as a starting point to develop more refined ecoregional nutrient criteria. (EPA is also using data and expertise provided by the RTAGs in the development of its section 304(a) nutrient criteria guidance for the 14 ecoregions it has identified.) EPA expects the RTAGs to use the processes set forth in the waterbody-type specific manuals to develop recommended nutrient criteria on an ecoregional basis or a more refined basis (such as subecoregion, coastal province, State or Tribe-level, more defined class of estuary/coastal marine water). Today's manual for estuarine and coastal marine waters also explains how States or Tribes can adopt nutrient water quality standards based on the criteria values recommended by the EPA and/or RTAGs.

The key parameters addressed in Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual: Estuarine and Coastal Marine Waters are total phosphorus, total nitrogen, algal biomass, and a measure of water clarity, such as Secchi depth. EPA encourages states and tribes to include additional response variables which they consider necessary to protect water quality. These variables may include (but are not limited to) dissolved oxygen, submerged aquatic vegetation, and macrobenthos. As set forth in the manual, the elements that EPA expects States and Tribes to consider in developing a nutrient criterion are:

(1) historical data and other information to establish perspective;

(2) current or historical reference site information;

(3) models used to simulate or validate the empirical relationships established between causal (nutrients) and response (biological indicators) variables; and

(4) evaluation of downstream consequences before finalizing criteria values.

EPA also expects the States or Tribes (or the RTAG when developing criteria guidance) to use their best professional judgement when examining the information and establishing criteria.

EPA expects the criteria development and implementation process (undertaken by EPA, the RTAGs and others) to proceed as follows:

- Data acquisition and review, as well as additional data gathering and processing methods.
- Classification of the estuarine and coastal waters by physical characteristics.
- Reference site selection and data reduction to identify current or historical reference conditions.
- Development of defensible nutrient criteria, verified by an RTAG and evaluated for potential downstream effects.
- Adoption of nutrient criteria by States and Tribes into their water quality standards, ideally taking into account the reference condition data and designated uses.
- Implementation of EPA-approved nutrient criteria by EPA, States, and Tribes to identify areas of water quality impairment due to nutrients and to respond appropriately.

These subjects are described in detail in the Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual: Estuarine and Coastal Marine Waters.

The manual concludes with chapters describing data models and management options that actively protect or restore estuarine and coastal marine waters. Case histories illustrating nutrient criteria development experiences are appended with the names of individual specialists to contact for more information.

The Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Document: Estuarine and Coastal Marine Waters that is being announced in this Notice was developed after consideration of peer review comments provided by a panel of five external reviewers.

Dated: September 18, 2001.

Geoffrey H. Grubbs,

Director, Office of Science and Technology.

[FR Doc. 01–25415 Filed 10–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7076–8; CWA–HQ–2001–6022; RCRA–HQ–2001–6022; CAA–HQ–6022]

Clean Water Act Class II: Proposed Administrative Settlement, Penalty Assessment and Opportunity To Comment Regarding Standard Steel, a Division of Freedom Forge Corporation; Correction

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On September 27, 2001, EPA published in the **Federal Register**, (66 FR 49379) information concerning a proposed settlement with Standard Steel, a Division of Freedom Forge Corporation (''Standard Steel'.) The purpose of this correction is to provide additional information about this settlement and to offer interested parties the opportunity to comment on all aspects of this consent agreement and proposed final order. This correction does not extend the public comment period beyond the date included in the original notice.

EPA has entered into a consent agreement with Standard Steel, a Division of Freedom Forge Corporation, to resolve violations of the Clean Water Act (''CWA''), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (''RCRA''), Clean Air Act (''CAA''), and their implementing regulations. Standard Steel failed to prepare a complete Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (''SPCC'') plan, failed to provide secondary containment, and failed to complete and maintain certification forms for two facilities where it stored oil or oil products in above ground tanks. Standard Steel failed to meet all requirements of its General Permit as required by its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for one facility. EPA, as authorized by CWA section 311(b)(6), 33 U.S.C. 1321(b)(6), and CWA section 309(g), 33 U.S.C. 1319(g), has assessed a civil penalty for these violations. The Administrator, as required by CWA section 311(b)(6)(C), 33 U.S.C. 1321(b)(6)(C), and CWA section 309(g)(4)(A), 33 U.S.C. 1319(g)(4)(A), is hereby providing public notice of, and an opportunity for interested persons to comment on, this consent agreement and proposed final order. EPA is also providing public notice of, and opportunity for interested parties to comment on, the CAA and RCRA portions of this consent agreement.

Standard Steel failed to meet all requirements of its Title V Operating Permit at one facility by (1) Failing to timely submit its first semi-annual monitoring report; (2) failing to conduct weekly inspections for fugitive emissions and odors; (3) failing to monitor and record the pressure drop at particulate matter control devices on a weekly basis; (4) failing to maintain a log of odorous air contaminants, visible emissions and fugitive visible emission exceedances; and (5) failing to maintain a monthly record of emissions of nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds. EPA, as authorized by CAA section 113(d)(1), 42 U.S.C. 7413(d)(1), has assessed a civil penalty for these violations.

Standard Steel failed to conduct weekly inspections of its Electric Arc Furnace (''EAF'') dust storage area, and failed to conduct annual hazardous waste training and maintain records of such training. Standard Steel failed to develop and implement a universal waste management program. EPA, as authorized by RCRA section 3008(a)(3),

42 U.S.C. 6928(a)(3), has assessed a civil penalty for these violations.

DATES: Comments are due on or before October 29, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Mail written comments to the Enforcement & Compliance Docket and Information Center (2201A), Docket Number EC–2001–006, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Mail Code 2201A, Washington, DC 20460. (Comments may be submitted on disk in WordPerfect 8.0 or earlier versions.) Written comments may be delivered in person to: Enforcement and Compliance Docket Information Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 4033, Ariel Rios Bldg., 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. Submit comments electronically to *docket.oeca@epa.gov.* Electronic comments may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

The consent agreement, the proposed final order, and public comments, if any, may be reviewed at the Enforcement and Compliance Docket Information Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 4033, Ariel Rios Bldg., 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. Persons interested in reviewing these materials must make arrangements in advance by calling the docket clerk at 202–564–2614. A reasonable fee may be charged by EPA for copying docket materials.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Beth Cavalier, Multimedia Enforcement Division (2248–A), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone (202) 564–3271; fax: (202) 564–9001; e-mail: cavalier.beth@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Copies

Electronic copies of this document are available from the EPA Home Page under the link ''Laws and Regulations'' at the **Federal Register**—Environmental Documents entry (http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr).

I. Background

Standard Steel, a Division of Freedom Forge Corporation, is an iron and steel minimill incorporated in the State of Delaware and located at 500 North Walnut Street, Burnham, Pennsylvania 17009, and at 107 Gertrude Street, Latrobe, Pennsylvania 15650. Standard Steel disclosed, pursuant to the EPA ''Incentives for Self-Policing: Discovery, Disclosures, Correction and Prevention of Violations'' (''Audit Policy''), 65 FR 19618 (April 11, 2000), that it failed to prepare complete SPCC plans for two facilities where it stored oil and oil products in above ground storage tanks, in violation of the CWA section 311(b)(3) and 40 CFR part 112. Standard Steel disclosed that it had not completed and maintained at the facility the certification form contained in appendix C to 40 CFR 112.20(e) in violation of the CWA section 311(b)(3) and 40 CFR part 112. Standard Steel disclosed that it had failed to meet all requirements of its NPDES General Permit. Standard Steel failed to conduct an annual site storm water compliance evaluation and failed to update documents relating to the facility's method to control storm water discharges, failed to update the emergency coordinator list, and failed to maintain a discharge certification and authorization to commit resources at one facility in violation of CWA sections 1311(a), and 402(a) and (p) and 40 CFR part 122. Standard Steel disclosed that it had failed to meet all requirements of its Title V permit by failing to (1) Timely submit its first semi-annual monitoring report; (2) monitor and record the pressure drop at particulate matter control devices on a weekly basis; (3) maintain a monthly record of emissions of nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds, based on a twelve month rolling total; (4) conduct weekly inspections for fugitive emissions and odors; and (5) maintain a log of odorous air contaminants, visible emissions, and fugitive visible emissions, in violation of 25 Pa. Code sections 127.511 and 127.441 and 40 CFR 70.4(b)(3)(ii). Standard Steel disclosed that it had failed to conduct weekly inspections of its EAF dust storage area, as required by 25 Pa. Code section 265(a).174 and 40 CFR 265.174, (referencing 25 Pa. Code section 262a.34a, and 40 CFR 262.34a). Standard Steel disclosed that it had failed to conduct annual hazardous waste training, and maintain records of such training, as required by 25 Pa. Code section 265a.16 and 40 CFR 265.16, (referencing 25 Pa. Code 262a.34a, and 40 CFR 262.34a.). Standard Steel disclosed that it had failed to develop and implement a universal waste management program, in accordance with the requirements found at 25 Pa. Code section 266b, and 40 CFR part 273.

EPA determined that Standard Steel met the criteria set out in the Audit Policy for a 100% waiver of the gravity component of the penalty. As a result, EPA waived the gravity based penalty ($275,136) and proposed a settlement penalty amount of fourteen thousand, three hundred and fifty dollars ($14,350.00). This is the amount of the economic benefit gained by Standard Steel, attributable to its delayed compliance with the SPCC regulations and General Permit conditions, Title V permit conditions, and RCRA hazardous waste regulations. Standard Steel has agreed to pay this amount in civil penalties. EPA and Standard Steel negotiated and signed an administrative consent agreement, following the Consolidated Rules of Procedure, 40 CFR 22.13, on September 12, 2001 *(In Re: Standard Steel, a Division of Freedom Forge*, Docket No. CWA–HQ–2001–6022). This consent agreement is subject to public notice and comment under CWA section 311(b)(6), 33 U.S.C. 1321(b)(6) and CWA section 309(g)(4)(A), 33 U.S.C. 1319(g)(4)(A). EPA is expanding this opportunity for public comment to all other aspects of this consent agreement.

Under CWA section 311(b)(6)(A), 33 U.S.C. 1321 (b)(6)(A), any owner, operator, or person in charge of a vessel, onshore facility, or offshore facility from which oil is discharged in violation of the CWA section 311 (b)(3), 33 U.S.C. 1321 (b)(3), or who fails or refuses to comply with any regulations that have been issued under CWA section 311 (j), 33 U.S.C. 1321(j), may be assessed an administrative civil penalty of up to $137,500 by EPA. Class II proceedings under CWA section 311(b)(6) are conducted in accordance with 40 CFR part 22.

Under CWA section 309(g)(1)(A), 33 U.S.C. 1319 (g)(1)(A), any person found in violation of any permit condition or limitation implementing any of such sections in a permit issued under the CWA section 402(a), 33 U.S.C. 1342, or the CWA section 301(a), 33 U.S.C. 1311(a), may be assessed an administrative civil penalty of up to $125,000 by EPA. Class II proceedings under CWA section 309(g)(1)(A) are conducted in accordance with 40 CFR part 22.

Under RCRA section 3008(a), 42 U.S.C. 6928(a), any person found in violation of any requirement of this subchapter may be issued an order assessing a civil penalty for any past or current violation, and/or requiring compliance immediately or within a specified time period. Proceedings under RCRA section 3008(a) are conducted in accordance with 40 CFR part 22.

Under CAA section 113(d), the Administrator may issue an administrative order assessing a civil penalty against any person who has violated an applicable implementation

plan or any other requirement of the Act, including any rule, order, waiver, permit or plan. Proceedings under CAA section 113(d) are conducted in accordance with 40 CFR part 22.

The procedures by which the public may comment on a proposed Class II penalty order, or participate in a Clean Water Act Class II penalty proceeding, are set forth in 40 CFR 22.45. The deadline for submitting public comment on this proposed final order is October 29, 2001. All comments will be transferred to the Environmental Appeals Board (''EAB'') of EPA for consideration. The powers and duties of the EAB are outlined in 40 CFR 22.04(a).

Pursuant to CWA section 311(b)(6)(C) and CWA section 309(g)(4)(A), EPA will not issue an order in this proceeding prior to the close of the public comment period.

Dated: October 1, 2001.

David A. Nielsen,

Director, Multimedia Enforcement Division, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance.

[FR Doc. 01–25412 Filed 10–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Farm Credit Administration Board; Regular Meeting

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), of the forthcoming regular meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board).

DATE AND TIME: The regular meeting of the Board will be held at the offices of the Farm Credit Administration in McLean, Virginia, on October 11, 2001, from 9:00 a.m. until such time as the Board concludes its business.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kelly Mikel Williams, Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, (703) 883–4025, TDD (703) 883–4444.

ADDRESS: Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102–5090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This meeting of the Board will be open to the public (limited space available). In order to increase the accessibility to Board meetings, persons requiring assistance should make arrangements in advance. The matters to be considered at the meeting are:

Open Session

A. Approval of Minutes

1. September 13, 2001 (Open)
2. September 27, 2001 (Open)

B. Report

—Corporate Approvals Report

C. New Business—Regulation

—National Charters—12 CFR parts 611, 618, and 620 (Final)

Dated: October 5, 2001.

Kelly Mikel Williams,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 01–25539 Filed 10–5–01; 2:20 pm]

BILLING CODE 6705–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[DA–01–2112]

Public Safety 700 MHz Band—Changes to Regional Planning Boundaries

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document, released by the Commission's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (''WTB''), accepts and approves the decisions of Connecticut and Michigan to ''opt out'' of their assigned planning regions for purposes of the regional planning process established by the Commission for the General Use channels in the 700 MHz public safety band. The intended effect of this document is to provide interested persons with notice of the WTB's actions and the specific ''opt out'' decisions made by Connecticut and Michigan.

ADDRESSES: The complete text of this Public Notice, including the attachment, is available for inspection and copying during regular business hours at the FCC Reference Center, Portals II, 445—12th Street, S.W., Room CY–A257, Washington, D.C., 20554. It also may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating copy contractor, Qualex International, Portals II, 445—12th Street, S.W., Room CY–B402, Washington, D.C. 20554. The full text of the Public Notice including the attachment is available online at www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Wireless/Public_Notices/2001/da012112.doc.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bert Weintraub, Public Safety and Private Wireless Division, WTB, at (202) 418–0680 or by e-mail: *publicsafety@fcc.gov*. Alternative formats of this Public Notice are available to persons with disabilities by contacting Martha Contee at (202) 418–0260 or TTY (202) 418–2555.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Following is a summary of Public Notice, DA 01–2112 (rel. Sept. 10, 2001). In 1998, the FCC decided that the 700 MHz regional planning committees would be based on the same fifty-five planning regions used in the 800 MHz band. The FCC, however, also decided to allow states or territories not in regions defined by state boundaries to ''opt out'' of their existing regions to form or join a planning region that corresponds with their state's boundaries. *See* First Report and Order and Third Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, WT Docket No. 96–86, 63 FR 58645 (Nov. 2, 1998). The deadline date for reporting ''opt out'' decisions was July 2, 2001. *See* Public Notice, 66 FR 13739 (Mar. 7, 2001), and Second Memorandum Opinion and Order, WT Docket No. 96–86, 65 FR 53641 (Sept. 5, 2000). (Pursuant to timely filed requests, however, the deadline date was extended until November 2, 2001, and January 2, 2002, for the 700 MHz Public Safety Band Region 42 RPC and the 700 MHz Public Safety Band Region 8 RPC, respectively.)

Connecticut was eligible to ''opt out'' because it was part of Region 8 and Region 19; Michigan was eligible to ''opt out'' because it comprised Region 21 and part of Region 54. The Public Notice announces the WTB's acceptance and approval of the Connecticut and Michigan decisions and it includes an attachment setting forth the 700 MHz planning regions as modified as a result of these ''opt out'' decisions. The attachment also corrects several typographical errors/omissions that appeared on earlier versions of the list of planning regions.

Federal Communications Commission.

D'wana R. Terry,

Chief, Public Safety and Private Wireless Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.

[FR Doc. 01–25306 Filed 10–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Network Reliability and Interoperability Council

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, this notice advises interested persons of the fifth meeting of the Network Reliability and Interoperability Council (Council)