

[FRL-5692-4]

**Proposed Settlement Agreement;
National Emission Standards for
Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP)
From Facilities That Manufacture
Pharmaceutical Products**

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed settlement; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act as amended (CA), 42 U.S.C. § 7413(g), notice is hereby given of a proposed settlement agreement entered into by EPA and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). The proposed settlement agreement establishes a schedule for when EPA intends to take final action on the NESHAP for manufacturers of pharmaceutical products. The proposed settlement agreement accompanies revisions to a consent decree entered into by EPA and NRDC in establishing schedules for EPA's issuance, *inter alia*, of a number of effluent guidelines and standards under section 304(m) of the Clean Water Act (CA), including effluent guidelines for pharmaceutical manufacturers. EPA is agreeing to undertake the NESHAP rulemaking for the pharmaceutical manufacturers on the same schedule as the effluent guidelines for pharmaceutical manufacturers.

For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the settlement from persons not party to the proposed settlement agreement. EPA or the Department of Justice may withhold or withdraw consent to the proposed settlement if the comments disclose facts or circumstances that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the CA.

A copy of the proposed settlement agreement was filed with the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on January 31, 1997. Copies are also available from Phyllis Cochran, Air and Radiation Division (2344), Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 260-7606. Written comments should be sent to Karen H. Clark at the address above and must be submitted on or before March 24, 1997.

Dated: February 10, 1997.

Scott C. Fulton,

Acting General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 97-4323 Filed 2-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[FRL-5693-3]

**Establishment of the Microbial and
Disinfectants/Disinfection Byproducts
Advisory Committee**

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Establishment of FACA committee and meeting announcement.

SUMMARY: As required by section 9(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) at 5 U.S.C. App. II section 9(a)(2), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is giving notice that it is establishing the Microbial and Disinfectants/Disinfection Byproducts Advisory Committee. The purpose of this Committee is to assist the Agency in the development of regulations, guidance and policies to address microorganisms and disinfectants/disinfection byproducts in drinking water. EPA has determined that this is in the public interest and will assist the Agency in performing its duties as prescribed in the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA).

Copies of the committee Charter will be filed with the appropriate committees of Congress and the Library of Congress.

NOTICE OF MEETING: The Committee's first meeting is scheduled for March 13 and 14, 1997, from 9:00 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. on each day, at the office of RESOLVE at 2828 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Suite 402, Washington D.C. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss 1) organizational matters of the Committee and 2) possible components of an Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (IESWTR) and a Stage 1 Disinfectants/Disinfection Byproducts (DBP) Rule, including discussion of related technical issues such as enhanced coagulation and turbidity control.

The meeting will be open to the public. Members of the public may attend the meeting, make statements to the extent time permits and file written statements with the Committee for its consideration.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Members of the public who would like more information or who would like to present an oral statement or submit a written statement are requested to contact Steve Potts, Office of Ground Water Drinking Water, U.S. EPA, Mail

Code 4607, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460. Mr. Potts may also be reached by telephone at (202) 260-5015 or contacted by e-mail at Potts.Steve@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

EPA is responsible under the SDWA for the development of regulations to address microbial pathogens and DBPs in drinking water. The 1996 amendments to the Act require the Agency to promulgate two of these regulations, the IESWTR and Stage 1 DBP Rule, by November 1998. The amendments also establish deadlines for subsequent rules in this cluster. Regulatory concerns include possible risk trade-offs between microbial pathogens and chemical DBPs.

As a result of formal regulatory negotiations in 1992 and 1993, EPA published regulatory proposals in the Federal Register in July 1994. In May 1996, the Agency initiated a series of public meetings for purposes of information exchange on issues related to the development of rules in the cluster. The creation of a Microbial and Disinfectants/Disinfection Byproducts Advisory Committee is necessary and in the public interest as it will provide the structured environment for focused efforts to collect, share and analyze information and data and for consensus building discussions.

Participants: The Committee will consist of a balanced membership of approximately twenty (20) members appointed by the Deputy Administrator. Membership will include but is not limited to representatives of EPA, States, drinking water suppliers and public interest groups.

Dated: February 18, 1997.

Cynthia C. Dougherty,

Director, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water.

[FR Doc. 97-4493 Filed 2-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[ER-FRL-5477-6]

**Environmental Impact Statements;
Notice of Availability**

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564-7167 OR (202) 564-7153.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed February 10, 1997 Through February 14, 1997 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 970057, Final EIS, AFS, TN, Upper Ocoee River Corridor Land and Water-Based Recreational

Development, Implementation, Cherokee National Forest, Ocoee Ranger District, Polk County, TN, *Due:* March 24, 1997, *Contact:* Dave Carroll (423) 339-8620.

EIS No. 970058, Draft EIS, FAA, NH, Manchester (New Hampshire) Airport Master Plan Update, Improvements to Airside and Landside Facilities, Airport Layout Plan, Permits and Approvals, Manchester, NH, *Due:* April 07, 1997, *Contact:* John Sila (617) 647-8211.

EIS No. 970059, Draft Supplement, AFS, AK, Kensington Venture Underground Gold Mine Project, Additional Information, Development, Construction and Operation, Operating Plan Approval, NPDES, Section 10 and 404 Permits, Tongass National Forest, Sherman Creek, City of Juneau, AK, *Due:* April 07, 1997, *Contact:* Roger Birk (907) 586-8800.

Dated: February 18, 1997.

B. Katherine Biggs,

Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 97-4351 Filed 2-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

[ER-FRL-5477-7]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared February 3, 1997 Through February 7, 1997 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 564-7167. An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 5, 1996 (61 FR 15251).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-J65060-UT Rating EC2, Alta Ski Area Master Development Plan Update Approval, Special-Use-Permit and COE Permits Issuance, Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Salt Lake Ranger District, Salt Lake County, UT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to wetlands and air quality impacts.

ERP No. D-AFS-J65258-MT Rating EC2, Lewis and Clark National Forest Plan, Implementation, Oil and Gas Leasing Analysis, Upper Missouri River Basin, several counties, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential

cumulative impacts from directional drilling and associated oil and gas exploration and development activities. The final EIS should address wetland protection, specific air and water quality monitoring and validation plans.

ERP No. D-AFS-J65259-CO Rating EC2, Aspen Highlands Ski Area Expansion, Master Development Plan Amendment, COE 404 Permit and Special-Use-Permit, White River National Forest, Aspen Ranger District, Pitkin County, CO.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about inadequate modeling and analysis to determine air quality impacts.

ERP No. D-AFS-K65192-CA Rating EC2, Jaybird Multi-Resource Project, Implementation, Downieville Ranger District, Yuba County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns that the proposed management activities are not directly integrated into the overall watershed management plan. The final EIS should clearly define roles and responsibilities for monitoring activities.

ERP No. D-AFS-L65265-WA Rating LO, North Sherman and Fritz Timber Sales, Implementation, Colville National Forest, Kettle Falls Ranger District, Ferry County, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed lack of objections. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. D-AFS-L65280-ID Rating EC2, Mosquito-Fly Project Area, Implementation, Harvest Timber, Road Construction and Grant Access to Private Land, Idaho Panhandle National Forests, St. Joe Ranger District, Shoshone County, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the retention of roadless area characteristics, water quality, and cumulative/indirect impacts.

ERP No. D-AFS-L67035-OR Rating EO2, Stewart Mining Operation, Plan of Operation Approval, Implementation, City Creek, North Umpqua Ranger District, Umpqua National Forest, Douglas and Lane Counties, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections about compliance with Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives provided in the Northwest Forest Plan Record of Decision, and about impacts to the Outstandingly Remarkable Values recognized in the North Umpqua River and Streamboat Creek, from sedimentation and acid rock drainage.

ERP No. D-BLM-J65191-00 Rating EC2, Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management on Bureau of Land

Management Administered Lands, Implementation, MT, ND and SD.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns that the Standards and Guidelines may not adequately protect the chemical, physical and biological integrity of water quality to meet the Clean Water Act. There was confusion concerning what CWA Section 303 water quality standards (WQS) mean and how the States implement WQS. Consistency, additional information and environmental commitments were requested in the final EIS. The final EIS should include specifics of the mitigation plans.

ERP No. D-BLM-K67039-NV Rating LO, Denton-Rawhide Mine Expansion Project, Plan of Operation Approval, Implementation, Mineral County, NV.

Summary: EPA expressed a lack of objection.

ERP No. D-BLM-L65272-ID Rating EC2, Challis Land and Resource Management Plan, Implementation, Upper Columbus—Salmon Clearwater Districts, Salmon River, Lemhi and Custer Counties, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns on water quality impacts from grazing activities. EPA suggests that the final EIS include specifics on mitigation plans, including implementation to improve degraded riparian areas.

ERP No. D-COE-L36104-WA Rating LO, Howard A. Hanson Dam Continued Operation and Maintenance Plan, Implementation, Green River, King County, WA.

Summary: Our abbreviated review has revealed no EPA concerns on this project.

ERP No. D-IBR-K31018-AZ Rating EO2, Programmatic EIS—Pima-Maricopa Irrigation Project, Construction and Operation, Maricopa and Pinal Counties, AZ.

Summary: EPA had environmental objection with the large scope of the proposed action and its long-term sustainability. The PDEIS did not persuasively demonstrate that potential adverse environmental impacts can be avoided, minimized, or mitigated. EPA recommended prioritization of project components for implementation with primary emphasis on rehabilitation of existing irrigation systems and agricultural areas. EPA also strongly advocated monitoring and adaptive management and urged full integration of the local comprehensive water management plan. EPA expressed concern with potential adverse impacts to surface and groundwater quality, riparian areas, air quality, fish and