risk is largely attributable to one contaminant, arsenic, although benzene and beryllium also contribute but at lower levels. Manganese is the main contributor to the noncarcinogenic hazard index of 8.4, which may present a level of concern for a human health drinking water scenario, assuming that groundwater at this location is ingested as a sole source of drinking water. This is a very conservative estimate of future exposure, however, as this location is immediately adjacent to the landfill and is not likely to be used for future water supplies due to the existing topographical and wetland considerations.

No adverse health effects associated with the inhalation of landfill gas, and ingestion of, or contact with, the contaminants in surficial soils, surface water and sediments were found, assuming conservative exposure to children who may trespass and wade in the wetlands and have skin contact with contaminants. All current and future risks attributable to these exposures were below the lower end of the acceptable risk range (i.e., 10^{-6}). Thus, even if the Site in the future is used for recreational or residential purposes, the resulting frequency of exposure would not pose unacceptable risk to human health.

EPA also evaluated the potential risk to the environment posed by contamination at the site. Contaminant concentrations in sediments found in the Davis GSR wetlands and surface waters were compared to Sediment Quality Criteria (SQC) as part of the ecological risk assessment. Given the abundance of surrounding water bodies and wetlands, it is unlikely that a reduction in viable wetland habitat, due to sediment contamination associated with the Davis GSR Landfill, would adversely impact any flora and fauna populations. The levels of contaminants found in the landfill surface soils also do not appear likely to pose significant ecological risk. Results of a conservative food chain modeling also indicated no adverse effects, and therefore, did not suggest the need for cleanup.

The Record of Decision (ROD) was signed by the Director of the Office of Site Remediation and Restoration on September 29, 1997. The No Action ROD recommendation includes: No further remedial action. Long-term monitoring will be conducted.

Based on the information currently available, EPA, with the concurrence of the State of Rhode Island, has determined that the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment and, therefore, taking of remedial measures at this time is not appropriate.

Dated: May 21, 1999.

John P. DeVillars,

Regional Administrator, Region I.

[FR Doc. 99–15172 Filed 6–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL–6360–5]

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of intent to delete Old Inland Pit NPL site from the National Priorities List update: request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 10, announces its intent to delete the Old Inland Pit NPL Site from the National Priorities List (NPL) and requests public comment on this proposed action. The NPL constitutes Appendix B of 40 CFR part 300 which is the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), which EPA promulgated pursuant to Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended. EPA and the State of Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) have determined that the Site poses no significant threat to public health or the environment and, therefore, further remedial measures pursuant to CERCLA are not appropriate.

DATES: Comments concerning this Site may be submitted on or before July 19, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to: Beverly Gaines, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Mail Stop, ECL–110, Seattle, Washington 98101.

Comprehensive information on this Site is available through Ecology which is available for viewing at the Old Inland Pit Site information repositories at the following locations:

Washington Department of Ecology, Eastern Regional Office, 4601 North Monroe Street, Suite 202, Spokane, WA 99205–1295.

Spokane Public Library, 12004 E. Main Avenue, Spokane, WA 99205–5193.

The deletion docket for the deletion of the Old Inland Pit Site is available through EPA at the following locations: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Superfund Records Center, Seattle, WA 98101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Beverly Gaines, U.S. EPA Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Mail Stop, ECL–110, Seattle, Washington 98101, (206) 553–1066.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Introduction
II. NPL Deletion Criteria
III. Deletion Procedures
IV. Basis of Intended Site Deletion

I. Introduction

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10 announces its intent to delete the Old Inland Pit Site (''Site'') at 3500 N. Sullivan Road, Spokane, Washington, from the National Priorities List (NPL) and requests public comment on this proposed action. The NPL constitutes Appendix B of 40 CFR Part 300 which is the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), which EPA promulgated pursuant to Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended. EPA identifies sites on the NPL that appear to present a significant risk to human health or the environment. The Old Inland Pit Site does not present a significant threat to human health or the environment. As described in § 300.425(e)(3) of the NCP, sites deleted from the NPL remain eligible for federal Fund-financed remedial actions or state action under the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) in the unlikely event that conditions at the site warrant such actions.

EPA plans to delete the Old Inland Pit Site (''Site'') at 3500 N. Sullivan Road, Spokane, Washington, from the NPL. EPA will accept comments on the plan to delete this site for thirty days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register**.

Section II of this document explains the criteria for deleting sites from the NPL. Section III discusses procedures that EPA is using for this action. Section IV discusses the Old Inland Pit Site and explains how the Site meets the deletion criteria.

II. NPL Deletion Criteria

Section 300.425(e) of the NCP provides that ''releases'' (sites) may be deleted from, or recategorized on the NPL where no further response is appropriate. In making a determination to delete a site from the NPL, EPA shall

consider, in consultation with the state, whether any of the following criteria have been met:

(i) Responsible parties or other parties have implemented all appropriate response actions required;

(ii) All appropriate Fund-financed responses under CERCLA have been implemented, and no further action by responsible parties is appropriate, or

(iii) The remedial investigation has shown that the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment and, therefore, taking of remedial measures is not appropriate.

Even if a site is deleted from the NPL, where hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants remain at the site *above* levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, EPA's policy is that a subsequent review of the site will be conducted at least every five years after the initiation of the remedial action at the site to ensure that the site remains protective of human health and the environment. In the case of the Old Inland Pit Site, a five year review is not required at this site under CERCLA because no hazardous substances remain on site above appropriate cleanup levels, and no conditional points of compliance have been established. Whenever there is a significant release from a site deleted from the NPL, the site may be restored to the NPL without application of the Hazard Ranking system.

III. Deletion Procedures

The following procedures have been used for the intended deletion of this Site:

(1) Ecology has issued a Final Closeout Report (FCOR) which documented the completion of all appropriate remedial activities; (2) Ecology has issued a letter certifying that no further remedial action is expected and that the remedy is protective of human health and the environment; (3) EPA has concurred with Ecology's finding that the remedy is protective of human health and the environment; (4) Ecology has concurred with the proposed deletion decision; (5) A notice has been published in the local newspaper and distributed to appropriate Federal, state, and local officials and other interested parties announcing the commencement of a 30-day public comment period on EPA's Notice of Intent to Delete; and, (6) All relevant documents have been made available for public review in the local site information repositories.

Deletion of the Site from the NPL does not in itself, create, alter or revoke any individual rights or obligations. The NPL is designed primarily for informational purposes to assist Agency management. As mentioned in Section II of this Notice, 40 CFR 300.425(e) (3) states that deletion of a site from the NPL does not preclude eligibility for future Federal Fund-financed response actions or future actions under the state's MTCA.

EPA's Regional Office will accept and evaluate public comments on the EPA's Notice of Intent to Delete before making a final decision. The Agency will prepare a Responsiveness Summary if any significant public comments are received.

A deletion occurs when the Regional Administrator places a final notice in the **Federal Register**. Generally, the NPL will reflect deletions in the final update following the Notice. Public notices and copies of the Responsiveness Summary will be placed in the local repositories and made available to local residents by the Regional Office.

IV. Basis of Intended Site Deletion

The following site summary provides the Agency's rationale for the intention to delete the Site from the NPL.

A. Site Background

The ten-acre Old Inland Pit was operated by Inland Asphalt as a sand and gravel source from 1969 to 1978. Materials were excavated to a depth of 35 to 50 feet below ground surface. Spokane Steel Foundry Company (SSFC), located just east of the pit, disposed of waste foundry sands and baghouse dust from May 1978 to May 1983. The sands were from metal molding operations, and the baghouse dust was generated from sand sieving, sandblasting operations, and the residue of electric arc furnaces. Approximately 200 tons of baghouse dust was thought to have been disposed of in the pit. Foundry sand disposal continued until 1986. In addition to the foundry dusts, permission was also given to Inland Asphalt and Central Premix to dispose of construction debris, and to Quarry Tile Company for disposal of broken decorative clay tiles. Combined dumping from all sources raised the bottom level of the pit to a uniform 35 feet below ground surface.

Concerns that the baghouse dust was potentially a hazardous waste first arose in 1981. In May 1983, Ecology collected four baghouse dust samples from the SSFC plant baghouses for waste classification. Two samples were from the sandblasting/sand sieving operations, and two were from the electric arc furnaces. All materials passed the EP Toxicity test, but the furnace dusts failed the Static Basic Acute Fish Toxicity test (fish bioassay) and were classified as state-only dangerous waste under the authority of WAC 173–303. The foundry sands from the sieving/abrader operations were not classified as dangerous waste.

In August 1984, Ecology & Environment (E&E) conducted a Preliminary Site Assessment (PSA) for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which consisted of interviews with SSFC personnel, a site visit, and soil sampling. PSAs are done to estimate threats posed by sites to human health and the environment. Samples were analyzed for inorganics, pesticides, and volatile and semi-volatile organics; elevated concentrations of copper, zinc, nickel, and chromium were detected. The results of the PSA were used to complete a Hazard Ranking System (HRS) scoring. The site scored 29.45, high enough to be nominated to the National Priorities List (NPL) in 1986. The nomination was finalized in February of 1990.

In July 1986, Reed Corporation was contracted by CH&E Investments to assess the data gathered during the PSA, collect data to confirm those samples, and provide additional site characteristics. E&E collected additional soil and dust samples for the EPA in late 1988 to assess the distribution and concentration of potential contaminants on the site. Both sample sets were analyzed for inorganics, organics, and pesticides.

E&E, under contract to Ecology, collected additional soil samples and installed four groundwater monitoring wells in May of 1991. Groundwater samples were collected from these wells in May 1991 and April 1993. Those groundwater samples and the splitspoon samples collected during well installation were analyzed for the same groups of analyses as previous samples.

On April 20, 1995, the PLPs entered into an Agreed Order with Ecology after public notice and opportunity to comment. Dames & Moore began site investigation on behalf of the PLPs. Further soil sampling was performed. Groundwater samples were taken in January 1995, March 1996, June 1996, and September 1996. Additional dust samples were also collected from the pit floor in September 1995 for a second fish bioassay test. Those test results indicated the material would no longer be characterized as a state dangerous waste, likely due to the difference in sampling location. The complete history of site investigations and sampling results is presented in the Final Phase I Remedial Investigation (RI) (Dames & Moore, 1998).

B. Conclusions of Studies Conducted at the Site

The RI was completed by Dames & Moore, contractors to CH&E Investments, in August of 1998. The conclusions reached by the studies are summarized below:

- The site is located in an historically industrial area, with current and future use expected to continue as such;
- Approximately 200 tons of furnace baghouse dust was disposed of during a five-year period, mainly in the northeast and south central sections of the pit;
- Fish bioassay testing initially designated the furnace dust as a state-only dangerous waste, but repeat testing has shown that the waste no longer classifies as such;
- Contaminants of potential concern in soils were inorganics, especially arsenic, chromium, zinc, and aluminum. These were all detected at levels below applicable cleanup standards. Groundwater has not been affected by waste disposal practices at the Site.

The site overlies the Spokane Valley-Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer, the sole source of water for the greater Spokane area. Groundwater at the site is about 65 to 70 feet below ground surface, and flows from the northeast to the southwest towards the Spokane River. Materials at depth and near the surface are comprised of native sands and gravels. The surficial soils are a mixture of native deposits and backfilled material, including the foundry sands and baghouse dust.

Method C Industrial Soil Cleanup Levels, specified in the Washington State Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA), were used since the site and the surrounding properties will remain industrial. Method C Industrial cleanup levels are protective of exposures at a cancer risk of $1x10^{-6}$ an a hazard index of 1. The highest possible use of groundwater is drinking water, so Method B Groundwater cleanup levels were applied. Method B cleanup levels are also protective of exposures at a cancer risk of $1x10^{-6}$ and a hazard index of 1. The concentrations of inorganics in both groundwater and soil are below their respective risk-based cleanup levels. Details of cleanup level development are presented in the Cleanup Action Plan issued by Ecology on January 20, 1999.

C. Remedial Construction Activities

Since there are no contaminants exceeding cleanup levels, no contamination of groundwater, and minimal risks from hazardous materials remaining on site, the Cleanup Action Plan required no remedial activities. MTCA requires that where Method C Industrial Soil Cleanup Levels are used, a restrictive convenant must be placed with the deed. A restrictive convenant was placed with this property for that purpose, with the following restrictions: industrial use only, no withdrawal of water, maintenance of fences and locked gates, and no actions that may facilitate a release or create an exposure pathway.

D. Characterization of Risk

The site is located in an industrially-zoned area, surrounded by properties all currently used in an industrial capacity. Future use of the site and the surrounding properties is expected to remain similar to current usage. Therefore, no residential or commercial exposure scenarios are anticipated.

Contaminants of potential concern at the site include metals and non-metallic elements such as aluminum, copper, zinc, iron, arsenic, and magnesium. These elements are present in varying concentrations in the soils on-site. Vegetation in the form of weeds and grasses covers most of the soil surface limiting the potential for windblown soil transport.

A direct contact pathway exists between people and surface soils. Although a fence surrounds the site restricting access, future workers have the potential to be in direct contact with soils down to a depth of 15 feet. WAC 173–340–740(6)(c) specifies that 15 feet is a ''reasonable estimate of the depth of soil that could be excavated and distributed at the soil surface as a result of site development activities.'' A deed restriction will alert future owners on restrictions on land use or development and risks associated with these activities.

Groundwater below the site has the potential to be affected by downward filtration of surface water through contaminated soils. However, sampling indicates that groundwater has not been contaminated and that leaching is not occurring. Therefore, the potential for ingestion of contaminated water due to site materials is unlikely.

Surface water is channeled to the pit floor where it percolates downward. Due to the nature of the soils, precipitation does not pond on or run off the surface. Transport of contaminated soils off-site via surface water is unlikely due to these features. Contact with temporarily ponded surface waters might happen during an extended precipitation event. Surface waters are not a permanent site feature, thus it represents an insignificant pathway.

E. Compliance Monitoring

According to MTCA, compliance monitoring is required for all cleanup actions. Compliance monitoring shall take place at the site to ensure that residual contaminants in site soils do not move or affect other site media. The compliance monitoring plan will consist of one year of groundwater sampling of wells MW–1 and MW–4 to confirm that aquifer remains unaffected by residual metals in site soils. Water samples will be collected quarterly beginning in February 1999 and tested for eight metals that were detected in previous groundwater sampling. Samples will be collected and analyzed using the same standard EPA methods as prior sampling, with similar techniques and QA/QC procedures. After one year, the data will be reviewed by Ecology to determine if compliance monitoring should continue.

F. Five-Year Review

A five-year review is not required at this site under MTCA or CERCLA because no hazardous substances remain on site above appropriate cleanup levels, and no conditional points of compliance have been established. Additional details on the compliance monitoring plan can be found in the Cleanup Action Plan.

G. Public Participation

Community input has been sought by Ecology throughout the cleanup process for the site. Community relations activities have included several public notices in local newspapers and routine publication of progress fact sheets. A copy of the Deletion Docket can be reviewed by the public at the EPA, Region 10 Superfund Records Center. The Deletion Docket includes this document, the CAP, and the Final Closeout Report. Comprehensive Site files are available for review at the Spokane Public Library, 12004 E. Main Avenue, Spokane, WA 99205–5193, and the Washington Department of Ecology, Eastern Regional Office, 4601 North Monroe, Suite 202, Spokane, WA 99205–1295. EPA Region 10 will also announce the availability of the Deletion Docket for public review in a local newspaper and informational fact sheet.

H. Applicable Deletion Criteria

One of the three criteria for deletion specifies that EPA may delete a site from the NPL if ''responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required''. EPA, with the concurrence of Ecology, has determined that this criteria for deletion has been met. EPA and Ecology

believe that no significant threat to human health or the environment remains because pathways of concern for exposure to contaminants no longer exist. If new information comes available that indicates that there is a significant threat to human health or the environment then EPA or Ecology can require or conduct additional remedial action, if appropriate. Subsequently, EPA is proposing deletion of this site from the NPL. Documents supporting this action are available from the docket.

Dated: June 7, 1999.

Chuck Clarke,

Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 99–15274 Filed 6–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 52

[CC Docket No. 99–200; FCC 99–122]

Numbering Resource Optimization

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document examines a variety of measures intended to increase the efficiency with which telecommunications carriers use telephone numbering resources. The purpose of this effort is two-fold: to slow the rate of number exhaust in this country as evidenced by the ever-increasing rate at which new area codes are assigned; and to prolong the life of the North American Numbering Plan (NANP).

DATES: Comments are to be filed on or before July 30, 1999, and reply comments are due on or before August 30, 1999. Written comments must be submitted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on the proposed information collections on or before August 16, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Secretary, 445 12th Street, SW, Room TW–B204F, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the Secretary, a copy of any comments on the information collections contained herein should be submitted to Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1–C804, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554, or via the Internet to jboley@fcc.gov, and to Timothy Fain, OMB Desk Officer, 10236 NEOB, 72—17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20503 or via the Internet to fain5__t@al.eop.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jared Carlson, (202) 418–2320 or email at jcarlson@fcc.gov or Tejal Mehta at (202) 418–2320 or tmehta@fcc.gov. For additional information concerning the information collections contained in this NPRM contact Judy Boley at 202–418–0214, or via the Internet at jboley@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking adopted on May 27, 1999, and released on June 2, 1999. The full text of this Notice is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center. The complete text may also be obtained through the world wide web, at http:/www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/CommonCarrier/Orders, or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This NPRM contains either a proposed or modified information collection. The Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, invites the general public and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to comment on the information collections contained in this NPRM, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Public and agency comments are due at the same time as other comments on this NPRM; OMB notification of action is due 60 days from date of publication of this NPRM in the **Federal Register**. Comments should address: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimates; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

OMB Control No.: None.

Title: Numbering Resource Optimization, CC Docket No. 99–200.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: New collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities.

Proposed number of collections	Estimated time per respondents	Total annual response (hours)	Burden (Annual) (hours)
Verification of Need for Numbers Submissions:			
a. Quarterly Report	3000	48	144,000
b. Initial Codes	3000	1	3000
c. Growth Codes	3000	3	9000

Frequency of Response: Quarterly; on occasion.

Total Annual Burden: 156,000 hours.

Estimated Costs Per Respondent: $0.

Needs and Uses: In CC Docket No. 99–200, the Commission examines a variety of measures intended to increase the efficiency with which telecommunications carriers use numbering resources in order to slow the rate of number exhaust in this country. The Notice examines existing mechanisms for the administration and allocation of numbering resources, which are governed by industry-developed Central Office Code Guidelines. The Notice proposes certain verification measures designed to prevent carriers from obtaining numbering resources that they do not need in the near term. The Notice tentatively concludes that a more extensive, detailed and uniform reporting mechanism should be developed that will improve numbering utilization and forecasting on a nationwide basis. The Notice tentatively concludes that carriers should report utilization and forecast data on a quarterly basis and that the Commission should mandate that all users of numbering resources must supply utilization and forecast data to the NANPA. With respect to an applicant's ability to obtain initial codes, the Notice seeks comment on what type of showing