

b. *Project No.*: 7264.

c. *Dated Filed*: June 19, 2000.

d. *Submitted By*: Fox River Paper Company, and N.E.W. Hydro, Inc.—current licensees.

e. *Name of Project*: Middle Appleton Dam Hydroelectric Project.

f. *Location*: On the Fox River in the city of Appleton, Outagamie County, Wisconsin. The project does not utilize federal lands.

g. *Filed Pursuant to*: Section 15 of the Federal Power Act.

h. *Licensee Contact*: Linda D. Mitchell, Mead & Hunt, Inc., 6501 Watts Road, Madison, WI 53719, (608) 273-6380.

i. *FERC Contact*: Tom Dean, thomas.dean@ferc.fed.us, (202) 219-2778.

j. *Effective date of current license*: July 1, 1955.

k. *Expiration date of current license*: June 30, 2005.

l. *Description of the Project*: The project consists of the following existing facilities: (1) A 10-foot-high, 372-foot-long concrete dam with 16 Taintor gates; (2) a 35.5-acre reservoir with a normal pool elevation of 721.37 feet msl; (3) a 100-foot-wide, 1,700-foot-long power canal (West's Canal); (4) Mill powerhouses 1, 2, and 3 containing two 240-kW generators, four 140-kW generators, and one 150-kW generator, respectively, with a total installed capacity of 1,190 kW; (5) a tailrace; (6) other appurtenances.

m. Each application for a subsequent license and any competing license applications must be filed with the Commission at least 24 hours prior to the expiration of the existing license. All applications for license for this project must be filed by June 30, 2003.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-18068 Filed 7-17-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6837-9]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Notice of Supplemental Distribution of a Registered Pesticide Product

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces

that the following Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval: *Notice of Supplemental Distribution of a Registered Pesticide Product*, (EPA ICR No. 0278.07, OMB No. 2070-0044). The ICR, which expires on September 30, 2000 and is abstracted below, describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden and cost; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument. The Agency is requesting that OMB renew approval of the ICR for a three year period.

DATES: Addition comments may be submitted on or before August 17, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sandy Farmer by phone at 202-260-2740, or via e-mail at "farmer.sandy@epa.gov", or using the address indicated below. Please refer to EPA ICR No. 0278.07 and OMB Control No. 2070-0044.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, referencing EPA ICR No. 0278.07 and OMB Control No. 2070-0044, to the following addresses: Ms. Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Collection Strategies Division (2822), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460; and to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title:

Notice of Supplemental Distribution of a Registered Pesticide Product (EPA) ICR No. 0278.07; OMB Control No. 2070-0044) expiring on September 30, 2000. This is a request to renew a currently approved information collection pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.12.

Abstract: This collection activity provides the Agency with notification of supplemental registration of distributors of pesticide products. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA, the Agency) is responsible for the regulation of pesticides as mandated by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended. Section 3(3) of FIFRA allows pesticide registrants to distribute or sell a registered pesticide product under a different name instead of or in addition to his own. Such distribution and sale is termed "supplemental distribution" and the product is termed "distributor product." EPA requires the pesticide registrant to submit a supplemental statement (EPA Form 8570-5) when the registrant has entered into an agreement with a second company that will distribute the registrant's product under

the second company's name and product name. Since the last approval, EPA has not changed the substance or the method of collection for this activity.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response. Under the PRA, "burden" means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. For this collection it includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information. The ICR provides a detailed explanation of this estimate, which is only briefly summarized in this notice. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15. The **Federal Register** document required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on December 29, 1999 (64 FR 73040). No comments were received on this ICR during the comment period. The following is a summary of the estimates taken from the ICR:

Respondents/Affected Entities: Pesticide Registrants.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 5000.

Frequency of Response: As needed per event.

Estimated total number of responses for each respondent: 1.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 1,250 hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Costs: \$118,350.

Changes in Burden Estimates: The total burden associated with this ICR has decreased from 1,500 hours in the 1997 ICR to 1,250 for this ICR. This adjustment represents an improved estimate of the volume of responses received by the Agency. According to the procedures prescribed in 5 CFR

1320.12, EPA has submitted this ICR to OMB for review and approval. Any comments related to the renewal of this ICR should be submitted within 30 days of this notice, as described above.

Dated: July 13, 2000.

Oscar Morales,

Director, Collection Strategies Division.

[FR Doc. 00-18107 Filed 7-17-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6838-6]

Notice of Availability, "Understanding and Accounting for Method Variability in WET Applications Under the NPDES Program"

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability of document.

SUMMARY: On June 30, 2000, EPA issued the final document, entitled "Understanding and Accounting for Method Variability in Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Applications Under the NPDES Program" in response to questions on WET test method variability. WET applications are implemented under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program.

DATES: Final document issued June 30, 2000.

ADDRESSES: A copy of the final document and supporting documents including the public comments received by EPA on the July 26, 1999 draft document are available for review at the EPA's Water Docket, Room EB57, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. For access the Docket materials, call (202) 260-3027 between 9 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. Eastern Time for an appointment.

The complete text of this **Federal Register** notice and "Understanding and Accounting for Method Variability in Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Applications Under the NPDES Program" may be viewed or downloaded on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/owm/npdes.htm>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical questions on this document, contact Debra Denton, (415-744-1919) or Laura Phillips (202-260-9522), Water Permits Division, (4203), USEPA, Office of Wastewater Management, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. Copies of the document may be requested from the Office of Water's Resource Center at (202-260-1827) or by contacting the

National Center for Environmental Publications and Information (NCEPI) at (513-489-8190).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) approach to protection of water quality is the focus of this document. In 1989, EPA defined whole effluent toxicity as "the aggregate toxic effect of an effluent measured directly by an aquatic toxicity test." At the same time, EPA promulgated regulations requiring NPDES permit limitations for WET under certain circumstances. [54 FR 23868 at 23895, June 2, 1989]. Aquatic toxicity tests are laboratory experiments that measure the biological effect (e.g., growth, survival, and reproduction) of effluents or receiving waters on aquatic organisms. In aquatic toxicity tests, groups of organisms of a particular species are held in test chambers and exposed to different concentrations of an aqueous test sample, for example, a reference toxicant, an effluent, or a receiving water. Observations are made at predetermined exposure periods. At the end of the test, the responses of test organisms are used to estimate the effects of the toxicant or effluent. In the early 1980s, EPA published methods (USEPA 1985, 1988, 1989) for estimating the short-term acute and chronic toxicity of effluents and receiving waters to freshwater and marine organisms.

Effect of This Document

EPA is providing this document to clarify several issues regarding WET variability and reaffirm EPA's earlier guidance and recommendations published in the Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control (TSD, USEPA 1991). Today's document is intended to provide NPDES regulatory authorities and all stakeholders, including permittees, with guidance and recommendations on how to understand and account for measurement variability in WET testing.

Three Goals of Today's Document

Today's document describes three goals EPA has defined to address issues surrounding WET variability. In addition, the document is intended to satisfy the requirements of a settlement agreement to resolve litigation over rulemaking to standardize WET testing procedures. These three goals are:

1. To quantify the variability of the promulgated test methods and report a coefficient of variation (CV) as a measure of test method variability.

2. To evaluate the statistical methods described in the Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control (TSD) for determining the need for and deriving WET permit conditions.

3. To suggest guidance for regulatory authorities on approaches to address and to minimize test method variability. In addition, the document is intended to provide guidance to regulatory authorities, permittees, and WET testing laboratories on conducting the biological and statistical methods and evaluating test effect concentrations.

Principal Conclusions

The principal conclusions of this document in response to the three document goals follow.

Evaluation of Test Method Variability

- Comparisons of WET method precision with method precision for analytes commonly limited in NPDES permits demonstrate that the variability of the promulgated WET methods is within the range of variability experienced in other types of analyses. Several researchers also noted that method performance improves when prescribed methods are followed closely by experienced analysts.

- The document provides interim CVs for promulgated WET methods in Appendix A of the final document pending completion of between-laboratory studies, which may affect these interim CV estimates.

Evaluation of Approach To Incorporate Test Method Variability

- EPA's Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control (TSD) presents guidance for developing effluent limits that appropriately protect water quality, regarding both effluent variability and analytical variability, provided that the WET criteria and waste load allocation (WLA) are derived correctly.

- EPA's analysis of data gathered in the development of today's document indicates that the TSD approach appropriately accounts for both effluent variability and method variability. EPA does not accept that a reasonable alternative approach is available to determine a factor that would discount the effects of method variability in TSD procedures based on CVs because the approach would not assure adequate protection of water quality.

Development of Guidance to Regulatory Authorities

- EPA recommends that NPDES permitting authorities implement the statistical approach as described in the