materials, and construction activities. EPA requested additional information on these issues be included in the Final EIS.

ERP No. D-NPS-K65187-CA Rating EC2, Santa Rosa Island Resources Management Plan, Improvements of Water Quality and Conservation of Rare Species and their Habitats, Channel Islands National Park, Santa Barbara County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with potential impacts associated with the weed and road management programs. EPA requested that the FEIS demonstrate consistency with the applicable Basin Plan, and encouraged Park Service to modify the preferred alternative to include more environmental protection features found in the Conservation Team Recommendations Alternative.

## Regulations

ERP No. RR-DOA-A90083-00, 7 CFR Part 12—Highly Erodible Land and Wetland Conservation.

Summary: EPA commented that the interim final rule raised a number of issues that may affect implementation of the Clean Water Action Section 404 regulatory program. Rather than proposing specific revisions to the regulations regarding the Swampbuster program. EPA recommended that issues be addressed, where possible, through the development of a formal interagency agreement between EPA, NRCS, the Corps of Engineers and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. EPA also recommended that the final rule clarify the Swampbuster status of priorconverted cropland when wetland characteristics return as a result of a lack of maintenance of the land or other circumstances beyond the control of the property owner. EPA raised concerns over the adequacy of the Environmental Assessment (EA) and recommended that the EA be revised prior to publication of the final rule.

ERP No. R–DOA–A99214–00, 7 CFR Part 1466—Environmental Quality Incentives Program—Commodity Credit Corporation.

Summary: EPA supported the proposed approach for designating priority areas, and recommended establishing a financial incentive program for states to develop priority areas that effectively direct funds to critical environmental resource problems, and that the Commodity Credit Corporation reject these proposals that do not meet the relevant criteria. EPA also recommended that in defining a "large confined livestock operation," the final rule should emphasize that assistance is meant for

family farmers and ranchers and that a specific level for defining large operations be established, allowing for exceptions based upon ability to pay and on maximizing environmental benefits per dollar.

Dated: November 25, 1996.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 96–30496 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

### [ER-FRL-5475-3]

# **Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability**

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 OR (202) 564–7153. Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed November 18, 1996 Through November 22, 1996 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 960542, Final EIS, FHW, MO, MO–13 Highway Improvement, Existing MO–13 to MO–10 just south of Richmond to US 24 just south of Lexington, Funding, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits and US Coast Guard Bridge Permit Issuance, Ray and Lafayette Counties, MO, Due: December 30, 1996, Contact: Donald Neumann (573) 636–7104.

EIS No. 960543, Draft Supplement, DOE, NM, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Disposal Phase, Updated Information, Disposal of Transuranic Waste, Carlsbad, NM, Due: January 28, 1997, Contact: Harold Johnson (505) 234– 7349.

EIS No. 960544, Final EIS, DOI, UT, Wasatch County Water Efficiency Project and Daniel Replacement Pipeline Project, Implementation, Wasatch County, UT, Due: December 30, 1996, Contact: Karen Ricks (801) 226–7126.

EIS No. 960545, Final EIS, DOE, CT, S1C Prototype Reactor Plant Disposal, Windsor Site Located at the Knolls Atom Power Laboratory, CT, Due: December 30, 1996, Contact: Christopher G. Overton (860) 687– 5610

Dated: November 25, 1996

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 96–30497 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

### [FRL-5656-9]

Proposed Cost Recovery Settlement Under Section 122(h)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as Amended, 42 U.S.C. 9622(h)(1), Pipe and Piling Superfund Site, Omaha and Avoca, Nebraska

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed cost recovery settlement under Section 122(h)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9622(h)(1), Pipe and Piling Superfund Site, Omaha and Avoca, Nebraska.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to enter into a cost recovery administrative settlement to resolve claims under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9622(h)(1). This settlement is intended to resolve the liability of Pipe and Piling Supplies (U.S.A.) Ltd. (Pipe & Piling) for the response costs incurred by the EPA in overseeing a removal action conducted by Pipe & Piling at Pipe and Piling Superfund Site, Omaha and Avoca, Nebraska. The proposed settlement consent order was signed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on October 29, 1996. Because EPA's total response costs did not exceed \$500,000, the Attorney General's concurrence is not required for this settlement.

**DATES:** Written comments must be provided on or before December 30, 1996

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Daniel J. Shiel, Office of Regional Counsel, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region VII, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101 and should refer to: In the matter of Pipe and Piling Supplies (U.S.A.) Ltd., EPA Docket No. VII–96–F–0031.

The proposed administrative settlement may be examined in person at the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region VII, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. To request a copy by mail please refer to the matter name and docket number set forth above and enclose a check in the amount of \$3.75 (25 cents per page for reproduction costs), payable to the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed administrative settlement concerns the Pipe and Piling Nebraska Superfund Site located in Omaha and Avoca, Nebraska. In November 1992, EPA Region VII issued a CERCLA Section 106 unilateral administrative order (UAO) to Pipe & Piling Supplies requiring it to remove asbestoscontaining materials from two locations in Nebraska. EPA treated the two locations, one in Omaha and one in Avoca, as one site. Pipe & Piling conducted the removal action as required by the UAO.

Pipe & Piling did not agree to reimburse EPA's costs of overseeing the removal action at the time EPA issued the UAO. By letter dated February 29, 1996, EPA sent Pipe & Piling a cost reimbursement bill for \$34,684.15. Pipe & Piling responded by questioning the appropriateness of some charges included within the bill. In the proposed settlement, Pipe & Piling has agreed to reimburse EPA \$20,000.

Dated: November 15, 1996 Dennis Grams, Regional Administrator. [FR Doc. 96–30480 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

### [FRL-5657-2]

Termination of Review of Department of Energy Petition to EPA for a No-Migration Determination for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
ACTION: Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency announces that the Office of Solid Waste has terminated its review of the final no-migration petition for the Department of Energy's (DOE) Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). The WIPP is a geological repository intended for the disposal of mixed hazardous and radioactive wastes. The hazardous portion of the waste was originally subject to EPA's land disposal restrictions of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). On September 23, 1996 the President signed Public Law 104–201 that, among other things, exempts WIPP from the provisions of the land disposal restrictions. Consequently, EPA has terminated its review of DOE's nomigration petition, effective October 1, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For general information, contact the RCRA

Hotline at (800) 424–9346 or TDD (800) 553–7672 (hearing impaired). In the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, call (703) 412–9810 or TDD (703) 412–3323.

For more detailed information on specific aspects of the issues discussed in this notice, contact Reid Rosnick (703–308–8758), (rosnick.reid@epamail.epa.gov), or Chris Rhyne (703–308–8658),

(rhyne.chris@epamail.epa.gov), Office of Solid Waste (5303W), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Wastes proposed for disposal at WIPP are mixed wastes, and are defined as a mixture of hazardous waste regulated under Subtitle C of RCRA, and radioactive materials regulated under the Atomic Energy Act. Consequently, these wastes have been regulated by EPA and the State of New Mexico as a hazardous waste, and by EPA (the Office of Radiation and Indoor Air) as a radioactive material.

Prior to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, the hazardous portion of the wastes were subject to the land disposal restrictions found in section 3004 (m) of RCRA, and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations at 40 CFR part 268. The regulations require that hazardous wastes be treated to specific standards prior to any land disposal, unless a "nomigration" demonstration can be made in accordance with 40 CFR 268.6. Persons seeking a no-migration determination must submit a petition to the EPA Administrator "\* \* demonstrating, to a reasonable degree of certainty, that there will be no migration of hazardous waste, or hazardous waste constituents from the disposal unit or injection zone for as long as the wastes remain hazardous.'

In June 1996, DOE submitted a nomigration petition to the Agency. This petition was designed to demonstrate that there would be no migration of the hazardous wastes disposed of at the WIPP for at least 10,000 years. The Agency announced the availability of the petition in the Federal Register on August 19, 1996 (see 61 FR 42899), and provided 60 days of public comment on the petition. EPA then began a completeness check and technical review of the petition.

In September 1996, the President signed the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997. Included as a subsection of the Act was the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Amendments Act, which prescribed significant changes to the way that RCRA applies to WIPP. The

Act states that transuranic mixed waste designated by the Secretary of DOE for disposal at WIPP is exempt from the treatment standards promulgated pursuant to section 3004(m) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act and is not subject to the land disposal restrictions in sections 3004 (d), (e), (f), and (g) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (the land disposal restrictions). Consequently, EPA terminated review of the no-migration petition for the WIPP when the bill was signed into law. It was the sense of the Congress that the land disposal restrictions, which restrict the land disposal of the hazardous portion of the mixed waste, were redundant with EPA's radioactive waste compliance certification standards at 40 CFR 191 and 194 (Congressional Record, June 20, 1996, page S6591). The 191 and 194 standards must be met by DOE prior to shipment of waste to WIPP, and in essence require that the transuranic waste be contained within the prescribed boundaries for at least 10,000 years.

In addition to EPA's role in regulation of the WIPP through the radiation protection standards, the hazardous portion of the mixed transuranic waste will continue to be regulated by the State of New Mexico through the RCRA hazardous waste permitting program. DOE must obtain a permit from the State that shows that the hazardous portion of the waste will be safely handled during the operating life of the facility, the closure period (when the facility shafts are sealed and permanent markers are installed), and for a period of time after closure known as the post-closure period. The State's RCRA permit, along with the compliance certification issued by EPA, will ensure that there is adequate protection of human health and the environment during and after disposal operations at WIPP.

EPA will continue to participate in the regulation of the WIPP under RCRA by offering assistance to the State of New Mexico in the preparation of the RCRA permit for the facility.

Dated: November 22, 1996.

Elliott P. Laws,

Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

[FR Doc. 96–30481 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P