

various producers located in the State of Oklahoma. Transportation of the gas is to be performed by an interstate pipeline from a point in Oklahoma for delivery into TUFCO's existing intrastate pipeline system in Texas pursuant to section 311(a)(1) of the NGPA. In some instances an intrastate pipeline in Oklahoma may be utilized to transport the gas from the wellhead or gathering lines to the interstate pipeline. Additionally, an intrastate pipeline may be utilized in Texas to transport the gas from the interstate pipeline to the pipeline facilities of TUFCO. If an intrastate pipeline transports such gas either to or from the interstate pipeline, the intrastate pipeline will do so pursuant to section 311(a)(2) of the NGPA. After receipt of the gas into its system, TUFCO would transfer legal title to and deliver the gas directly to TU Electric, delivering it along with the rest of its system supply for use in TU Electric's electric generating stations. TUFCO does not propose, nor will it be required, to add any facilities to its system in order to implement the arrangement herein described. The transaction with Sunrise is subject to the receipt by TUFCO of a final order from the Commission granted in accordance with this petition and in a form acceptable to TUFCO.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or to protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rule 214 or 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 and 385.211 (1987)) within 15 days of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. 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 motion to intervene.

Lois D. Cashell,  
Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 88-11910 Filed 5-25-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

(FRL-3386-4)

### Agency Information Collection Activities Under OMB Review

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and is available to the public for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Carla Levesque at EPA, (202) 382-2740.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Office of Air and Radiation

*Title:* Survey of Indoor Air Quality Diagnostic and Mitigation Firms. (EPA ICR #1448).

*Abstract:* Survey of companies in the private sector that offer services related to the prevention, diagnosis, and mitigation of indoor air quality (IAQ) problems in residences, schools, and commercial/public buildings. Survey results will be used to evaluate the private sector's ability to solve IAQ problems; the results will also be reported to Congress.

*Respondents:* Indoor Air Quality Diagnostic and Mitigation Firms.

*Estimated Burden:* 3,000 hours.

*Frequency of Collection:* One time only.

Comments on the ICR should be sent to:

Carla Levesque, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Information Policy Branch (PM-223), 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460  
and

Nicolas Garcia, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, DC 20503,  
(Telephone (202) 395-3084).  
Date: May 13, 1988.

Paul Lapsley,

Acting Director, Information and Regulatory Systems Division.

[FR Doc. 88-11834 Filed 5-25-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[WH-FRL-3385-9]

### Reallotment of Funds Under Municipal Wastewater Treatment Works Construction Grants Program

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of reallotment of funds under Municipal Wastewater Treatment Works Construction Grants Program (40 CFR Part 35, Subpart I).

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the distribution of unobligated fiscal year (FY) 1986 construction grant funds subject to reallotment after September 30, 1987, under section 205 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1285, and explains the procedure by which the reallotment distribution was determined.

The construction grants program operates under authority of the Clean Water Act (the Act), Pub. L. No. 92-500, as amended. Section 205(d) of the Act requires that funds allotted to a State which are not obligated by the end of the second year of their availability " \* \* \* shall be immediately reallotted by the Administrator \* \* \*". This notice advises the public of the reallotted amounts made available to the eligible States and of \$1,000,000 made available to the National Small Flows Clearinghouse as required under section 104(q) of the Act as amended by Pub. L. No. 100-4. Funds reallotted to participating States are added to their allotments for grants for the construction of municipal wastewater treatment facilities. Under section 205(d), these funds are available for obligation until September 30, 1989.

**DATE:** May 26, 1988.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Richard McDermott, Program Management Branch, Municipal Construction Division, Office of Municipal Pollution Control, (202) 382-5830.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Sums allotted to a State under section 205 of the Act remain available for obligation during the fiscal year in which appropriated and the following 12 months (40 CFR 35.2010(b)). Funds not obligated at the end of this period of availability are reallotted under section 205(d) to the States which fully obligated their allotments, after funds are made available to the National Small Flows Clearinghouse in accordance with the requirements of section 104(q) of the Act, as amended by Pub. L. No. 100-4. Section 104(q) requires the Administrator to make available to the Small Flows Clearinghouse, from funds reserved for innovative and alternative projects under section 205(i), an amount equal to those unobligated funds or \$1,000,000, whichever is less. Congress appropriated \$600 million in FY 1986 funding for the construction grants program. Subsequent to a sequestration order being applied to these funds, \$574.2 million was allotted to the States of the original \$600 million. In Pub. L. No. 99-349 Congress appropriated an additional \$1.2 billion in FY 1986 construction grants funding. At

the close of the availability period for the FY 1986 allotment (September 30, 1987), 17 States and territories had not obligated \$4,600,043 of the \$1,774.2 million available in FY 1986 allotments. The \$4,600,043 consists of \$2,914,175 of funds reserved under section 205(i) for innovative and alternative projects and \$1,685,868 of funds reserved for small communities under section 205(h).

As explained below, not all of the unobligated funds remaining after the period of availability are subject to reallocation under section 205(d) as modified by section 104(q). Due to the following exception the total amount reallocated is \$4,596,273.

**Northern Mariana Islands:** Section 3(b)(2) of Pub. L. No. 95-348 provides that any funds made available to the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI) by the Congress after March 24, 1976

" \* \* \* are hereby authorized to remain available until expended." Accordingly, construction grants funds allotted to the NMI which remain unobligated at the close of the period of availability prescribed by section 205(d) of the Act are not subject to reallocation. Because the NMI would have lost \$3,770 to reallocation without this statutory provision, section 205(d) prevents the NMI from receiving any funds reallocated from other states.

#### Reallocation Procedure

To distribute the \$4,596,273 that is subject to reallocation in accordance with the requirements of sections 205(d) and 104(q) of the Act the following procedure was used:

1. The sum of \$1,000,000 was subtracted from the total subject to reallocation. This amount will be made available to the Small Flows Clearinghouse and reduce the amount for reallocation to the participating States to \$3,596,273.
2. The State allotment shares listed in section 205(c) of the Act (as amended by Pub. L. 100-4) were modified to reflect funding reductions resulting from the former Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands' new status as freely associated States under Pub. L. No. 99-239, as amended by Pub. L. No. 99-658. Those shares were then adjusted to reflect the absence of States which did not fully obligate their funds (40 CFR 35.2010(b)).
3. The resulting allotment shares were applied to the \$3,596,273 to arrive at each participating State's reallocation amount.
4. The resulting figures (rounded to the nearest \$100, except for New York which is used as the balancing factor) are listed in the table which follows in the column titled "Reallocation." The table also identifies the States which did

not fully obligate their funds and displays these amounts in the column titled "Subject to Reallocation."

These reallocated funds are available for obligation until September 30, 1989. After that date, unobligated balances will be reallocated under section 205(d) of the Act (40 CFR 35.2010). Grants from these funds may be awarded as of the date that advices of allowance are issued to the EPA Regional Administrators by the Comptroller of EPA.

Dated: May 10, 1988.

Lee M. Thomas,  
Administrator.

#### SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1986 CONSTRUCTION GRANTS REALLOCATION

State	Subject to reallocation	Reallocation
Alabama		\$46,900
Alaska		25,100
Arizona		28,300
Arkansas	\$335,554	
California		299,800
Colorado		33,500
Connecticut	167,833	
Delaware	694,030	
Dist. Of Columbia	44,045	
Florida	305,230	
Georgia		70,900
Hawaii	560,280	
Idaho		20,600
Illinois		189,600
Indiana		101,000
Iowa		56,700
Kansas		37,800
Kentucky		53,400
Louisiana		46,100
Maine		32,400
Maryland		101,400
Massachusetts		142,300
Michigan		180,200
Minnesota		77,000
Mississippi		37,900
Missouri		116,200
Montana		20,600
Nebraska		21,400
Nevada		20,600
New Hampshire	234,100	
New Jersey	30	171,300
New Mexico	352,308	
New York		462,673
North Carolina		75,700
North Dakota	267,935	
Ohio		236,900
Oklahoma		33,900
Oregon		47,400
Pennsylvania		166,000
Rhode Island	226,071	
South Carolina		42,900
South Dakota		20,600
Tennessee		60,900
Texas		191,600
Utah		22,100
Vermont		20,600
Virginia		85,800
Washington	118,445	
West Virginia		65,300
Wisconsin		113,300
Wyoming		20,600
Guam	46,960	
Puerto Rico	1,061,460	
Virgin Islands	75,360	
American Samoa	56,805	

#### SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1986 CONSTRUCTION GRANTS REALLOCATION—Continued

State	Subject to reallocation	Reallocation
Trust Territories of Pacific Islands	49,857	
Northern Mariana Islands		
National Small Flows Clearinghouse		1,000,000
Total	4,596,273	4,596,273

[FR Doc. 88-11835 Filed 5-25-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[FRL-3386-3]

#### Sole Source Aquifer Designation for the Hunt-Annaquatucket-Pettaquamscutt Aquifer Area, Rhode Island

**AGENCY:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a petition from the the towns of North Kingstown and East Greenwich, Rhode Island, notice is hereby given that the Regional Administrator, Region I, of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has determined that the Hunt-Annaquatucket-Pettaquamscutt (HAP) Aquifer Area satisfies all determination criteria for designation as a Sole Source Aquifer, pursuant to section 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act. The designation criteria include the following: The HAP Aquifer Area is the principal source of drinking water for the residents of that area; there are no viable alternative sources of sufficient supply; the boundaries of the designated area and project review area have been reviewed and approved by EPA; and if contamination were to occur, it would pose a significant public health hazard and a serious financial burden to the area's residents. As a result of this action, all federal financially assisted projects proposed for construction within the HAP Aquifer Area will be subject to EPA review to reduce the risk or ground water contamination from these projects.

**DATES:** This determination shall be promulgated for purposes of judicial review at 1:00 p.m. Eastern time two weeks after the date of publication in the Federal Register.

**ADDRESSES:** The data upon which these findings are based are available to the public and may be inspected during normal business hours at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

Region I, JFK Federal Building, Water Management Division, WGP-2113, Boston, MA 02203. The designation petition submitted may also be inspected at the North Kingstown Free Library in North Kingstown, Rhode Island.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Robert E. Mendoza, Chief of the Ground Water Management Section, EPA Region I, JFK Federal Building, WGP-2113, Boston, MA 02203, 617-565-3600.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

Section 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f, 300h-3(e), Pub. L. 93-523) 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 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 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 law, be entered into to plan or design the project to assure that it will not so contaminate the aquifer.

On December 30, 1987, EPA received a petition from the towns of N. Kingstown and E. Greenwich, Rhode Island requesting designation of the HAP Aquifer Area as a sole source aquifer. EPA determined that the petition, after receipt and review of additional requested information fully satisfied the Completeness Determination Checklist. A public hearing was then scheduled and held on March 16, 1988, in N. Kingstown, Rhode Island, in accordance with all applicable notification and procedural requirements. A two week public comment period followed the hearing.

**II. Basis For Determination**

Among the factors considered by the Regional Administrator as part of the detailed review and technical verification process for designating an area under section 1424(e) were: (1) Whether the aquifer is the sole or principal source (more than 50%) of drinking water for the defined aquifer service area, and that the volume of water from an alternative source is insufficient to replace the petitioned aquifer; (2) whether contamination of the aquifer would create a significant

hazard to public health; and (3) whether the boundaries of the aquifer, its recharge area and streamflow source area(s), the project designation area, and the project review area are appropriate. On the basis of technical information available to EPA at this time, the Regional Administrator has made the following findings in favor of designating the HAP Aquifer Area as a sole source aquifer:

1. The HAP Aquifer Area is the principal source of drinking water to all of the residents within the service area.

2. There exists no reasonable alternative drinking water source or combination of sources of sufficient quantity to supply the designated service area.

3. EPA has found that the towns of N. Kingstown and E. Greenwich have appropriately delineated the boundaries of the aquifer recharge area, designation area and project review area.

4. Although the quality of the area's ground water is rated as good to excellent, it is highly vulnerable to contamination due to the area's geological characteristics.

Because of this, contaminants can be rapidly introduced into the aquifer system from a number of sources with minimal assimilation. This may include contamination from chemical spills, highway, urban and rural runoff, septic systems, leaking storage tanks, both above and underground, road salting operations, saltwater intrusion, and landfill leachate. Since all residents are dependent upon the aquifer for their drinking water, a serious contamination incident could pose a significant public health hazard and place a severe financial burden on the service area's residents.

**III. Description of the HAP Aquifer Area, Designated Area, and Project Review Area**

The HAP Aquifer Area covers 41 square miles in central Rhode Island. It encompasses most of N. Kingstown and E. Greenwich, and portions of Coventry, Exeter, Warwick, W. Greenwich and W. Warwick. It is comprised of three hydrogeologically interconnected aquifers. The aquifers consist of extensive deposits of stratified drift. They are generally located in the lowland areas of the basin. The recharge areas or highland portions of the basin consist of interfingering stratified drift and till deposits. Bedrock outcrops can also be found in these highland areas.

The designated area is defined as the surface area above the aquifer system and its recharge area. For the HAP Aquifer Area the boundary of the designated area coincides with the

boundary of the project review area. The northern and southern boundaries of the area are the same as those delineated for the Potowomut-Wickford area in the US Geological Survey Water Supply Paper (WSP) #1775. The western boundary of the HAP Aquifer Area is coterminous with the western boundary of the Potowomut-Wickford area except in two areas. In these two areas, the ground water divide differs from the surface water divide. Using the ground water divide for the boundary includes a larger area than would be included using the surface water divide. Technically it is reasonable to extend the designated and project review area boundaries to the ground water divide because ground water from this area can recharge the aquifer system and therefore should be protected. The eastern boundary was mapped by the RI Department of Environmental Management, and is based upon surface topography. This eastern boundary represents the watershed/surface water divide which separates those areas contributing to the ground water reservoirs from those areas contributing to Narragansett Bay.

The recharge areas are usually comprised of bedrock and/or till which may be interfingering with stratified drift materials. The lowland areas, where the aquifers are located, generally consist of stratified drift. Activities occurring in the upland areas can have a direct impact on the ground water quality of the aquifers. For this reason, the designated area boundary and project review area boundary are coincident.

**IV. Information Utilized in Determination**

The information utilized in this determination includes: The petition submitted to EPA Region I by the towns of N. Kingstown and E. Greenwich, Rhode Island; additional information requested from and supplied by the petitioners; written and verbal comments submitted by the public; and the technical paper and maps submitted with the petition. This information is available to the public and may be inspected at the address listed above.

**V. Project Review**

EPA Region I is working with the federal agencies most likely to provide financial assistance to projects in the project review area. Interagency procedures and Memoranda of Understanding have been developed through which EPA will be notified of proposed commitment by federal agencies for projects which could contaminate the HAP Aquifer Area. 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 financial assistance may, if authorized under another provision of law, be entered into to plan or design the project to ensure that it will not contaminate the aquifer. Included in the review of any federal financially assisted project will be the coordination with state and local agencies and the project's developers. Their comments will be given full consideration and EPA's review will attempt to complement and support state and local ground water protection mechanisms. Although the project review process cannot be delegated, EPA will rely to the maximum extent possible on any existing or future state and/or local control mechanisms to protect the quality of ground water in the HPA Aquifer Area.

#### VI. Summary and Discussion of Public Comments

The majority of comments received from the public supported designation of the HAP Aquifer Area as a sole source aquifer. Twelve comments were received from the public. None of these comments expressed opposition to the designation. A few comments raised questions about the implications of the designation. These questions were all answered completely. Notable letters of support were received from state and local governments, as well as letters from environmental organizations and residents. Reasons given for support include: (1) The dependence of the residents on ground water for their drinking water supply; (2) the fact that there are no reasonably available alternative sources; (3) that growth and development in the HAP Aquifer Area threaten the continued purity of the resource; and (4) that the area's designation as a sole source aquifer would heighten public awareness of the vulnerability of the resource, and would encourage further protective efforts.

Michael R. Deland,  
Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 88-11836 Filed 5-25-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[OW-FRL-3386-1]

#### Water Quality Criteria; Availability of Document

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of final ambient water quality criteria document.

**SUMMARY:** EPA announces the availability and provides a summary of the final ambient water quality criteria document for chloride. These criteria are published pursuant to section 304(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act. These water quality criteria may form the basis for enforceable standards.

**Availability of Document:** This notice contains: A summary of the final chloride criteria document containing final ambient water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic organisms and their uses. Copies of the complete criteria document may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5282 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161 (phone number ((703) 487-4650)). The NTIS publication order number for the document is published below. This document is also available for public inspection and copying during normal business hours at the Public Information Reference Unit, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Room 2404 (rear), 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. As provided in 40 CFR Part 2, a reasonable fee may be charged for copying services. Copies of this document are also available for review in the EPA Regional Office libraries. Copies of the document are not available from the EPA office listed below. Requests sent to that office will be forwarded to NTIS or returned to the sender.

#### 1. Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Chloride

EPA 440/5-88-001  
NTIS Number PB88-175-047

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Frank Gostomski, Criteria and Standards Division (WH585), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202) 475-7321.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Section 304(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)(1)) requires EPA to publish and periodically update ambient water quality criteria. These criteria are to reflect the latest scientific knowledge on the identifiable effects of pollutants on public health and welfare, aquatic life, and recreation.

EPA has periodically issued ambient water quality criteria, beginning in 1973

with publication of the "Blue Book" (Water Quality Criteria 1972). In 1976 the "Red Book" (Quality Criteria for Water) was published. On November 28, 1980 (45 FR 79318), and February 15, 1984 (49 FR 5831), EPA announced the publication of 65 individual ambient water quality criteria documents for pollutants listed as toxic under section 307(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act.

EPA issued nine individual water quality criteria documents on July 29, 1985 (50 FR 30784) which updated or revised criteria previously published in the "Red Book" or in the 1980 water quality criteria documents. A revised version of the National Guidelines for Deriving Numerical National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Organisms and Their Uses was announced at the same time. A bacteriological ambient water quality criteria document was published on March 7, 1986 (51 FR 8012). A water quality criteria document for Dissolved Oxygen was published on June 24, 1986 (51 FR 22978). All of the publications cited above were summarized in "Quality Criteria for Water, 1986" which was released by the Office of Water Regulations and Standards on May 1, 1986. Final water quality criteria documents for chlorpyrifos, nickel, pentachlorophenol, parathion, and toxaphene were issued by EPA on December 3, 1986 (51 FR 43665). A final criteria document for zinc was issued on March 2, 1987 (52 FR 6213), and a final criteria document for selenium was issued on January 5, 1988 (53 FR 177).

Today EPA is announcing the availability of a final water quality criteria document for chloride. A draft criteria document for chloride was made available for public comment on October 8, 1987 (52 FR 37655). These final criteria have been derived after consideration of all comments received and after analysis of additional toxicity data which EPA received after the draft document was published.

Dated: May 11, 1988.

Rebecca Hanmer,  
Acting Assistant Administrator for Water.

#### Appendix A—Summary of Water Quality Criteria for Chloride

The procedures described in the "Guidelines for Deriving Numerical National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Organisms and Their Uses" indicate that, except possibly where a locally important species is very sensitive, freshwater aquatic organisms and their uses should not be affected unacceptably if the four-day average concentration of dissolved