and Chemistry; American Chemical Society; Water Environment Federation; Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies; AOAC International; and EPA's Discharge Monitoring Requirement Quality Assurance Program.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 136

Environmental protection, Analytical methods, Incorporation by reference, Monitoring, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waste treatment and disposal, Water pollution control.

Dated: January 22, 1999.

J. Charles Fox,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Water.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, Part 136, title 40, chapter I of the Code of Federal Regulations, is amended as follows:

PART 136—GUIDELINES ESTABLISHING TEST PROCEDURES FOR THE ANALYSIS OF POLLUTANTS

1. The authority citation for Part 136 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 301, 304(h), 307, and 501(a) Pub. L. 95–217, 91 Stat. 1566, *et seq.* (33 U.S.C. 1251, *et seq.*) (the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 as amended by the Clean Water Act of 1977.)

2. Section 136.3 is amended by adding paragraph (b)(41) and revising the entry for ''Table IA—Aquatic Toxicity Tests'' in paragraph (e) Table II as follows:

§ 136.3 Identification of test procedures.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(41) USEPA, January 1999 Errata for the Effluent and Receiving Water Testing Manuals: Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms; Short-Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms; and Short-Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Marine and Estuarine Organisms. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Duluth, MN. EPA–600/R–98/182.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

TABLE II.—REQUIRED CONTAINERS, PRESERVATION TECHNIQUES, AND HOLDING TIMES

Parameter No./name	Container [1]	Preservation [2, 3]	Maximum holding time [4]
* * * *	*	*	*
Table IA—Aquatic Toxicity Tests: 6–10 Toxicity, acute and chronic	P,G.	Cool, 4 °C [16]	36 hours.
* * * *	*	*	*

[1] Polyethylene (P) or glass (G). For microbiology, plastic sample containers must be made of sterilizable materials (polypropylene or other autoclavable plastic).

[2] Sample preservation should be performed immediately upon sample collection. For composite chemical samples, each aliquot should be preserved at the time of collection. When use of an automatic sampler makes it impossible to preserve each aliquot, then chemical samples may be preserved by maintaining at 4C until compositing and sample splitting is completed.

[3] When any sample is to be shipped by common carrier or sent through the United States Mails, it must comply with the Department of Transportation Hazardous Materials Regulations (49 CFR Part 172). The person offering such material for transportation is responsible for ensuring such compliance. For the preservation requirements of Table II, the Office of Hazardous Materials, Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation, has determined that the Hazardous Materials Regulations do not apply to the following materials: Hydrochloric Acid (HCl) in water solutions at concentrations of 0.04% by weight or less (pH about 1.96 or greater); Nitric Acid (HNO_3) in water solutions of 0.15% by weight or less (pH about 1.62 or greater); Sulfuric Acid (H_2 SO_4) in water solutions of 0.35% less (pH about 1.15 or greater); and Sodium Hydroxide (NaOH) in water solutions at concentrations of 0.080% by weight or less (pH about 12.30 or less).

[4] Samples should be analyzed as soon as possible after collection. The times listed in the table are the maximum times that samples may be held before analyses and still be considered valid. Samples used for toxicity tests are to be used for test initiation or for renewal of test solutions within 36h of collection as grab samples, or within 36 hours of the collection of the last sample of the composite. Samples for bacteria or chemical analysis may be held for longer periods than specified in this table only if the permittee or monitoring laboratory has data on file to show that the specific types of samples under study, the analytes are stable for the longer time, and has received a variance from the Regional Administrator under Para. 136.3(e). Some samples may not be stable for the maximum time period given in the table. A permittee or monitoring laboratory is obligated to hold the samples for a shorter time if knowledge exists to show that this is necessary to maintain sample stability. See Para. 136.3(e) for details. The term ''analyze immediately'' usually means within 15 minutes or less of sample collection.

* * * * * * *

[16] Sufficient ice should be placed with the samples in the shipping container to ensure that ice is still present when the samples arrive at the laboratory. However, even if ice is present when the samples arrive, it is necessary to immediately measure the temperature of the samples and confirm that the 4C temperature maximum has not been exceeded. In the isolated cases where it can be documented that this holding temperature can not be met, the permittee can be given the option of on-site testing or can request a variance. The request for a variance should include supportive data which show that the toxicity of the effluent samples is not reduced because of the increased holding temperature.

[FR Doc. 99–2197 Filed 2–1–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

44 CFR Part 64

[Docket No. FEMA–7706]

List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule identifies communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). These communities have applied to the program and have agreed to enact certain floodplain management measures. The communities' participation in the program authorizes the sale of flood insurance to owners of property located in the communities listed.

EFFECTIVE DATES: The dates listed in the third column of the table.

ADDRESSES: Flood insurance policies for property located in the communities listed can be obtained from any licensed property insurance agent or broker serving the eligible community, or from the NFIP at: Post Office Box 6464, Rockville, MD 20849, (800) 638–6620.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert F. Shea, Jr., Division Director, Program Support Division, Mitigation Directorate, 500 C Street SW., room 417, Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–3619.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NFIP enables property owners to purchase

flood insurance which is generally not otherwise available. In return, communities agree to adopt and administer local floodplain management measures aimed at protecting lives and new construction from future flooding. Since the communities on the attached list have recently entered the NFIP, subsidized flood insurance is now available for property in the community.

In addition, the Associate Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency has identified the special flood hazard areas in some of these communities by publishing a Flood Hazard Boundary Map (FHBM) or Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). The date of the flood map, if one has been published, is indicated in the fourth column of the table. In the communities listed where a flood map has been published, Section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 4012(a), requires the purchase of flood insurance as a condition of Federal or federally related financial assistance for acquisition or construction of buildings in the special flood hazard areas shown on the map.

The Associate Director finds that the delayed effective dates would be contrary to the public interest. The Associate Director also finds that notice and public procedure under 5 U.S.C. 553(b) are impracticable and unnecessary.

National Environmental Policy Act

This rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR Part 10, Environmental Considerations. No environmental impact assessment has been prepared.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Associate Director certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities in accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, because the rule creates no additional burden, but lists those communities eligible for the sale of flood insurance.

Regulatory Classification

This final rule is not a significant regulatory action under the criteria of section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review, 58 FR 51735.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not involve any collection of information for purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

Executive Order 12612, Federalism

This rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under Executive Order 12612, Federalism, October 26, 1987, 3 CFR, 1987 Comp., p. 252.

Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets the applicable standards of section 2(b)(2) of Executive Order 12778, October 25, 1991, 56 FR 55195, 3 CFR, 1991 Comp., p. 309.

List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 64

Flood insurance, Floodplains.

Accordingly, 44 CFR part 64 is amended as follows:

PART 64—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 64 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*, Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 329; E.O. 12127, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp., p. 376.

§ 64.6 [Amended]

2. The tables published under the authority of § 64.6 are amended as follows:

State/location	Community No.	Effective date of eligibility	Current effective map date
NEW ELIGIBLES—Emergency Program:			
Iowa:.			
Imogene, city of, Fremont County	190391	December 3, 1998	October 29, 1976.
Westfield, city of, Plymouth County	190482	.....do	August 13, 1976.
Kentucky: Elkton, city of, Todd County	210381	December 4, 1998..	
South Dakota: Potter County, unincorporated areas	460285	December 10, 1998.	
Texas: Ranger, city of, Eastland County	480205	December 15, 1998	April 23, 1976.
Illinois: Davis Junction, village of, Ogle County	171076	December 16, 1998.	
Missouri: Shelbina, city of, Shelby county	290665	December 30, 1998	April 25, 1975.
NEW ELIGIBLES—Regular Program:			
Georgia: Appling County, unincorporated areas	130001	December 3, 1998	May 3, 1990.
Tennessee: Lawrence County, unincorporated areas	470354	December 10, 1998	December 16, 1988.
North Carolina:			
Marvin, village of, Union County [1]	370514	December 28, 1998	January 17, 1997.
Walstonburg, town of, Greene County [2]	370515	.....do	January 6, 1983.
Waxhaw, town of, Union County	370473	.....do	NSFHA.
Missouri:			
Dutchtown, village of, Cape Girardeau County [3]	290927	December 30, 1998	August 15, 1989.
Huntleigh, city of, St. Louis County	290359	.....do	August 2, 1995.
REINSTATEMENTS:			
Tennessee: Hardin County, unincorporated areas	470082	April 16, 1976, Emerg; September 1, 1986, Reg.; April 2, 1991, Susp; December 3, 1998 Rein.	April 2, 1991.
Wisconsin: Wyeville, village of, Monroe County	550293	July 18, 1975, Emerg; March 1, 1984, Reg; March 1, 1984, Susp; December 3, 1998, Rein.	March 1, 1984.

State/location	Community No.	Effective date of eligibility	Current effective map date
Pennsylvania: West Pikeland, township of, Chester County	420051	April 10, 1974, Emerg; June 1, 1983, Reg; November 20, 1996, Susp; December 17, 1998, Rein.	November 20, 1996.
REGULAR PROGRAM CONVERSIONS:			
Region I:			
Maine: Portland, city of, Cumberland County	230051	December 8, 1998, Suspension Withdrawn.	December 8, 1998.
Region II:			
New Jersey: Allendale, borough of, Bergen County	340019	.....do	Do.
Fair Lawn, borough of, Bergen County	340033	.....do	Do.
Glen Rock, borough of, Bergen County	340038	.....do	Do.
Ho-Ho-Kus, borough of, Bergen County	340044	.....do	Do.
Mahwah, township of, Bergen County	340049	.....do	Do.
Midland Park, borough of, Bergen County	340051	.....do	Do.
Montvale, borough of, Bergen County	340052	.....do	Do.
Park Ridge, borough of, Bergen County	340063	.....do	Do.
Ramsey, borough of, Bergen County	340064	.....do	Do.
Ridgewood, village of, Bergen County	340067	.....do	Do.
Saddle River, borough of, Bergen County	340073	.....do	Do.
Upper Saddle River, borough of, Bergen County	340077	.....do	Do.
Waldwick, borough of, Bergen County	340078	.....do	Do.
Woodcliff Lake, borough of, Bergen County	340082	.....do	Do.
Wyckoff, township of, Bergen County	340084	.....do	Do.
Region V:			
Ohio: Tipp City, city of, Miami County	390401	.....do	Do.
Region VI:			
Louisiana:			
Natchez, village of, Natchitoches Parish	220370	.....do	Do.
Natchitoches Parish, unincorporated areas	220129	.....do	Do.
Richland Parish, unincorporated areas	220154	.....do	Do.
Texas:			
Bastrop County, unincorporated areas	481193	.....do	Do.
Luling, city of, Caldwell County	480096	.....do	Do.
Martindale, town of, Caldwell County	481587	.....do	Do.
Region IX:			
California:			
Menlo Park, city of, San Mateo County	060321	.....do	Do.
Palo Alto, city of, Santa Clara County	060348	.....do	Do.
Region X:			
Washington: Mason County, unincorporated areas	530115	.....do	Do.
Region II:			
New Jersey: Highlands, borough of, Monmouth County	345297	December 22, 1998 Suspension Withdrawn.	December 22, 1998
Region III:			
Pennsylvania: Reynoldsville, borough of, Jefferson County	420513	.....do	Do.
Region IX:			
Arizona: Quartzsite, town of, La Paz County	040134	.....do	Do.
California:			
Morgan Hill, city of, Santa Clara County	060346	.....do	Do.
Region X:			
Oregon:			
Burns, city of, Harney County	410084	.....do	Do.
Harney County, unincorporated areas	410083	.....do	Do.

Code for reading third column: Emerg.—Emergency; Reg.—Regular; Rein.—Reinstatement; Susp.—Suspension; With.—Withdrawn; NSFHA—Non Special Flood Hazard Area.

[1] The Village of Marvin has adopted the Union County (CID #370234) Flood Insurance Rate Map dated January 17, 1997.

[2] The Town of Walstonburg has adopted the Greene County (CID #370378) Flood Insurance Rate Map dated January 6, 1983.

[3] The Village of Dutchtown has adopted the Cape Girardeau County (CID #290790) Flood Insurance Rate Map dated August 15, 1989 (panel 125B).

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.100, ''Flood Insurance'')

Issued: January 21, 1999.

Michael J. Armstrong,

Associate Director for Mitigation.

[FR Doc. 99–2432 Filed 2–1–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

46 CFR Parts 1 and 10

[USCG–1998–3824]

RIN 2115–AF58

Maritime Course Approval Procedures

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard issues a final rule revising the regulations that govern Maritime Course Approval Procedures. The rule streamlines the process by which courses are submitted to and reviewed by the Coast Guard. The rule also adds a mechanism to allow us to suspend or withdraw approvals for courses. Although the current regulations govern training schools with approved courses, only a methodology for course approval is provided. Revising the regulations to include suspension and withdrawal procedures will motivate schools to maintain a uniformly high standard, improve compliance with course approval regulations, and ultimately promote public safety.

DATES: This final rule is effective on March 4, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Documents as indicated in this preamble are available for inspection or copying at the Docket Management Facility, (USCG–1998–3824), U.S. Department of Transportation, room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions on this rule, contact James Cavo, National Maritime Center (NMC), 703–235–0018. For questions on viewing, or submitting material to, the docket, contact Dorothy Walker, Chief, Dockets, Department of Transportation, telephone 202–366–9329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory History

On May 13, 1998, the Coast Guard published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled ''Maritime Course Approval Procedures'' in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 26566). The Coast Guard received eight comments in response to the proposed rulemaking.

Background and Purpose

Regulations for merchant mariner course approvals have been in place for several years and are found in 46 CFR part 10. Courses were first approved for education mandated by regulation such as radar observer, fire-fighting, and first aid. Courses were then approved for formal training instead of required sea service for both renewal and raise in grade of a license or an endorsement, and to substitute for a Coast Guard examination.

With the publication of a Focus Group Study, *Licensing 2000 and Beyond* in 1993, the Coast Guard began approving courses to substitute for certain modules of examination, especially for lower level licenses. Now, with the implementation of the 1995 Amendments to the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978 (STCW) of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), requirements for basic entry-level education, structured shipboard training programs, and specific assessment protocols, the course approval burden has increased considerably.

Presently, the Coast Guard has approved in excess of 700 courses presented by over 225 schools and the number is growing weekly. As part of a Quality Standard System (QSS), Coast Guard Regional Examination Centers (RECs) are charged with oversight of these widespread training institutions.

The majority of schools consistently operate according to the regulations governing course approvals. There are times, however, when audits of a particular school show evidence of infractions ranging from incomplete recordkeeping to major deficiencies dealing with examination tampering, operating outside the conditions of the course approval, and outright misrepresentation of course material. Some primary reasons for suspending or withdrawing a course approval include (but are not limited to):

- Failure to comply with the provisions of the course approval.
- Failure to comply with the provisions of parts 10, 12, 13 or 15 of Title 46, Code of Federal Regulations (46 CFR) especially Part 10, Subpart C.
- Scheduling and teaching an approved course at a location other than the site requested in the application for approval and authorized in the approval letter unless prior site approval is requested of and granted by the Officer in Charge, Marine Inspection (OCMI) of the Regional Exam Center in whose area of responsibility the ''remote site'' is located.
- Not adhering to the approved length of the course; cutting short instructional time on a daily or weekly basis. Substituting ''homework'' or ''preparation time,'' either on computer-based questions or artificially drawn-out plotting exercises for quality classroom instructional contact hours.
- Using unqualified instructors, substandard facilities or otherwise presenting the course in a manner that is not sufficient for or conducive to achieving the learning objectives of the course.
- Not giving a final (end-of-course) exam equal in scope and difficulty to the Coast Guard exam for that particular license or endorsement. Also, for not giving a final exam or a ''re-take'' exam which is totally different than any homework, classroom ''practice exercise'' or exam previously viewed by the student.
- Issuing certificates of course completion to students who have not demonstrated competency or who have not otherwise met the course requirements.
- Advertising, holding a course, or issuing certificates of course completion to students as having passed a course of instruction for which the school does not hold a valid Coast Guard approval.
- Assisting a student in passing the final (end-of-course) exam by either directly or indirectly providing any assistance including, but not limited to, supplying answers, hinting at the correct answer, grading and returning the exam for completion and indicating that certain answers or choices are incorrect prior to grading.
- Giving a student a final (end-of-course) exam orally. The authority to give an oral examination rests with the OCMI per 46 CFR 10.205.
- Allowing a student to enroll or join the course after the beginning of course instruction.

In order to prevent these infractions, and ensure the integrity of Coast Guard approved courses, the Coast Guard is issuing this rule to establish suspension, withdrawal, and appeal provisions in our regulations.

Discussion of Comments and Changes

The Coast Guard is substituting the words ''withdraw,'' ''withdrawn,'' and ''withdrawal'' wherever the words ''revoke,'' ''revoked,'' and ''revocation'' were used in the NPRM and in the regulatory text of sections 1.03–15, 1.03–45, and 10.302. This is being done for clarity and to avoid any confusion with the suspension and revocation