus, there is reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposures to paraquat residues.

2. *Infants and children.* EPA has determined that the established tolerances for paraquat, with amendments and changes as specified in this notice, meet the safety standards under the FQPA amendments to section 408(b)(2)(*C*) for infants and children. The safety determination for infants and children considers the factors noted above for the general population, but also takes into account the possibility of increased dietary exposure due to specific consumption patterns of infants and children, as well as the possibility of increased susceptibility to the toxic effects of paraquat residues in this population subgroup.

In determining whether or not infants and children are particularly susceptible to toxic effects from paraquat residues, EPA considered the completeness of the database for developmental and reproductive effects, the nature and severity of the effects observed, and other information.

Based on the current data requirements, paraquat has a complete database for developmental and reproductive toxicity. In the developmental studies effects were seen (delayed ossification in the forelimb and hindlimb digits) in the fetuses only at the same or higher dose levels than effects in the mother. In the reproduction study, no effects on reproductive performance were seen. Also because the NOAELs from the developmental and reproduction studies were equal to or greater than the NOAEL used for establishing the reference dose, EPA concludes that it is unlikely that there is additional risk concern for immature or developing organisms. Finally, the Agency has no epidemiological information suggesting special sensitivity of infants and children to paraquat. Therefore, the Agency finds that the uncertainty factor (100X) routinely used in RfD calculations is adequately protective of infants and children, and an additional uncertainty factor is not warranted for paraquat.

Zeneca estimates that paraquat residues in the diet of non-nursing infants (less than 1 year) account for 18% of the RfD and 22% of the RfD for children aged 1–6 years. Further, residues in drinking water are not expected. Therefore, the Zeneca has determined that there is reasonable certainty that dietary exposure to paraquat will not cause harm to infants and children.

F. International Tolerances

Codex maximum residue levels (MRL) are established for residues of paraquat for corn grain at 0.1 ppm. The proposed tolerances for corn grain at 0.05 ppm differ from the Codex MRL's based on field residue data generated in the United States for this use (Pesticide Petitions 5F1625 and 5H5088 for corn grain. Differences in use patterns and pre-harvest intervals may account for the differences between the Codex MRLs and the tolerance values generated from the pesticide residue trials in the United States. (Jim Tompkins)

[FR Doc. 98–26783 Filed 10–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6173–6]

State and Tribal Water Quality Standards; Notice of EPA Approvals

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document contains a listing of State and Tribal submissions of new or revised water quality standards that EPA approved during the period September 1, 1995 through March 31, 1998. This document is published in accordance with a requirement contained in the Water Quality Standards Regulation (40 CFR 131.21). Additionally, this notice contains a listing of Indian Tribes that obtained EPA approval to administer a water quality standards program during the same period. It also contains a list of EPA actions to promulgate or remove Federal water quality standards during the same period.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Region	WQS coordinator	Phone No.
1	Bill Beckwith, Office of Ecosystem Protection (MC CWQ), JFK Federal Building, Boston, MA 02203	617–565–3539
2	Wayne Jackson, Division of Environmental Planning and Protection, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007.	212–637–3807
3	Denise Hakowski, Water Protection Division (3WP11), 1650 Arch St., Philadelphia, PA 19103–2029	215–814–5726
4	Fritz Wagener, Water Division—15th Floor, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, GA 30303.	404–562–9267

Region	WQS coordinator	Phone No.
5	David Pfeifer, Water Division (WT–15J), 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604–3507	312–353–9024
6	Sharon Parrish, Water Division, 1445 Ross Avenue, First Interstate Bank Tower, Dallas, TX 75202	214–665–7145
7	Larry Shepard, Water Resources Protection Branch, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101	913–551–7441
8	Bill Wuerthele, Office of Ecosystems Protection and Remediation, Ecosystems Protection Program (8EPR–EP), 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202–2466.	303–312–6943
9	Phil Woods, Water Division (WTR–5), 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	415–744–1997
10	Lisa Macchio, Water Division (OW–134), 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101	206–553–1834

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document contains a list of State and Tribal water quality standards adoptions and revisions which EPA approved during the period beginning on September 1, 1995, and ending on March 31, 1998. The most recent previous such list was published on October 3, 1995 (60 FR 51793).

For each EPA approval action, this document provides a reference to the state's or Tribe's regulations that contain the State and Tribal water quality standards; the date of State and Tribal adoption; the date of EPA approval; and a brief description of EPA's approval. Additionally, this notice contains a listing of Tribes that have obtained EPA approval to administer a water quality standards program. It also contains a listing of federal water quality standards rulemakings.

This document does not include the following information: (1) the text of the water quality standards, (2) any conditions (including disapprovals of portions of the State and Tribal submittals) that might have been attached to the approvals, (3) Tribal application materials submitted to EPA for authorization to administer the water quality standards program, or (4) the text of the federal water quality standards rulemakings. The text of a State's or Tribe's standards and copies of the approval letters may be obtained from the State's or Tribe's pollution control agency or the appropriate EPA Regional Office (see ''For Further Information Contact'' section above). Proprietary publications such as those of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. also contain the text of State and Tribal water quality standards.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS APPROVALS

EPA REGION 1

CONNECTICUT

Water quality standards for the State of Connecticut as adopted pursuant to section 22a–426 of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Adopted by the State: April 8, 1997
Effective date: October 20, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on October 20, 1997

Connecticut adopted revisions to its water quality standards establishing site-specific copper criteria for certain freshwater stream segments and updated other numeric criteria to incorporate new scientific information and maintain consistency with EPA recommendations.

VERMONT

Water quality standards for the State of Vermont as adopted pursuant to Vermont state law at 3 V.S.A.

Adopted by the State: January 23, 1996
Effective Date: February 13, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on December 5, 1996

Vermont adopted revisions to its water quality standards removing the absolute presumption that nonpoint sources satisfy water quality standards if the activities are conducted in accordance with ''accepted agricultural and silvicultural practices'' or other appropriate management practices. In addition, the definition of ''Waters of the U.S.'' was clarified to ensure coverage for wetlands. The State also adopted numeric criteria for toxic pollutants and eliminated the waiver of water quality criteria in small drainage areas.

EPA REGION 2

NEW JERSEY

Water quality standards for the State of New Jersey are adopted pursuant to: New Jersey Administrative Code 7:9B.

Adopted by the State: July 15, 1996
Effective Date: July 15, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on September 27, 1997

New Jersey adopted revisions to its water quality standards establishing site-specific copper criteria for those waters of the New York/New Jersey Harbor for which the State of New Jersey has jurisdiction, including the Hudson River south from the Tappan Zee Bridge; Upper and Lower New York Bays to the Sandy Hook—Rockaway transect; Raritan Bay; Newark Bay; and the tidal portions of the New Jersey tributaries, including the Hackensack, Passaic, and Raritan Rivers. These water quality criteria were developed through the joint efforts of EPA, the States of New York and New Jersey, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection and the New York/New Jersey Harbor Estuary Program. Three waters have been reclassified to reflect trout production: a tributary to the Musconetcong River; Turkey Hill Brook (Delaware River Basin); and Blue Mine Brook (Passaic River Basin).

EPA REGION 3

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Water quality standards for the District of Columbia are contained in: Chapter 11 of Title 21 DCMR, Water Quality Standards (WQS) of the District of Columbia.

Adopted by the District: March 4, 1994
Effective Date: March 4, 1994
EPA Action: Approval on November 4, 1996

The District of Columbia adopted revisions to its water quality standards in response to EPA's June 27, 1994 disapproval of subsection 1103.2 of the District's regulations. The disapproval was removed based on the District's January 30, 1996 letter which certified the broad application of the District's definition of wetlands. The District removed the public water supply use designation from subsection 1101.1.

PENNSYLVANIA

Water quality standards for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are contained in: Title 25, Environmental Protection, Department of Environmental Protection, Chapter 93, Water Quality Standards, and Chapter 16, Water Quality Standards Toxics Management Strategy, Appendix C and D, Statement of Policy.

Adopted by the Commonwealth: May 28, 1996
Effective Date: May 28, 1996
EPA Action: Conditional approval on April 29, 1996

Pennsylvania adopted revisions to its water quality standards modifying the site specific acute and chronic water quality criteria for copper, based upon a water-effect ratio, for Laurel Run, a tributary to the Schuylkill River near Reading, Pennsylvania at the site of the NGK Metals Corporation. EPA's approval was conditional upon satisfactory completion of the public participation requirements.

Adopted by the Commonwealth: June 13, 1996
Effective Date: June 13, 1996
EPA Action: Conditional approval on June 18, 1996

Pennsylvania adopted revisions to its water quality standards modifying the site-specific acute and chronic water quality criteria for copper and zinc, based upon a water-effect ratio, for the Upper Wissahickon Creek, a tributary to the Schuylkill River, near North Wales, Pennsylvania at the site of the Upper Gwynned Township Authority. EPA's approval was conditional upon satisfactory completion of the public participation requirements.

Adopted by the Commonwealth: October 25, 1995
Effective Date: Conditional approval on October 16, 1995

Pennsylvania adopted revisions to its water quality standards modifying the site specific acute and chronic water quality criteria for cadmium in Chester Creek, a tributary of the Delaware River Estuary, at the site of the Southwest Delaware County Municipal

Authority. EPA's approval was conditional upon satisfactory completion of the public participation requirements.

Date of Adoption: November 18, 1995
Effective Date: November 18, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on June 27, 1997

Pennsylvania adopted revisions to its water quality standards amending Chapter 16 which includes: adoption of dissolved aquatic life criteria for arsenic, cadmium, chromium VI, copper, lead, mercury (acute only), nickel, selenium, silver and zinc; conversion factors to convert total recoverable criteria to dissolved criteria; the adoption of regulations to allow dischargers to derive site-specific chemical and biological translators; the adoption of EPA's final lead criteria formulae; and, the replacement of the human health criterion of 0.02 ug/l for arsenic with the current drinking water maximum contaminant level of 50 ug/l.

VIRGINIA

Water quality standards for the Commonwealth of Virginia are contained in: 9 VAC 25–260–5 et seq.

Adopted by the Commonwealth: December 12, 1996
Effective Date: March 19, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on November 6, 1997

Virginia adopted revisions to its antidegradation policy requiring the State Water Control Board to notify localities and other affected parties when a water body is nominated for designation as an Exceptional State Water. The revision also specifies the information that the Board must disclose to the affected parties.

Adopted by the Commonwealth: December 12, 1996
Effective Date: April 30, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on November 6, 1997

Virginia adopted revisions to its antidegradation policy designating one surface water for special protection as an Exceptional Water. The segment of North Creek, Upper James River watershed, located within the Glenwood Ranger District of the Jefferson National Forest in Botetourt County was designated as an exceptional water.

Adopted by the Commonwealth: September 12, 1996
Effective Date: April 2, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on January 8, 1998

Virginia adopted revisions to its water quality standards deleting the Potomac Embayment Special Standard and adding a paragraph explaining that a Policy for the Potomac River Embayments had been adopted by the State on September 12, 1996. In addition, the State adopted revisions necessary to conform the Potomac River Subbasin section and the special standards and requirements section of the water quality standards to the new policy.

WEST VIRGINIA

Water quality standards for the State of West Virginia are contained in: Title 46, Legislative Rule, Environmental Quality Board, Series 1, Requirements Governing Water Quality Standards.

Adopted by the State: May 23, 1995
Effective Date: August 18, 1995
EPA Action: Conditional approval and partial approval on November 9, 1995

West Virginia adopted revisions to its water quality standards for the State's antidegradation policy, mixing zone policy, definitions, and specific water quality criteria. EPA conditionally approved and partially approved portions of these revisions. Provisions that were conditionally approved include the antidegradation policy, and the mixing zone policy and definitions. Provisions that were partially approved include specific water quality criteria.

EPA REGION 4

ALABAMA

Water quality standards for the State of Alabama are contained in: Rules of Alabama Department of Environmental Management, Water Division, Water Quality Program, Chapter 335–6–10 (Water Quality Criteria) and Chapter 335–6–11 (Water Use Classifications for Interstate and Intrastate Waters).

Adopted by the State: April 22, 1997
Effective date: May 30, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on December 7, 1997

The State of Alabama adopted revisions to its water quality standards modifying the designated use of Fish and Wildlife for 15 stream segments, formerly classified for the Agricultural and Industrial Water Supply use, as well as several other reclassification actions. The State also adopted a revised reference dose for mercury for use in establishing water quality criteria for the protection of human health.

GEORGIA

Water quality standards for the State of Georgia are contained in: Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control, Chapter 391–3–6-.03, Water Use Classification and Water Quality Standards.

Adopted by the State: June 26, 1996 and September 27, 1996
Effective date: July 20, 1996 and November 6, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on April 30, 1997

Georgia adopted revisions to its water quality standards including site specific criteria for West Point Lake (June 26, 1996) and Lake Jackson and Lake Walter F. George (September 27, 1996). Georgia also adopted revised water quality criteria for arsenic.

KENTUCKY

Water quality standards for the State of Kentucky are contained in: Kentucky Administrative Regulations, Title 401, Chapters 5:026, 5:029, 5:030, and 5:031.

Adopted by the Commonwealth: July 12, 1995
Effective date: July 12, 1995
EPA Action: Partial approval on August 7, 1997

Kentucky adopted revisions to its water quality standards including a new regulation, 401 KAR 5:030, which comprises the procedures for implementation of antidegradation for point sources within the Commonwealth.

MISSISSIPPI

Water quality standards for the State of Mississippi are contained in: State of Mississippi Water Quality Criteria for Intrastate, Interstate, and Coastal Waters.

Adopted by the State: February 24, 1994
Effective date: February 24, 1994
EPA Action: Approval on September 12, 1995

Mississippi adopted revisions to its water quality standards including a Fish and Wildlife use classification for seven stream segments that were previously classified as Ephemeral Streams.

NORTH CAROLINA

Water Quality Standards for the State of North Carolina are contained in: 15 NCAC 2B .0100 Procedures for Assignment of Water Quality Standards and .0200 Classifications and Water Quality Standards Applicable to Surface Waters of North Carolina.

Adopted by State: May 11, July 13, and September 14, 1995; and February 8, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on June 12, 1997

North Carolina adopted revisions to its water quality standards including an overall reorganization of its water quality standards.

Adopted by State: October 12, 1996
Effective date: April 1, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on November 3, 1997

North Carolina adopted revisions to its water quality standards adding section .0229 Tar-Pamlico River—Nutrient Sensitive Waters: Nutrient Offset Payments for non-Tar-Pamlico Basin Association Members to further the state's effort in continued implementation of its Nutrient Sensitive Water management strategy for the Tar-Pamlico Basin.

Adopted by State: March 14, 1996
Effective date: October 1, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on January 9, 1998

North Carolina adopted revisions to its water quality standards revising and establishing water quality standards for wetlands. (15 NCAC 2B .0100, .0200 and 2H .0500). The wetland rules established freshwater and saltwater classifications for wetlands and a supplemental classification for unique wetlands. The rules defined wetlands to be classified, and established narrative water quality standards to protect the designated uses of wetlands, and the addition of a separate codified procedural review process for reviewing requests for Clean Water Act section 401 Water Quality Certification.

SEMINOLE OF FLORIDA

Water quality standards for the Seminole of Florida are contained in: Seminole Tribe of Florida's Rules, Chapter B, Part 12, Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters.

Adopted by Tribe: September 13, 1996
Effective Date: September 13, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on September 26, 1997

The Seminole of Florida adopted water quality standards establishing designated uses, water quality criteria, and an antidegradation policy for the Seminole waters of the Big Cypress Reservation.

TENNESSEE

Water quality standards for the State of Tennessee are contained in: State of

Tennessee Water Quality Standards, Rules of the Department of Environment and Conservation, Bureau of Environment, Division of Water Pollution Control Chapter 1200–4–3 General Water Quality Criteria and Chapter 1200–4–4 Use Classifications for Surface Waters.

Adopted by the State: July 30, 1995
Effective Date: July 30, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on April 3, 1996

Tennessee adopted revisions to its water quality standards including an additional 46 priority and non-priority pollutant criteria values for Domestic Water Supply, additional water quality criteria values for Total Residual Chlorine and an updated PCB criterion, additional narrative standards for Biological Integrity and additional toxic substance criteria (human health: water and organism consumption) applicable to waters classified for both recreation and water supply uses.

The state also adopted a new procedure for development of fish consumption advisories for typical and atypical consumers. The state adopted a new designation process for Outstanding National Resource Waters and language for the protection of these waters. Additional language characterizing High Quality Waters was also adopted. The State also revised its use classifications to include: additional stream segments named and listed, additional designation of trout and naturally reproducing trout streams, and several stream segments upgraded by the removal of industrial water supply designation.

EPA REGION 5

Mole Lake Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians, Sokaogon Chippewa Community

Water quality standards for the Mole Lake Tribe are contained in: Sokaogon Chippewa Community Water Quality Standards.

Date Adopted: December 29, 1995
Effective Date: December 29, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on January 22, 1996

The Sokaogon Chippewa Community adopted water quality standards including designated uses, water quality criteria and an antidegradation policy. Designated uses include the protection of fish and aquatic life uses, recreation in and on the water, public water supplies and other cultural uses. The Tribe's antidegradation policy designates all Tribal waters as outstanding national resource waters (ONRWs).

EPA REGION 6

ARKANSAS

Water Quality Standards for the State of Arkansas are contained in: Regulation No. 2-Regulation Establishing Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Arkansas.

Adopted by the State: September 29, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on April 9, 1996

Arkansas adopted revisions to its water quality standards modifying the total dissolved solids criteria for Bayou de Loutre. The State also removed the domestic water supply use designation for Gum Creek, Bayou de Loutre from the confluence of Gum Creek to the State Line, Walker Branch, and Little Cornie Bayou from the confluence of Walker Branch to the State Line.

LOUISIANA

Water quality standards for the State of Louisiana are contained in: Louisiana Administrative Code, Title 33, Part IX, Chapter 11.

Adopted by the State: July 20, 1995
Effective Date: July 20, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on October 31, 1995

Louisiana adopted revisions to its water quality standards changing its beneficial uses and/or dissolved oxygen criteria for five water bodies: Tisdale Brake/Staulkinghead Creek, Deer Creek, Mahlin Bayou/McCain Creek, Red Chute Bayou and Bayou Cocodrie. These changes to the water quality standards were supported by use attainability analyses.

Adopted by the State: November 20, 1996
Effective Date: November 20, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on February 21, 1997

Louisiana adopted revisions to its water quality standards modifying the dissolved oxygen criteria for the portion of the Ouachita River from the Arkansas-Louisiana state line to Columbia Lock and Dam. The previous numerical criterion for dissolved oxygen was modified to site-specific seasonal dissolved oxygen criteria.

OKLAHOMA

Water Quality Standards for the State of Oklahoma are contained in: OAC 785:45, Oklahoma's Water Quality Standards.

Adopted by State: July 24, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on February 26, 1997

Oklahoma adopted revisions to its water quality standards including new numeric criteria for the following substances: Acrylonitrile, Dichlorobromomethene, Mercury, Tetrachloroethylene, Thallium and Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX). The State removed the chronic criteria for silver. The State made a provision for the designation of the Habitat Limited Aquatic Community under certain circumstances. Oklahoma adopted limits for chlorides, sulfides, and TDS in stream segments. Stream segments located within the following areas were added to the category of Appendix B waters (waters of the state within State parks, forests, wilderness areas, wildlife management areas, and wildlife refuges): Deep Fork National Wildlife Refuge, Little River National Wildlife Refuge, Oklahoma Bat Caves National Wildlife Refuge, and Washita National Wildlife Refuge.

PUEBLO OF NAMBE

Water quality standards for the Pueblo of Nambe are contained in the Pueblo of Nambe Water Quality Code as adopted by Tribal Resolution NP 95–023.

Adopted by the Tribe: May 11, 1995
Effective Date: May 11, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on August 18, 1995

The Pueblo of Nambe adopted its first set of water quality standards which contains designated uses, criteria to protect uses and an antidegradation policy. Discretionary items include: compliance schedules, variances, mixing zones, critical low flow design and short-term exemptions on a limited basis.

Note: The water quality standards for the Pueblo of Nambe were omitted from the most recent list of review and revisions of State and Tribe water quality standards published October 3, 1995 (60 FR 51793). It is printed here for a matter of record.

PUEBLO OF POJOAQUE

Water quality standards for the Pueblo of Pojoaque are contained in the Pueblo of Pojoaque Water Quality Code as adopted pursuant to Tribal Resolution No. 95–55.

Adopted by the Tribe: December 15, 1995
Effective Date: December 15, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on March 21, 1996

The Pueblo of Pojoaque adopted its first set of water quality standards containing designated uses, water quality criteria to protect uses and an antidegradation policy. Discretionary items include: compliance schedules, variances, mixing zones, critical low flow design and short-term exemptions on a limited basis.

PUEBLO OF TESUQUE

Water quality standards for the Pueblo of Tesuque are contained in the Pueblo of Tesuque Water Quality Code as adopted pursuant to Tribal Resolution 1996–11–01.

Adopted by the Tribe: November 26, 1996
Effective Date: November 26, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on April 29, 1997

The Pueblo of Tesuque adopted its first set of water quality standards containing designated uses, water quality criteria and an antidegradation policy. Discretionary items include: compliance schedules, variances, mixing zones, critical low flow design and short-term exemptions on a limited basis.

TEXAS

Water quality standards for the State of Texas are contained in: Surface Water Quality Standards Chapter 307.

Adopted by the State: June 14, 1995
Effective Date: July 13, 1995
EPA Action: Approvals on June 28, 1996 and March 11, 1998

Texas adopted revisions to its water quality standards establishing site-specific aquatic life use designations for the following water bodies: Beals Creek, Black Cypress, Chacon Creek, Fort Ewell Creek, Grace Creek, control ditches (Harris), Rabbs Bayou, Jefferson County canals (0702), Pond Creek, Rabbit Creek, Rita Blanca Lake, South Concho River water bodies and Eightmile Creek. These specific standards were justified by use attainability analyses. Texas added water quality criteria for dicolfol, diuron, benzo(a)anthracene, benzo(a)pyrene, chrysene, and cyanide. Chronic and human health criteria were deleted for silver. Other water quality criteria values were revised, including site-specific standards for several designated segments.

Adopted by the State: March 19, 1997
Effective Date: April 30, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on March 11, 1998

Texas adopted revisions to its water quality standards establishing site-specific aquatic life uses for 39 previously unclassified

streams and a presumed use of high aquatic life use for unclassified, perennial streams.

EPA REGION 7

KANSAS

Water Quality Standards for the State of Kansas are contained in: Kansas Administrative Regulations, Title 28, Article 16, Section 28, Surface Water Quality Standards.

Adopted by the State: June 28, 1994
Effective Date: August 29, 1994
EPA Action: Partial approval on February 19, 1998

Kansas adopted revisions to its water quality standards designating all surface waters for at least secondary contact recreation and aquatic life uses. Numeric criteria were adopted for an additional 176 pollutants or parameters. The State adopted by reference a Kansas Surface Water Register and associated maps for all classified surface water based on EPA's River Reach Files 2 and 3.

EPA REGION 8

COLORADO

Water quality standards for the State of Colorado are contained in: The Basic Standards and Methodologies for Surface Water (3.1.0 (5 CCR 1002–8)).

Date Effective: December 12, 1994
EPA Action: Approval on February 23, 1996

Colorado adopted a plan of implementation for salinity control, as contained in ''1993 Review Water Quality Standards for Salinity, Colorado River System Final Report,'' October 1993, as a policy statement.

CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES

Water quality standards for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes are contained in: Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation—Surface Water Quality Standards and Antidegradation Policy.

Adopted by the Tribe: March 28, 1995
Effective Date: April 27, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on March 18, 1996

The Tribes adopted water quality standards for all surface waters within the reservation boundary. The standards include designated uses, numerical criteria for toxic and conventional pollutants, narrative criteria, and an antidegradation policy.

UTAH

Water quality standards for the State of Utah are contained in: Part II Utah Wastewater Disposal Regulation, Standards of Quality for Waters of the State.

Effective Date: February 16, 1994
EPA Action: Approval on February 23, 1996

Utah adopted a plan of implementation for salinity control, as contained in ''1993 Review Water Quality Standards for Salinity, Colorado River System Final Report,'' October 1993.

WYOMING

Water quality standards for the State of Wyoming are contained in: Water Quality Rules and Regulations, Chapter 1—Quality Standards for Wyoming Surface Waters.

Effective Date: May 19, 1993
EPA Action: Approval on February 23, 1996

Wyoming adopted revisions to its water quality standards amending its Statewide Water Quality Management Plan to incorporate the plan of implementation for salinity control, as contained in ''1993 Review Water Quality Standards for Salinity, Colorado River System Final Report.''

EPA REGION 9

ARIZONA

Water quality standards for the State of Arizona are contained in: Arizona's Rules on Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters (Title 18, Chapter 11, Article 1).

Adopted by the State: March 22, 1996 and April 3, 1996; implementation procedures on January 16, 1996 and April 1, 1996
Effective Date: April 24, 1996
EPA Action: Partial approval on April 26, 1996

Arizona adopted revisions to its water quality standards including the addition of the Fish Consumption designated use for approximately 90 water bodies, the modification of the Mining Impoundment Exemption and the deletion of Practical Quantitation Limits. Also, Arizona adopted a mercury tissue residue monitoring plan to implement its mercury criteria. (These revisions were the subject of EPA's partial approval.)

The State also adopted procedures for the implementation of its narrative standards: (1) Implementation Guidelines for the Narrative Nutrient Standard, and (2) Interim Whole Effluent Toxicity Implementation Guidelines for Arizona.

California

These water quality standards for the State of California are contained in: ''1993 Review—Water Quality Standards for Salinity, Colorado River System Final Report,'' October 1993. (State Water Resources Control Board Resolution No. 94–28).

Adopted by the State: March 21, 1994
EPA Action: Approval on October 16, 1995

California adopted the 1993 Review of Salinity Standards for the Colorado River Basin.

These water quality standards for the State of California are contained in: ''Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary (1995 Bay/Delta Plan). (State Water Resources Control Board Resolution No. 95–24).

Adopted by the State Office of Administrative Law: July 17, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on September 26, 1995

California adopted the 1995 Bay/Delta Plan to replace the water quality standards in the 1991 Plan that were partially disapproved by EPA on September 3, 1991.

NEVADA

Water quality standards for the State of Nevada are contained in: Nevada Administrative Code (NAC), Water Pollution Control Provisions.

Adopted by the State: Nevada Attorney General certified on July 7, 1994 and June 26, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on November 8, 1995

Nevada adopted revised water quality standards for Carson River System and revised its un-ionized ammonia criteria for Las Vegas Bay.

Adopted by the State: Nevada Attorney General certified on July 7, 1994 and June 13, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on July 13, 1997

Nevada adopted revisions to its water quality standards for metals expressed as dissolved metals for the protection of the aquatic life beneficial uses. The State also revised water quality standards for the protection of municipal and domestic water supply uses based on current maximum contaminant levels.

Adopted by the State: Nevada Attorney General certified on June 13, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on January 31, 1997

Nevada adopted revised water quality standards for Lake Tahoe and selected tributaries.

COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Water quality standards for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are contained in: Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Water Quality Standards.

Adopted by the Commonwealth: January 15, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on February 3, 1997

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands adopted revisions to its water quality standards including miscellaneous changes to use designations and criteria, revisions to the Water Quality Certification (section 401) process, and clarification of implementation provisions.

EPA REGION 10

ALASKA

Water quality standards for the State of Alaska are contained in: Alaska Administrative Code (AAC), Chapter 18 (i.e. identified in 18 AACC 70.020).

Adopted by State: December 4, 1994, amended February 16, 1996
Effective Date: January 4, 1995, amendments on March 16, 1996
EPA Action: Approval with one exception on April 7, 1997

Alaska adopted water quality standards revisions to its antidegradation policy and conventional pollutants criteria, including color for freshwater use categories and fecal coliform criteria. For site-specific criteria, Alaska added a definition of natural background and clarified processes that may be used in the development of site specific criteria. A revision to the petroleum hydrocarbon criterion was also adopted.

Adopted by State: August 22, 1997
Effective Date: November 17, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on November 17, 1997

Alaska adopted revisions to its water quality standards restructuring its mixing

zone policy. Additions and deletions were made to the mixing zone policy that had been adopted December 4, 1994. Chapter 18 AAC 70 was reorganized and wording changed in several sections to clarify the meaning of the regulations.

Adopted by State: February 26, 1997
Effective Date: February 11, 1998
EPA Action: Approval on February 11, 1998

Alaska adopted water quality standards revisions to their designated uses for Red Dog Creek, several small tributaries to Red Dog Creek (Sulfur, Shelly, Connie, Rachael, and Hilltop Creeks), and Ikalukrok Creek in the DeLong Mountains in Northwest Alaska.

CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE CHEHALIS RESERVATION

Water quality standards for the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation are codified in the Law and Order Code, Title 20 (Environmental Protection), Chapter 1.

Adoption by the Tribes: February 15, 1996
Effective Date: February 15, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on February 3, 1997

The Tribes adopted water quality standards covering all surface waters within the boundary of the Reservation and including both toxic and conventional numeric water quality criteria as well as narrative criteria, designated uses based on a classification system, an antidegradation policy, and policies for mixing zones and allowance of short-term modifications of standards.

IDAHO

Water quality standards for the State of Idaho are contained in: IDAPA 16, Title 1, Chapter 2 Water Quality Standards and Wastewater Treatment Requirements.

Adopted by State: August 24, 1994; April 10, 1995; and April 14, 1995
EPA Action: Approval on June 25, 1996

Idaho adopted revisions to its water quality standards including numeric toxic criteria, chronic ammonia criteria for warm water and cold water biota, human health criteria for arsenic, dissolved oxygen criteria, bacteriological criteria, specific designated uses, antidegradation policy, variance policy and mixing zone policy.

Adopted by State: June 19, 1997
EPA Action: Conditional approval on July 15, 1997

Idaho adopted water quality standards revisions to its designated uses for thirty-five specific water bodies, provisions to the mixing zone policy, uses for undesignated waters and numeric temperature criteria for Kootenai River sturgeon spawning.

Adopted by State: November 14, 1996
Effective Date: December 1, 1996
EPA Action: Approval on May 27, 1997

Idaho adopted revisions to its water quality standards including factors for converting aquatic life water quality criteria for metals from total recoverable to dissolved concentrations.

Adopted by State: February 11, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on May 27, 1997

Idaho adopted water quality standards revisions to its designated uses for Lindsay Creek and West Fork Blackbird Creek and to its antidegradation policy.

PUYALLUP TRIBE OF INDIANS

Water Quality Standards for the Puyallup Tribe of Indians are contained in the Tribal Water Quality Standards Ordinance.

Adopted by Tribe: August 15, 1994
Effective Date: August 15, 1994
EPA Action: Approval on October 31, 1994

The Puyallup Tribe of Indians adopted its first set of water quality standards. These standards include narrative and numeric water quality criteria for toxics and conventional pollutants, an antidegradation policy, and use designations for surface waters specified in the Puyallup Land Claim Settlement Act.

Note: The water quality standards for the Puyallup Tribe of Indians were omitted from the most recent list of review and revisions of State and Tribe water quality standards published October 3, 1995 (60 FR 51793). It is printed here for a matter of record.

WASHINGTON

Water Quality Standards for surface waters for the State of Washington are contained in: Chapter 173–201A Washington Administrative Code (WAC).

Adopted by State: November 18, 1997
Effective Date: December 19, 1997
EPA Action: Approval on February 6, 1998

Washington adopted water quality standards revisions clarifying definitions and revising ammonia criteria. Conversion factors for dissolved metals and a site specific criterion for marine cyanide have been added. The State adopted a chronic marine copper criterion, developed an approach to nutrient criteria for lakes, adopted wetlands provisions and revised its short-term modification provisions.

TRIBAL WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

EPA REGION 5

MOLE LAKE BAND OF THE LAKE SUPERIOR TRIBE OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS, SOKAOGON CHIPPEWA COMMUNITY

EPA Approval: September 29, 1995

FOND DU LAC BAND OF CHIPPEWA

EPA Approval: May 16, 1996

GRAND PORTAGE BAND OF CHIPPEWA

EPA Approval: July 15, 1996

EPA REGION 6

PUEBLO OF POJOAQUE

EPA Approval: March 21, 1996

PUEBLO OF TESUQUE

EPA Approval: April 29, 1997

EPA REGION 8

ASSINIBOINE AND SIOUX TRIBES OF THE FORT PECK RESERVATION

EPA Approval: August 29, 1996

EPA REGION 9

HOOPA VALLEY TRIBE

EPA Approval: May 17, 1996

WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE

EPA Approval: February 3, 1997

REGION 10

TULALIP TRIBES

FEDERAL WATER QUALITY STANDARDS RULEMAKINGS

For purposes of informing the public, EPA is listing those federal water quality standards rulemakings taken pursuant to section 303(c)(4) of the CWA for the period of September 1, 1995 through March 31, 1998. For the full text of the rules, the reader is referred to the **Federal Register** notices cited below.

EPA REGION 3

PENNSYLVANIA

Date of Rule: August 29, 1996
Reference: 61 FR 64822 (40 CFR 131.32)

EPA promulgated an antidegradation policy for application in the State.

EPA REGION 9

ARIZONA

Date of Rule: May 7, 1996
Reference: 61 FR 20685 (40 CFR 131.31.(b))

EPA established the fish consumption use for 14 waterbodies and set forth a requirement that EPA or the State implement a monitoring program to identify where mercury contamination of fish may be affecting wildlife.

EPA REGION 10

ALASKA

Date of Rule: October 10, 1997
Reference: 62 FR 53212

EPA withdrew from Federal Regulation (National Toxics Rule) 19 acute aquatic life water quality criteria applicable to Alaska.

Date of Rule: March 2, 1998
Reference: 63 FR 10140

EPA withdrew from Federal Regulation (National Toxics Rule) the arsenic human health water quality criteria applicable to Alaska.

IDAHO

Date of Rule: November 29, 1996
Reference: 61 FR 60616

EPA withdrew from Federal Regulation (National Toxics Rule) all human health water quality criteria applicable to Idaho except for arsenic.

Date of Rule: July 31, 1997
Reference: 62 FR 41162

EPA's rule ensures that (1) five water body segments not currently designated for fishable uses will have an aquatic life use; (2) the numeric criteria for temperature will adequately protect bull trout; and (3) where waters on privately-owned lands are waters of the U.S., those waters will be protected in the same way other unclassified waters are protected. In addition, in recognition that new information may become available over time, EPA incorporated a provision which allows site-specific adjustments to the bull trout temperature criteria; a provision which allows the list of bull trout waters to be modified; and a variance provision for

temporary site-specific relief from the criteria associated with the federal aquatic life use designation.

Date of Rule: October 9, 1997
Reference: 62 FR 52926

EPA withdrew from Federal Regulation (National Toxics Rule) the arsenic human health water quality criteria applicable to Idaho.

Dated: September 30, 1998.

Tudor T. Davies,

Director, Office of Science and Technology.

[FR Doc. 98–26887 Filed 10–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collections Submitted to OMB for Emergency Review and Approval

October 1, 1998.

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, Pub. L. 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 Commissions 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 Commission is seeking emergency approval for this information collection by October 23, 1998 under the provisions of 5 CFR 1320.13.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before October 21, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Les Smith, Federal Communications Commission, Room 234, 1919 M St., NW, Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to lesmith@fcc.gov and Timothy Fain, OMB Desk Officer, 10236 NEOB 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503 or fain__t@a1.eop.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Les Smith at 202–418–0217 or via internet at lesmith@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval No.: 3060–0600.

Title: Application to Participate in an FCC Auction.

Form No.: FCC 175 and FCC 175–S.

Type of Review: Revision of an existing collection.

Respondents: Business or other for profit; Not-for-profit institutions; State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Respondents: 12,400.

Estimate Hour Per Response: the time for completing the FCC 175 and providing the required Identity/Ownership Information is .75 hours per response. The estimated time for completing the FCC 175–S is .25 hours per response.

Total Annual Burden: 15,600 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Costs: $3,120,00. The Commission assumes most respondents will hire an attorney at approximately $200 per hour to prepare the required information. There are not additional costs associated with these requirements.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Needs and Uses: The information will be used by the Commission to determine if the applicant is legally, technically, and financially qualified to participate in an FCC auction. The rules and requirements are designed to ensure that the competitive bidding process is limited to serious qualified applicants and deter possible abuses of the bidding and licensing process. The Commission plans to use this form for all upcoming auctions and reauctions.

Federal Communications Commission.

Shirley S. Suggs,

Chief, Publications Branch.

[FR Doc. 98–26849 Filed 10–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

[Docket No. 98–18]

Owens Refrigerated Freight Limited Possible Violations of Section 10(a)(1) of the Shipping Act of 1984; Order of Investigation and Hearing

Owens Refrigerated Freight Limited (''Owens'') is a tariffed and bonded non-vessel-operating common carrier (''NVOCC'') located at 100 Carlyle Street, P.O. Box 1044, Christ Church, New Zealand. Between April 8, 1994 and February 11, 1997, Owens maintained an effective tariff in the Commission's Automated Tariff Filing and Information System (''ATFI'') under the name Cooltainer Services Limited. (ATFI Tariff No. 012483–001) Since February 12, 1997, Owens has maintained its current tariff under the name, Owens Refrigerated Freight Limited (ATFI Tariff No. 014596–001). A NVOCC bond of $50,000 issued by Washington International Insurance Company (Bond No. 56065) has covered Owens' operations since April 8, 1994.[1] Owens is the refrigerated freight division of a publicly traded New Zealand corporation, Owens Group Limited.[2] According to its Directors' Report published on the Internet, Mr. Russell J. Hunter is the Group General Manager of Owens and, according to ATFI, he is the contact person for Owens' tariff filing. Owens' resident agent in the United States is NORAM Agencies Limited (''Noram''), 801 Second Ave., #419, Seattle, WA 98104.[3]

Between March 15, 1994 and August 19, 1997, Owens is believed to have entered into and participated in arrangements which allowed Owens to obtain ocean transportation for property at less than the rates or charges that would be otherwise applicable for shipments between Australia/New Zealand and the United States. In March 1994, Owens entered into an agreement with a common carrier, Ocean Management, Inc. (''OMI''), in which Owens obtained certain ocean transportation rates and other special transportation considerations from OMI for the transportation of Owens' cargo between the United States and Australia. The terms of this arrangement were not filed with the Commission. The agreement between OMI and Owens appears to have continued until March 1, 1997, when Owens and OMI entered into a service contract which was filed with the Commission and became effective on March 1, 1997.

In November 1996, Owens entered into another agreement with an ocean common carrier, South Seas Steamship Co., Ltd., in which Owens obtained certain ocean transportation rates and other special transportation

[1] Washington International Insurance Company is located at Suite 500, 300 Park Blvd., Itasca, IL 60143–2625.

[2] In addition to the refrigerated freight division, Owens Group Limited has operating divisions for specialized transport, ship agency, container services, international freight, etc.

[3] According to ATFI, Noram has been Owens' resident agent in the United States since July 28, 1995. Prior to that time, Owens apparently did not designate a resident agent in its NVOCC tariff.