Plan Update for the Proposed New Runway, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Miami-Dade County, FL, Due: November 02, 1998, Contact: Bart Vernace (407) 812–6331.

EIS No. 980385, Draft EIS, BLM, UT, Ferron Natural Gas Project, Proposal to Construct, Maintain and Operate a Natural Gas Transmission Pipeline, Application for Permit to Drill (APD), Special-Use-Permit and Right-of-Way Grant, Carbon and Emery Counties, UT, Due: November 25, 1998, Contact: George Diwachak (801) 539–4048.

EIS No. 980386, Final Supplement, COE, NY, NJ, Arthur Kill Channel—Howland Hook Marine Terminal, Deepening and Realignment, Limited Reevaluation Report (LRR) Port of New York and New Jersey, NY and NJ, Due: November 02, 1998, Contact: Vincent Guida (212) 264–5736.

EIS No. 980387, Final EIS, FHW, SC, Carolina Bays Parkway (better known as Grand Strand), Funding, NPDES Permit, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Horry and Georgetown Counties, SC, Due: November 02, 1998, Contact: Kenneth R. Myers (803) 253–3881.

EIS No. 980388, Final EIS, FHW, SC, Cooper River Bridges Replacement Project, Grace Memorial/Silas N. Pearman Bridges on US 17 over Cooper River and Town Creek, Funding, COE Section 10/404 Permits and CGD Permit, Charleston County, SC, Due: November 02, 1998, Contact: Kenneth R. Myers (803) 253–3881.

Dated: September 29, 1998.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 98–26499 Filed 10–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5495–9]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared August 24, 1998 Through August 28, 1998 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 10, 1998 (62 FR 17856).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–L65305–WA Rating EC2, Plum Creek Checkerboard Access Project, Grant Permanent Easements, Cle Elum and Naches Ranger Districts, Wenatchee National Forest, Kittitas County, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the potential impacts to water quality from direct and indirect effects of this project. EPA requests that the Forest Service and Plum Creek Timber incorporate BMP's based on the results of the watershed analysis.

ERP No. D–AFS–L65306–AK Rating EC2, Sea Level Harvest Timber Sale, Implemention, Tongass National Forest, Ketchikan Ranger District, U.S. Coast Guard Permit, NPDES Permit and COE Section 10 and 404 Permit, Revillagigedo (Revilla) Island/Cleveland Peninsula, AK.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the potential impacts of the project on water quality and the marine environment. EPA requested more information.

ERP No. D–DOE–G06010–NM Rating EC2, Los Alamos National Laboratory Continued Operation Site-Wide, Implementation, Los Alamos County, NM.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the potential electrical power shortfall and the potential need of upgrading the existing electrical power transmission system and the need for subsequent NEPA analysis to identify possible alternatives to address this need.

ERP No. D–FTA–L40205–00 Rating EC2, South/North Corridor Project, Improvements to the Existing Urban Transportation, Funding, Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington Counties, OR and Clark County, WA.

Summary: EPA's concerns are based on issues related to: (1) Early involvement of EPA in the NEPA analysis process, (2) potential public health risks from disturbing CERCLIS and ECSI sites, (3) the appearance of disproportionate impacts to low and minority neighborhoods and inadequate analysis of race and ethnicity to neighborhoods affected by direct and indirect impacts (Environmental Justice).

ERP No. D–IBR–L31002–WA Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement (Phase 2) Project, Implementation, Benton, Yakima and Kittitas Counties, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns based on a lack of information on water quality, indirect impacts from tribal water uses, the range of alternatives and environmental justice and impacts to the fishery resources.

ERP No. D–OSM–E61047–TN Rating EC2, Fall Creek Falls Petition Evaluation Document, Implementation, Designate the Land as Unsuitable for Surface Coal Mining Operation, Van Buren and Bledsoe Counties, TN.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns to water quality under a partial petition (Alternate 3.C.) coupled with a requirement that all mining plans in the remainder of the petition area require an individual EIS. Additional information on cumulative impacts was requested.

ERP No. D–USA–F11036–IN Rating EO2, Newport Chemical Depot, Construction and Operation, Pilot Testing of Neutralization/Supercritical Water Oxidation of VX Agent, Vermillion County, IN.

Summary: EPA requested that the Army include more information to substantiate the choice of alternative technologies brought forward for pilot testing. Additional concerns centered around the range of alternatives evaluated, future plans if pilot testing is successful, spill containment measures for VX and regulatory status of VX and byproducts of its treatment.

ERP No. D–USN–D11029–00 Rating EC2, Patuxent River Complex Project, Increased Flight and Related Ground Operations in Test Area, Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division (NAWCAD) Chesapeake Bay, Patuxent River, several counties, MD, DE and VA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the cumulative impacts resulting from increased flight operations. Specific areas of concern are noise, air quality, water and sediment quality, wildlife and fisheries, and aircraft operations and safety. More information is needed to fully assess the environmental impacts associated with the proposed increased activity.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–AFS–E65050–MI, Porter Creek Recreational Lake and Complex, Implementation, Homochitto National Forest, Homochitto Ranger District, Franklin County, MI.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the need to adequately treat sewage entering in the Porter Creek water shed prior to opening the recreational reservoir to the public. EPA recommends the Forest Service be involved with monitoring the county's sewage treatment facility.

ERP No. F–AFS–K65082–CA, Payen, Pass Creek and English Range Allotments, Grazing Land Management Plan, Implementation, Tahoe National Forest, Sierraville Ranger District, Sierra and Nevada Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA does not expect proposed project to result in significant adverse environmental impacts and has no objections to its implementation.

ERP No. F–AFS–L65296–OR, Crown Pacific Limited Partnership Land Exchange Project, Implementation, Consolidate Land Ownership and Enhance Future Resource, Deschutes, Fremont and Winema National Forests, Deschutes, Jefferson, Klamath and Lake Counties, OR.

Summary: Review of the Final EIS was not deemed necessary. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. F–BLM–L65295–OR, Northeast Oregon Assembled Land Exchange Resource Management Plan (RMP), Implementation, Site Specific, John Day, Umatilla, Granda Ronde, Power River Basins, Grant, Umatilla, Morrow, Wheeler, Baker, Wallowa and Union, OR.

Summary: Review of the Final EIS has been completed and the agency has addressed the concerns EPA expressed in the Draft EIS.

ERP No. F–FHW–C40141–NY: Judd Road Connector Transportation Improvements, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, Village of New York Mills, Towns of New Hartford and Whitestown, Oneida County, NY.

Summary: EPA's concerns have been adequately addressed. Moreover, EPA has concluded that the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts; Therefore, EPA had no objections to the implementation of the project.

ERP No. FS–AFS–L65286–OR: Summit Fire Recovery Forest Restoration Project, Implementation, Malheur National Forest, Long Creek Ranger District, Grant County, OR.

Summary: Review of the Final EIS was not deemed necessary. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

Dated: September 29, 1998.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 98–26500 Filed 10–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPP–00473E; FRL–6028–5]

Antimicrobial Rule Development; Stakeholder Meetings

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of Public Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Antimicrobials Division (AD) of the Office of Pesticide Programs of EPA is continuing its series of stakeholder meetings to obtain views about the antimicrobial rule that is being developed. The rule is being revised in accordance with principles set forth in the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–170). To ensure that all interested parties can obtain information about activities related to developing this rule, EPA, in its discretion, has opened a docket in advance of the rule's proposal. This docket includes, but is not limited to, a summary of major discussions at stakeholder meetings, as well as copies of any documents distributed at these meetings.

DATES: The next stakeholder meetings will take place on Thursday, October 8, 1998 from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City Hotel, 2799 Jefferson Davis Highway, in the Potomac Room. The room is located on the bottom level, to the left of the escalators.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: La Tanya Brown, Antimicrobials Division (7510W), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Sixth Floor Crystal Station #1, 2800 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, (703) 308–1532, fax: (703) 308–8481; e-mail: brown.latanya@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice announces a series of public meetings to ensure that all parties interested in the development of antimicrobial rules can obtain information about activities related to the development of these rules. Additionally, a public record has been established for development of the antimicrobial rule under docket number ''OPP–00473.'' The docket is available for inspection from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The public record is located in Rm. 119 of the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch, Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA. Copies of the EPA documents may be obtained by contacting: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch, Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M. St., SW., Washington, DC 20460.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection.

Dated: September 24, 1998.

Frank Sanders,

Director, Antimicrobials Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 98–26616 Filed 10–02–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6171–8]

Announcement of Stakeholders Meeting on the National Primary Drinking Water Regulation for Radon–222

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of stakeholders meeting.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will be holding a one-and-a-hald day public meeting on October 19 and 20, 1998 in Washington, D.C. The purpose of this meeting is to present updated information on EPA's activities for developing a proposed National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (NPDWR) for radon-222 and a summary of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) Report findings on radon in drinking water, and to discuss the implications of these findings for the overall radon rule development. This upcoming meeting is the fourth stakeholders meetings on the NPDWR for radon. The first meeting was held on June 26, 1997 in Washington, DC, the second meeting on September 2, 1997 in San Francisco, CA, and the third on October 30, 1997 in Boston, MA. At the upcoming meeting, EPA is seeking input from State and Tribal drinking water and radon programs, the regulated community (public water systems), public health and safety organizations, environmental and public interest groups, and other stakeholders on a number of issues related to developing the NPDWR for radon. EPA encourages the full participation of stakeholders throughout this process.

DATES: The stakeholder meeting on the NPDWR for radon will be held on