B. How Can I Get Additional Information, Including Copies of this Document and Other Related Documents?

1. *Electronically*. You may obtain electronic copies of this document, and certain other related documents that might be available electronically, from the EPA Internet Home Page at http://www.epa.gov/. On the Home Page select ''Laws and Regulations'', ''Regulations and Proposed Rules,'' and then look up the entry for this document under the ''**Federal Register**— Environmental Documents.'' You can also go directly to the **Federal Register** listings at http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/. In addition, copies of the pesticide interim risk management decision documents released to the public may also be accessed at http://www.epa.gov/REDs.

2. *In person*. The Agency has established an official record for this action under docket control numbers OPP–34145C. The official record consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, and other information related to this action, including any information claimed as Confidential Business Information (CBI). This official record includes the documents that are physically located in the docket, as well as the documents that are referenced in those documents. The public version of the official record does not include any information claimed as CBI. The public version of the official record, which includes printed, paper versions of any electronic comments submitted during an applicable comment period is available for inspection in the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

For questions on the IRED in this document, contact the Chemical Review Manager listed in this table:

Chemical name	Case No.	Chemical Review Manager	Telephone no.	E-mail address
Fenthion	0290	Tracy Truesdale	(703) 308–8073	truesdale.tracy@epa.gov

III. What Action is the Agency Taking?

EPA has assessed the risks of fenthion and reached an Interim Reregistration Eligibility Decision (IRED) for this organophosphate pesticide. The Agency believes that currently registered uses of fenthion pose unreasonable adverse effects to human health and the environment, and that mitigation measures are necessary. EPA will conduct a public process in the near future to identify the best ways to reduce the risks associated with fenthion exposure. This process will include a public comment period on the risk mitigation proposed in this interim RED, as well as a stakeholder meeting. At the conclusion of this process, the Agency will announce a final determination on the risk mitigation it believes must be adopted in order for products containing fenthion to remain eligible for reregistration.

The interim risk management decision documents for fenthion were made through the organophosphate pesticide pilot public participation process, which increases transparency and maximizes stakeholder involvement in EPA's development of risk assessments and risk management decisions. The pilot public participation process was developed as part of the EPA-USDA Tolerance Reassessment Advisory Committee (TRAC), which was established in April 1998, as a subcommittee under the auspices of EPA's National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology. A goal of the pilot public participation process is to find a more effective way for the public to participate at critical junctures in the Agency's development of organophosphate pesticide risk assessments and risk management decisions. EPA and USDA began implementing this pilot process in August 1998, to increase transparency and opportunities for stakeholder consultation.

EPA worked extensively with affected parties to reach the decisions presented in the interim risk management decision document for fenthion . As part of the pilot public participation process, numerous opportunities for public comment were offered as these interim risk management decision documents were being developed. In addition, the Agency will provide further opportunity for public involvement through a stakeholder meeting to discuss risk mitigation options and approaches for fenthion.

The risk assessments for fenthion were released to the public through a notice published in the **Federal Register** on September 9, 1998 (63 FR 48213) (OPP–34141; FRL–6030–2) and October 14, 1999 (64 FR 55712) (OPP–34145A; FRL–6389–2).

EPA's next step under FQPA is to complete a cumulative risk assessment and risk management decision encompassing all the organophosphate pesticides, which share a common mechanism of toxicity. The interim risk management decision documents on fenthion cannot be considered final until this cumulative assessment is complete.

When the cumulative risk assessment for all organophosphate pesticides has been completed, EPA will issue its final tolerance reassessment decision for fenthion and further risk mitigation measures may be needed.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Chemicals, Pesticides and pests.

Dated: December 21, 2000.

Lois Rossi,

Director, Special Review and Reregistration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 00–33014 Filed 12–28–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6926–1]

ILCO Superfund Site; Notice of Proposed Settlement

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed settlement.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency is proposing to enter into two settlement agreements with a total of 19 parties for response costs at the ILCO Superfund Site pursuant to section 122(h)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. 9622(h)(1). EPA will consider public comments on the proposed settlements for thirty (30) days. EPA may withdraw from or modify the proposed settlements should such comments disclose facts or considerations which indicate the proposed settlement is inappropriate, improper or inadequate. Copies of the

proposed settlements are available from: Ms. Paula V. Batchelor, U.S. EPA, Region 4 (WMD–PSB), 61 Forsyth Street SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303, (404) 562–8887.

Written comments may be submitted to Ms. Batchelor within 30 calendar days of the date of this publication.

Dated: December 21, 2000.

Franklin E. Hill,

Chief, CERCLA Program Services Branch, Waste Management Division.

[FR Doc. 00–33356 Filed 12–28–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6924–9]

Stage 2 Microbial and Disinfection Byproducts Federal Advisory Committee Agreement in Principle

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of agreement in principle.

SUMMARY: The purpose of today's notice is to make available to the public recommendations to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency contained in the Stage 2 Microbial and Disinfection Byproducts (M–DBP) Federal Advisory Committee Agreement in Principle (Agreement) that was signed in September 2000. The Stage 2 M–DBP rules are a set of interrelated drinking water regulations which address risks from microbial pathogens and disinfection byproducts (DBPs). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) convened the Stage 2 M–DBP Federal Advisory Committee (Committee) to collect, share, and analyze information that has become available since promulgation of the Stage 1 M–DBP rules in December 1998. The purpose of the Committee was to evaluate whether and to what degree USEPA should establish revised or additional DBP and microbial standards to protect public health. The Committee consisted of organizational members representing USEPA, public interest groups, State and local public health and regulatory agencies, local elected officials, Indian tribes, drinking water suppliers, and chemical and equipment manufacturers. Recommendations from the Committee are contained in the Agreement in Principle which is provided below. This Agreement is the result of a tremendous collaborative effort and USEPA would like to express its appreciation to all members of the Committee, as well as to members of the Technical Workgroup (TWG) which supported the Committee.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information contact the Safe Drinking Water Hotline, Telephone (800) 426–4791. The Safe Drinking Water Hotline is open Monday through Friday, excluding federal holidays, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Eastern Time. For technical inquiries contact Dan Schmelling or Jennifer McLain, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (MC 4607), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone (202) 260–1439 (Schmelling) or (202) 260–0431 (McLain).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction and Background

The Stage 2 M–DBP rules represent the final stage in a two phase M–DBP rulemaking strategy agreed upon by USEPA and stakeholders during a regulatory negotiation process in 1992–93, and later affirmed by Congress as part of the 1996 Amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). They comprise the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2ESWTR) and the Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (DBPR). The LT2ESWTR focuses on risk from microbial pathogens, specifically *Cryptosporidium,* and the Stage 2 DBPR addresses risk from DBPs. These rules are being developed simultaneously in order to address complex risk trade-offs between the control of pathogens and limiting exposure to DBPs. Statutory deadlines require USEPA to promulgate the Stage 2 DBPR by May 2002. Consistent with statutory objectives for risk balancing, EPA will finalize the LT2ESWTR concurrent with the Stage 2 DBPR to ensure parallel protection from microbial and DBP risks.

Committee recommendations for the Stage 2 M–DBP rules would build upon the public health protection provided by the Stage 1 M–DBP rules, which include the Stage 1 DBPR, Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (IESWTR), and Long Term 1 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT1ESWTR). The Stage 1 DBPR and IESWTR were issued in December, 1998, and promulgation of the LT1ESWTR is anticipated for late 2000 or early 2001. The Stage 1 M–DBP rules are based on stakeholder agreements reached during the 1992–93 negotiated rulemaking, as well as the agreement of a subsequent Federal Advisory Committee which met from March to July 1997.

Prior to convening the Stage 2 M–DBP Advisory Committee, USEPA held three preparatory stakeholder meetings on pathogen and DBP health effects, occurrence, and treatment. The Committee then held fourteen formal negotiation meetings between March 1999 and September 2000 to discuss issues related to the Stage 2 DBPR and LT2ESWTR. The objective of the Committee at the outset was to reach a consensus regarding provisions for the two rules. Technical support for these discussions was provided by the TWG, which was established by the Committee at its first meeting. The Committee's activities resulted in the collection, development, evaluation, and presentation of substantial new information related to key elements for both rules. This information included new data on pathogenicity, occurrence, and treatment of microbial contaminants, specifically including *Cryptosporidium,* as well as new data on DBP health risks, exposure, and control.

A significant source of new data was the Information Collection Rule (ICR), which EPA promulgated in 1996 pursuant to SDWA requirements. The ICR required approximately 300 large public water systems to conduct 18 months of sampling for water quality and treatment parameters related to DBP formation and the occurrence of microbial pathogens. Data on DBP formation in small systems was obtained through a survey of approximately 120 treatment plants in systems serving fewer than 10,000 people. Seven states also provided small system DBP data. Subsequent to the ICR, EPA obtained additional data on pathogen occurrence through the ICR Supplemental Surveys (ICRSS). These surveys involved 127 water treatment plants, including 40 small systems, and comprised one year of bi-monthly sampling for *Cryptosporidium, Giardia,* and other water quality parameters (small systems did not measure protozoa).

USEPA and the TWG developed a series of eight databases to facilitate analysis of ICR data. The ICR databases were integrated with a Surface Water Analytical Tool model to predict the impact of potential new standards for DBPs and/or pathogens on shifts in treatment technologies among water systems and resulting DBP exposure profiles. Based on data supplied by equipment vendors, the TWG produced unit cost estimates for a number of potential regulatory compliance technologies. These technology unit costs were used in conjunction with SWAT projections of technology shifts