

SUMMARY: There will be a 1-day meeting of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) to review a set of scientific issues being considered by the Agency in connection with the Special Review of Tributyltin (TBT); a set of scientific issues being considered by the Agency in connection with the peer review classification of: Acifluorfen as a Class B-2 oncogen; Assure as a Class C oncogen; Oxadixyl as a Class C oncogen; Methidathion as a Class C oncogen; Paraquat as a Class C oncogen; Savey as a Class B-2/C oncogen; Terbutryn as a Class C oncogen; Triadimenol (Baytan) as a Class C oncogen; and an information briefing on Part 158—Toxicology Data Requirements for Food Use Pesticides.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 15, 1987, from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

ADDRESS: The meeting will be held at: Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 1121, Crystal Mall Building No. 2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

By mail: Stephen L. Johnson, Executive Secretary, FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel, Office of Pesticide Programs (TS-769C), 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Office location and telephone number: Rm. 1121, Crystal Mall Building No. 2, Arlington, VA, (703-557-7695).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The agenda for the meeting is: 1. Review of a set of scientific issues in connection with the Special Review of TBT. The Agency initiated a Special Review of TBT in January 1986, based on the Agency's determination that adverse acute and chronic effects of nontarget aquatic organisms may result from the use of TBT compounds as antifoulants.

2. Review of a set of scientific issues in connection with the Agency's classification of the peer review of Acifluorfen as a Class B-2 oncogen (probable human carcinogen). The classification of Acifluorfen as a B-2 oncogen was based on an increased incidence of combined malignant and benign liver tumors in two different studies employing different strains (B6C3F1 and CR-CD-1) of mice.

3. Review of a set of scientific issues in connection with the Agency's classification of the peer review of Assure as a Class C Oncogen (possible human carcinogen). The classification of Assure was based on the incidence of liver tumors in CD-1 mice.

4. Review of a set of scientific issues in connection with the Agency's classification of the peer review of

Methidathion as a Class C oncogen (possible human carcinogen). The classification of Methidathion as a Class C oncogen was based on an increased incidence of hepatocellular adenoma/adenocarcinoma, adenoma, and adenocarcinoma only in one sex (male) and one species mouse.

5. Review of a set of scientific issues in connection with the Agency's classification of the peer review of Oxadixyl as a Class C oncogen (possible human carcinogen) based on a significant increased incidence of benign hepatocellular tumors in both sexes in Han-Wistar rats.

6. Review of a set of scientific issues in connection with the Agency's classification of the peer review of Paraquat as a Class C oncogen (limited evidence for oncogenicity in animals). The classification of Paraquat as a Class C oncogen was based on one study which showed increased incidences in squamous cell carcinomas in male rats.

7. Review of a set of scientific issues being considered by the Agency's classification of Savey as a Class B-2/C oncogen (intermediate between probable and a possible human carcinogen). The classification of Savey as a Class B-2/C was based on varying interpretation of the evidence from two animal studies, in two species.

8. Review of a set of scientific issues being considered by the Agency's classification of Terbutryn as a Class C oncogen. The classification of Terbutryn as a Class C oncogen was based on increased incidences of benign and/or combined malignant/benign tumors in one species, the rat.

9. Review of a set of scientific issues being considered by the Agency's classification of Triadimenol (Baytan) as a Class C oncogen based on increased incidence of benign tumors in female mice but not in male mice or male and female rats.

10. An information briefing on Part 158—Toxicology Data Requirements for Food Use Pesticides.

11. In addition, the Agency may present status reports on other ongoing programs of the Office of Pesticide Programs.

Copies of documents relating to items 1-9 may be obtained by contacting:

By mail: Information Services Branch, Program Management and Support Division (TS-757C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Office location and telephone number: Rm. 1006, Crystal Mall Building No. 2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA., (703-557-2805).

Any member of the public wishing to submit written comments should contact Stephen L. Johnson at the address or telephone number given above to be sure that the meeting is still scheduled and to confirm the Panel's agenda. Interested persons are permitted to file such statements before the meeting. To the extent that time permits and upon advance notice to the Executive Secretary, interested persons may be permitted by the chairman of the Scientific Advisory Panel to present oral statements at the meeting. There is no limit on written comments for consideration by the Panel, but oral statements before the Panel are limited to approximately 5 minutes. Since oral statements will be permitted only as time permits, the Agency urges the public to submit written comments in lieu of oral presentations. Information submitted as a comment in response to this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as "Confidential Business Information" (CBI). Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR Part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information not marked confidential will be included in the public docket without prior notice. The public docket will be available for public inspection in Rm. 236 at the address given above, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. All statements will be made part of the record and will be taken into consideration by the Panel. Persons wishing to make oral and/or written statements should notify the Executive Secretary and submit ten copies of a summary no later than December 8, 1987, in order to ensure appropriate consideration by the Panel.

Dated: November 23, 1987.

Victor J. Kimm,
Assistant Administrator for Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 87-27489 Filed 11-25-87; 11:16 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[FRL-3296-4]

Southern Oahu Basal Aquifer in the Pearl Harbor Area of Oahu; Principal Source Aquifer Determination

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final determination.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, the

Regional Administrator in Region IX of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has determined that the Southern Oahu Basal Aquifer is the sole or principal source of drinking water for the entire Districts of Wahiawa and Ewa, and the portion of the Honolulu District west of the Manoa Stream channel and this aquifer, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health. As a result of this action, Federal financially assisted projects constructed anywhere in the Pearl Harbor area mentioned above will be subject to EPA review to ensure that these projects are designed and constructed so that they do not create a significant hazard to public health.

ADDRESSES: The data on which these findings are based are available to the public any may be inspected during normal business hours at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, Water Management Division, Fifth Floor, 214 Fremont Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chris Wohlers, Office of Groundwater Protection, Water Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, at (415) 974-0830.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that pursuant to section 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h-3(e), Pub. L. 93-523) the Regional Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has determined that the Southern Oahu Basal Aquifer of Oahu is the sole or principal source of drinking water for the Wahiawa District, the Ewa District, and the portion of the Honolulu District west of the Manoa Stream channel. Pursuant to section 1424(e), Federal financially assisted projects, constructed anywhere in the Pearl Harbor area mentioned above, will be subject to EPA review.

I. Background

Section 1423(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act states:

If the Administrator determines, on his own initiative or upon petition, that an area has an aquifer which is the sole or principal drinking water source for the area and which, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health, he shall publish notice of that determination in the **Federal Register**. After the publication of any such notice, no commitment for Federal financial assistance (through a grant, contract, loan guarantee, or otherwise) may be entered into for any project guarantee, or otherwise) may be entered into for any project which the Administrator determines may

contaminate such aquifer through a recharge zone so as to create a significant hazard to public health, but a commitment for Federal financial assistance may, if authorized under another provision of the law, be entered into to plan or design the project to assure that it will not so contaminate the aquifer.

On May 3, 1983, Hazel Cunningham of Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioned the EPA to designate groundwater resources of the Pearl Harbor area as a principal source of drinking water. In response to this petition, EPA published a notice in the **Federal Register** on July 17, 1984, announcing receipt of the petition and requesting public comment. EPA prepared a draft technical document summarizing available information and proposing a sole or principal source aquifer designation. A public comment period, including a hearing on the proposed designation, was public noticed in the **Federal Register** on February 9, 1987. A public hearing was conducted on April 2, 1987, and the public was allowed to submit comments until April 16, 1987.

II. Basis for Determination

Among the factors to be considered by the Regional Administrator in connection with the designation of an area under section 1424(e) are: (1) Whether the aquifer is the area's sole or principal source of drinking water, and (2) whether contamination of the aquifer would create a significant hazard to public health.

On the basis of information available to this Agency, the Regional Administrator has made the following findings, which are the bases for the determination noted above:

1. The Southern Oahu Basal Aquifer currently serves as the "principal source" of drinking water for approximately 763,000 permanent residents within the Pearl Harbor area.

2. There is no existing alternative drinking water source, or combination of sources, which provides fifty percent or more of the drinking water to the designated area, nor is there any demonstrated available alternative future source capable of supplying the area's drinking water needs.

3. Although the water quality over most of the study area is satisfactory for domestic use, widespread potential exists for degradation. The main threats to the quality of the basal aquifer include salt water intrusion; recharge from excess irrigation; industrial, military and urban sources; landfills; chemical spills; poorly situated injection wells; and cesspools.

III. Description of the Southern Oahu Basal Aquifer

The aquifer is composed of a basal fresh water lens floating on sea water. The basal fresh water lens is a continuous, but compartmental aquifer situated in the coastal plain of southern Oahu. The aquifer is very thick, exceeding 1000 feet in some areas. Recharge is ultimately from rainfall as well as from excess irrigation. Total domestic water use in 1978 consisted of 68% groundwater resources from this system.

IV. Information Utilized in Determination

The information utilized in this determination includes the petition from Hazel Cunningham of Honolulu, Hawaii, research of available literature on the groundwater resources of Oahu, and written and verbal comments submitted by the public. This data is available to the public, and may be inspected during normal business hours at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

V. Project Review

EPA Region IX will work with the Federal agencies that may in the future provide financial assistance to projects in the area of concern. Interagency procedures will be developed in which EPA will be notified of proposed commitments by federal agencies for projects which could contaminate the aquifer. EPA will evaluate such projects and, where necessary, conduct an in-depth review, including soliciting public comments where appropriate. Should the Regional Administrator determine that a project may contaminate the aquifer through its recharge zone so as to create a significant hazard to public health, no commitment for Federal financial assistance may be entered into. However, a commitment for Federal assistance may, if authorized under another provision of law, be entered into to plan or design the project to assure that it will not contaminate the aquifer.

Although the project review process cannot be delegated, the U.S. EPA will rely upon, to the maximum extent possible any existing or future state and local control mechanisms in protecting the groundwater quality of the aquifer. Included in the review of any Federal financially assisted project will be the coordination with the state and local agencies. Their comments will be given full consideration and the federal review process will attempt to complement and

S000041

support state and local groundwater mechanisms.

VI. Summary and Discussion of Public Comments

Overall, commentors at the public hearing favored designation by a margin of 18 to 8. EPA received several comments concerning whether the technical document implies that groundwater in Southern Oahu occurs in only one aquifer. EPA responded by referring to the technical document which defines the sole or principal source aquifer as being composed of semi-independent reservoirs.

One comment concerned the inference that irrigation return flow is a potential source of contamination without stating clearly the importance of irrigation return as a source of recharge. It was pointed out that the technical document does identify irrigation return flow as a source of recharge as well as a potential source of contamination.

EPA received several comments stating that the designation is unnecessary because the Honolulu Board of Water Supply maintains a distribution system which interconnects the island's other sources of drinking water. EPA responded by recognizing the suitability of using this distribution system as a possible emergency source of drinking water. EPA also noted that no demonstration has been made concerning the long-term capability of the system to meet the entire island's needs.

EPA received several comments doubting the reliability and applicability of the references cited in the technical document. EPA responded by taking into account any new information and corrections, and setting aside any new data which did not substantially differ from existing data or significantly affect its interpretation.

VII. Economic and Regulatory Impact

Pursuant to provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 605(b), I hereby certify that the attached rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. For purposes of this Certification, the term "small entity" shall have the same meaning as given in Section 601 of the RFA. This action is only applicable to the Pearl Harbor area. The only affected entities will be those businesses, organizations, or governmental jurisdictions that request Federal financial assistance for projects which have the potential for contaminating the aquifer so as to create a significant hazard to public health. EPA does not expect to be reviewing

small isolated commitments of financial assistance on an individual basis, unless a cumulative impact on the aquifer is anticipated; accordingly, the number of affected small entities will be minimal.

For those small entities which are subject to review, the impact of today's action will not be significant. Most projects subject to this review will be preceded by a groundwater impact assessment required pursuant to other federal laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq. Integration of those related review procedures with sole source aquifer review will allow EPA and other federal agencies to avoid delay or duplication of effort in approving financial assistance, thus minimizing any adverse effect on those small entities which are affected. Finally, today's action does not prevent grants of Federal financial assistance which may be available to any affected small entity in order to pay for the redesign of the project to assure protection of the aquifer.

Under Executive Order 12291, EPA must judge whether a regulation is "major" and therefore subject to the requirement of a Regulatory Impact Analysis. This regulation is not major because it will not have an annual effect of \$100 million or more on the economy, will not cause any major increase in costs or prices, and will not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States enterprises to compete in domestic or export markets. Today's action only affects the Pearl Harbor area. It provides additional reviews of groundwater protection measures, whenever possible, for only those projects which request Federal financial assistance. This regulation was submitted to OMB for review under EO 12291.

Dated: November 2, 1987.

Judith E. Ayres,
Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 87-27418 Filed 11-27-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Petitions for Reconsideration of Actions in Rulemaking Proceedings; Correction

November 23, 1987.

On November 20, 1987, the Commission published in the *Federal Register* (52 FR 44634), a Notice of

Petitions for Reconsideration (Report No. 1690) in CC Docket No. 87-113 (Amendment of Part 69 of the rules, Access Charges, to conform to Part 36, Jurisdictional Separations). That Notice was released on November 13, 1987. In the *Federal Register*, the date on which opposition are due was misstated as being November 27, 1987. The correct date is *December 8, 1987*. Replies to oppositions will be due on *December 18, 1987*.

Federal Communications Commission.

William J. Tricarico,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 87-27502 Filed 11-27-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

[FEMA-802-DR]

Amendment to Notice of a Major-Disaster Declaration; Texas

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of Texas (FEMA-802-DR), dated November 20, 1987, and related determinations.

DATED: November 23, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Neva K. Elliott, Disaster Assistance Programs, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC 20472 (202) 646-3614.

Notice

The notice of a major disaster for the State of Texas, dated November 20, 1987, is hereby amended to include the following areas among those areas determined to have been adversely affected by the catastrophe declared a major disaster by the President in his declaration of November 20, 1987:

The Counties of Burleson, Lee, Panola, Shelby, Smith, and Upshur for Individual Assistance only.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.516, Disaster Assistance)

Dave McLoughlin,

Deputy Associate Director, State and Local Programs and Support, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 87-27385 Filed 11-27-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-02-M

S000042