**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Objectives

In 1982, the Treasury Department made more than 170 million payments by EFT. This program has been shown to be more safe and secure than payment by check, and provides greater convenience and confidence to recipients. The Treasury Department, in considering this legislation, is following the increasingly common practice among corporations to make wage and salary payments to their employees by EFT.

As of December 1982, there were approximately 2.8 million Federal employees. Treasury and other disbursing activities annually make about 74 million payments of net pay. Since 1978, Treasury has been promoting the conversion of Federal salary payments from check to EFT. It has been highly successful and well received in those agencies where it has been implemented.

The primary purpose of Treasury's legislative proposal is to increase the number of EFT payments. This will improve operating efficiency, increase productivity and reduce the costs associated with current payments of Federal salaries and wages. The average savings associated with all Federal recurring EFT payments compared to check is approximately $.21 per payment.

If more payments were made by EFT and fewer by check, other economies may result. For example, payments made without checks preclude the possibility that checks will be stolen and forged, thereby reducing the circumstances that obligate the Government to make replacement payments and benefiting the general taxpayer.

### Policy

It is recognized that in a legislative proposal furthering the expansion of EFT payments there must be accommodations for individuals who do not maintain active deposit account relationships with financial institutions and others who cannot receive EFT payments. That flexibility will exist in the regulations that Treasury will issue if the Secretary is authorized to require that wages and salaries of Federal employees be paid by EFT. The proposed regulations would provide:

1. All employees of the Government employed on the effective date of the legislation and up to one year thereafter, who receive wages or salaries on a regular basis, will receive their pay by EFT, unless:

a. They certify that they have no active deposit account relationship with a financial institution; or

b. They request a waiver based on compelling need that the head of the agency employing them and the Secretary of the Treasury approve.

2. All employees of the Government first employed or re-employed by the Government twelve months after the enactment of the legislation, who receive wages or salaries on a regular basis, will receive their pay by EFT, unless—

They request a waiver based on compelling need that the head of the agency employing them and the Secretary of the Treasury approve.

3. An employee may request that a payment of Federal salary or wages be directly deposited in no more than three accounts with financial institution(s) of the employee's choice.

4. No later than twelve months after publication of the regulations as a final rule, heads of employing agencies shall commence to include in certifications of payments of wages and salaries the information needed to make EFT payments. Before this date, but after publication of Treasury's regulations as a final rule, heads of agencies may initiate programs in their agencies to meet this requirement.

### List of Subjects in 31 CFR Parts 209 and 210

Banks, banking, Electronic funds transfer, Government employees, Wages.

**Authority:** 31 CFR Parts 209 and 210 as proposed to be amended; 31 U.S.C. 3332 as proposed to be amended.

Dated: November 10, 1983.

**W. E. Douglas,**

*Commissioner, Bureau of Government Financial Operations.*

[FR Doc. 83-3114 Filed 11-18-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-35-M

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 461, 421, 471 and 464

[OW-FRL-2474-4]

## Battery Manufacturing, Nonferrous Metals Manufacturing, Nonferrous Metals Forming, and Metal Molding and Casting Point Source Categories, Effluent Limitations Guidelines, Pretreatment Standards, and New Source Performance Standards

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Data Availability and Request for Comment.

**SUMMARY:** EPA has obtained additional data and information relating to the proposed battery manufacturing effluent limitations guidelines, pretreatment standards and new source performance standards under the authority of the Clean Water Act. EPA is making these data and information available for public inspection and comment.

In addition, EPA is considering the transfer of lead forming and lead casting operations from regulation under the nonferrous metals forming and metal molding and casting categories, respectively, to regulation under the lead subcategory of the battery manufacturing category. Finally, as discussed in the Supplementary Information Section of this notice, EPA is considering truck washing operations under nonferrous metals manufacturing as well as in battery manufacturing.

**DATES:** Comments on the new data and on the preliminary conclusions concerning the data discussed in this notice must be submitted by December 21, 1983.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to Ms. Mary L. Belefski, Effluent Guidelines Division (WH-552), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, Attention: EGD Docket Clerk. The supporting information is available for inspection and copying at the EPA Public Information Reference Unit, Room 2404 (Rear), (PM-213). The comments will be made available as they are received. The EPA public information regulation (40 CFR Part 2) provides that a reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Technical information may be obtained from Mr. Ernst P. Hall, at (202) 382-7126.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** EPA proposed effluent limitations guidelines, new source performance standards, and pretreatment standards for existing and new sources for the battery manufacturing point source category on November 10, 1982 ( 47 FR 51052). The comment period was scheduled to close on January 10, 1983 but was extended for all subcategories until January 24, 1983 and for the lead subcategory only until February 7, 1983. We received over 250 individual comments from 23 different commenters.

After considering the comments, we dicided to collect additional information relating primarily to the lead subcategory. The Battery Council International (BCI), in coordination with

the Agency, developed an industry survey which the Council distributed to their membership and to the Independent Battery Manufacturers Association (IBMA). Completed forms were sent to the EPA at the request of BCI. These surveys contained information on process element flows, treatment system operating characteristics, solid waste disposal, and personal hygiene and cleaning practices required at the plant. We received survey responses from sixty-five plants and are considering these new data. Two of the survey responses indicated that their plants were closed and did not provide any new data. The nonconfidential portions of these responses are available for inspection in the EPA Public Information Reference Unit.

We also made engineering visits to seventeen lead battery manufacturing sites and one foliar battery (Leclanche subcategory) manufacturing site to determine the flow characteristics of process and nonprocess wastewater streams at these battery plants. During plant visits we collected information, where available, about the quality and flow of raw and treated wastewater. We also received treatment effectiveness data from the plants where monitoring was conducted. Additionally, we collected samples for chemical analysis at five of these sites to determine the nature of the wastewater stream and the effectiveness of end-of-pipe treatment.

At one of these five sites, we obtained a single effluent grab sample. This site had the proposed treatment (lime and settle) in place but was not operating it properly. The lab results from the grab sample, however, show an effluent lead concentration of 0.1 mg/l. Other data received from the plant indicated that the treatment system achieved an average effluent lead concentration of 1.0 mg/l. At two other sites, the treatment system consisted of lime, settle and filter. At one of these two sites, we took a set of composite samples during one day. This particular plant had unusual treatment practices such as adding acid after settling and before filtration. Adding acid before filtration would tend to increase the fraction of dissolved lead and reduce the effectiveness of filtration. The other site was sampled for three days and showed effluent lead concentrations comparable to those projected in the development document for lime, settle and filter. Of the two remaining sites, both had lime and settle treatment in place. One had less than optimal treatment in that it did not use sludge recirculation or add iron as a coagulant and coprecipitant. The other which appeared to be well designed and operated showed effluent lead levels comparable to those proposed for lime and settle.

As an indication of the effectiveness of existing treatment systems, we also collected discharge monitoring report (DMR) data from state and EPA Regional offices for direct dischargers in the lead subcategory and other battery subcategories. DMR data are self monitoring data supplied by permit holders to meet state or EPA permit requirements. The state and EPA Regional offices provided data for five lead subcategory battery manufacturing sites. We also received selfmonitoring treatment effectiveness data from plants in the lead and cadmium subcategories. Because these data varied widely in character and nature, they provide only limited information on the optimal operation of treatment systems. The DMR data are not adequate for establishing effluent limitations and standards.

Our preliminary analysis of the new data and information for the lead subcategory indicates that there are additional usable data available on treatment of lead from well operated lime and settle treatment systems and there are wastewater flows associated with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) lead requirements which need to be considered. Additional information does not support significant changes in the remaining processes addressed by the proposal, but the data do support the addition of some process streams not previously considered. Additional information also supports some changes in the in-process cost methodology. Furthermore, there are additional process flows previously considered under other industrial point source categories which are more appropriately regulated under the Battery Manufacturing Category. Finally, for the Leclanche subcategory there are additional data available which support considering discharge allowances for foliar battery production. Each of these points is discussed below in more detail.

In summary, the following new information is being added in the public record for this rulemaking: industry survey information; DMR data and new permits; self monitoring treatment effectiveness data; trip reports from the visited plants; chemical analysis data and flow data collected by EPA from four sample sites and one single effluent grab sample from another site; and a new costing model. Some data in these trip reports have been claimed as confidential by affected companies. This information will be treated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR Part 2 and is not being placed in the public file.

(a) *Treatment Effectiveness for Lead.* We received comments that there were not enough data points from battery manufacturing used in the combined metals data base (CMDB) to calculate the lead limitations from the lead subcategory. We have received long term self monitoring (raw and treated) wastewater data from one lead plant which has lime and settle technology, other raw and treated wastewater sampling data collected by EPA since proposal, and plant-supplied effluent data from various treatment technology systems. From the preliminary analysis of this data, we are considering using long term data supplied by one plant during a site visit, in addition to data used as a basis for the proposed regulation, to establish lead treatment effectiveness for the final regulation. These data are in the public record along with a descriptive statistical summary.

(b) *OSHA—Related Streams.* Commenters stated that we did not account for wastewater flows associated with personal hygiene requirements. The OSHA lead standard requires employers to control exposure to airborne lead within a plant based on the established lead permissible exposure limit (PEL), and to make blood sampling and analysis monitoring available for their employees. To achieve this, plants require handwashing (63 survey respondents require mandatory handwashing), showers (63 require showers); wearing uniforms which are routinely washed (10 have on-site laundries), wearing respirators which are routinely washed (37 wash respirators on-site), and frequently washing floors (61 wash floors) to control particulate lead. Each of these requirements generates wastewaters for which a discharge allowance may be appropriate.

1. *Hand Wash.*—The new data appear to support a discharge allowance for employee hand wash within the production area. Of the seventeen sites visited, ten discharge to a sanitary sewer without treatment and seven treat on-site before discharge.

2. *Respirator Wash.*—The new data appear to support a discharge allowance for respirator wash water. Of the seventeen sites visited, respirator wash information was obtained for twelve sites. Of these twelve, five treat wash water on-site before discharge, six discharge to the sanitary sewer without

treatment and one discharges to an unknown destination. The observed methods used for respirator wash were varied. Washing techniques included rinsing in lab sinks, laundering in conventional clothes washing machines, and sanitizing in more sophisticated machinery specifically devoted to respirator washing such as "Wavicide" machines.

3. *Showers.*—Industry comments on the proposed regulations suggested that employee shower water is a stream which should have a discharge allowance. This water appears to be nonprocess wastewater which can be discharged without a specific allowance to a sanitary sewer provided employees always wash their hands when leaving the production area, and employees working in high lead areas wear protective gloves, hair covers, long sleeved uniforms, and boots (all of which must be laundered or disposed of properly). A discharge allowance for showers may not be justified in these effluent limitations guidelines and standards.

4. *Laundry.*—The data collected appear to support a discharge allowance for on-site laundering of work uniforms. Information on laundry activity was obtained for all sites. Four of these wash clothing on-site. One of the on-site laundries treats water on-site; the other three laundries discharge to an sanitary sewer without treatment. Laundry discharge flows were obtained during sampling visits.

5. *Floor Wash.*—The new data appear to support a discharge allowance for floor wash water outside of the pasting and formation areas. Floor washing is done at many more plants than had previously reported this procedure. Information was obtained from all sites visited. Wastewater discharges from floor wash machines contain high concentrations of lead and may need to be settled or filtered prior to treatment to recover particulate lead and reduce loadings on the treatment system.

The information supplied in the industry survey responses and data collected during sampling visits will be considered for establishing discharge allowances for these operations. The Agency expects to calculate production normalized discharge allowances for these OSHA-related streams by using the average of the measured flows, information suplied in the industry survey on typical OSHA practices, and the Combined Metals Data Base (CMDB) treatment effectiveness. Total lead use, lead in finished batteries, and number of employees are three factors currently being considered as production normalizing parameters for these flows. Allowances for any operation would be granted only to plants performing the operation. An alternative approach being considered is to combine some or all of these and other small discharge allowances into a miscellaneous allowance applicable to any manufacturer who has any one of the grouped items. Comment on this approach is specifically requested.

(c) *Other Process Streams.* We received comments that there were other wastewater sources within lead plants which should also be considered in the effluent limitations and standards. We are considering new information received on laboratories and truck wash.

1. *Laboratories.*—The new data appear to support a discharge allowance for wastewater discharged from on-site laboratory facilities. Information was obtained for all sites, and flow rates were acquired from five of these sites. Of the remaining twelve sites, ten reported an unmeasured small discharge from the laboratory and two either did not have a lab or did not report a lab discharge. Data from four of the five sites which reported flow rates appear to be realistic and usable. One value estimated by a plant during a site visit was more than an order of magnitude greater than the other values measured or reported. This large flow was not justified in terms of differences among plants' testing and analysis procedures and will not be considered in establishing an allowance.

The tests performed which generate water were found to be very similar amoung these plants. We also observed at some plants that the lead samples taken for quality control are reclaimed for their lead value. Based on this practice, lead loadings in the discharge water to treatment should mostly be due to lab instrument washing and dumped electrolyte from battery teardown.

We are considering combining laboratory discharge allowances with the OSHA—related process stream allowance to provide a single allowance available to any plant performing any of these operations. We do not expect to require flow reduction for these operations to achieve BAT or PSES.

We request specific comment on this approach.

2. *Truck Wash.*—The new data appear to support a discharge allowance for truck wash wastewater in both the battery manufacturing and nonferrous metals manufacturing categories. We observed that trucks are used to transport used batteries in connection with battery cracking (secondary lead subcategory of the Nonferrous Metals Category) processes. Trucks are also used to transport batteries for various purposes related to battery manufacturing operations. The truck wash discharge allowance being considered for the lead subcategory of battery manufacturing would apply only to those sites without an associated on-site secondary lead smelting plant. Truck washing at sites that have battery cracking or secondary lead smelting will be regulated under the nonferrous metals manufacturing regulation which is expected to be promulgated at about the same time as this regulation. We expect to promulgate equivalent discharge allowances for truck wash under the two regulations. From the sixty-five industry surveys, eighteen lead battery sites operate and wash down trucks and have no associated secondary lead smelter operation.

Both sampling data collected at visited plants and flows obtained from commercial truck washing operations may be averaged in calculating the discharge allowance for this operation.

(d) *Process Element Flows Considered at Proposal.*

We received comments that we had not adequately considered certain process wastewater flows for the processes considered at proposal. Consequently we have re-evaluated each such process operation.

1. *Leady Oxide Production.*—The new data do not appear to support commenters' claims that continuous discharge of cooling wastewater (primarily non-contact cooling) is required in ball mill operations for the production of leady oxide. We are continuing to consider no discharge allowance for this operation because plants can choose alternate methods for water reuse or use a non-wastewater generating process. Information for leady oxide production was collected at nine of the seventeen sites visited. Five of these use only the Barton process, which produces no process wastewater. At four sites (one site has both Barton and ball mill production), ball mills with widely varying cooling water applications and wastewater generation configurations are used. One uses a completely closed recirculating cooling configuration with annual sump cleaning. One uses non-contact water to cool bearings with minimal wastewater generation. One has two ball mills with two different cooling configurations: one is a once-through shell cooling with wastewater generation and one uses recirculating water with reduced wastewater generation. One uses once through shell cooling with wastewater generation.

2. *Pasting.*—The data collected do not appear to support the claim in comments that pasting machine and pasting area washdown water cannot be recycled because it does not meet paste formulation engineering specifications. Washdown is a required procedure because different paste formulations may be used on any one pasting line, and the equipment must be periodically cleaned. Sixteen of the seventeen sites visited perform paste formulation and application operations. Of these, six totally reuse this water for washdown; the paste is settled and reclaimed. One site reuses washdown water but some water from a wet air scrubber flows to treatment. Another site plans on installing a complete recirculation washdown water system by December 1983. Some plants use rotoclone air scrubbers which do not generate a water discharge.

Information was provided by only one company for paste formulation water specifications; no specifications were made available by any company for washdown water. Thus, the information does not support the contention that water quality specifications preclude water reuse.

3. *Curing.*—Data collected during the site visits do not appear to support discharge allowances for curing operations. Of the seventeen sites visited, eight do not generate a wastewater discharge from either positive or negative plate curing. Of these eight, six use humidity-controlled rooms for both types of plates; one uses steam curing for both types of plates; and one uses ambient curing, humidity controlled rooms, or steam curing depending on the battery and type of plate. In the zero discharge steam curing operations, steam is generated by heating elements in the oven. In one case, the steam is partially vented, in the other it is totally enclosed. Based on this information, it is observed that the zero discharge allowance does not preclude the use of any particular type of curing operation.

4. *Formation.*—The new data do not appear to support any increase of the proposed discharge allowances for formation processes. Operations were observed on site visits which support a no-discharge allowance for single fill, double fill, and fill and dump processes. Controlled charging rates preclude the necessity for cooling water in closed formation processes. Double fill and fill and dump operations were found to use automatic fillers to control overfilling spills; dumped acid, spills, and battery second stage rinse water can be reused.

Continuation of a discharge allowance for plate rinsing operations associated with open formation—dehydrated appears to be supported. We are considering basing the open formation-dehydrated regulatory flow on the new data obtained during the sample visits. The industry is invited to comment on this possibility.

5. *Battery Wash.*—The new data gathered during the site visits appears to support the proposed BPT, BAT, PSES and new source discharge allowances for battery washing processes. Detergent battery wash water which is frequently used on the final product cannot be reused in other production processes, such as acid cutting. Other battery rinses which do not contain detergent can be reused in battery manufacturing processes for such purposes as acid cutting. Two of the seventeen sites visited reuse battery rinse water in other battery manufacturing processes.

(e) *Transfer of Process Operations from Other Categories.* We received comments in other industrial categories on processes which occur primarily in lead battery plants. For administrative convenience we are seriously considering the transfer of certain battery manufacturing operations from regulation under two other categories to regulation under the lead subcategory of battery manufacturing. The first set of requirements concerns grid casting, continuous (direct chill) casting of lead, and melting furnaces used in battery manufacturing. These have previously been included in the metal molding and casting category (40 CFR 464—see Subpart D 464.40, 464.41, 464.42, 464.43, 464.44 and 464.45). This reguation was proposed November 15, 1982 (47 FR 51512). Second, we plan to propose regulation of all lead rolling operations associated with battery manufacturing under the battery manufacturing category. (These operations were initially studied by the Agency as part of the nonferrous metals forming category.) Comment on this transfer of process operations is specifically requested.

1. *Continuous Strip Casting.*—Continuous strip lead casting was performed at two of the 17 sites visited after proposal. The direct chill casting is followed by rolling at the visited plants. There is a small discharge of wastewater from the direct chill casting when the recirculation system is cleaned out—approximately semiannually. The available data appear to justify a discharge allowance for this operation. A discharge allowance based on a BPT regulatory flow of 0.227 1/kg lead cast was proposed for this operation under the proposed metal molding and casting regulation. We are evaluating the new data received and considering combining it with the old data.

2. *Die Casting.*—Die casting of lead or grid casting is performed at a majority of lead battery plants and was performed at 14 of the 17 sites visited. Noncontact cooling water (for which no discharge allowance is required) is used to cool the molds; air scrubbers are sometimes used for air pollution control; and mold release preparation usually generates a wastewater from equipment washout.

Wet air pollution control devices (scrubbers) may sometimes produce wastewaters baghouses do not. We scrutinized air pollution control practices at visited plants. Of the fourteen sites visited which have grid casting, information concerning air pollution devices treating fumes from the casting area was obtained from eight sites. Of these eight sites, two have wet air pollution control scrubbers; two sites use baghouses; and four sites have no air pollution control devices for the casting area. Air pollution regulations for new sources that perform grid casting are based upon the use of scrubbers (see 47 FR 16564, April 16, 1982). The proposed effluent guidelines for these operations required zero discharge, based upon the recycling of scrubber wastewaters. It is notable that our site visits indicated that baghouses, which produce no wastewater, may be an additional acceptable means to simultaneously control air pollution and achieve zero wastewater discharge. One of the sites which we visited had previously been considered by EPA as an example of baghouse operational problems and fires which made baghouses unsuitable as a basis for air pollution standards of performance for new stationary sources. The fire problem has been solved at that plant by plant operational procedures and no fire has occurred in the baghouse in about three years. The fires appear to have been related to the use of a kerosene-cork mixture as a mold release. Such a mixture tends to collect in the ventilation ducts and occasionally ignites, burning with an explosion-like rate of flame propagation. Other mold release formulations based on other suspension fluids (e.g., silicones) and using other release fillers (e.g,. silica) do not appear to experience the same fire problems in ventilation ducts or baghouses. Considering the possibility of scrubber wastewater recycle, as well as the potential for safe operation of baghouses, a no-discharge allowance for grid casting area air pollution control appears to remain appropriate.

3. *Mold Release Formulation.*—Mold release formulation is performed at most

sites that cast grids. However, commercial mold releases (both cork or silica based and with either kerosene or silicon carrier fluids) are available from commercial sources. The generation of wastewater by mold release formulation is related to equipment cleaning after mixing batches of the release material. Data supplied during plant visits on the amount of wastewater generated during the formulation of mold releases appear to justify a discharge allowance for grid casting when mold release is formulated at the battery manufacturing site. We are considering using this flow data to develop and discharge allowance for this operation.

4. *Lead Melting Furnaces.*—Plants involved in other manufacturing categories and in battery manufacturing produce parts from molten lead. Air scrubbers used in these operations are potential sources of wastewater discharge. When lead melting pots or furnaces are located in battery plants the discharge will be included under the Battery Manufacturing Category. The metal molding and casting regulation proposed no discharge allowance for air scrubbers. This approach is being considered for the final regulation.

5. *Lead Rolling.*—Lead rolling is performed in conjunction with direct chill casting and is followed by expanded metal grid production. During the rolling operation the lead is lubricated with an oil-water mixture which is periodically disposed. We intend to propose regulations for this process operation in the future.

(f) *Costing.* We are using a new computer model for estimating end-of-pipe wastewater treatment systems costs for the lead subcategory. This program uses standard engineering costing procedures and generates treatment system costs that are similar to those used at proposal. The treatment system designs and equipment are the same as those considered at proposal. The model will generate costs based on June 1983 dollars.

Based on data collected during site visits we are considering revising some in-plant costing procedures. First, we observed that batteries can be stacked in charging racks and slow-formed. We observed batteries stacked in racks as high as fifteen batteries high, and at all the visited sites we observed sufficient vertical height in the building to provide the necessary stacking for slow formation. Because batteries can be successfully formed when stacked in racks, the claimed need for additional floor space in the formation area appears to be unsupported. Therefore, the in-plant costs are being revised to eliminate new building costs for slow formation. Second, the capital recovery factor has been adjusted to reflect a current interest rate. The cumulative effect of the above changes is anticipated to reduce the overall regulatory compliance costs.

(g) *Foliar Batteries.* In response to comments, the Agency visited one foliar (Leclanche subcategory) battery plant to obtain aditional flow and process data. These new data highlight differences between the floiar type Leclanche battery and other Leclanche batteries. The new information about the process and wastewater generation and discharge appear to support a discharge allowance for this segment of the Leclanche subcategory.

Copies of this new information and data are available for public inspection in the EPA Public Information Reference Unit. Comments are solicited only on the new data and on the preliminary analysis outlined above. These comments must be received by EPA on or before December 21, 1983 to ensure their consideration.

Dated: November 10, 1983.

**Rebecca W. Hanmer,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator for Water.*

[FR Doc. 83-31237 Filed 11-18-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

## FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

### 44 CFR Part 67

**[Docket No. FEMA-6563]**

### National Flood Insurance Program

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency.

**ACTION:** Removal of proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Emergency Management Agency has erroneously published a proposed rule for modified base flood elevation determinations for the City of Newport, Jackson County, Arkansas. This notice will serve to delete that publication. The proposed rule referenced a newspaper publication at which time a 90-day appeal period would be initiated. In fact, no 90-day appeal period was required for this community, as the revised Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) did not change base flood elevations.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Brian R. Mrazik, Chief, Engineering Branch, Natural Hazards Division, Federal Emergency Managment Agency, Washington, D.C. 20472, (202) 287-0230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Federal Emergency Management Agency gives notice of the deletion of the Notice of Proposed Modified Determinations of base (100-year) flood elevations for the City of Newport, Jackson County, Arkansas, as published on October 17, 1983, at 48 FR 47015.

**List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 67**

Flood insurance, Flood plains.

(National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (Title XIII of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968), effective January 28, 1969 (33 FR 17804, November 28, 1968), as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4001-4128; Executive Order 12127, 44 FR 19367; delegation of authority to Associate Director, State and Local Programs and Support)

Issued: November 4, 1983.

**Dave McLoughlin,**

*Deputy Associate Director, State and Local Programs and Support.*

[FR Doc. 83-31273 Filed 11-18-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-03-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

### 50 CFR Part 17

### Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Proposed Endangered Status and Critical Habitat for the Fresno Kangaroo Rat

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Service proposes to determine Endangered status and Critical Habitat for the Fresno kangaroo rat. This small, hopping mammal is restricted to the native grasslands of Fresno County in the San Joaquin Valley of California. From 1938 to April 1981, about 90 percent of the approximately 100,000 acres of these grasslands was destroyed by agricultural development. Just in the period from April to November 1981, 34 percent of the remaining habitat was eliminated, and the loss of additional areas appears imminent.

Moreover, most of the native grasslands still in existence are being adversely modified through grazing by domestic livestock. Although there are still about 6,417 acres of potentially suitable habitat, a recent survey found only about 857 acres to be actually occupied by the kangaroo rat. This proposal, if made final, would implement the protection of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, for the Fresno kangaroo rat. The Service seeks data and comments from the public.