Other Facilities, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, U.S. Coast Guard Permit, Contra Costa County, CA, Due: November 17, 1997, Contact: Craig Vassel (415) 977–8546.

EIS No. 970375, FINAL EIS, IBR, AZ, Programmatic EIS—Pima-Maricopa Irrigation Project, Construction and Operation, Maricopa and Pinal Counties, AZ, Due: November 3, 1997, Contact: Bruce D. Ellis (602) 395–5685.

EIS No. 970376, FINAL EIS, NAS, CA, WA, UT, X–33 Advanced Technology Demonstrator Vehicle Program, Final Design, Construction and Testing, Implementation, Approvals and Permits Issuance, CA, UT and WA, Due: November 3, 1997, Contact: Kenneth M. Kumor (202) 358–1112.

EIS No. 970377, FINAL EIS, AFS, MT, Lewis and Clark National Forest Plan, Implementation, Oil and Gas Leasing Analysis, Upper Missouri River Basin, several counties, MT, Due: November 3, 1997, Contact: Robin Strathy (406) 791–7726.

Dated: September 30, 1997.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 97–26329 Filed 10–2–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5484–9]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared September 1, 1997 Through September 5, 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 11, 1997 (62 FR 16154).

DRAFT EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–J61098–MT Rating EC2, Lost Trail Ski Area Expansion Project, Implementation, New Master Development Plan, Bitterroot National Forest, Sula Ranger District, Ravalli County, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential increased wastewater pollutant loadings to area ground water, and lack of analysis and disclosure of potential indirect effects of induced development. Additional information is needed to fully assess and mitigate all potential environmental impacts of the management actions.

ERP No. D–MMS–L02026–AK Rating LO, Beaufort Sea Planning Area Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Lease Sale 170 (1997) Lease Offering, Offshore Marine, Beaufort Sea Coastal Plain, North Slope Borough of Alaska.

Summary: EPA does not foresee having any environmental objections to the proposed project.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–BLM–J60018–UT Price Coalbed Methane Gas Resources Project, Construction, Federal and Non-Federal Lands, Permit-to-Drill Application, Right-of-Way Grants and COE Section 404 Permits, Carbon and Emery Counties, UT.

Summary: The Final EIS addresses most of EPA's air quality concerns on the proposed project and EPA still recommend a cumulative effects analysis in the Price area.

ERP No. F–BLM–J60019–WY Cave Gulch-Bullfrog-Waltman Natural Gas Development Project, Implementation, Platte River Resource Area, Natrona County, WY.

Summary: While the Final EIS addresses most concerns expressed in our comment letter on the draft EIS. EPA still maintains environmental concerns about the protectiveness of the proposed plans for ground water and surface water.

ERP No. F–DOE–L36109–00 Watershed Management Program Standards and Guidelines, Implementation, ID, NV, MT, OR, WA and WY.

Summary: Review of the Final EIS has been completed and the project found to be satisfactory. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. F–UAF–G11031–TX Programmatic EIS—Kelly Air Force Base (AFB), Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, San Antonio County, TX.

Summary: EPA has reviewed the lead agency's responses to EPA comments offered on the draft statement. EPA finds the FEIS has reasonably addressed our concerns and therefore we have no further comments.

ERP No. F–UAF–K11080–CA Programmatic EIS—McClellan Air Force Base (AFB) Disposal and Reuse Including Rezoning of the Main Base, Implementation, Federal Permits, Licenses or Entitlements, Sacramento County, CA.

Summary: EPA was generally satisfied with the additional information provided, but continues to express concerns about groundwater overdraft.

ERP No. F–UMC–K11067–00 Yuma Training Range Complex Management, Operation and Development, Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, Goldwater Range, Yuma and La Paz Cos., AZ and Chocolate Mountain Range, Imperial and Riverside Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA commented that the Final EIS addresses the concerns that were expressed in the Draft EIS.

ERP No. F–UMC–K24018–CA Sewage Effluent Compliance Project, Implementation, Lower Santa Margarita Basin, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, CA.

Summary: EPA commented that while additional alternatives were not developed or advanced in the Final EIS, the additional information regarding Clean Water Act Section 404 requirements that EPA requested was provided.

ERP No. F–USA–K11073–AZ Western Army National Guard Aviation Training Site Expansion Project, Designation of an Expanded Tactical Flight Training Area (TFTA), Development or Use of a Helicopter Gunnery Range and Construction and Operation of various Facilities on the Silver Bell Army Heliport (SBAH), Maricopa, Pima and Pinal Counties, AZ.

Summary: EPA commented regarding analysis of water, noise, biological resources and NEPA issues that the Army has addressed our concerns.

ERP No. FR–USA–G11029–AR Disposal of Chemical Agents and Munitions Stored at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Site-Specific Impacts Associated with On-Site Disposal, Construction and Operation and Approval of Permits, Jefferson County, AR.

Summary: EPA had no objection to the selection of the preferred alternative described in the Revised Final EIS.

Other: ERP No. LD–AFS–J65268–CO Rating EO2, North Fork of the South Platte and the South Platte Rivers, Wild and Scenic River Study, To Determine their Suitability for Inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, Pike and San Isabel National Forests, Comache and Cimarron National Grasslands, Douglas, Jefferson, Park and Teller Counties, CO.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections with the first agency preferred alternative (local community protection) because the DLEIS did not include how this would be accomplished or what the impacts would be. EPA expressed environmental concerns with the second agency preferred alternative (congressional

recommendation) because it did not recommend equal protection to the Outstandingly Remarkable Values of several river segments within the study area and did not fully consider the broader implications of designation on other, nearby wilderness and roadless areas.

Dated: September 30, 1997.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 97–26350 Filed 10–2–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPTS–00226; FRL–5749–6]

Forum on State and Tribal Toxics Action (FOSTTA) Projects; Open Meetings

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Three projects of the Forum on State and Tribal Toxics Action (FOSTTA) will hold meetings open to the public at the time and place listed below in this notice. The Lead Project will not be meeting this session. The public is encouraged to attend the proceedings as observers. However, in the interest of time and efficiency, the meeting is structured to provide maximum opportunity for state, tribal, and EPA invited participants to discuss items on the predetermined agenda. At the discretion of the chair of the project, an effort will be made to accommodate participation by observers attending the proceedings.

DATES: The three projects will meet October 20, 1997, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., with a plenary session on Cutting Edge Initiatives in Pollution Prevention from 8 a.m. to 9:30 a.m., and on October 21, 1997, from 8 a.m. to noon.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held at The Embassy Suites Hotel, 1900 Diagonal Road, Alexandria, VA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Darlene Harrod, Designated Federal Official (DFO), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (7408), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, Telephone: (202) 260–6904, e-mail: harrod.darlene@epamail.epa.gov. Any observer wishing to speak should advise the DFO at the telephone number or e-mail address listed above no later than 4 p.m. on October 16, 1997.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: FOSTTA, a group of state and tribal toxics environmental managers, is intended to foster the exchange of toxics-related program and enforcement information among the states/tribes and between the states/tribes and EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances (OPPTS) and Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA). FOSTTA currently consists of the Coordinating Committee and four issue-specific projects. The projects are the: (1) Toxics Release Inventory Project; Pollution Prevention Project; (3) Chemical Management Project; and (4) Lead (Pb) Project.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection.

Dated: September 27, 1997.

Susan B. Hazen,

Director, Environmental Assistance Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics.

[FR Doc. 97–26323 Filed 10–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5902–5]

Proposed Settlement Under Section 122(h)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as Amended, 42 U.S.C. 9622(h)(1)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed administrative settlement and opportunity for comment.

SUMMARY: The EPA is proposing to enter into an administrative settlement to resolve claims under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended (CERCLA). Notice is being published to inform the public of the proposed settlement and of the opportunity to comment. The settlement is intended to recover all past response costs incurred by EPA at the Spruce Street Site in Anchorage, Alaska.

DATES: Comments must be provided on or before November 3, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Docket Clerk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, ORC–158, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington, 98101, and should refer to the Spruce Street Site, Anchorage, Alaska, U.S. EPA Docket No. 10–96–0090–CERCLA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward J. Kowalski, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Regional Counsel, ORC–158, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington, 98101, (206) 553–6695; Gina Belt, U.S. Department of Justice, Environmental & Natural Resources Division, 801 B Street, #504, Anchorage, Alaska, 99501–3657, (907) 271–3456.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with section 122(i)(1) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622(i)(1), notice is hereby given of a proposed administrative settlement, Agreement for Payment of Response Costs (Agreement), concerning the Spruce Street Site (Site) located in Anchorage, Alaska. Pursuant to section 104 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9604, EPA undertook response actions at the Site, which was an inactive salvage yard of about two acres. The Agreement resolves EPA's claims regarding liability under section 107(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9607(a), for response costs incurred by EPA in connection with the Site. Subject to review by the public pursuant to this Notice, the Agreement has been approved by the United States Department of Justice. The following are the parties who have executed the proposed Agreement: the Municipality of Anchorage, The State of Alaska, the Defense Logistics Agency, the Federal Aviation Administration; the United States Air Force, and the United States Army. EPA is entering into this Agreement under the authority of section 122(h)(1) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622(h)(1).

EPA initiated a time critical removal action at the Site in October 1991 to stabilize the wastes located on-site. Hazardous wastes on-site included paints, electrical equipment containing PCBs, soils contaminated with heavy metals, soils contaminated with PCBs, chemicals, acids, and caustics. Due to inclement weather, removal activities by EPA were suspended and resumed in June 1992, when EPA sorted on-site debris and prepared hazardous materials for removal. In January 1993, hazardous materials including paints, electrical equipment containing PCBs, some contaminated soils and oils were transported off-site. Two nearby residences were supplied with bottled water because of elevated levels of arsenic in their wells. These two residences have since been hooked up to the city water supply. To restrict access to the Site, the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation erected a fence around the Site and posted hazardous substance warning signs. In performing these response actions, EPA and the State of Alaska incurred response costs at the Site. The Agreement requires, *inter alia*, that the Municipality of Anchorage