Area sales rates of 4.49¢ per Mcf at 1000 Btu per cubic foot and a decrease of 4.53¢ per Mcf in its field area sales rate.

Northern requests any waiver of the Commission's regulations to the extent, if any, required to effectuate the tariff sheets on April 27, 1983.

The Company states that copies of the filing have been mailed to each of the Gas Utility customers, interested State Commissions, and all parties to Docket Nos. RP82-71 and TA83-1-59.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before May 9, 1983. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Kenneth F. Plumb,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 83-12439 Filed 5-9-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP83-75-000]

Northwest Central Pipeline Corp.; Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

May 4, 1983.

Take notice that on April 22, 1983 Northwest Central Pipeline Corporation (Northwest Central) tendered for filing Second Revised Sheet No. 6 and Original Sheet Nos. 96 through 99 to Original Volume No. 1 and First Revised Sheet No. 91 and First Revised Sheet No. 219 to Original Volume No. 2 of its FERC Gas Tariff to be effective on May 23, 1983.

Northwest Central states that the filing proposes an increase above its presently effective rates which reflects an increase in revenues of $19,030,347 inclusive of transportation services, based on the test period (the twelve months ended February 28, 1983, adjusted for known changes through November 30, 1983). Northwest Central states that the increased rates are required to reflect an overall rate of return of 14.63 percent; increases in wages and benefits; increases in administrative expenses; increases in prepayments for gas; increases in plant and related cost of service items; and reduced sales volumes.

Northwest Central's filing also proposes for inclusion in the General Terms and Conditions of Original Volume No. 1 of its FERC Gas Tariff a new Article 25 containing a prepayments rate adjustment provision.

Northwest Central states that this filing was served on each of its customers and affected states commissions pursuant to § 154.16(b) of the Commission's Regulations.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before May 9, 1983. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Kenneth F. Plumb,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 83-12440 Filed 5-9-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket Nos. TA83-2-35-000 and RP83-76-000]

Peoples Natural Gas Company, Division of InterNorth, Inc.; Rate Change and Proposal To Change Purchased Gas Cost Adjustment Provision

May 4, 1983.

Take notice that on April 25, 1983, Peoples Natural Gas Company, Division of InterNorth, Inc., (Peoples) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 4 the following tariff sheets:

Thirtieth Revised Sheet No. 3a
Second Revised Sheet No. 21a
Second Revised Sheet No. 21b

Thirtieth Revised Sheet No. 3a is being filed to reflect reductions in rates received from the Colorado Interstate Gas Company. Peoples proposes to make these reductions effective to its Volume No. 4 customers on June 1, 1983.

Peoples is also proposing in this filing to change its Volume No. 4 PGA Procedures to reflect that the market area served under Volume No. 4 is potentially supplied from multiple sources rather than "a sole source of supply" as specified in the currently effective tariff.

Copies of the filing were served upon the Gas Utility Customers and interested State Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before May 9, 1983. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Kenneth F. Plumb,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 83-12442 Filed 5-9-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

Oil Pipeline; Tentative Valuation

May 9, 1983.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by order issued February 10, 1978, established an Oil Pipeline Board and delegated to the Board its functions with respect to the issuance of valuation reports pursuant to Section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Notice is hereby given that a tentative annual valuation is under consideration for the common carrier by pipeline listed below:

1981 Annual Report

Valuation Docket No. PV-1466-000
Tomahawk Pipe Line Company, P.O. Box 378, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101

On or before June 16, 1983, persons other than those specifically designated in Section 19a(h) of the Interstate Commerce Act having an interest in this valuation may file, pursuant to rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's "Rules of Practice and Procedure" (18 CFR 385.214), an original and three copies of a petition for leave to intervene in this proceeding.

If the petition for leave to intervene is granted the party may thus come within the category of "additional parties as the FERC may prescribe" under Section 19a(h) of the Act, thereby enabling it to file a protest. The petition to intervene must be served on the individual company at its address shown above and an approporiate certificate of

service must be attached to the petition. Persons specifically designated in Section 19a(h) of the Act need not file a petition; they are entitled to file a protest as a matter of right under the statute.

Francis J. Connor,

Administrative Officer, Oil Pipeline Board.

[FR Doc. 83-12467 Filed 5-9-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[WH-FRL 2361-1]

Availability of Report; *Monitoring Results and Environmental Impact on the Gulf of Mexico Incineration Site from the Incineration of PCB's under Research Permit HQ 81-002;* April 1983.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of Availability and Summary Report.

SUMMARY: EPA is today announcing the availability of a report entitled: *Monitoring Results and Environmental Imapct on the Gulf of Mexico Incineration Site from the Incineration of PCB's under Research Permit HQ 81-002. April 1983.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alan B. Rubin (WH-585), U.S. EPA, Criteria and Standards Division, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460 (202) 245-3030.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Two trial burns of PCB-laden wastes were conducted in 1981-1982 onboard the incinerator vessel VULCANUS I at the designated Ocean Incineration Site in the Gulf of Mexico under research permit HQ 81-002 issued by EPA under Section 102 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act. The purpose of these trial burns was to determine the incinerability of PCB's on this vessel by calculating the material's destruction efficiency (DE) and observing incinerator operating conditions. A public meeting and a public hearing were conducted in Brownsville, Texas, on May 20, 1982 and August 31, 1982, respectively, to discuss preliminary results from the two burns and receive comment.

EPA is today announcing the availability of the final technical report on these two trial burns. The report consisting of six studies and conclusions, presents results on incinerator stack gas and environmental monitoring conducted for both burns. A summary of this report follows (attachment). The full report is available for inspection at several locations identified at the end of the report summary.

Dated: May 3, 1983.

Frederic A. Eidsness, Jr.,

Assistant Administrator.

Summary of Report Entitled: Monitoring Results and Environmental Impact on the Gulf of Mexico Incineration Site from the Incineration of PCB's under Research Permit HQ 81-002

April 1983

Abstract

From December 22, 1981 to January 2, 1982, 698,500 U.S. gallons of PCB-laden wastes were incinerated aboard the VULCANUS I. Monitoring data showed that overall waste combustion efficiency (CE) exceeded the permit requirement of 99.9%. The destruction efficiency (DE) of PCB's calculated from data obtained from the one valid sample of stack emissions was greater than the permit requirement of 99.9%. However, problems with the incinerator stack gas sampling equipment prevented the securing for analysis of more than one valid stack gas sample. Consequently, a second research burn was authorized in order to gather additional information of DE for PCB-laden wastes incinerated on the VULCANUS.

From August 15-31, 1982, an additional 800,000 gallons of liquid PCB-laden wastes were incinerated on the VULCANUS I. CE averaged 99.99%. The calculated DE for PCB's exceeded 99.99%. Environmental monitoring in the vicinity of the VULCANUS I showed no impact.

Based upon the monitoring results and incinerator performance data, EPA concludes that the operating and performance parameters under EPA research permit HQ 81-002 were met.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Summaries of Studies and Conclusions

Appendix I—*Monitoring of Combustion Efficiency, Destruction Efficiency and Safety during the Test Incineration of PCB Waste, Carried out in the Gulf of Mexico under EPA Permit HQ 81-002—"Research", from December 22, 1981 to January 2, 1982 on the Incineration Vessel VULCANUS. Part I: Combustion and Destruction.*. Report Written by H. Compaan. TNO Delft, Netherlands. 1982.

Appendix II—*A Summary of Events, Communications, and Technical Data Related to the At-Sea Incineration of PCB—Containing Wastes Onboard the M/T VULCANUS, December 20, 1981 to January 4, 1982.* Report Written by J. F. Metzger and D. G. Ackerman. TRW Inc., Energy and Environmental Division. Redondo Beach, California 90278. March, 1983.

Appendix III—*Audit of the VULCANUS Incineration Ship Prior to the August 1982 PCB Burn, Mobile, Alabama.* Report Written by F. W. Sexton and D. E. Lentzen. Environmental Quality Assurance Department, Systems, and Measurements Division, Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709. October, 1982.

Appendix IV—*At-Sea Incineration of PCB Containing Wastes Onboard the M/T VULCANUS* (August 15-31, 1982). Report Written by D. G. Ackerman, J. F. McGaughey, and D. E. Wagoner. TRW, Inc., Energy and Environmental Division. Redondo Beach, California 90278. February, 1983.

Appendix V—*Biological Monitoring of PCB Incineration at the Designated Site in the Gulf of Mexico.* Report Written by TerEco Corporation, College Station, Texas 77841. October, 1982.

Appendix VI—*Ambient Air Monitoring of the August 1982 M/T VULCANUS PCB Incineration at the Gulf of Mexico Designated Site.* Report Written by Michael A. Guttman, Norman W. Flynn, and Robert F. Shokes. JRB Associates. La Jolla, California 92038. January, 1983.

Executive Summary

Pursuant to reasarch permit HQ 81-002, issued under the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act by EPA to Chemical Waste Mangement and Ocean Combustion Service (the Permittees), the incinerator vessel VULCANUS I incinerated 698,500 U.S. gallons of liquid PCB wastes from December 22, 1981 to January 2, 1982, at the Gulf of Mexico incineration site. A second burn of an additional 800,000 U.S. gallons of these wastes occurred at the site from August 15 to August 31, 1982.

The first burn was monitored by TNO, Dutch scientific consulting organization hired by the Permittees, and these monitoring activities were observed by EPA personnel serving as shipriders. In addition, an EPA contractor, TRW, evaluated TNO's overall monitoring activities and verified their incinerator parameter measurements and their calculation of incinerator performance (CE and DE). Monitoring results showed that overall waste combustion efficiency (CE) varied between 99.916% and 99.999% (permit requirement for CE was equal to or greater than 99.9%). The wall temperatures of both incinerators varied between 1270 and 1320° C (flame temperature 1470 to 1520° C). The permit requirement for minimum wall termperature was 1200° C. A destruction eficiency (DE) for Report PCB's of greater than 99.92% was tentatively determined. TRW verified this result by

analysis of a split stack gas sample. However, problems with the incinerator stack gas sampling apparatus prevented TNO from obtaining more than one valid sample to conclusively determine a scientifically supportable DE for PCB's. Monitoring data and results for the other major incinerator operational and performance parameters (temperature, carbon monoxide, excess oxygen, CE, residence time) demonstrated that the other permit requirements were met or exceeded. Permit requirements for excess oxygen in the stack gas and residence time of the waste in the incinerator were 3% minimum and 1 second or longer, respectively.

On May 20, 1982, a public meeting was held in Brownsville, Texas, to discuss these preliminary results. Several comments received at this meeting indicated that the preliminary information obtained from this burn was not sufficient and/or of a quality to demonstrate adequate incinerability of PCB's aboard the vessel. In addition, both TNO and EPA shiprider reported several minor operating difficulties during this burn. Therefore, it was decided to authorize a second burn under the permit in order to gather additional information for PCB DE calculation.

From August 15–31, 1982, an additional 800,000 gallons of liquid PCB wastes were incinerated on the vessel at the Gulf site. EPA had total control over the emissions and environmental monitoring of this burn. EPA designed, installed, and supervised the operation of the sampling train used in the determination of DE's for PCB's, chlorinated benzenes, and tetrachlorodibenzofuran isomers. In addition, EPA utilized the ocean survey vessel ANTELOPE to conduct environmental monitoring in the vicinity of the VULCANUS. The State of Texas conducted onshore monitoring for possible remnants of the incineration plume.

The various measures of incinerator performance again met or exceeded requirements of the permit. Incinerator wall temperatures averaged 1303°C (permit requirement 1200°C minimum). Excess oxygen in the incinerator stack gas averaged 10.1% (permit requirement 3% minimum). CE avereged 99.99% (permit requirement 99.9% minimum).

The Agency monitored for PCB's, chlorobenzenes, TCDF's and TCDD's in the incinerator stack gas and in the raw wastes. PCB content in the raw wastes ranged from 13.2% to 25.3% with a mean of 19.3%. Chlorobenzene content was approximately 8%. TCDF content in the waste ranged from 25 to 80 ppb. One sample of raw waste contained 0.83 ppb TCDD. None of the first two compounds were found in stack gas concentrations above detecable limits of the analytical method. On that basis, DEs for these first two compounds were calculated to be greater than 99.9906% and greater than 99.996%, respectively (permit requirement for PCB DE was 99.9% minimum). TCDF's were found in some but not all of the stack gases. TCDF DE was calculated to be greater than 99.93%..

Trace amounts of 2,3,7,8–TCDD (dioxin) were found in one of the incinerator stack gas samples. The maximum concentration of dioxin emitted was approximately 2.6% of the concentration found acceptable for emissions from land-based municipal waste resource recovery incinerators.

Environmental monitoring in the vicinity of the VULCANUS showed no impact. No effect on water chemistry or on biota exposed to the plume in the vicinity of the vessel was detected. An increase in ambient water background concentrations of organochlorines was not detected. Organochlorines in the ambient air in the immediate vicinity of the vessel were not detected.

In summary, the monitoring results obtained from the two burns of PCB wastes executed under research permit HQ 81–002 demonstrated that VULCANUS I incinerator operational and performance requirements were met or exceeded. Finally, there were no apparent environmental impacts from incineration of PCB's under these operating and performance conditions.

Summaries of Studies and Conclusions

The following section summarizes the six appendices of the report.

Appendix I—*Monitoring of Combustion Efficiency, Destruction Efficiency and Safety During the Test Incineration of PCB Waste, Carried out in the Gulf of Mexico under EPA Permit HQ 81–002—"Research", from December 22, 1981 to January 2, 1982 on the Incineration Vessel VULCANUS. Part I: Combustion and Destruction.* Report Written by H. Compaan. TNO Delft, Netherlands. 1982

From December 22, 1981 to January 2, 1982, approximately 3300 metric tons (698,500 U.S. gallons) of chemical wastes, containing PCB's were incinerated on the M/T VULCANUS I at the Gulf of Mexico incineration site.

The PCB content of the waste as specified by Chemical Waste Management, Inc., varied between 5.6 and 26.3% (w/w) per tank; the chlorine content as measured by TNO varied between 29 and 66% (w/w) per tank. Other important components of the waste were: hexachlorobutadiene, trichlorobenzene, hexachlorobenzene, hexachloroethane and fuel oil.

The incineration was carried out smoothly and there were no major problems. Minor problems encountered were vibrations of the incinerators, probably caused by the high energy content of part of the waste, and the repeated activation of the automatic shut-off valves by the ultra high frequency radio transmitter signals.

The wall temperatures of both incinerators varied between 1270 and 1320° C, which means that the flame temperatures varied from about 1470 to 1520° C. The calculated average residence times varied from 0.91 to 1.46 seconds. The combustion efficiency was monitored continuously by feeding the signals from the CO and CO_2 monitors into a microcomputer and calculating and printing the results. The combustion efficiency was never lower than 99.916% and normally varied between 99.940% and 99.999%. The stack gas monitors were calibrated three of four times a day.

In order to determine destruction efficiencies of selected waste components, three stack sampling boxes, each containing 8 sampling trains were installed on the catwalk near the top of the ovens. The stack samples were taken through one quartz tube, mounted in a water cooled stainless steel jacket, for each set of 8 sampling trains. Two of these sets could be used, the third one was lost, probably due to plugging of the quartz sampling probe by solid material coming from the brick lining of the incinerators. This may have been caused by incinerator vibrations mentioned above. The recovery factors for the sampling trains were determined in two separate experiments and varied between about 60 and 10% for different substances. The destruction efficiencies for hexachlorobutadiene, different chlorobenzenes and a number of PCB isomers were greater than 99.92% for the one valid stack gas sample obtained.

A number of stack samples were taken through the long heat traced PTFE lines, carrying the stack gases to the stack gas monitors. However, a recovery experiment showed that such a sampling line causes losses of the less volatile PCB components. Traces of PCB's were found in the samples taken through the PTFE line, but these results have not been used for the calculation of destruction efficiencies. Small amount of TCDF were found in the quartz sampling probes and in the condensate flasks.

Appendix II—*A Summary of Events, Communications, and Technical*

Data Related to the At-Sea Incineration of PCB—Containing Wastes Onboard the M/T VULCANUS, December 20, 1981 to January 4, 1982. Report Written by J. F. Metzger and D. G. Ackerman, TRW Inc., Energy and Environmental Division. Redondo Beach, California 90278. March, 1983.

This section was prepared by an EPA contractor and EPA representative who served as shipriders on VULCANUS for the first incineration cruise. It confirms TNO's findings of CE, DE, and other incinerator operational parameters. However, it reports a number of minor problems encountered during the voyage. While these problems did not affect overall ship operations, they did contribute to problems in obtaining sufficient valid measurements to allow EPA to conclude that the DE of PCB wastes was adequate.

- Routing radio transmissions interfered with operation of the camera in the "black box", and portions of the film were not properly exposed.
- The same transmissions interfered with the control electronics of ther waste feed system causing an automatic switch from waste to gasoil feed, thereby also increasing consumption of gasoil. The length of the voyage was increased.
- The fixed-position probe in the port incinerator which supplied gas to the on-line monitoring instrumentation system became plugged. The combustion gas monitors were switched to TNO's probe, but it too became plugged. Thereafter, no combustion gas measurements were possible for the port incinerator. The corresponding probe in the starboard incinerator remained functional
- Continuous and severe vibration occurred during burning of waste material having a heating value in excess of 12,000 Btu/lb. The waste injection systems did not have sufficient turndown, and all other attempts to eliminate the vibration were similary not effective.
- Sampling problems were evidenced by the loss of impinger solution. No fully adequate explanation could be advanced, but the losses for Test 3 were particularly severe and were believed to have been caused by back pressure surges occurring when the probe became plugged. Additionally, the condensate from Test 3 was colorless rather than the green expected. The pressure surges were possibly responsible for this as well, expelling liquid from the downstream impingers into the condensate trap. Test 3 was therefore judged totally invalid.
- Also during the test periods, TNO's CO analyzer was rendered inoperable by the vibration. The calibration electronics of the ship's standard CO analyzer were likewise damaged, but otherwise this instrument seemed to remain functional. It was believed that all subsequent CO readings were high by a value of 9 to 10 ppm. Erroneously high readings such as these lead to calculated combustion efficiency values that are erroneously low.

Appendix III—*Audit of the VULCANUS Incineration Ship Pior to the August 1982 PCB Burn, Mobile, Alabama.* Report Written by F.W. Sexton and D.E. Lentzen. Environmental Quality Assurance Department, Systems and Measurements Division, Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709. October, 1982.

This section describes the procedures by EPA to calibrate instruments on the VULCANUS I used to calculate overall PCB waste C.E. for the second incineration voyage permitted under research permit HQ 81-002.

Appendix IV—*At-Sea Incineration of PCB Containing Wastes Onboard the M/T VULCANUS* (August 15–31, 1982). Report Written by D.G. Ackerman, J.F. McGaughey, and D.E. Wagoner. TRW, Inc., Energy and Environmental Division. Redondo Beach, California 90278. February, 1983.

This report describes the testing that was performed during the incineration at sea of 3,523 metric tons of wastes (800,000 U.S. gallons) containing PCB's onboard the incineration ship M/T VULCANUS from August 15–31, 1982 (2nd burn authorized under research permit HQ 81-002).

EPA contracted the Energy and Environmental Division of TRW, Inc., Redondo Beach, CA, to sample and monitor the incineration process and analyze the samples in order to determine compliance with the operating and safety requirements of the permit. A representative from EPA, (the Task Officer) was onboard during the testing, and a technician-employee of EPA assisted the TRW Test Team.

A standard EPA-specified sampling train was used to acquire samples of the effluent combustion gases. A fixed-position, water-cooled probe was mounted in the starboard incinerator and directed stack gas to the train. A total of 10 stack gas monitoring tests were performed. Samples of the waste were also taken during each test. Samples thus acquired were analyzed on land for PCB's by TRW, and other possible compounds of concern in either the waste or the stack gas, tetrachlorodibenzofurans (TCDF's) and tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxins (TCDD's), were analyzed by the University of Nebraska Chemistry Department and EPA's Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

Other test-relate activities included wipe-sampling and onboard analysis of these samples to determine compliance with the health and safety plan, acquisition of samples of work space air in the incineration control room and the dining room, and acqusition of pertinent process-related data (e.g., temperatures in the incinerators and concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO_2), oxygen (O_2), and carbon monoxide (CO) in the combustion gas).

The various measures of incinerator performance met or exceeded requirements of the permit. Incinerator wall temperatures averaged 1303° C, oxygen 10.1%, carbon dioxide 9.1%, carbon monoxide 8 ppm, and combustion efficiency 99.99%.

The Agency monitored for PCB's, chlorobenzenes, TCDF's and TCDD's in the incinerator stack gas to determine DE's of these compounds (permit requirement for PCB DE was 99.9% minimum). None of the first two compounds were present in stack gas concentrations above detectable limits of the analytical method. On that basis, DE's for these first two compounds were calculated to be greater than 99.9906% and greater than 99.996%, respectively. TCDF's were found in some but not all of the stack gases. TCDF DE was calculated to be greater than 99.93%.

Minute amounts of TCDD were found in one waste and one stack gas sample. Since the two samples did not come from the same test, no DE conclusions could be derived. The amount of TCDD found in the waste (0.83 ppb) was well below levels of TCDD found in Agent Orange incinerated during earlier burns (2.0 ppm). The amount of TCDD found in the one stack gas sample corresponded to an emission concentration of 0.09 ng/m³ whereas EPA's—*Interim Evaluation of Health Risks Associated with Emissions of Tetrachlorinated Dioxins from Municipal Waste Resource Recovery Facilities—November 1982,* allows TCDD emission up to 3.5 ng/m³.

Appendix V—*Biological Monitoring of PCB Incineration at the Designated Site in the Gulf of Mexico.* Report Written by TerEco Corporation, College Station, Texas 77841. October, 1982.

This section details environmental monitoring for changes in water

chemistry and toxicity effects on marine organisms as a result of incineration plume exposure.

During July 1982, TerEco personnel conducted a 4-day baseline or preburn cruise to the Gulf Ocean Incineration Site to check upon environmental conditions at the site to the incineration of PCB wastes and to launch two pelagic biotal ocean monitors (P–BOM's). In August they participated in a 5-day monitoring cruise during which time they launched five P–BOM's, three of which were impacted by the fallout plume of M/T VULCANUS, and two of which served as controls. Three species of marine organisms were exposed in each BOM and were processed for laboratory analyses while still aboard the OSV ANTELOPE.

Laboratory analyses involved determinations of concentrations of PCB's in the surface waters, in collectors placed on each P–BOM, in neuston, and in the tissues of *Menidia beryllina* and *Fundulus grandis* (both finfish). No increase in ambient water background levels of organochlorines was detected from the incineration. Results show that *Fundulus* and *Menidia* did not accumulate additional PCB's above their background levels. The core of the monitoring effort centered in determining the adenylate energy charge (AEC) of test (exposed to fallout plume) and control individuals of the above species and the grass shrimp *Palaemonetes pugio*. Although the results of AEC calculations revealed that all three species suffered some stress during their stay on the ship and their exposure in the P–BOM's, it was concluded that plume contact from the incineration of PCB wastes could not have caused this physiological reaction. More likely as a cause is the long delay in deciding upon ship departure and the related long period that test organisms had to stay in crowded conditions. Metabolic enzyme analyses carried out on *Fundulus* tissues compare favorably with results obtained by TerEco in other environmental studies. No evidence was generated that related any metabolic change in test animals directly to the incineration process.

Appendix VI—*Ambient Air Monitoring of the August 1962, M/T VULCANUS PCB Incineration at the Gulf of Mexico Designated Site.* Report Written by Michael A. Guttman, Norman W. Fynn, and Robert F. Shokes. JRB Associates. La Jolla, California 92038. January, 1983.

This section reports on ambient air monitoring in the immediate vicinity (0.5–15 miles) of the incinerator vessel conducted onboard EPA's ocean research vessel, the ANTELOPE. Plume contract was demonstrated by HCl readings significantly higher than background levels. Organochlorines were not detected for the incineration of PCB wastes.

During July and August, 1982, scientists from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and JRB Associates conducted preburn baseline and incineration monitoring surveys at the Gulf of Mexico designated incineration site. Data on ambient air background concentrations of HCl and organochlorines were obtained on the baseline cruise. The August 1982 incineration was a controlled PCB waste burn conducted by the M/T VULCANUS. Using the government's survey vessel, OSV ANTELOPE, as a sampling platform to track the incineration plume and collect ambient air samples for polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) measurement, the primary objective was to determine if any detectable amounts of fugitive PCB's or organochlorine residues from the incineration process could be found in the atmosphere. Using a dispersion model (Turner, 1970) to predict plume location and guide the sampling, a secondary objective was to check the model's validity using hydrogen chloride (HCl) from the incineration process as a tracer.

Results from the baseline survey indicate only very trace amounts of airborne organic materials, and no organochlorines. By comparison during the incineration monitoring, significantly higher amounts of airbrne organics were measured, but again no PCB's or other organochlorines were detected. Presumably, the elevated airborne organics were generated by combustion on the VULCANUS, either from the waste incineration or from the vessel's propulsion engines. Real-time HCl monitoring assured that the incineration emission plume generated by the VULCANUS was being sampled. Although there were discrepancies between measured airborne HCl levels and distributions predicted by the model, agreement between the two was relatively good considering the uncertainties involved in modeling atmospheric stabiltiy.

Supplemental Reports

Presently, two supplemental reports are still in preparation. They will be made available for public inspection within the next thirty days at the locations identified below.

The first supplemental report is being prepared by the State of Texas. This report will furnish monitoring data for incineration plume remnants at several shore locations. Preliminary results indicate no detectable increase in ambient air organochlorine or HCl concentrations. These results are expected since ambient air monitoring in the immediate vicinity of the VULCANUS yielded no detectable concentrations of organochlorines and only ppm concentrations of HCl.

The second supplemental report is being prepared by EPA and will present descriptive worst case scenarios for spillage of a full shipload of PCB wastes over commercially and recreationally important Gulf Coast fishing and shrimping grounds as well as spillage at the Gulf of Mexico incineration site. Probabilities of such occurrences will also be stated. This report will also describe a worst case meteorological scenario for plume remnant transport to landfall, indicating PCB concentrations reching land. These concentrations will be compared to ambient background PCB concentrations and several OSHA and NIOSH standards. Total PCB exposure due to contact with plume remnants under worst case meteorological conditions will be compared to PCB exposure from other routes such as diet. As with worst case spillages, a probability or occurrence frequency of such worst case meteorological conditions will be stated.

Full Report Availability

All appendices in this report are on file at the following locations for inspection during normal business hours:

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Criteria and Standards Division, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, Attn: Dr. Alan B. Rubin, 2818 Mall, (202) 245–3030

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Library, Room 2404 Mall, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Brownsville, Room 508, Boca Chica Towers, 2100 Boca Chica Blvd., Brownsvill, Texas

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region VI, 1201 Elm Street, Dallas, Texas 75270, Attn: Bob Vickery

Appendix IV to this report is also identified as EPA Report No. 600/7–83–024, April, 1983 and may be ordered from the National Technical Information

Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161, (703) 487–4650.

[FR Doc. 83-12387 Filed 5-9-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[PF-323; PH-FRL 2351-8]

Certain Companies; Pesticide, Food, and Food Additive Petitions

Correction

In FR Doc. 83–10740, in the issue of Wednesday, April 27, 1983, appearing on page 19078, in the second column, first full paragraph, line 6, *"[N–T1 (1-ethylpropyl)-3,4-"* should read *"[N-(1-ethylpropyl)-3,4-"*.

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Highlands Broadcasting Co., Inc. et al.; Hearing Designation Order; Correction

In re applications of Highlands Broadcasting Company, Inc., Stevens Point, Wisconsin, Req: 96.7 MHz, Channel 244 3kW (H&V), 300 feet (MM Docket No. 83–274, File No. BPH–810709AD); Skipko Broadcasting, Inc., Junction City, Wisconsin, Req: 96.7 MHz, Channel 244 3kW (H&V), 280 feet (MM Docket No. 83–275, File No. BPH–811201AK); Sharon Broadcasting Corporation, Whiting, Wisconsin, Req: 96.7 MHz, Channel 244 3 kW (H&V), 300 feet (MM Docket No. 83–276 File No. BPH–820122AR); Central Wisconsin Broadcasting Company, Stevens Point, Wisconsin, Req: 96.7 MHz, Channel 244 3 kW (H&V), 291 feet (MM Docket No. 83–277 File No. BPH–820129AU). (3–31–83; 48 FR 13491)

Released: April 21, 1983.

The Commission, by the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, has before it the hearing designation order designation for comparative hearing the above-captioned applications, released March 25, 1983, which inadvertently and erroneously listed the proposed community of license of the Skipko Broadcasting, Inc. application as "Stevens Points, Wisconsin."

Accordingly, it is ordered, That the caption of the Skipko Broadcasting, Inc. application is corrected to read "Junction City, Wisconsin."

Federal Communications Commission.

Larry D. Eads,

Chief, Audio Services Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 83-12471 Filed 5-9-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

[Report No. 1402]

Petitions for Reconsideration and Applications for Review of Actions in Rulemaking Proceedings

May 3, 1983.

The following listings of petitions for reconsideration and applications for review filed in Commission rulemaking proceedings is published pursuant to CFR 1.429(e). Oppositions to such petitions for reconsideration and applications for review must be filed within 15 days after publication of this Public Notice in the **Federal Register.** Replies to an opposition must be filed within 10 days after time for filing oppositions has expired.

Subject: Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Assignments, FM Broadcast Stations. (North Charleston, Eastover, and Ravenel, South Carolina) (BC Docket No. 80–201, RM's 3249 & 3710)

Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Assignments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Elloree, South Carolina) (BC Docket No. 80–211, RM–3579)

Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Assignments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Mount Pleasant, Parris Island, Manning, Bamberg, and Batesburg, South Carolina) (BC Docket No. 80–213, RM's 3406, 3718 & 3719)

Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Assignments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Johnston, Leesville, Winnsboro Mills, Saluda, Union and Batesburg, South Carolina) (BC Docket No. 81–171, RM's 3518, 3556, 3613, 3666 & 3771)

Filed by: Edward B. Reddy & Matthew H. McCormick, Attorneys for Edgefield-Saluda Radio Co., Inc., on 3–28–83. Robert E. Kelly, Attorney for Clarence E. Jones, d/b/a Santee-Cooper Broadcasting Company on 3–28–83. Lawrence J. Bernard, Jr., Attorney for Clarendon County Broadcasting Company (WTWE–FM) & Jerrold Miller, Attorney for Ridge Broadcasting Company (WKWQ–FM) on 3–28–83.

Subject: Expansion of the Telephony Segments of the High Frequency Amateur Radio Service Bands. (PR Docket No. 82–83, RM's 3705, 3729, 3734, 3778, 3831, 3833 & 3860)

Filed by: Malcolm C. Mallette (WA9BVS), on 4–22–83.

Subject: Interconnection Arrangements Between and Among the Domestic and International Record Carriers. (CC Docket No. 82–122)

Filed by: Arthur H. Simms, Attorney for The Western Union Telegraph Company on 4–25–83. John A. Ligon, Attorney for ITT World Communications Inc., on 4–26–83.

Subject: The Suburban Community Policy, the *Berwick* Doctrine, and the *De Facto* Reallocation Policy. (BC Docket No. 82–320)

Filed by: George H. Shapiro & Michael J. Hirrel, Attorneys for Buena Vista Telecasters of Texas, Inc., on 4–13–83. Roy F. Perkins, Jr., for Perkins and Root, law firm on 4–13–83. Joseph F. Hennessey, Attorney for Denton Channel Two Foundation, Inc., on 4–13–83. John R. Feore & Thomas J. Hutton, Attorneys for Suncoast Radio-South Carolina Corporation on 4–14–83. Dennis P. Corbett & Robert W. Coll, Attorneys for Wilson Communications Corp., on 4–22–83. Dennis P. Corbett, James A. McKenna, Jr. & Steven A. Lerman, Attorneys for the law firm of McKenna, Wilkinson & Kittner on 4–22–83. James A. McKenna, Jr., Robert W. Coll & Jill Abeshouse Stern, Attorneys for American Broadcasting Companies, Inc., on 4–22–83. J. Richard Carr, Attorney for Washington Oregon Broadcasting, Inc., on 4–22–83. Robert B. McKenna, Attorney for W–2, Incorporated on 4–22–83. Lawrence J. Bernard, Jr., Attorney for Jack A. Carpenter and Beaufort County Broadcasting Company on 4–22–83.

Subject: Establishment of a Class of Amateur Operator License Not Requiring a Demonstration of Proficiency in the International Morse Code. (PR Docket No. 83–28)

Rule Part: 97.

Filed by: Robert G. Wheaton (W5XW), on 4–25–83. (Request that the Commission review and reverse denial of extension of time in which to file comments)

Federal Communications Commission.

William J. Tricarico,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 83-12470 Filed 5-9-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

Telecommunications Industry Advisory Group Income and Other Accounts Subcommittee

Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Telecommunications Industry Advisory Group (TIAG) Income and Other Accounts Subcommittee scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday, June 8 and 9, 1983. The meeting will begin on June 8 at 9:30 a.m. in the offices of AT&T, Conference