

B. Applicant's Demonstrations Under 40 CFR 268.5 for Case-by-Case Extension

When it became apparent that DuPont's reissuance request could not be processed by the land disposal restriction effective date, they submitted a case-by-case extension request. This request, which was submitted on February 16, 1998, documented their need for the extension and included their justification for a case-by-case extension approval. DuPont's request letter is part of the docket.

Case-by-case extension applications must satisfy the requirements outlined in 40 CFR 268.5. The following is a discussion of each of the seven demonstrations of 40 CFR 268.5(a)(1)–(7) made by DuPont:

Section 268.5(a)(1) requires the applicant to make a good-faith effort to locate and contract with treatment, recovery, or disposal facilities nationwide to manage its waste in accordance with the effective date of the applicable restriction.

DuPont has demonstrated that it has made a good-faith effort to provide protective disposal capacity. EPA approved DuPont's no migration demonstration for injection wells on September 10, 1991. This exemption approval expires on December 31, 2000. In addition, there is limited other capacity to handle the two wastestreams subject to this request. Currently there is not sufficient backup well capacity available to handle the affected wastestreams due to one backup well being shut-in due to loss of mechanical integrity and the other backup well not having sufficient injectivity. In addition the high volume of the affected wastestreams makes trucking the waste off-site logistically problematic.

Section 268.5(a)(2) requires the applicant to enter into a binding contractual commitment to construct or otherwise provide alternative treatment, recovery, or disposal capacity that meets the treatment standards specified in 40 CFR Part 268 subpart D or, where treatment standards have not been specified, such treatment, recovery, or disposal capacity is protective of human health and the environment.

By retaining consultants and experts in geology, engineering, seismicity and other areas to prepare and file its reissuance request, which EPA has found to be technically adequate, EPA believes that DuPont has satisfied the requirement to obtain a binding commitment to provide disposal capacity that is protective of human health and the environment. The injection wells covered by the petition already exist and will be sufficient to manage the full volume of waste if the facility's reissuance request is approved.

Section 268.5(a)(3) requires the applicant to demonstrate that due to circumstances beyond the applicant's control, such alternative capacity cannot reasonably be made available by the applicable effective date. This demonstration may include a showing that the technical and practical difficulties associated with providing the alternative capacity will result in the capacity not being available by the applicable effective date.

The inability to obtain alternative capacity by April 8, 1998, is beyond DuPont's control. Since the time DuPont requested approval of the changes to its petition demonstration in October 1997, DuPont and EPA Region 6 have worked together through technical issues, and DuPont has responded to all of the Agency's comments and requests for additional information or demonstrations. The Agency has completed its review of DuPont's reissuance request and will propose its approval once DuPont has demonstrated to EPA that the well that is shut-in due to mechanical integrity problems has been repaired. Currently the mechanical integrity of the shut-in well is being reestablished. When EPA publishes its notice of intent to approve the reissuance request there will be a 45-day comment period and if there is sufficient public interest a public hearing will be held. After this public participation process is completed, the Agency will evaluate all comments received, prepare a responsiveness summary and determine whether it is appropriate to finalize the approval of the reissuance or if additional information is needed.

Section 268.5(a)(4) requires the applicant to demonstrate that the capacity being constructed or otherwise provided by the applicant will be sufficient to manage the entire quantity of waste that is the subject of the application.

If DuPont's reissuance request is approved, the facility's injection well operations will continue to provide adequate capacity for the entire volume of the Plant's waste.

Section 268.5(a)(5) requires the applicant to provide a detailed schedule for obtaining operating and construction permits or an outline of how and when alternative capacity will be available.

All injection wells at the DuPont facility have approved Class I injection well permits and the wells have been constructed. See the information provided for Section 268.5(a)(3) for the processing schedule of DuPont's no migration petition reissuance request.

Section 268.5(a)(6) requires the applicant to arrange for adequate capacity to manage its waste during an extension, and has

documented the location of all sites at which the waste will be managed.

During the proposed one year case-by-case extension period, DuPont will have adequate capacity at the facility to manage the facility's waste.

Section 268.5(a)(7) requires that the applicant demonstrate that any waste managed in a surface impoundment or landfill during the extension period will meet the requirements of 40 CFR 268.5(h)(2).

There are no surface impoundments or landfills managing hazardous waste at the DuPont facility.

II. EPA's Proposed Action

For the reasons discussed above, the Agency believes that DuPont has satisfied all the requirements for a case-by-case extension to the April 8, 1998, effective date of the RCRA land disposal restrictions (LDR) treatment standards applicable to wastewaters with the hazardous waste code D018 (Benzene). Therefore, EPA is proposing to grant DuPont's requested case-by-case extension for a one year period. If during this time frame a final decision on DuPont's petition reissuance request is made, then this case-by-case extension will expire.

Dated: February 23, 1998.

William B. Hathaway,
Director, Water Quality Protection Division
(6WQ), EPA Region 6.
[FR Doc. 98-5312 Filed 2-27-98; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPTS-42191C; FRL-5776-4]

Endocrine Disruptors; Notice of Public Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: EPA is announcing the eighth meeting the Endocrine Disruptors Screening and Testing Advisory Committee (EDSTAC), a committee established under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) to advise EPA on a strategy for screening chemicals and pesticides for their potential to disrupt endocrine function in humans and wildlife.

DATES: The EDSTAC Plenary meeting will begin on Tuesday, March 17, 1998, at 9 a.m. and end at 4 p.m. The meeting on Wednesday, March 18, 1998, will start at 8:30 a.m. and end at 4 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at The Sheraton International - BWI (Baltimore Washington International

Airport) located at 7032 Elm Road, Baltimore, Maryland. The telephone number is (410) 859-3300 and the guest fax number is (410) 859-0565.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical information about the EDSTAC contact Dr. Anthony Maciorowski (telephone: (202) 260-3048; e-mail: maciorowski.tony@epamail.epa.gov) or Mr. Gary Timm (telephone (202) 260-1859; e-mail: timm.gary@epamail.epa.gov) at EPA. To obtain additional information please contact the contractor assisting EPA with meeting facilitation and logistics: Ms. Tutti Otteson, The Keystone Center, P.O. Box 8606, Keystone, CO 80435; telephone: (970) 468-5822; fax (970) 262-0152; e-mail: totteson@keystone.org.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The tentative agenda for the March 17-18, 1998 plenary meeting includes status reports from the Screening and Testing and Priority Setting workgroups. This plenary will not include a public comment session.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection.

Dated: February 24, 1998.

Susan H. Wayland,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 98-5258 Filed 2-27-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5972-4]

Notice of Proposed Revisions to Approved Programs To Administer the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permitting Program in Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin Resulting in Part From Adoption of the Water Quality Guidance for the Great Lakes System

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has received for review and approval revisions to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) programs in Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Ohio. Most of the proposed revisions were adopted to comply with section 118(c) of the Clean Water Act and 40

CFR 132.4, although in some cases, States have also proposed revisions that are not related to those required by section 118(c) of the CWA and 40 CFR 132.4. EPA invites public comment on whether EPA should approve these revisions pursuant to 40 CFR 123.62 and 132.5.

DATES: Comments on whether EPA should approve the revisions to Indiana's, Michigan's, Ohio's and Wisconsin's NPDES programs must be received in writing by April 1, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on these documents may be submitted to Jo Lynn Traub, Director, Water Division, Attn: GLI Implementation Procedures, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. In the alternative, EPA will accept comments electronically. Comments should be sent to the following Internet E-mail address: karnauskas.joan@epamail.epa.gov. Electronic comments must be submitted in an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. EPA will print electronic comments in hard-copy paper form for the official administrative record. EPA will attempt to clarify electronic comments if there is an apparent error in transmission. Comments provided electronically will be considered timely if they are submitted electronically by 11:59 p.m. (Central time), April 1, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mery Jackson-Willis, Standards and Applied Sciences Branch, Water Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, or telephone her at (312) 886-3717.

Copies of the rules adopted by the States, and other related materials submitted by the States in support of these revisions, are available for review at: EPA, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, 15th Floor, Chicago, Illinois; Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Office of Water Management, Rule Section, 100 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, Indiana; Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Surface Water Quality Division, Knapps Centre, 300 South Washington, Lansing, Michigan; Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Surface Water, 1800 WaterMark Drive, Columbus, Ohio; and Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Wastewater Management, GEF II Building, 101 South Webster, Madison, Wisconsin. To access the docket material in Chicago, call (312) 886-3717 between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (Central time) (Monday-Friday); in Indiana, call (317) 232-8399; in

Michigan, call (517) 335-4184; in Ohio, call (614) 644-2154; and in Wisconsin, call (608) 267-7662.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 23, 1995, EPA published the Final Water Quality Guidance for the Great Lakes System (Guidance) pursuant to section 118(c)(2) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1268(c)(2) (March 23, 1995, 60 FR 15366). The Guidance, which was codified at 40 CFR Part 132, requires the Great Lakes States to adopt and submit to EPA for approval water quality criteria, methodologies, policies and procedures that are consistent with the Guidance. 40 CFR 132.4 and 132.5. EPA is required to approve of the State's submission within 90 days or notify the State that EPA has determined that all or part of the submission is inconsistent with the Clean Water Act or the Guidance and identify any necessary changes to obtain EPA approval. If the State fails to make the necessary changes within 90 days, EPA must publish a notice in the **Federal Register** identifying the approved and disapproved elements of the submission and a final rule identifying the provisions of Part 132 that shall apply for discharges within the State.

As of January 31, 1998, EPA Region 5 had received submissions from Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Ohio. The bulk of these submissions consist of new, revised or existing water quality standards which EPA is reviewing for consistency with the Guidance in accordance with 40 CFR 131 and 132.5. EPA is not soliciting comment on those portions of these submissions relating to the water quality criteria and methodologies, use designations or antidegradation. EPA also is not soliciting comment on the Guidance itself.

Instead, EPA is only requesting comment on whether it should approve, pursuant to 40 CFR 123.62, and 132.5(g), those portions of these submissions that revise the States' approved National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program. In most cases these revisions relate to the following provisions of 40 CFR Part 132, Appendix F: Procedure 3 ("Total Maximum Daily Loads, Wasteload Allocations for Point Sources, Load Allocations for Nonpoint Sources, Wasteload Allocations in the Absence of a TMDL, and Preliminary Wasteload Allocations for Purposes of Determining the Need for Water Quality Based Effluent Limits"); Procedure 4 ("Additivity"); Procedure 5 ("Reasonable Potential"); Procedure 6 (Whole Effluent Toxicity"); Procedure 7 ("Loading Limits"); Procedure 8: