

[FRL-5157-3]

Public Water System Supervision Program Revision for the State of South Carolina

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the State of South Carolina is revising its approved State Public Water System Supervision Primacy Program. South Carolina has adopted drinking water regulations for Volatile Organic Chemicals, Synthetic Organic Chemicals and Inorganic Chemicals (known as the Phase V Rule of the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations). EPA has determined that the State program revisions are no less stringent than the corresponding federal regulations. Therefore, EPA has tentatively decided to approve the State program revisions.

All interested parties may request a public hearing. A request for a public hearing must be submitted March 31, 1995 to the Regional Administrator at the address shown below. Frivolous or insubstantial requests for a hearing may be denied by the Regional Administrator. However, if a substantial request for a public hearing is made March 31, 1995, a public hearing will be held. If no timely and appropriate request for a hearing is received and the Regional Administrator does not elect to hold a hearing on his/her own motion, this determination shall become final and effective thirty (30) days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

Any request for a public hearing shall include the following: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the individual, organization, or other entity requesting a hearing; (2) a brief statement of the requesting person's interest in the Regional Administrator's determination and a brief statement of the information that the requesting person intends to submit at such hearing; and (3) the signature of the individual making the request, or, if the request is made on behalf of an organization or other entity, the signature of a responsible official of the organization or other entity.

ADDRESSES: All documents relating to this determination are available for inspection between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the following offices:

Department of Health and Environmental Control, 2600 Bull Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV, 345 Courtland Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Philip H. Vorsatz, EPA, Region IV, Drinking Water Section at the Atlanta address given above or telephone (404) 347-2913.

(Sec. 1413 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (1986), and 40 CFR parts 141 and 142 of the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations)

Dated: February 2, 1995.

Patrick M. Tobin,

Acting Regional Administrator, EPA, Region IV.

[FR Doc. 95-4467 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-S162-5]

Proposed Settlement Under Section 122(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, as Amended, 42 U.S.C. 9622(h), Arkla Hunnewell Compressor Station, Hunnewell, Sumner County, KS

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

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

SUMMARY: In accordance with Section 122(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act ("CERCLA"), notice is hereby given of a proposed settlement to resolve a claim against NorAm Energy Corporation, formerly Arkla, Inc. The proposed settlement concerns the federal government's past response costs at the Arkla Hunnewell Compressor Station Site, Hunnewell, Sumner County, Kansas. The settlement requires the settling party, NorAm Energy Corporation, to pay \$130,938.25 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund.

For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the settlement. The Agency's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at the U.S. EPA Region VII office at 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. A copy of the proposed settlement may be obtained from Venessa Cobbs, Regional Hearing Clerk, EPA Region VII, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101, telephone number (913) 551-7630. Comments should reference the "Arkla Hunnewell Compressor Station Site" and EPA Docket No. VII-95-F-0006 and should

be addressed to Ms. Cobbs at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Kahn, Assistant Regional Counsel, EPA Region VII, Office of Regional Counsel, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101, telephone number (913) 551-7252.

Dated: February 1, 1995.

Dennis Grams,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-4894 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[FRL-5159-8]

Invitation for Proposals; Environmental Education and Training Program

I. Important Application Information

Eligible applicants: U.S. institutions of higher education or not-for-profit institutions or a consortia of such institutions.

Funding: One cooperative agreement of approximately \$1.8 million per year for a three year project period (for a total of approximately \$5.4 million), subject to performance and the availability of appropriations

Purpose: To operate the Environmental Education and Training Program

Application deadline: Applications (one original and four copies) must be POSTMARKED no later than Friday, April 28, 1995 and mailed to U.S. EPA, Environmental Education Division (1707), Environmental Education and Training Program, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460

Award made: By September 29, 1995

II. Purpose of Notice

A. What is the purpose of this notice?

The purpose of this notice is to invite eligible institutions to submit proposals to operate the Environmental Education and Training Program as authorized under section 5 of the National Environmental Education Act of 1990 (the Act) (Pub.L. 101-619).

B. What is the relationship between the Environmental Education and Training Program and the Environmental Education Grants Program?

This notice applies only to the Environmental Education and Training Program as authorized under section 5 of the Act. This notice does not apply to the Environmental Education Grants Program authorized under section 6 of the Act in which EPA funds approximately 250 individual projects annually. To obtain information on the

grants program, please write to George Walker, U.S. EPA, Environmental Education Division (1707), Environmental Education Grants Program, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, or call 202-260-8619.

III. Purpose of Environmental Education and Training Program

C. What is environmental education and training?

The long term goal of environmental education is to increase public awareness and knowledge about environmental issues as well as provide the public with the skills necessary to make informed decisions and the motivation to take responsible actions. Environmental education enhances critical-thinking, problem-solving, and effective decision-making skills. Environmental education engages and motivates individuals, and enables them to weigh various sides of an environmental issue to make informed and responsible decisions. Under this program, training refers to activities such as classes, workshops, or seminars which are designed to prepare education professionals to teach about the environment.

D. What is the goal of the Environmental Education and Training Program?

EPA's broad goal is to increase the public's ability to make responsible environmental decisions. To accomplish this, EPA believes that it is critical to train education professionals who can develop and deliver quality environmental education and training programs. EPA believes that such efforts should, at a minimum, include the following:

- (1) supporting and expanding existing quality training efforts;
- (2) identifying, evaluating, and disseminating information on "model" education materials, teaching methods, and programs; and
- (3) strengthening and expanding partnerships and networks.

E. Who should be targeted for training under this program?

The education professionals, in both formal and non-formal education and in pre-service and in-service programs, who may receive training under this program are:

- (1) Teachers, faculty, and administrators with local education agencies (e.g., schools and school districts, K-12th grades), colleges, and universities;
- (2) Employees of State, local, or tribal education, environmental protection, and natural resource departments; and

(3) Employees of not-for-profit organizations as well as businesses and their professional trade groups and associations who are involved in environmental education activities and issues.

Training efforts may include a "train-the-trainer" approach or may directly reach the education professionals identified above.

IV. Funding and Project Period

F. How much money is available to fund this program? When will the award be made?

To implement this program over the past three years, EPA awarded \$1.6 million in FY 1992, \$1.8 million in FY 1993, and \$2.0 million in FY 1994, for a total of \$5.4 million. EPA expects annual funding for this program to remain relatively constant. For planning purposes, EPA suggests applicants plan for approximately \$1.8 million per year for three years. However, funding for this program is subject to annual Congressional appropriations. EPA expects to announce the award by September 29, 1995.

G. How many awards will be made? What is the expected project period for the award?

EPA will award one cooperative agreement per year for a three year project period to the institution (or lead institution in a consortium) which is responsible for managing the implementation of the entire environmental education and training program. By law, EPA must award this cooperative agreement on an annual basis. However, EPA expects to award three consecutive cooperative agreements to the same institution (or the same lead institution in a consortium) over a three year project period, subject to the recipient's ability to meet the goals of the program and the availability of appropriations. Thus, EPA expects to fund this program over a three year project period from approximately October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1998.

H. What is a cooperative agreement? How is a cooperative agreement different from a grant?

Under the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977 (Pub. L. 95-224), both a grant and cooperative agreement are legal instruments in which the Federal government transfers money to a state or local government or other recipient for the benefit of the public. A grant is used when "no substantial involvement" is anticipated between the federal agency and the recipient during the performance of the project. By contrast, a cooperative agreement is used when

"substantial involvement" is anticipated between the federal agency and the recipient of the funds.

Because EPA will award a cooperative agreement to fund this training program, applicants should expect EPA to have "substantial involvement" in the recipient's overall implementation of this program to ensure that it meets the goals of this notice. EPA's involvement will include active participation in advisory committee and other planning meetings (in an ex-officio capacity), review and approval of yearly work plans, as well as review of products under development. Specific conditions regarding the relationship of EPA and the recipient will be identified in the award document.

I. If selected, when should proposed activities start and how much time will the selected institution have to complete its activities?

Proposed activities cannot begin before the funds are awarded. Therefore, start dates should not be scheduled to begin before October 1, 1995. Note that during the first quarter following the award, additional planning activities may need to take place along with the development of a final work plan for the first year. The selected institution will have a total of three years to complete the activities specified in three consecutive annual work plans, from about October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1998. Work plans must be submitted to and approved by EPA annually and activities for a given year must be completed before additional funds can be awarded.

J. How will funds be awarded in years two and three of the three year project period?

The institution which received funding for the first year of the program must submit a new application, work plan, and other required forms to obtain funding for each of the two subsequent years of the three year project period. The actual award of funds for years two and three will depend on the institution's ability to meet the goals of the program and the annual appropriation of funds by Congress.

K. Are matching funds required?

Yes, non-federal matching funds of at least 25% of the total cost of the program are required. The matching funds must be from a non-federal source. For planning purposes, you may wish to estimate a matching share of approximately \$600,000 per year or \$1.8 million for three years. The match may be provided in cash or by in-kind contributions.

L. What cannot be funded under this program?

As specified by the Act, no funds shall be used for the acquisition of real property (including buildings) or the construction or substantial modification of any building, the technical training of environmental management professionals, or the support of noneducational research and development.

V. Eligible Institutions

M. What types of institutions are eligible to apply to operate this program?

Only U.S. institutions of higher education or not-for-profit institutions (or a consortia of such institutions) may apply to operate the Environmental Education and Training Program as specified under the Act.

N. What type of institution has the best chance of being selected to operate this program?

EPA strongly encourages institutions to cooperate and, where appropriate, to form a consortium to operate this program. EPA believes that a consortium of institutions would be best suited to operate this training program. Under this scenario, EPA envisions that there would be a lead institution who is responsible for managing the overall implementation of the training program and for ensuring that the training program meets the goals of this notice. The lead institution would select other institutions as partners who would implement specific components of the training program under the overall direction and guidance of the lead institution. Thus, the lead institution and its partners would be working cooperatively to develop and deliver a cohesive training program which benefits both formal and non-formal education professionals in various geographic regions of the country.

EPA believes that a strong consortium must include both not-for-profit environmental and/or education institutions as well as institutions of higher education. Furthermore, EPA believes a strong consortium should include partners that have demonstrated experience in operating training programs, not just academic programs. Consortium partners may also include Federal, state, local, and tribal education, environmental protection, and natural resource agencies as well as private sector businesses and/or training institutions. EPA also strongly encourages cooperation which builds upon existing environmental education and training programs, such as those operated by the National Consortium for Environmental Education and Training (NCEET), the North American Association for Environmental

Education (NAAEE), and the Western Regional Environmental Education Council (WREEC) which sponsors Project Wild, Project Learning Tree, and Project WET.

EPA believes that a cooperative approach is important not only because partnerships can help leverage scarce resources, but also because working together can help improve effectiveness and avoid duplication of effort in a field which is highly fragmented.

Cooperation is also important to ensure that the program reaches a culturally diverse audience of both formal and non-formal educators in various geographic region of the country.

O. May an institution be part of or submit more than one application?

An educational or not-for-profit institution may appear in more than one application as a member of a consortium. However, an educational or not-for-profit institution may not apply as the sole applicant or as the lead institution in a consortium in more than one application.

P. How has this program been operated since the first award was made in 1992?

EPA awarded the first cooperative agreement in June 1992 to a consortia of institutions led by the University of Michigan. This program, called the National Consortium for Environmental Education and Training (NCEET), supports environmental education in grades K-12 through three primary mechanisms: teacher in-service training, information dissemination, and innovations and assessments. Subsequent cooperative agreements were awarded in 1993 and 1994.

NCEET has developed an "EE Toolbox" which includes workshop resource manuals for in-service teacher trainers, and "EE Link" which provides computerized access to environmental education information and instructional materials through the Internet. NCEET also supports "small experiments" which explore methods of teaching environmental education, and conducts assessments of student environmental literacy and the needs of teachers. For more information, contact: NCEET, School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, 430 East University/Dana Building, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1115, 313-998-6726.

VI. Program Activities

Q. What activities must be carried out under this program?

At a minimum, this program must include:

(1) Support for and dissemination of training for classroom teachers and other education professionals. The goal

of training is to ensure that formal and non-formal education professionals in various academic disciplines or curriculum areas and in diverse geographic, ethnic, and cultural regions of the country benefit from this program. Training activities may include classes, workshops, or seminars which prepare education professionals to better utilize new or existing education materials. Training activities should emphasize an investigative approach to learning and should use a "hands-on" process approach to learning that leads to the development of problem-solving and critical-thinking skills. Examples of training activities are:

a. how to integrate environmental problem-solving into existing science, social science, and other curricula areas;

b. how to effectively reach an urban and multicultural audience; and

c. how to use specific methods or practices to teach about the environment.

Special emphasis should be placed on:

d. using existing good quality training programs and networks;

e. ensuring that the needs of diverse ethnic and cultural groups are met;

f. designing classes, workshops, or seminars that can be broadly disseminated; and

g. including opportunities for the international exchange of teachers and other education professionals between the U.S., Canada, and Mexico.

(2) Support for or the development and maintenance of an environmental education resource library. The goal of the resource library is to ensure that good quality education materials, teaching methods, and programs which have already been developed are utilized more fully. New materials, methods, and programs should be developed only if it is determined that they do not exist and are truly needed. Thus, success should be measured in terms of the effective dissemination of existing materials, methods, and programs, not the development of new ones. A process should be established for identifying, evaluating, and disseminating information on existing materials, methods, and programs to identify "model" materials, methods, and programs. An effective program should also use appropriate technology to widely disseminate this information through mechanisms that include hard copy and electronic distribution.

(3) Strengthen and expand existing partnerships and networks. The goal is to improve the effectiveness of the environmental education community by facilitating communication, sharing

information, and leveraging scarce resources. Specific activities may include the support for or sponsorship of national, regional, or multi-state leadership conferences or seminars for education professionals. These conferences or seminars should bring together education and environmental education professionals who represent the various sectors of society (e.g., federal agencies; state, local, and tribal governments; non-profit environmental and environmental education organizations; educational institutions such as schools, colleges, universities and their professional associations; as well as businesses and their professional trade groups and associations). Such activities should also emphasize the importance of strengthening the capacity of state governments to provide training programs for education professionals, and integrating environmental education into current education reform efforts in the sciences, social sciences, and other curricula areas. This may include the development of education standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessment strategies.

VII. The Application

R. What must be included in the application?

To qualify for review, the application must include the three components discussed below.

(1) Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424). This form, which requests basic information about proposals such as the name of the project and the amount of money requested, is required for all federal grants. A completed SF 424 must be submitted as part of the application. The SF 424 may be obtained by contacting EPA as discussed under Section VII.S. below.

(2) Budget Information: Non-Construction Programs (SF 424A). This form, which requests budget information by object class categories such as personnel, travel, and supplies, is also required for all federal grants. A completed SF 424A must also be submitted as part of the application. The SF 424A may be obtained by contacting EPA as discussed under Section VII.S. below. Note that additional budget information describing how the funds will be used for all major activities such as workshops or education materials evaluation is also required under the budget section of the work plan as discussed under Section VII.3.e.1. below.

(3) Work Plan. A detailed plan of no more than 20 pages (not including the appendices) which describes how the applicant proposes to design and

operate the training program. Note that the recipient of the cooperative agreement will have an opportunity to revise their work plan once the award is made. For example, EPA expects that the recipient may need to revise the implementation or evaluation plans to further clarify the relationship and responsibilities of the lead institution and its partners and to set up and hold advisory committee and other planning meetings. Thus, the recipient may wish to or be asked to submit a revised work plan to EPA at the end of the first quarter if it is determined that additional changes are needed.

Work plans must contain all four sections discussed below, in the format presented. Note that each section of the work plan includes a brief discussion of some of the factors that will be considered in reviewing and scoring applications.

a. Summary: A brief synopsis of no more than two pages stating:

1. the nature of the institution requesting funding and all major partners (if applicable);
2. the key activities of the proposed program and how it will be implemented;
3. the total number of education professionals to be reached and their demographics;
4. the expected results of the project by the end of years one, two, and three; and
5. how the funds will be used.

Scoring: The summary will be scored on its overall clarity and the extent to which all five of the elements identified above are addressed. Maximum Score: 5 points.

b. Mission Statement: A discussion of the goals and objectives of the program and how they will meet the requirements of this notice. Also include a discussion about the needs of the environmental education community and how these needs will be met.

This statement should include a discussion about both the short-term and the long-term goals and objectives of the program. (The short-term refers to the first three years of the program; the long-term refers to the period beyond the three-year project period of this notice. Although EPA funds may be available to support this program beyond the three-year project period, EPA considers funding for this program to be "seed money" to get the program "off-the-ground." All applicants should establish a long-term goal of self-sustainability and demonstrate, in their application, an effective method for achieving it).

Scoring: The mission statement will be scored based upon factors that include its overall clarity as well as the extent to which the applicant demonstrates their capability to meet the goals of the training program identified under Section III.D. and the stated needs of the environmental education community. Maximum Score: 20 points.

c. Management and Implementation Plan: A detailed plan of how the project will be managed and implemented (i.e., what steps will be taken to reach the goals of the program). The plan should identify the target audience as well as key activities and deliverables/products. It should also describe the major responsibilities of the Program Director, key staff, and various partners in the consortium (if applicable).

The plan must include a matrix or table identifying all key activities and deliverables/products as well as a precise schedule for conducting these activities and completing these deliverables/products. The plan must also include an organizational chart which clearly shows the responsibilities and relationships of the Program Director, key staff, and various partners (if applicable).

Scoring: The management and implementation plan will be scored based upon factors that include its overall clarity as well as the extent to which the applicant demonstrates their capability to:

- deliver training to the broad range of education professionals identified under Section III.E.1-4;
- carry out the specific program activities identified under Section VI.Q.1-3; and
- effectively manage the program, including effectively managing the lead institution's relationship with various partners as discussed under Section V.N. Maximum Score: 20 points

d. Evaluation Plan: A detailed plan of how the effectiveness of the program will be evaluated (i.e., how the applicant will know whether the goals and objectives of the program are being met, the program meets the requirements of this notice, and the program meets the needs of the environmental education community). The evaluation plan must discuss the anticipated strengths and challenges expected in implementing the program.

The evaluation plan must also include a discussion on the approach, mechanisms, and amount of money that will be used to conduct annual evaluations of the program. This evaluation must be conducted by an

advisory committee established by the recipient to help guide the program. The advisory committee must include representatives from the various sectors involved in environmental education, including teachers, state and local education officials, institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector. Advisory committee members may not include partners in the consortium (if applicable).

Scoring: The evaluation plan will be scored based upon factors that include its overall clarity as well as the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that an effective evaluation process will be used to strengthen the program and facilitate the realization of the program's goals. Maximum Score: 20 points

e. Appendices: Attachments to the work plan which contain information on the budget, key personnel, and letters of commitment from partners (if applicable).

1. Budget: A statement describing how funds will be used, including budget milestones for each major proposed activity and a timetable showing the month/year of completion. Estimates must include the allocation of funding for all major activities. Budget estimates are for planning and evaluation purposes only, recognizing that neither EPA nor the applicant can predict in advance exactly how much money will be appropriated by Congress for this program. Minor deviations from these amounts are expected. Include estimates of overhead and/or indirect costs as well as a statement on the relative economic effectiveness of the program in terms of the ratio of overhead costs to direct services. Note that additional budget information is also requested on the SF 424A which must be submitted as part of the application as discussed under Section VII.R.2. above.

Scoring: The budget will be scored on the extent to which the budget clearly and accurately shows how the funds will be used and whether the budget demonstrates the effective use of public funds. Maximum Score: 20 points

2. Key Personnel and Letters of Commitment: Include resumes of up to three pages for the Program Director as well as each of the key staff and key partners responsible for implementing the project. Resumes should describe the educational, administrative, management, and professional qualifications and experience of the Program Director, key staff, and key partners. Also include one page letters of commitment from each partner with a significant role in the proposed program (if partners will be used to

implement the program). Letters of endorsement from individuals or organizations who are not partners will not be considered in evaluating proposals.

Scoring: This section will be scored on the extent to which the Project Director, key staff, and key partners are qualified to manage and implement the program. In demonstrating the capability of key personnel, EPA strongly encourages applicants to provide examples of relevant experience in designing and operating similar programs. In addition, the score will reflect whether letters of commitment are included from key partners and whether a firm commitment is made (if applicable). Maximum Score: 15 points

S. Where may I obtain an application kit and how must the application be submitted?

Institutions may request an application kit by contacting U.S. EPA, Environmental Education Division (1707), Environmental Education and Training Program, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., 20460, 202-260-3335. The applicant must submit one original and four copies of the application (a signed SF 424, SF 424A, and a work plan). The SF 424 must be signed by a person authorized to receive funds. Applications must be reproducible; do not submit bound copies of applications. They should be on white paper and stapled in the upper left hand corner, and include page numbers.

Work plans must be no more than 20 pages (not including the appendices). A "page" refers to one side of a single-spaced typed page. The pages must be letter sized (8½ × 11 inches), with normal type size (10 or 12 cpi) with at least 1 inch margins. To conserve paper, please provide double-sided copies of the work plan and appendices where possible.

T. When are applications due to EPA and where must they be submitted?

Applications (a signed original and four copies of the SF 424, SF 424A, and work plan) must be mailed to EPA **POSTMARKED no later than Friday, April 28, 1995.** Any application which is postmarked after April 28, 1995 will not be considered for funding. All applications must be mailed to U.S. EPA, Environmental Education Division (1707), Environmental Education and Training Program, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. VIII.

VIII. Review and Selection Process

U. What will be the basis for selection and award?

As discussed above, applications will be evaluated on factors that include the

extent to which the proposed program meets the goals specified in this notice and the key personnel are qualified to successfully manage and implement the program. This means that applications will be evaluated not only on the strategic planning aspects of the proposal, but on project management, implementation, and evaluation aspects as well. Section VII.R.3 above identifies some of the specific factors which will be used to evaluate the proposals.

V. How will the applications be reviewed and the final selection made?

Applications will be reviewed in three primary phases by federal officials and external environmental education experts. First, EPA will assemble teams of federal environmental and education officials (from EPA and the Department of Education) to review applications and identify approximately ten of the top proposals which best meet the criteria in this notice. Second, EPA will select external reviewers from among the National Environmental Education Advisory Council to review and provide comments on the top proposals. Third, EPA will convene a federal panel with representatives from various federal agencies who implement environmental education programs to further review the top proposals, taking into account the comments provided during the first two phases of the review process. The federal panel will rank the top proposals and provide their recommendations for funding to EPA.

EPA expects to conduct site visits to a small number of the highest ranking proposals. The purpose of the site visits is to provide EPA with an opportunity to ask questions and to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals. The Administrator of EPA will then select the recipient from among the highest ranking proposals, taking into account the comments and recommendations of the federal panel and the Advisory Council as well as observations made during the site visits.

Section IX. Additional Information

W. Who can I contact to obtain additional information?

To clarify the information provided in this notice, please contact Kathleen MacKinnon at U.S. EPA, Environmental Education Division (1707), Environmental Education and Training Program, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., 202-260-3335.

Dated: February 15, 1995.

Loretta M. Ucelli,

Associate Administrator, Office of Communications, Education, and Public Affairs.

[FR Doc. 95-5027 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5163-1]

Ores and Minerals; Additional Data Available on Wastes From Extraction and Beneficiation

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of technical documents issued by the Agency concerning wastes from non-coal extraction and beneficiation. Focused on selected mineral sectors, these documents update and supplement the information contained in the Agency's December 1985, Report to Congress on Wastes from the Extraction and Beneficiation of Metallic Ores, Phosphate Rock, Asbestos, Overburden from Uranium Mining, and Oil Shale. The documents were developed over the past four years, and take into account public comments received during that time. Therefore, the Agency is not soliciting comments on the information described in this notice, and is not reopening the comment period on the Report to Congress.

ADDRESSES: This information is available on paper at the RCRA docket, EPA Headquarters, Washington, DC and all EPA Regional Libraries. Copies of the documents may also be purchased from the National Technical Information Service at (703) 487-4650 or (800) 553-NTIS.

The RCRA public docket room is located at EPA Headquarters, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C., Room M2616, 2nd floor, Waterside Mall and is available for viewing 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding federal holidays. Public review of the docket materials is by appointment only. Call (202) 260-9327. The documents are located under docket number F-95-MTDA-FFFFF.

As part of an interagency "streamlining" initiative, EPA is making this notice and most of the supporting documents available electronically. They can be accessed in electronic format on the Internet System through:

EPA Public Access Gopher Server: Go to: gopher.epa.gov; From the main menu, choose "EPA Offices and Regions"; Next choose "Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response

(OSWER)"; Finally choose "Office of Solid Waste/Other Wastes/Bevill Amendment-Mining Waste."

Through FTP: Go to: [ftp.epa.gov](ftp://ftp.epa.gov); Login: anonymous; Password: Your Internet Address; Files are located in /pub/gopher. All OSW files are in directories beginning with OSW.

Through MOSAIC: Go to: <http://www.epa.gov>; Choose the EPA Public Access Gopher; From the main (Gopher) menu choose "EPA Office and Regions"; Next choose "Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER)"; Finally, choose "Office of Solid Waste/Other Wastes/Bevill Amendment-Mining Waste."

Through Dial-up Access: Dial 919-558-0334; Choose EPA Public Access Gopher; From the main (Gopher) menu choose "EPA Offices and Regions"; Next choose "Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER)"; Then choose "Office of Solid Waste/Other Wastes/Bevill Amendment-Mining Waste."

EPA is interested in learning whether people have obtained these documents electronically and what their experiences were in doing so. You are encouraged to provide feedback on the electronic availability of these documents by sending E-mail to OSW-Pilot@epamail.epa.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information, contact the RCRA/Superfund Hotline at (800) 424-9346; for technical information contact Bonnie Robinson (5302W), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, (703) 308-8429 or by sending an E-mail to: Robinson.Bonnie@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

A. Regulatory Activities

RCRA Section 3001(b)(3)(A)(i-iii) ("the Bevill Exemption") exempted among other things solid wastes from the "extraction, beneficiation, and processing of ores and minerals" from regulation under RCRA Subtitle C, pending completion of a Report to Congress and a subsequent regulatory determination of whether such regulation is warranted. In particular, Section 8002 (f) and (p) of RCRA required EPA to conduct a detailed and comprehensive study and submit a Report to Congress on the adverse effects on human health and the environment, if any, of the disposal of these wastes.

EPA published the Report to Congress on Wastes from the Extraction and Beneficiation of Metallic Ores, Phosphate Rock, Asbestos, Overburden

from Uranium Mining, and Oil Shale in December, 1985. This report addresses wastes from the extraction and beneficiation of metallic ores (with special emphasis on copper, gold, iron, lead, silver, and zinc), uranium overburden, and the nonmetals asbestos and phosphate rock. EPA selected these mining industry segments because they generate large quantities of wastes that are potentially hazardous.

On July 3, 1986 (51 FR 24496) EPA published a regulatory determination based on the findings of the Report to Congress. These findings concluded that non-coal extraction and beneficiation mining wastes should be regulated as solid wastes under RCRA Subtitle D, rather than as hazardous wastes under RCRA Subtitle C.

The Agency has also promulgated rules that identify mineral processing wastes that meet the exemption criteria of being high-volume and low-hazard¹. With the exception of 20 wastes, the majority of the mineral processing wastes do not meet this criteria and are subject to Subtitle C hazardous waste regulations². Today's notice focuses on the release of information concerning non-coal extraction and beneficiation wastes and references no new mineral processing information. For more information on Mineral Processing Wastes, consult the RCRA docket (#F-90-RMPA-FFFF).

B. Non-Regulatory Activities

Since 1985, the Agency has collected information on selected mineral sectors to update and supplement the 1985 Report to Congress. EPA has been working closely with States, public interest groups, and industry to solicit input on waste management approaches and to gather information. Since the Report to Congress on Wastes from the Extraction and Beneficiation of Metallic Ores, Phosphate Rock, Asbestos, Overburden from Uranium Mining, and Oil Shale was published in 1985, the Agency has conducted site visits and prepared case study reports on waste generation and management practices of operating mines. Additionally, the Agency has compiled reports on the selected mineral sectors and has provided research grants to support continued study of the environmental impacts of non-coal mining, as well as current waste management and engineering practices. This new information is described in today's notice.

¹ See 54 FR 36592 September 1, 1989 and 55 FR 2322 January 23, 1990.

² Final Regulatory Determination on Special Wastes from Mineral Processing (56 FR 27300 June 13, 1991).