announcement will be published as a Federal Register notice. Written comments on the DEIS should be received at the address listed below within ninety (90) days from the date on which the Environmental Protection Agency notice is published in the Federal Register stating that the DEIS has been filed with EPA. To the extent practicable, NRC staff will grant reasonable requests for extensions of time for comment up to fifteen (15) days. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: A single copy of the DEIS (NUREG–1543) may be requested by those considering public comment by writing to the NRC Publications Section, ATTN.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013–7082, or by calling 202–512–1800. A copy of the DEIS is available for inspection and/or copying in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L St. NW., Washington, DC 20555–0001. A copy will also be available shortly for public inspection at the Guernsey County District Library, 800 Steubenville Avenue, Cambridge, Ohio 43725–2385.

Any interested party may submit comments on this document for consideration by the staff. Consistent with its past commitments, NRC is extending the comment period 45 days beyond the required minimum of 45 days. To be certain of consideration, comments on these reports must be received within 90 days from the date of this notice. Comments received after the due date will be considered to the extent practical. Comments should be sent to Michael Weber, Chief, Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning Projects Branch, Mail Stop T7F–27, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Mark Thaggard, Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning Projects Branch, Mail Stop T7D–13, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555–0001. Telephone 301/415–6718.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NRC has prepared a DEIS that evaluates the environmental impacts and alternatives associated with SMC's proposed approach to decommissioning radiologically contaminated waste piles by capping and stabilizing the piles in place and implementing appropriate land-use restrictions. NRC noticed its intent to prepare an EIS on the decommissioning of the SMC facility in Cambridge, Ohio, on November 26, 1993 (58 FR 62383) and conducted a public meeting to obtain comments on the intended scope of the EIS in Byesville, Ohio, on December 13, 1993.

SMC holds a license (SMB–1507) with the NRC for possession of source material (i.e., uranium and thorium) at its Cambridge facility. The source material is in the form of slag and contaminated soil located in two piles that contain a total of 546,000 metric tons (606,000 tons) of material. The radioactive materials in the slag were contaminants in the ores and processed materials used at the site to produce metal alloys and other compounds. The contaminated slag was produced at the site prior to Shieldalloy's acquisition of the facility in 1987. The piles also contain chemical contaminants that may require remediation.

SMC proposes to stabilize and cap the slag piles in place and implement land-use restrictions to ensure people do not inadvertently dig into the piles and expose themselves to elevated levels of radiation. Three other variations of SMC's proposed alternative are considered in the DEIS, including: (1) Stabilizing the material on site along with an additional 10,000 cubic yards of slag added from off site, (2) stabilizing the material on site along with additional soil contaminated with metals, and (3) stabilizing the material on site along with both the additional slag and soils. In addition, the DEIS considers three other alternatives, including: (1) The no-action alternative, (2) disposing the material off site at a facility that is licensed to dispose of radioactive waste, and (3) sale of the slag for reuse. Two additional alternatives were considered but eliminated from detail study; these are: (1) diluting the contaminated material to reduce concentrations of radioactive materials, and (2) separating and removing the most contaminated material for disposal offsite.

The DEIS evaluates radiological and nonradiological impacts associated with the proposed action. Impacts are assessed for land use, socioeconomic and cultural resources, air quality, water quality, human health, and biological resources. The NRC staff's preliminary conclusion is that environmental impacts from SMC's proposed alternative is not significant if certain mitigative measures are implemented, and there is no obviously superior alternative. The potential long-term human health effects from taking no action are significant; therefore, some remediation actions is appropriate and required by NRC regulations. Removing the contaminated material from the site will result in the smallest long-term environmental effects (impacts at the disposal facility have been previously assessed); however, the costs are quite significant. The off-site disposal alternative also has some potentially significant impacts on air quality and noise that would require mitigation. Further, the off-site disposal alternative is expected to result in a slightly higher incident of worker injuries than the on-site disposal alternatives. A cost benefit analysis shows that all on-site disposal alternatives have identical economic benefits, and the no action alternative has no economic benefits.

The NRC is offering an opportunity for public review and comment on the DEIS in accordance with NRC requirements in 10 CFR 51.73, 51.74, and 51.117. Any comments of Federal, State, and local agencies, Indian tribes, or other interested parties will be made available for public inspection when received. The DEIS is a preliminary analysis of the environmental impacts of SMC's proposed approach. The issuance of a final EIS, and any NRC decisionmaking based on a final EIS, will not be made until public comments on the DEIS are received and evaluated. NRC staff will review the comments, conduct any necessary analyses, and make appropriate revisions in developing the final EIS on the decommissioning of the Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation Cambridge, Ohio, facility. NRC anticipates completing the EIS on this facility in 1997. However, this schedule may need to be adjusted in reviewing public comments.

NRC is also arranging a public meeting on the DEIS to be held in the vicinity of Cambridge, Ohio, during the public comment period in the early Fall of 1996. The meeting will consist of an overview of the DEIS and an opportunity for the NRC to hear any public comments on the DEIS. NRC will announce the date and location for this meeting in a subsequent Federal Register notice well in advance of the public meeting.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of July 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael F. Weber,

Chief Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning Projects Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 96–18920 Filed 7–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

WTO Dispute Settlement Proceeding Regarding Patent Protection in Pakistan for Pharmaceuticals and Agricultural Chemicals

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 127(b)(1) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1)), the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is providing notice that the United States has requested the establishment of a dispute settlement panel under the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO), to examine Pakistan's failure to make patent protection available for inventions as specified in Article 27 of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), or provide systems that conform to obligations of the TRIPS Agreement regarding the acceptance of applications and the grant of exclusive marketing rights. More specifically, the United States has requested the establishment of a panel to determine whether Pakistan's legal regime is inconsistent with the obligations of the TRIPS Agreement, including but not necessarily limited to Articles 27, 65 and 70. USTR also invites written comments from the public concerning the issues raised in the dispute.

DATES: Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement proceedings, comments should be submitted on or before August 30, 1996, to be assured of timely consideration by USTR in preparing its first written submission to the panel.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted to Sybia Harrison, Office of the General Counsel, Room 222, Attn: Pakistan Mailbox Dispute, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Robertson, Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508, (202) 395–6800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 4, 1996, the United States requested establishment of a WTO dispute settlement panel to examine whether Pakistan's legal regime is inconsistent with the obligations of the TRIPS Agreement. The WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) considered the U.S. request at its meeting on July 15, 1996. Under the WTO Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes, the DSB must establish a panel at the next DSB meeting where this request is on the agenda, unless the DSB determines by consensus otherwise. Under normal circumstances, the panel would be expected to issue a report detailing its findings and recommendations within six to nine months after it is established.

Major Issues Raised by the United States and Legal Basis of Complaint

The TRIPS Agreement requires all WTO Members to grant patents for the subject matter specified in Article 27 of the Agreement. Article 70.8 of the TRIPS Agreement provides that where a Member takes advantage of the transitional provisions under the Agreement and does not make product patent protection available for pharmaceutical and agricultural chemical inventions as of the date of entry into force of the WTO Agreement (i.e., January 1, 1995), that Member must implement measures to permit Members' nationals to file patent applications drawn to such inventions on or after that January 1, 1995. When the member fully implements the product patent provisions of TRIPS Agreement Article 27, these applications must be examined according to the criteria for patentability set forth in the Agreement, based on the earliest effective filing date claimed for the application. Patents granted on these applications must enjoy the term and rights mandated by the TRIPS Agreement.

The TRIPS Agreement further requires Members subject to the obligations of Article 70.8 to provide exclusive marketing rights to those persons who have filed an application under the interim filing procedures, provided that the product covered by the invention has been granted marketing approval in the member providing this transitional protection and another Member, and a patent has been granted on the invention in another Member.

The legal regime in Pakistan currently does not make patent protection available for inventions as specified in Article 27 of the TRIPS Agreement, or provide systems that conform to obligations of the TRIPS Agreement regarding the acceptance of applications and the grant of exclusive marketing rights. As a result, Pakistan's legal regime appears to be inconsistent with the obligations of the TRIPS Agreement, including but not necessarily limited to Articles 27, 65 and 70.

Public Comment: Requirements for Submissions

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the issues raised in the dispute. Comments must be in English and provided in fifteen copies. A person requesting that information contained in a comment submitted by that person be treated as confidential business information must certify that such information is business confidential and would not customarily be released to the public by the commenter. Confidential business information must be clearly market ''BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL'' in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page of each copy.

A person requesting that information or advice contained in a comment submitted by that person, other than business confidential information, be treated as confidential in accordance with section 135(g)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155)—

(1) must so designate that information or advice;

(2) must clearly mark the material as ''CONFIDENTIAL'' in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page of each copy; and

(3) is encouraged to provide a non-confidential summary of the information or advice.

Pursuant to section 127(e) of the URAA, USTR will maintain a file on this dispute settlement proceeding, accessible to the public, in the USTR Reading Room: Room 101, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington DC 20508. The public file will include a listing of any comments made to USTR from the public with respect to the proceeding; the U.S. submissions to the panel in the proceeding; the submissions, or non-confidential summaries of submissions, to the panel received from other participants in the dispute, as well as the report of the dispute settlement panel and, if applicable, the report of the Appellate Body. An appointment to review the public file (Docket WTO/D–8, ''U.S.-Pakistan: Mailbox''), may be made by calling Brenda Webb, (202) 395–6186. The USTR Reading Room is open to the public from 10 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Jennifer Hillman,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96–18933 Filed 7–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M