would also require that POTWs meeting the above criteria monitor for pollutants not listed in proposed Appendix J, Table 2, for which the State or EPA have established State water quality standards (see discussion in Background section of this preamble). A number of States have established water quality standards for pollutants not listed as CWA sec. 307(a) priority pollutants. For the reasons stated in the above paragraph, the Agency believes that it is appropriate to require sampling for these pollutants, as well.

In addition, EPA considered, but is not proposing, requiring applicants to monitor for other pollutants, such as those on the "Gold Book" list of Federal Water Quality criteria, those regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act, or those on data bases such as the Toxics Release Inventory System (TRIS), the Aquatic Toxicity Information Retrieval data base (AQUIRE), and the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). The Agency determined that adding these other pollutants to the list of pollutants proposed would impose additional monitoring and reporting requirements on the applicant, at substantial additional cost, but without significant benefit. Additionally, not all pollutants on these lists have been assigned numeric criteria. Moreover, available information reviewed by EPA does not indicate that these chemicals occur with either sufficient frequency or at high enough concentrations in typical POTW effluents to support their inclusion among pollutants for which monitoring is proposed to be uniformly required.

Under today's proposal, in proposed 122.21(j)(3)(v), permit writers would have the option to require monitoring and reporting for any other potentially toxic chemicals for which the authority has a reasonable basis to suspect that such materials may be contained in POTW effluents. Such basis could include the presence of industrial users known to release chemicals not included among the pollutants for which routine analyses are otherwise required. EPA invites comments on all aspects of this proposal that would allow for case-by-case information requests that might otherwise extend the time involved in streamlined permit issuance procedures.

In addition, EPA solicits comment on whether to require applicants to summarize and report, as part of the application process, analytical results for any toxic pollutant determined during the three-year period preceding the application to be a known or likely constituent of the facility's discharge. That is, when an applicant has reason to know or suspect the presence of other

toxic constituents in their effluents, its reporting requirements would not necessarily be limited either to the general list of toxic pollutants provided by proposed Appendix J, Tables 1 and 2, or to specific monitoring requirements placed on the applicant by the permitting authority. EPA considers results from toxic release inventory (TRI) as providing one likely basis for information that could cause applicants to initiate additional effluent monitoring analyses during the application process.

Finally, the Agency is interested in providing flexibility where POTWs can demonstrate that the risk of occurrence of pollutants in the discharge is sufficiently small. The Agency seeks comment on whether POTWs could be exempted from providing information on specific pollutants where there are statistically valid data to allow the permitting authority to predict the absence of particular pollutants. In addition, EPA solicits comments on the appropriateness of exempting POTWs from providing information about certain contaminants which are detectable in only a small fraction of POTWs (e.g., less commonly occurring metals such as antimony) and which would not be expected to occur based on other data about the POTW or the indirect discharge.

Other approaches to collecting pollutant data were considered for proposal. EPA solicits comment on each of these, as follows:

A. Types of Industrial Contributors

This approach would have required monitoring for specific pollutants, depending on the identity of industrial users discharging to the POTW. Although this approach was supported by a number of commenters in the course of our outreach efforts, it appeared to be too difficult to implement for non-pretreatment POTWs. Non-pretreatment POTWs are not required to do user inventories of, for example, all categorical industries, and thus would probably be unaware of what monitoring data to provide. On the other hand, pretreatment POTWs would be required to provide entire priority pollutant scans if they had only 2-3 different types of industries. The Agency solicits comment on how, specifically, such an approach would work and how it would benefit applicants and provide permit writers with appropriate information.

B. TRI as a Basis for Determining Additional Pollutants for Sampling

It was suggested that we use TRI data to determine what additional pollutants for which to require sampling. Although industrial user TRI reports are not currently provided to POTWs by TRI-reporting industries, such reporting could be required, for example, through the pretreatment program. Of course, permit writers may always request TRI data from EPA. At issue is whether the applicant should be required to provide additional monitoring data for pollutants reported through TRI. The Agency solicits comment as to whether this approach might be feasible and whether it would provide useful information to the permit writer that is not otherwise available.

C. Existing Pollutant Data from SIUs

In order to obtain information on pollutants that occur in POTW discharges in low concentrations, permit writers could make use of information provided to POTWs by SIUs during the term of the existing permit. The Agency solicits comment on this approach, and is particularly interested in whether such information could be provided in lieu of requiring end-of-pipe effluent data for certain pollutants (e.g., dioxin, pesticides, or other organic chemicals received principally from industrial sources).

D. Ambient Data

Another issue considered was whether or not to require POTWs to provide the results of ambient monitoring as part of the permit application. Although some have suggested that this information would be helpful for implementation of the watershed approach, States were generally opposed to requiring POTWs to collect ambient data. The view was expressed that it is the permitting authority's responsibility to collect this information, and not the POTW's responsibility to provide it. Nevertheless, the Agency is interested in soliciting comment as to whether such data should be required.

E. Bioaccumulation Data

Although analytical methods to assess bioaccumulation in the aquatic biota are available, they are costly compared to approved test methods for pollutants in effluent. Since WET tests are an indirect indicator for human health risks, the Agency is not proposing to require bioaccumulation data from POTWs. However, such data are directly relevant to human health risk considerations. Therefore, the Agency solicits comment on whether to require bioaccumulation data. Because of cost considerations, the Agency also solicits comment as to what tradeoffs, in terms of other types of reporting, might make such an approach acceptable.