

Standard Paragraphs

F. Any person desiring to be heard or make any protest with reference to said filing should on or before the comment date file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this filing if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for the applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

G. Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after the issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to § 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefore, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for

authorization pursuant to section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 91-12232 Filed 5-22-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

Office of Fossil Energy

[FE Docket No. 90-113-NG]

Coenergy Ventures, Inc.; Order Granting Authorization to Export Natural Gas to Canada

AGENCY: Department of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy.

ACTION: Notice of an order granting blanket authorization to export natural gas to Canada.

SUMMARY: The Office of Fossil Energy of the Department of Energy gives notice that it has issued an order granting Coenergy Ventures, Inc., authorization to export up to 20 Bcf of natural gas to Canada over a two-year period commencing with the date of first delivery.

A copy of this order is available for inspection and copying in the Office of Fuels Programs Docket Room, 3F-056, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586-9478. The docket room is open between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued in Washington, DC, May 16, 1991.

Clifford P. Tomaszewski,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fuels Programs, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 91-12308 Filed 5-22-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

[FE Docket No. 90-05-NG]

Rochester Gas and Electric Corp.; Conditional Authorization to Import Natural Gas From Canada

AGENCY: Department of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy.

ACTION: Notice of issuance of conditional order granting long-term authorization to import natural gas from Canada.

SUMMARY: The Office of Fossil Energy (FE) of the Department of Energy (DOE) gives notice that it has issued an order conditionally authorizing Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (RG&E), to import from Canada up to 16,000 Mcf per day of natural gas over a term of ten years commencing on the date the proposed pipeline facilities of Empire State Pipeline Company are placed in service. This gas would be used for

RG&E's system supply. The order makes preliminary findings on issues that do not involve environmental matters. The approval is conditioned on the entry of a final opinion and order after DOE independently reviews the results of an environmental assessment being prepared by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on the new facilities needed to transport the gas.

A copy of this order is available for inspection and copying in the Office of Fuels Programs Docket Room, room 3F-056, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586-9478. The docket room is open between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued in Washington, DC, May 16, 1991.

Clifford P. Tomaszewski,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fuels Programs, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 91-12309 Filed 5-22-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPP-00303; FRL-3928-4]

State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG); Working Committee on Groundwater Protection and Pesticide Disposal; Open Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG) Working Committee on Groundwater Protection and Pesticide Disposal will hold a 2-day meeting, beginning on May 30, 1991, and ending on May 31, 1991. This notice announces the location and times for the meeting and sets forth tentative agenda topics. The meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The SFIREG Working Committee will meet on Thursday, May 30, 1991, from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., and on Friday, May 31, 1991, beginning at 8:30 a.m. and adjourning at approximately 1 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at: Holiday Inn - Crowne Plaza, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, VA 22202 (703) 892-4100.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Arty Williams, Office of Pesticide Programs (H7506C), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: rm. 1100E, Crystal Mall No. 2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA (703) 557-7371.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The tentative agenda includes the following:

1. Pesticides and Ground Water Strategy Status Report.
2. State Management Plan guidance and support documents discussion.
3. Proposed Ground Water Restricted Use Rule.
4. Report of the Senior Pesticide Officials' Ground Water Course.
5. FIFRA section 6(g) policy.
6. FIFRA section 19 disposal regulations.
7. Other topics as appropriate.

Dated: May 15, 1991.

Douglas D. Campit,

Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 91-12294 Filed 5-22-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

[OPTS-400050; FRL-3802-2]

Statement of Policy and Guidance for Petitions under Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document outlines EPA's policy concerning the provisions for petitions to delist individual members of the metal compound categories reportable under section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986. This document also provides guidance regarding the appropriate support documentation that will be necessary to allow the Agency to make decisions on such petitions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Maria J. Doa, Petitions Coordinator, Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Information Hotline, Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Stop OS-120, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, Toll free: 800-535-0202, In Washington, DC and Alaska, 202-479-2449.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On June 1, 1988, EPA received a petition from the Dry Color Manufacturers' Association (DCMA) requesting EPA to exempt three phthalocyanine pigments C. I. Pigment Blue 15, C. I. Pigment Green 7, and C. I. Pigment Green 36 from the reporting requirements under the section 313 list of toxic chemicals category "copper compounds." This petition was the first that the Agency had received requesting that EPA differentiate between and delete individual members of a category

based on the varying toxicities of each individual compound. Because of the precedent that would be set by EPA's response to this request, the Agency determined to seek public comment on the issue of breaking out individual members of categories for delisting decisions made under EPCRA.

Chemicals defined by the 16 metal compound categories are unique in that they are of concern not only because of the toxicity which may be exhibited by the intact species, but also because these compounds may dissociate or react to yield the toxic metal and metal ion. Because of the additional concerns of metal ion toxicity, the Agency believes that it is in the public's best interest to have access to information on all the species that contribute to the burden on the environment of the metal ions described by each of the metal compound categories.

The Agency has taken a conservative approach in developing a policy for reviewing petitions to delete chemicals from these categories. EPA is concerned that without careful consideration, chemicals may be deleted from the list which may be contributory to the concerns for human health and the environment. EPA wants to ensure that the public has information on all chemicals described by these categories which may reasonably be anticipated to contribute to the toxic effects described by the metals as well as the intact metal compounds.

The Agency's concern with metal compounds, which is articulated in this document, is reflected in its decisions to withdraw the proposed rule to delete barium sulfate from the EPCRA section 313 list of toxic substances and to issue a final rule to exempt the three copper phthalocyanine pigments from the EPCRA section 313 list of toxic substances. Both decisions are published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register.

II. Metal Compound Categories

Metal-containing compounds are of concern not only because of the toxicity which may be exhibited by the intact species (e.g., methyl mercury), but also because these compounds may dissociate or react to yield the toxic metal and metal ion. The toxicity of a metal-containing compound that dissociates or reacts to generate the metal ion can be expressed as a function of the toxicity induced by the intact species and the availability of the metal ion, where the degree of dissociation, bioaccumulation, and the level at which toxicity is induced by the metal ion must be considered. The level at which a metal ion induces toxicity varies

depending upon the metal ion. This may be viewed, in a sense, as the toxicologic potency of the metal ion. For example, cadmium ion is considered to be more potentially toxic than barium ion, because the toxicologic effects of cadmium ion are produced at very low doses while the toxicologic effects of barium ion are produced at relatively higher doses. Although the level at which a metal ion induces toxicity varies depending upon the metal ion, the effects induced by each metal ion corresponding to each section 313 metal ion category meet the criteria under section 313(d)(2).

The following list consists of metal compound categories that are currently subject to the reporting requirements under section 313.

Antimony compounds
Arsenic compounds
Barium compounds
Beryllium compounds
Cadmium compounds
Chromium compounds
Cobalt compounds
Copper compounds
Lead compounds
Manganese compounds
Mercury compounds
Nickel compounds
Selenium compounds
Silver compounds
Thallium compounds
Zinc compounds

Availability of the metal ion may be the result of biotic or abiotic processes. There are a number of factors which must be considered in determining the availability of the metal ion. These factors are listed below:

Hydrolysis at various pHs
Solubilization in the environment at various pHs
Photolysis
Aerobic transformations -- abiotic and biotic
Anaerobic transformations -- abiotic and biotic
Biological transformations, for example, change in valence or *in vivo* alkylation
Bioavailability of the ion when the compound is ingested -- solubilization in and/or absorption from the gastrointestinal tract -- solubilization in various organs
Bioavailability of the ion when the compound is inhaled -- solubilization in and/or absorption from lungs, especially taking into account the likelihood that the compound will lodge in the lungs and be converted to soluble forms by the lung's defense mechanism.
Bioaccumulation and subsequent food chain magnification.

Although the processes described above must be considered when determining metal ion availability, the data are usually very limited. The lack of data on a particular transformation process may not be important if there is

information which indicates that the metal ion is available by another route. On the other hand, lack of information on one transformation process may lead to incorrect decisions if the data on the remainder of the transformation processes indicate that the metal ion will not become available via these processes.

The metal categories, which include but are not limited to compound classes such as metal hydroxides and oxides, halides, simple and hydrated salts, organometallic compounds, and inorganic complexes loosely can be divided into three groups: (1) Those chemicals which neither dissociate or react to yield the metal ion at a level which would induce toxicity, nor induce toxic effects in their intact state; (2) those chemicals which dissociate or react to yield the metal ion at a level which can induce toxicity (the intact species may or may not be toxic); and (3) those compounds which remain intact but induce toxicity in this form.

Although, in theory, the categories can be separated into the three groups described above, there are a number of obstacles which would prevent the success of this task. The lack of information on the transformation processes to which the chemicals may be subject may preclude a correct determination of the toxicity of a chemical or group of chemicals within a category. EPA may use all available information, but because of data gaps some chemicals may inadvertently be categorized incorrectly.

"General rules" which could be used to separate the categories into "not significantly toxic" and "toxic" subcategories would have many exceptions. For many groups of chemicals these "general rules" would have to be applied for many, if not all, of the transformation processes. As a result, this exercise may not be very different from the task in which every chemical is evaluated.

The question of metal ion availability has been critical in every petition review of a metal-containing compound. Since the copper pigments petition, the Agency has received seven petitions on metal compounds subject to reporting under section 313. EPA's decision on each petition was made primarily on metal ion availability.

III. Response to Public Comment

In the proposed rule to delete the three copper pigments which was published in the *Federal Register* of May 15, 1989 (54 FR 20866), EPA requested comment on approaches for addressing the issues raised by this petition with

regard to chemical categories under section 313. The options that were presented for comment are:

1. EPA would respond to petitions to delete named chemicals from a category, but would give such petitions a secondary priority to those which pertain to individually listed chemicals.

2. EPA would subcategorize the listed categories by assessing the chemical structure of the chemicals within each category.

3. EPA would attempt to evaluate independently the many thousands of chemicals within the listed categories to determine if the individual chemicals meet the toxicity criteria of section 313(d)(2).

4. EPA would consider the set of chemicals defined by each section 313 category as inseparable units for the purpose of making modifications to the list of toxic substances.

EPA has received 19 comments on the options described above.

The majority of the commenters contend that EPA's proposed approach in which the Agency would assign secondary priority to petitions for metal-containing compounds contravenes the statute. The Chemical Manufacturers' Association (CMA) states "[s]uch an approach is ... inconsistent with Congressional intent, which provides that specific listing/delisting procedures be followed." The DCMA contends "[r]ather than adopting a policy inconsistent with Congressional intent, EPA could under such circumstances approach Congress with a request for either more resources or legislative relief from the burden imposed on it." EPA agrees that imposing this type of condition on the petition process is untenable because of the statutory deadline which must be met by the Agency.

With few exceptions, the commenters argue that the approach in which EPA would consider the set of chemicals defined by each section 313 category as inseparable units for the purpose of making modifications to the list of toxic substances is scientifically insupportable and is contradictory to the statute. SCM Chemicals contends "[s]uch a policy would ignore Congress' statutory language and purpose. EPA's mandate is to act, within 180 days, on petitions for deletion of both individually-listed substances and of substances in the general category." Merck and Company, Incorporated believes that this approach is "bad science" because it ignores the fact that some members of the categories do not meet the criteria under section 313(d)(2).

EPA agrees with the commenters that some members of the metal categories

may not meet the criteria under section 313(d)(2). The intact metal-containing compound may not be toxic and may not dissociate or react by any of the processes described above. Requiring facilities that manufacture, process, or otherwise use these chemicals to report may be an unnecessary burden, particularly if the release reporting does not contribute to information on the burden of the metal ion upon the environment. In light of these considerations, EPA concluded that it is reasonable to allow for the deletion of members of the categories that do not meet the toxicity criteria of section 313. EPA considered the comments on the remaining alternatives with a view to determining the appropriate approach to providing for such deletions.

The majority of the commenters prefer the approach in which EPA would divide the metal compound categories into "not significantly toxic" and "toxic" subcategories. Color Converting Industries states "[t]hese steps will enable quick, inexpensive and reasonable action by the EPA." Merck and Company, Incorporated contends that this approach would provide "for the public more precise data on releases of toxic chemicals." In contrast, Alex Chemical Company believes that this approach is not feasible because "chemical properties (and toxicity) cannot be generalized."

EPA agrees with the comments that state that this option is not viable because the categories cannot be subcategorized successfully. This is a result of the number of factors which must be taken into account in determining metal ion availability, the lack of information on availability of metal ions via some pathways, and because every general rule applied is likely to have exceptions.

In determining whether a subcategory of chemicals within a category is likely to be "not significantly toxic," EPA must first ascertain that the intact species that make up the subcategory will not meet the criteria of section 313(d)(2) and that the metal ion will not become available at a level which will induce toxicity as a result of the processes described above.

Every rule that could be applied would have exceptions. The Agency suggested in the proposed rule to delete the copper pigments that a criterion that it might consider using to divide the categories into "not significantly toxic" and "toxic" subcategories is bond type, i.e. ionic vs. covalent bonding. Ionic metal salts may be expected to readily dissociate in water to give the metal ion and the appropriate counter ion,

whereas covalently bonded metal compounds are not expected to readily dissociate in water. An exception to this rule is illustrated in EPA's review of the barium sulfate petition. Although barium sulfate is ionically bonded, it does not readily dissociate in water. Thus, barium ion, which exhibits toxic effects, is not available as might be expected via dissociation in water of barium sulfate.

Another drawback to this approach is the lack of information on the effect of the transformation processes listed above upon metal compounds. Thus, even if EPA were to carry out this task, some subcategories could be labeled as "not significantly toxic" even though this label may not be appropriate. Deleting category members for which the metal ion availability cannot be properly characterized is neither the intent of EPCRA nor in the public's best interest.

Many of the commenters agree with EPA's position that individually assessing the many thousands of chemicals within the section 313 metal compound categories would not be viable. However, the Procter and Gamble Company contends that this would be the best option because "[i]f EPA were to evaluate each chemical individually, then each chemical's presence on the 40 CFR 372.65 list would be scientifically justified." The Soap and Detergent Manufacturers also prefer this option. They suggest that EPA "announce in advance a schedule for its consideration of section 313 categories. That approach would rationalize the assessment process, allow for meaningful input from the public and the regulated community. . . ."

EPA disagrees with the Procter and Gamble Company's assertion that this option would ensure that each chemical's presence on the section 313 list would be "scientifically justified." As was discussed above, in most cases there will not be sufficient information to properly characterize the availability of the metal ion from a compound. This may result in an incorrect assessment of the availability of the metal ion from a compound and as a consequence the toxicity induced by the compound may be incorrectly assessed.

In addition, the section 313 reporting rule allows facilities to aggregate and report on the total weight of the parent metal released, rather than submitting separate reports for all the individual metal compounds (40 CFR 372.25(h)). Thus, facilities' reporting burdens may be significantly reduced. However, if EPA were to conduct an extensive analysis of each chemical within all the listed categories and delete those chemicals which failed to meet the

section 313(d) criteria, EPA might then be obligated to modify the reporting requirement such that separate reports would have to be filed for each of the remaining chemicals in the category listings. An EPA decision to require such individual reporting for chemicals within a category is supported by the legislative history of section 313 (joint Explanatory Statement of The Committee of Conference at 296). This approach, which would effectively transform category listings into separate listings for each chemical within a category that meets the toxicity criteria, would increase the reporting burden for facilities and increase EPA's costs of maintaining the section 313 data base.

IV. Metal Compound Categories Petition Policy

The majority of the commenters objected to option 4 because it would preclude the deletion of individual members of the categories that do not meet the toxicity criteria of section 313. As indicated by the discussion in Unit III, however, none of the proposed options provides a completely satisfactory alternative. The option most favored by commenters, dividing the metals categories, presents potentially insurmountable technical problems and could require the Agency to act on insufficient information. On the other hand, commenters generally recognized that significant problems were presented by the other two options that would have allowed for deletion of individual chemicals.

In response to these concerns, EPA has developed a modified alternative that allows for the deletion of individual chemicals, recognizes the importance of metal ion availability, and provides EPA with sufficient information to make a decision. Accordingly, EPA will accept delisting petitions for individual members of the categories and will give these petitions the same priority as delisting petitions for other chemicals. However, the petition must meet basic criteria which relate to the availability of the metal ion from the metal compound category member and the inherent toxicity of that individual category member. Therefore, EPA has decided to grant petitions on individual members providing that the petitioner establishes and EPA concludes that the intact species does not meet the criteria of section 313(d)(2), and that the metal ion will not become available at a level that can be expected to induce toxicity.

For petitions to exempt specific metal-containing compounds from the reporting requirements under section 313, EPA has decided to base its decisions on the evaluation of all

chemical and biological processes that may lead to the metal ion's availability as well as on the toxicity exhibited by the intact species. These decisions will continue to be based on information provided by the petitioner, Agency documents, and available literature. Because the effects induced by the metal ions described by the metal compounds categories meet the criteria under section 313(d)(2), the petitioner must provide competent scientific evidence that demonstrates that the metal compound does not dissociate or react to generate the toxic metal ion at a level that can be expected to induce toxicity by any of the processes described above. Since EPA believes that deleting metal compound category members for which the metal ion availability cannot be properly characterized is neither the intent of EPCRA or in the public's best interest, EPA will deny petitions for chemicals for which the metal ion availability cannot be properly characterized. In its review of petitions to delete individual metal compounds from a metal category, the Agency will consider transformation processes, including but not limited to those listed in unit II above, that may lead to the availability of the metal ion. In this document, the Agency is not specifying toxicity thresholds for each of the effects specified in section 313(d)(2) because these thresholds vary depending upon the metal ion. If the metal compound does not dissociate or react to generate the metal ion at a level which can reasonably be anticipated to cause adverse effects, EPA will determine whether the effects which may be induced by the intact species meet the toxicity criteria of section 313(d)(2).

In its previous reviews of petitions on metal compounds, EPA used a weight-of-evidence approach in determining whether the metal ion is available at a level which would induce toxicity. Although the majority of petitions on metal category compounds have been denied based on the availability of the metal ion, there have been two (barium sulfate and the three copper phthalocyanine pigments) which have been proposed to be granted because the available limited information did not indicate that the respective metal ions would become available at a level which would induce toxicity. The Agency's concern with metal ion availability as articulated in this document is reflected in its decisions to withdraw the proposed rule to delete barium sulfate from the EPCRA section 313 list of toxic substances and to issue a final rule to exempt the three copper

phthalocyanine pigments from the EPCRA section 313 list of toxic substances. Both decisions are published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register.

EPA is issuing a final rule to exempt the three copper phthalocyanine pigments from the EPCRA section 313 list of toxic substances because: (1) The copper ion cannot reasonably be anticipated to become available at a level that induces toxicity from any of these pigments; and (2) there is no indication from the available data that the (intact) copper pigments can reasonably be anticipated to cause acute, chronic, or environmental toxicity. Release reporting on the three copper pigments will not contribute information on the total environmental loading of copper, because copper ion is not expected to be available from the three copper pigments.

EPA is withdrawing the proposal to delete barium sulfate from the EPCRA section 313 list of toxic substances. This decision is based on the availability of the barium ion from barium sulfate and the potential of toxicity due to available barium ion. Limited data suggest that the barium ion can reasonably be anticipated to become available as a result of the anaerobic degradation of barium sulfate, although the extent of this degradation is unknown. In addition, one of EPA's reasons for requiring reporting on the metal compound categories is to provide the public with release information on the total environmental loading of each toxic metal. This decision is consistent with EPA's category policy because the data on the anaerobic degradation of barium sulfate indicate that barium ion, which meets the criteria under EPCRA section 313(d)(2), will be available. EPA's reviews of barium sulfate and the three copper pigments illustrate the factors that are considered important in determining metal ion availability.

EPA believes that the effects induced by the metal ions described by the metal compound categories meet the criteria under section 313(d)(2), although the level at which a metal ion induces toxicity varies depending on the metal ion. Consequently, EPA will not continue to make weight-of-evidence determinations on metal ion availability. EPA will grant a petition to delist a member of a metal compound category only if the Agency can determine with a high degree of certainty that the metal ion will not become available at a level that can reasonably be anticipated to induce adverse effects. Such availability would be the result of any of the transformation processes previously

described in this document. Lack of information on a transformation process will result in a denial of a petition to delist. This will minimize the errors that may be a consequence of using limited information. Limited data and limited predictive ability may result mainly in underestimating the overall burden a metal ion may place upon the environment. An effect of this underestimation may be incorrect decisions leading to the deletion of potentially toxic chemicals from the list. EPA believes that this approach will allow the Agency to make scientifically based decisions that ensure that the intent of community right-to-know is served.

This approach will still allow for the removal of specific members from the metal categories that do not meet the criteria of section 313(d)(2) and do not contribute to the burden of the metal ion on the environment. The public's ability to assess the burden of a metal ion upon the environment will not be hindered, because the lack of metal ion availability of the compound will be well characterized before the Agency proposes to delete a chemical. For the majority of the categories the number of exceptions is not expected to be large.

V. Petition Guidance

A petitioner should provide the Agency with enough information concerning his or her petition request and as much credible scientific support documentation as can reasonably be developed to assist the Agency in reviewing the petition. EPA issued a statement of petition policy and guidance in the *Federal Register* of February 4, 1987 (52 FR 3479), to provide guidance regarding the recommended content and format for submitting petitions. The detailed information given below is similar to that provided in the previous guidance, but is more specific to metal compounds. The burden to the petitioner to develop petitions to delete individual members of the metal compound categories is expected to be the same as for petitions to delete individually listed chemicals.

A. Published Literature Citations

For information that appears in published literature sources, the petitioner should provide EPA with a citation and two copies of pertinent sections of the specific documents that the petitioner believes support the requested action. Such information sources could include one or more of the following:

1. Textbooks on inorganic or organometallic chemistry.

2. Textbooks on toxicology or other health sciences.

3. Reference books or reports relating to toxic effects of chemicals, published by government or private sources.

4. Reference books or reports relating to the environmental fate of chemicals, published by government or private sources.

5. Regulatory documents or other official public notification documents, e.g., *Federal Register* notices relating to current regulation of the chemical, or other Federal, State, or local government actions.

6. Specific scientific journal articles, preferably those articles that have undergone peer review.

7. Results of data base searches. Several comprehensive, computer-accessible data bases contain abstracts of health or environmental studies, or environmental fate or provide citations to specific journal articles or other sources. If petitioners do not have access to such computer-based search services, they may want to start by contacting their local public library. The following list contains representative data bases and certain components of those data bases that can provide information on health, environmental effects, and fate of chemical substances:

DIALOG (a privately maintained data base)

BIOSIS

EXERPTA MEDICA MEDLARS

(maintained by the National Library of Medicine)

TOXLINE

CANCERLINE

HSDB Toxnet system CIS (Chemical Information System—a privately maintained data base)

ENVIROFATE

AQUIRE (Aquatic Information Retrieval)

RTECS (Registry of Toxic Effects of Chemical Substances)

GENETOX CAS-ONLINE (Chemical Abstract Service—a privately maintained data base)

REG-FILE

CA-FILE

B. Unpublished Information

The petitioner may be aware of studies or documents that could support the proposed action to which EPA would not have immediate access. In such cases of unpublished information, the petitioner should provide EPA with an actual copy of the unpublished work.

Examples of unpublished information include:

1. Company-sponsored studies.
2. University research papers and dissertations.

3. Government-sponsored reports and assessments, especially those done at the local and State level.

Dated: May 15, 1991.

Victor J. Kimm,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 91-12295 Filed 5-22-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[DA 91-591]

Comments Invited on Arizona Public Safety Plan

May 16, 1991.

The Commission has received the public safety radio communications plan for Arizona (Region 3).

In accordance with the Commission's Report and Order in General Docket No. 87-112 implementing the Public Safety National Plan, parties may file comments on or before June 25, 1991 and reply comments on or before July 10, 1991. (See Report and Order, General Docket No. 87-112, 3 FCC Rcd 905 (1987), at paragraph 54.)

In accordance with the Commission's Memorandum Opinion and Order in General Docket No. 87-112, Region 3 consists of the State of Arizona. (See Memorandum Opinion and Order, General Docket No. 87-112, 3 FCC Rcd 2113 (1988)).

Comments should be clearly identified as submissions to PR Docket 91-143, Arizona—Region 3, and commenters should send an original and five copies to the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554.

Questions regarding this public notice may be directed to Betty Woolford Private Radio Bureau, (202) 632-6497 or Ray LaForge, Office of Engineering and Technology, (202) 653-8117.

Federal Communications Commission.

Donna R. Searcy,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 91-12193 Filed 5-22-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

[FEMA-894-DR]

California; Amendment to Notice of a Major Disaster Declaration

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of California (FEMA-894-DR), dated February 11, 1991, and related determinations.

DATES: May 13, 1991.

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 California, dated February 11, 1991, is hereby amended to include the Crisis Counseling program in the following areas determined to have been adversely affected by the catastrophe declared a major disaster by the President in his declaration of February 11, 1991: The counties of Alameda, Butte, Colusa, Fresno, Glenn, Imperial, Kern, Los Angeles, Medera, Marin, Mendocino, Merced, Monterey, Napa, Riverside, San Benito, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba for Crisis Counseling.

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

Grant C. Peterson,

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

[FR Doc. 91-12281 Filed 5-22-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-02-M

[FEMA-902-DR]

Louisiana; Amendment to Notice of a Major Disaster Declaration

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of Louisiana (FEMA-902-DR), dated April 23, 1991, and related determinations.

DATES: May 10, 1991.

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 Louisiana, dated April 23, 1991, 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 April 23, 1991: The parishes of Catahoula, Claiborne

Morehouse, and West Carroll for Individual Assistance.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83-516, Disaster Assistance)

Grant C. Peterson,

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

[FR Doc. 91-12282 Filed 5-22-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-02-M

[FEMA-904-DR]

Louisiana; Amendment to Notice of a Major Disaster Declaration

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of Louisiana (FEMA-904-DR), dated May 3, 1991, and related determinations.

DATES: May 10, 1991.

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 Louisiana, dated May 3, 1991, 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 May 3, 1991: The parishes of Bienville, Caddo, Catahoula, Franklin, Grant, Natchitoches, and Webster for Individual Assistance

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

Grant C. Peterson,

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

[FR Doc. 91-12283 Filed 5-22-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-02-M

[FEMA-904-DR]

Louisiana; Amendment to Notice of a Major Disaster Declaration

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of Louisiana (FEMA-904-DR), dated May 3, 1991, and related determination.

DATES: May 12, 1991.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Neva K. Elliott, Disaster Assistance