

of the public comment and input submitted focused on expressing opposition or support for the announced ELGs for Shale Gas Extraction, Coalbed Methane Extraction and Dental Amalgam. A few comments provided a small amount of information and ideas on the 304(m) planning process in general; nanomaterial discharges; the disposal of unused pharmaceuticals; and on the ore mining and dressing study report.

#### *E. Summary of the Process for 2012 Annual Reviews*

EPA conducted four new targeted review methodologies to better identify new industries or industry processes at existing industries that may need new or revised effluent guidelines and standards for the 2012 reviews. These methodologies included:

- Identifying pass-through pollutants in sewage sludge using the 2009 Targeted National Sewage Sludge Survey (TNSSS).
- Identifying new pollutants and industry discharges using data and information from EPA's toxic substances control programs.
- Identifying new waste streams generated from new air pollution controls associated with Clean Air Act rulemakings.
- Identifying new industries through potential TRI expansion sectors.

These new targeted review methodologies are further described in the Preliminary 2012 Plan available for review at: <http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/lawguidance/cwa/304m/index.cfm>.

EPA has modified its annual review process to conduct a toxicity ranking analysis for industry only during the odd numbered years and additional targeted reviews of industry during the even numbered years.

#### *F. Request for Comment and Information*

EPA requests comments and information on the Preliminary 2012 Effluent Guidelines Program Plan and on the 2011 Annual Effluent Guidelines Review Report in the following areas.

##### 1. Data Sources and Methodologies

EPA solicits comments on whether it used the correct evaluation factors, criteria, and data sources in conducting its 2011 annual review and developing this Plan. EPA also solicits comment on other data sources EPA can use in its annual reviews and biennial planning process.

##### 2. Methodologies for the 2012 Annual Reviews

EPA solicits comments on its methods for the 2012 Annual Reviews and for subsequent even numbered year reviews. EPA used targeted industrial review methods during 2012, as described above. Specifically, EPA solicits comment on data and other sources of available information or approaches that EPA could consider for the annual reviews in subsequent even years, or comments regarding the targeted approaches described above and in the Preliminary 2012 Plan.

##### 3. The Preliminary 2012 Effluent Guidelines Program Plan

EPA solicits comments on its Preliminary 2012 Plan, including the data and information used to support the findings and conclusions stated in the Preliminary 2012 Plan. EPA also solicits comments on the proposed decisions to not identify any industry categories for the development of new or revised effluent guidelines and to delist the Coalbed Methane Extraction subcategory and Chlorine and Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Manufacturing from the effluent guidelines plan.

##### 4. Implementation Issues Related to Existing Effluent Guidelines and Pretreatment Standards

As a factor in its decision-making, EPA considers opportunities to eliminate inefficiencies or impediments to pollution prevention or technological innovation, or opportunities to promote innovative approaches such as water quality trading, including within-plant trading. Consequently, EPA solicits comments on implementation issues related to existing effluent guidelines and pretreatment standards.

##### 5. Innovation and Technology in the Effluent Guidelines Program

EPA is requesting public comment and ideas on the subject of technology innovation. EPA seeks public input and comment on the following questions and related themes:

- Are there new, innovative pollution control or pollution prevention technologies that can be used by any of the existing 57 categories of industry with effluent limitations guidelines?
- Are there innovative manufacturing approaches that can be used by industries to reduce or prevent their wastewater discharges?
- How can EPA's effluent limitations guidelines program enhance technology transfer to catalyze and

harness innovation to solve industrial wastewater problems, both now and in the future?

- How can EPA better foster consideration of innovative technologies through the effluent guidelines planning process?

Nancy K. Stoner,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Water.

[FR Doc. 2013-19074 Filed 8-6-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-9844-5]

### Proposed Consent Decree, Clean Air Act Citizen Suit

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed consent decree; request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (CAA or the Act), notice is hereby given of a proposed consent decree to address a lawsuit filed by Sierra Club (Plaintiff) in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia: *Sierra Club v. Jackson*, No.1:12-cv-01237-ESH (D.D.C.). On or about July 26, 2012, the plaintiff filed a complaint alleging that EPA had failed to take action on certain State Implementation Plan (SIP) submittals by the states of New Jersey and Michigan. Specifically, the complaint alleged that EPA had failed to make a finding that the state of New Jersey did not submit SIP revisions addressing the nonattainment New Source Review requirements for the 1997 fine particulate matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard (1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS) in the State of New Jersey portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington nonattainment area. The complaint further alleged that EPA had failed to take final action on the attainment demonstration, contingency measures, emission inventory and Reasonably Available Control Measures or Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACM/RACT), requirements for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in both the State of Michigan's SIP submittal for the Detroit-Ann Arbor nonattainment area and the New Jersey SIP submittal for the State of New Jersey portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington nonattainment area. The complaint also alleged that EPA failed to publish a notice of determination in the **Federal Register** regarding whether the Detroit-Ann Arbor area had attained the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS by the applicable

attainment date. The proposed consent decree establishes deadlines for EPA to take certain actions.

**DATES:** Written comments on the proposed consent decree must be received by September 6, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID number EPA-HQ-OGC-2013-0553, online at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) (EPA's preferred method); by email to [oei.docket@epa.gov](mailto:oei.docket@epa.gov); mailed to EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mailcode: 2822T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; or by hand delivery or courier to EPA Docket Center, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC, between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. Comments on a disk or CD-ROM should be formatted in Word or ASCII file, avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption, and may be mailed to the mailing address above.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Winifred N. Okoye, Air and Radiation Law Office (2344A), Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone: (202) 564-5446; fax number (202) 564-5603; email address: [okoye.winifred@epa.gov](mailto:okoye.winifred@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Additional Information About the Proposed Consent Decree**

The proposed consent decree would resolve a lawsuit seeking to compel action by the Administrator to take final action under section 110(k)(3) and (4), 42 U.S.C. 7410(k)(3) and (4), to approve or disapprove, in whole or in part certain States of New Jersey and Michigan SIP submittals.

The proposed consent decree requires EPA, on or before September 30, 2013, to sign and thereafter promptly forward to the Office of Federal Register for review and publication a notice of final action addressing whether the State of New Jersey has failed to submit SIP revisions addressing the nonattainment New Source Review requirements for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in the State of New Jersey portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington nonattainment area. The proposed consent decree also requires EPA, on or before November 30, 2013, to sign and thereafter promptly forward to the Office of Federal Register for review and publication a notice taking final action on the attainment demonstration, contingency measures, emission inventory and Reasonably Available Control Measures or

Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACM/RACT), requirements for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in the State of New Jersey SIP submittal for the State of New Jersey portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington nonattainment area. EPA is not required, however, to act on any submission or portion thereof that is withdrawn prior to the applicable deadline. Because the state of Michigan withdrew its SIP submission for the attainment demonstration for the Detroit-Ann Arbor 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment area, on May 20, 2013, the proposed consent decree does not require EPA to act on this submission or any portion thereof.

The proposed consent decree also states that the consent decree can be modified by either the parties, or the court following a motion by a party and a response thereto. In addition, the parties agree to informally resolve Sierra Club's claim for litigation costs pursuant to section 304(d), 42 U.S.C. 7604(d), but that the court would retain jurisdiction to resolve that claim.

For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the proposed consent decree from persons who were not named as parties or intervenors to the litigation in question. EPA or the Department of Justice may withdraw or withhold consent to the proposed consent decree if the comments disclose facts or considerations that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the Act. Unless EPA or the Department of Justice determines, based on any comment which may be submitted, that consent to the consent decree should be withdrawn, the terms of the decree will be affirmed.

**II. Additional Information About Commenting on the Proposed Consent Decree**

**A. How can I get a copy of the consent decree?**

Direct your comments to the official public docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OGC-2013-0553, which contains a copy of the consent decree. The official public docket is available for public viewing at the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) Docket in the EPA Docket Center, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone

number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the OEI Docket is (202) 566-1752.

An electronic version of the public docket is available through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). You may use the [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select "search," then key in the appropriate docket identification number.

It is important to note that EPA's policy is that public comments, whether submitted electronically or in paper, will be made available for public viewing online at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, CBI, or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information claimed as CBI and other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute is not included in the official public docket or in the electronic public docket. EPA's policy is that copyrighted material, including copyrighted material contained in a public comment, will not be placed in EPA's electronic public docket but will be available only in printed, paper form in the official public docket. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the EPA Docket Center.

**B. How and to whom do I submit comments?**

You may submit comments as provided in the **ADDRESSES** section. Please ensure that your comments are submitted within the specified comment period. Comments received after the close of the comment period will be marked "late." EPA is not required to consider these late comments.

If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name, mailing address, and an email address or other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD ROM you submit. This ensures that you can be identified as the submitter of the comment and allows EPA to contact you in case EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties or needs further information on the substance of your comment. Any identifying or contact information provided in the body of a comment will be included as part of the comment that is placed in the official public docket, and made available in EPA's electronic

public docket. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment.

Use of the [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) Web site to submit comments to EPA electronically is EPA's preferred method for receiving comments. The electronic public docket system is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity, email address, or other contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. In contrast to EPA's electronic public docket, EPA's electronic mail (email) system is not an "anonymous access" system. If you send an email comment directly to the Docket without going through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), your email address is automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the official public docket, and made available in EPA's electronic public docket.

Dated: July 31, 2013.

**Lorie J. Schmidt,**

*Associate General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 2013-19073 Filed 8-6-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

### Notice of Agreements Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreements under the Shipping Act of 1984. Interested parties may submit comments on the agreements to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within ten days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**. Copies of the agreements are available through the Commission's Web site ([www.fmc.gov](http://www.fmc.gov)) or by contacting the Office of Agreements at (202) 523-5793 or [tradeanalysis@fmc.gov](mailto:tradeanalysis@fmc.gov).

*Agreement No.:* 002206-006.

*Title:* California Association of Port Authorities—Northwest Marine Terminal Association Terminal Discussion Agreement.

*Parties:* California Association of Port Authorities and Northwest Marine Terminal Association.

*Filing Party:* Patti A. Fulghum, Executive Officer; Northwest Marine Terminal Association; P.O. Box 5684; Bellevue, WA 98006.

*Synopsis:* The amendment reflects the addition of the Port of St. Helens, Oregon as a member to the Northwest Marine Terminal Association.

*Agreement No.:* 009335-007.

*Title:* Northwest Marine Terminal Association, Inc. Agreement.

*Parties:* Port of Anacortes; Port of Astoria; Port of Bellingham; Port of Coos Bay; Port of Everett; Port of Grays Harbor; Port of Kalama; Port of Longview; Port of Olympia; Port of Port Angeles; Port of Portland; Port of Seattle; Port of St. Helens; Port of Tacoma; and Port of Vancouver, USA.

*Filing Party:* Patti A. Fulghum; Executive Officer; Northwest Marine Terminal Association, Inc.; P.O. Box 5684; Bellevue, WA 98006.

*Synopsis:* The amendment reflects the addition of the Port of St. Helens, Oregon as member to the agreement.

*Agreement No.:* 012184-001.

*Title:* Crowley/Maersk Line Panama—U.S. Space Charter Agreement.

*Parties:* Crowley Latin America Services, LLC and A.P. Moller-Maersk A/S.

*Filing Party:* Wayne R. Rohde, Esq.; Cozen O'Connor; 1627 I Street NW., Suite 1100; Washington, DC 20006-4007.

*Synopsis:* The agreement adjusts the amount of space and the number of reefer plugs to be provided.

*Agreement No.:* 201162-010.

*Title:* NYSA-ILA Assessment Agreement.

*Parties:* International Longshoremen's Association and New York Shipping Association.

*Filing Parties:* Donato Caruso, Esq.; The Lambos Firm; 303 South Broadway, Suite 410; Tarrytown, NY 10591 and Andre Mazzola, Esq.; Marrinan & Mazzola Mardon, P.C.; 26 Broadway, 17th Floor; New York, NY 10004.

*Synopsis:* The amendment extends the agreement and reduces the assessment for all house containers within 260 miles, except in the Bermuda trade effective August 1, 2013.

Dated: August 2, 2013.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

**Rachel E. Dickon,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2013-19081 Filed 8-6-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Notice of a Department of Health and Human Services Public Meeting and Request for Comments on Matters Related to the Protection of Human Subjects and Research Studying Standard of Care Interventions; Amended Notice of Meeting

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** On June 26, 2013, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) published in the **Federal Register** an announcement of a public meeting to be held on August 28, 2013, to discuss how certain provisions of the HHS protection of human subjects should be applied to research studying one or more interventions which are used as standard of care treatment in the non-research context (78 FR 38343).

In the June 26, 2013 meeting announcement, HHS stated that presenters will be scheduled to speak at the public meeting in the order in which they register. Notice is hereby provided that HHS may group presenters according to the topic of their presentation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Jerry Menikoff, Director, Office for Human Research Protections, Department of Health and Human Services, 1101 Wootton Parkway, Suite 200; Rockville, MD 20852, 240-453-6900; email [Jerry.Menikoff@hhs.gov](mailto:Jerry.Menikoff@hhs.gov).

DATED: August 1, 2013.

**Howard K. Koh,**

*Assistant Secretary for Health.*

[FR Doc. 2013-19056 Filed 8-6-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4150-36-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

### Board of Scientific Counselors, National Center for Health Statistics

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) announces the following meeting of the aforementioned committee:

**TIMES AND DATES:** 11:00 a.m.—5:30 p.m., September 19, 2013; 8:30 a.m.—1:00 p.m., September 20, 2013.

**PLACE:** NCHS Headquarters, 3311 Toledo Road, Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

**STATUS:** This meeting is open to the public; however, visitors must be processed in accordance with established federal policies and procedures. For foreign nationals or non-US citizens, pre-approval is required (please contact Gwen Mustaf, 301-458-4500, [glm4@cdc.gov](mailto:glm4@cdc.gov) or Virginia Cain, [vcain@cdc.gov](mailto:vcain@cdc.gov) at least 10 days in advance for requirements). All visitors are required to present a valid form of picture identification issued by a state, federal or international