

volume weighted average NO_x emissions of imported conventional gasoline for a multi-year period (MYA_{NO_x}). This calculation:

(i) Shall use the Phase II Complex Model;

(ii) Shall include all conventional gasoline in the following categories:

(A) Imported conventional gasoline that is classified as conventional gasoline, and included in the conventional gasoline compliance calculations of importers for each year; and

(B) Imported conventional gasoline that is classified as certified FRGAS, and included in the conventional gasoline compliance calculations of foreign refiners for each year;

(iii)(A) In 2000 only, shall be for the 1998 and 1999 averaging periods and also shall include all conventional gasoline classified as FRGAS and included in the conventional gasoline compliance calculations of a foreign refiner for 1997, and all conventional gasoline batches not classified as FRGAS that are imported during 1997 beginning on the date the first batch of FRGAS arrives at a United States port of entry; and

(B) Starting in 2001, shall include imported conventional gasoline during the prior three calendar year averaging periods.

(2)(i) If the volume-weighted average NO_x emissions (MYA_{NO_x}), calculated in paragraph (p)(1) of this section, is greater than 1,465 mg/mile, the Administrator shall calculate an adjusted baseline for NO_x according to the following equation:

$$AB_{NO_x} = 1,465 \text{ mg/mile} - (MYA_{NO_x} - 1,465 \text{ mg/mile})$$

where:

AB_{NO_x} = Adjusted NO_x baseline, in mg/mile

MYA_{NO_x} = Multi-year average NO_x emissions, in mg/mile

(ii) For the 1998 and 1999 multi-year averaging period only the value of AB_{NO_x} shall not be larger than 1,480 mg/mile regardless of the calculation under paragraph (p)(2)(i) of this section.

(3)(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of § 80.91(b)(4)(iii), the baseline NO_x emissions values applicable to any United States importer who has not been assigned an individual importer baseline under § 80.91(b)(4) shall be the more stringent of the statutory baseline value for NO_x under § 80.91(c)(5), or the adjusted NO_x baseline calculated in paragraph (p)(2) of this section.

(ii) On or before June 1 of each calendar year, the Administrator shall announce the NO_x baseline that applies to importers under this paragraph (p). If

the baseline is an adjusted baseline, it shall be effective for any conventional gasoline imported beginning 60 days following the Administrator's announcement. If the baseline is the statutory baseline, it shall be effective upon announcement. A baseline shall remain in effect until the effective date of a subsequent change to the baseline pursuant to this paragraph (p).

(q) *Withdrawal or suspension of a foreign refinery's baseline.* EPA may withdraw or suspend a baseline that has been assigned to a foreign refinery where:

(1) A foreign refiner fails to meet any requirement of this section;

(2) A foreign government fails to allow EPA inspections as provided in paragraph (i)(1) of this section;

(3) A foreign refiner asserts a claim of, or a right to claim, sovereign immunity in an action to enforce the requirements in 40 CFR part 80, subparts D, E and F; or

(4) A foreign refiner fails to pay a civil or criminal penalty that is not satisfied using the foreign refiner bond specified in paragraph (k) of this section.

(r) *Early use of a foreign refinery baseline.* (1) A foreign refiner may begin using an individual refinery baseline before EPA has approved the baseline, provided that:

(i) A baseline petition has been submitted as required in paragraph (b) of this section;

(ii) EPA has made a provisional finding that the baseline petition is complete;

(iii) The foreign refiner has made the commitments required in paragraph (i) of this section;

(iv) The persons who will meet the independent third party and independent attest requirements for the foreign refinery have made the commitments required in paragraphs (f)(3)(iii) and (h)(7)(iii) of this section; and

(v) The foreign refiner has met the bond requirements of paragraph (k) of this section.

(2) In any case where a foreign refiner uses an individual refinery baseline before final approval under paragraph (r)(1) of this section, and the foreign refinery baseline values that ultimately are approved by EPA are more stringent than the early baseline values used by the foreign refiner, the foreign refiner shall recalculate its compliance, *ab initio*, using the baseline values approved by EPA, and the foreign refiner shall be liable for any resulting violation of the conventional gasoline requirements.

(s) *Additional requirements for petitions, reports and certificates.* Any

petition for a refinery baseline under paragraph (b) of this section, any report or other submission required by paragraphs (c), (f)(2), or (i) of this section, and any certification under paragraph (d)(3) or (g)(1)(ii) of this section shall be:

(1) Submitted in accordance with procedures specified by the Administrator, including use of any forms that may be specified by the Administrator.

(2) Be signed by the president or owner of the foreign refiner company, or in the case of (g)(1)(ii) the vessel owner, or by that person's immediate designee, and shall contain the following declaration:

I hereby certify: (1) that I have actual authority to sign on behalf of and to bind [insert name of foreign refiner or vessel owner] with regard to all statements contained herein; (2) that I am aware that the information contained herein is being certified, or submitted to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, under the requirements of 40 CFR part 80, subparts D, E and F and that the information is material for determining compliance under these regulations; and (3) that I have read and understand the information being certified or submitted, and this information is true, complete and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief after I have taken reasonable and appropriate steps to verify the accuracy thereof.

I affirm that I have read and understand that the provisions of 40 CFR part 80, subparts D, E and F, including 40 CFR 80.94 (i), (j) and (k), apply to [insert name of foreign refiner or vessel owner]. Pursuant to Clean Air Act section 113(c) and Title 18, United States Code, section 1001, the penalty for furnishing false, incomplete or misleading information in this certification or submission is a fine of up to \$10,000, and/or imprisonment for up to five years.

[FR Doc. 97-22803 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 268 and 271

[FRL-5884-2]

RIN 2050-AD38

Second Emergency Revision of the Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Treatment Standards for Listed Hazardous Wastes From Carbamate Production

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA, the Agency).

ACTION: Immediate final rule.

SUMMARY: This second emergency revision extends the time that the alternative carbamate treatment

standards are in place by one additional year. The Agency is taking this action because analytical problems associated with the measurement of constituent levels in carbamate waste residues have not yet been resolved.

EFFECTIVE DATES: This action becomes effective on August 21, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Supporting materials are available for viewing in the RCRA Information Center (RIC), located at Crystal Gateway One, 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway, First Floor, Arlington, VA. The Docket Identification Number is F-96-P32F-FFFFF. The RIC is open from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. The public must make an appointment to review docket materials by calling (703) 603-9230. The public may copy a maximum of 100 pages from any regulatory document at no cost. Additional copies cost \$0.15 per page.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information, contact the RCRA Hotline at 800-424-9346 (toll-free) or 703-412-9810 locally. For technical information on the carbamate treatment standards, contact Shaun McGarvey, phone 703-308-8603. For information on analytic problems associated with carbamate wastes, contact John Austin on 703-308-0436. For information on State Authorization, contact Wayne Roepe on 703-308-8630. For specific information about this rule, contact Rhonda Minnick on 703-308-8771.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Availability of rule on Internet

This **Federal Register** notice is available on the Internet System through the EPA Public Web Page at: <http://www.epa.gov/EPA-WASTE/>. For the text of the notice, choose: Year/Month/Day.

I. Background

The Phase III final rule established treatment standards for hazardous wastes associated with carbamate pesticide production (61 FR 15583; see appendix for a list of regulated constituents). The treatment standards were expressed as concentration levels that had to be monitored in the treatment residue. All constituents were placed on the Universal Treatment Standard (UTS) list. These regulations were issued on April 8, 1996 (61 FR 15663), and corrected June 28, 1996 (61 FR 33683). The prohibition on land disposal of carbamate wastes was effective July 8, 1996 and the prohibition on radioactive waste mixed with newly listed or identified wastes, including soil and debris, was effective April 8, 1998.

On November 1, 1996, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, in *Dithiocarbamate Task Force v. EPA* (98 F.3d 1394), vacated certain of the listings of carbamate wastes. Accordingly, EPA removed from the Code of Federal Regulations those listings vacated by the court and all references to those listings. EPA notes that substantial portions of the decisions made in the carbamate listing rule remain in effect and are not changed by the court's ruling. See 62 FR 32973, June 17, 1997.

The court vacated the listings of 24 U wastes, one K-waste (K160), and three of the K-wastes (K156, K157 and K158) only to the extent they apply to the chemical, 3-iodo-2-propynyl n-butylcarbamate (IPBC). Twenty-three of the vacated U wastes consisted of all the dithiocarbamates and thiocarbamates. The other vacated U waste was IPBC, a carbamate.

This notice applies only to the carbamate wastes that remain listed as hazardous wastes. Carbamates that were regulated as UHCs were unaffected by the courts decision, because the decision didn't deal with adding carbamates as underlying hazardous constituents.

After promulgation of the Phase III rule on April 8, 1996, but shortly before the treatment standards took effect on July 8, 1996, several companies in the waste management industry contacted EPA, reporting that laboratory standards were not available for some of the carbamate waste constituents. The Agency confirmed this assertion, and realized that the waste management industry was unintentionally left in a quandary: they were required to certify compliance with the carbamate waste treatment standards, but commercial laboratories were only able to perform the necessary analyses for some of the newly regulated constituents. Thus, it was impossible to document whether the treatment standards were or were not achieved for those constituents which could not be analyzed.

The problem was complicated by the LDR rules that pertain to regulation of underlying hazardous constituents (UHCs) in characteristic (or formerly characteristic) hazardous wastes. Because new constituents were added to the UTS list, they thus became potential UHCs. Whenever a generator sends a characteristic (or formerly-characteristic) waste to a treatment facility, they must identify for treatment not only the hazardous characteristic, but also all UHCs reasonably expected to be present in the waste at the point of generation. (See 40 CFR 268.2(i).) Because of the lack of laboratory

standards for all carbamate constituents, generators could not in all cases identify the UHCs reasonably expected to be present in their wastes, and treatment facilities and EPA could not monitor compliance with the standards for the carbamate UHCs. Generators also reported that commercial laboratories were unable to provide the recommended methods.

II. The Revised Carbamate Treatment Standards

In an emergency final rule promulgated on August 26, 1996 (61 FR 43924), EPA established temporary alternative treatment standards for carbamate wastes for a one-year period. EPA believed that one year was sufficient time for laboratory standards to be developed and for laboratories to take appropriate steps to do the necessary analyses for these wastes.

The Phase III rule required treatment of carbamate wastes to UTS levels. The temporary alternative standards promulgated in the August 26, 1996 rule provided waste handlers a choice of meeting the Phase III treatment levels, or of using a specified treatment technology, the specified standard being the technology upon whose performance the numerical treatment standard was based. (See 61 FR 43925, August 26, 1996.) Combustion was the specified technology for nonwastewaters; combustion, biodegradation, chemical oxidation, and carbon adsorption are the specified technologies for wastewaters. If the wastes were treated by a specified technology, there was no requirement to measure compliance with treatment levels, thus avoiding the analytical problems.

III. Today's Extension of the Alternative Treatment Standard Provision

EPA is extending the alternative treatment standards for carbamate wastes for one additional year. EPA and the regulated community initially expected that laboratory standards would be developed during the past year, but that appears not to be the case for all carbamate constituents. Furthermore, there appears to be confusion as to which analytical methods can be used to measure carbamate constituents. (See memorandum from Kevin Igli, Waste Management, Inc., to James Berlow, EPA, dated July 16, 1997, in the docket for this rule.)

The waste treatment industry has begun a testing project that will determine whether existing analytical methods can be extended to apply to all carbamate constituents. (See August 8,

1997 letter from Kevin Igli, Waste Management, Inc., to Michael Petruska, EPA.) The Agency believes that much can be learned from this study. EPA estimates it will take four to six months to conduct this study, and then additional time to review the results. If the study verifies that analytical problems remain, EPA may issue an appropriate notice seeking comment, and then a final rule modifying the standard. This would all take approximately 1 year. If EPA finds there are no serious analytical difficulties, however, the Agency may consider reinstating the numeric standard sooner than 1 year.

Since the analytical problems which necessitated the 1996 emergency rule remain, however, EPA is allowing the alternative treatment standards to remain in place until the study is completed and the results factored into a final decision on whether to retain the alternative treatment standards permanently or to revert to the exclusive numerical standards promulgated in the Phase III rule. (The Agency's general preference is to establish numerical treatment standards for hazardous wastes whenever possible because they provide maximum flexibility in selecting treatment technologies, while ensuring that the technologies are optimally operated to achieve full waste treatment.)

Under the alternative treatment standards, combustion is the specified technology for nonwastewaters; combustion, biodegradation, chemical oxidation, and carbon adsorption are the specified technologies for wastewaters. (Descriptions of these treatment technologies can be found in 40 CFR 268.42, Table 1.) If the wastes are treated by a specified technology, there is no requirement to measure compliance with treatment levels.

Because the performance of these Best Demonstrated Available Technologies (BDATs) were the basis of the originally promulgated treatment levels, EPA believes that temporarily allowing the use of these BDATs for an additional year—without a requirement to monitor the treatment residues—fully satisfies the core requirement of the LDR program: Hazardous wastes must be treated to minimize threats to human health and the environment before they are land disposed.

The Agency is also suspending for an additional year inclusion of carbamate waste constituents on the UTS list at 40 CFR 268.48. Not including these constituents on the UTS list eliminates the need to identify and treat them, and monitor compliance with their UTS levels, when they are present as UHCs

in characteristic hazardous wastes. The Agency believes that suspending the carbamate constituents from the UTS list will not have adverse environmental consequences because it will be in effect for only one additional year. Furthermore, EPA found in the Phase III rulemaking that these constituents are unlikely to occur in wastes generated outside the carbamate production industry (61 FR 15584, April 8, 1996), so today's rule may not cause an adverse environmental impact because carbamate constituents simply are not present in most characteristic hazardous wastes.

IV. Good Cause for Foregoing Notice and Comment Requirements

This final rule is being issued without notice and opportunity for public comment. Under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), an agency may forgo notice and comment in promulgating a rule when, according to the APA, the agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of the reasons for that finding into the rules issues) that notice and public comments procedures are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest. For the reasons set forth below, EPA believes it has good cause to find that notice and comment would be unnecessary and contrary to the public interest, and therefore is not required by the APA.

First, although both industry and EPA have endeavored to resolve the problem during the past year, analytic laboratory standards will continue to be unavailable for a number of the carbamate waste constituents covered by the Phase III rule. Members of the regulated community thus cannot fully document compliance with the requirements of the treatment standard through no fault of their own. For the same reason, EPA cannot ascertain compliance for these constituents.

In addition, this unavailability of analytic standards is likely to create a serious disruption in the production of at least some carbamate pesticides. Although the treatment of the restricted carbamate wastes through biodegradation, carbon adsorption, chemical oxidation (for wastewaters), and combustion is both possible and highly effective, certification that the treatment actually meets the treatment standard levels may not be possible in many instances. Without the certification, disposal of the residuals left after treatment cannot legally occur. The Agency believes this situation will quickly impede production of certain pesticides, since legal disposal of some

carbamate wastes will no longer be available. See *Steel Manufacturers Ass'n v. EPA*, 27 F.3d 642, 646-47 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (absence of a treatment standard providing a legal means of disposing of wastes from a process is equivalent to shutting down that process). With regard to the suspension of certain carbamates as underlying hazardous constituents in characteristic (and formerly-characteristic) prohibited wastes, the Agency believes that the same practical difficulties described for listed carbamate wastes would be created.

Furthermore, the Agency believes it is necessary for industry to complete a study project that will provide answers to the questions raised about the availability of analytical standards and which analytical methods are appropriate for carbamate wastes. This study will require a number of months to be completed, and then the Agency must make a decision about whether or not to retain the alternative treatment standards.

This extension of the emergency rule preserves the core of the promulgated Phase III rule by ensuring that the restricted carbamate wastes are treated by a BDAT before they are land disposed. At the same time, EPA is eliminating the situation which could halt production of carbamate pesticides, and allowing time for a study project to be completed. For these reasons, EPA believes there is good cause to issue the rule immediately without prior notice and opportunity for comment.

V. Rationale for Immediate Effective Date

The Agency believes that the regulated community is in the untenable position of having to comply with treatment standards but lacks analytical methods to measure compliance. To avoid this result, therefore, this extension needs to take effect essentially immediately. In addition, today's rule does not create additional regulatory requirements; rather, it provides greater flexibility for compliance with treatment standards. For these reasons, EPA finds that good cause exists under section 3010(b)(3) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6903(b)(3), to provide for an immediate effective date. See generally 61 FR at 15662. For the same reasons, EPA finds that there is good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3) to waive the requirement that regulations be published at least 30 days before they become effective.

VI. Analysis Under Executive Order 12866, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and the Paperwork Reduction Act

This final rule does not create new regulatory requirements; rather, it provides a temporary alternative means to comply with the treatment standards already promulgated. Therefore, this final rule is not a "significant" regulatory action within the meaning of Executive Order 12866.

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), Public Law 104-4, establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. Under section 202 of the UMRA, EPA generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost-benefit analysis, for proposed and final rules with "Federal mandates" that may result in expenditures to State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any one year. Before promulgating an EPA rule for which a written statement is needed, section 205 of the UMRA generally requires EPA to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and adopt the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. The provisions of section 205 do not apply when they are inconsistent with applicable law. Moreover, section 205 allows EPA to adopt an alternative other than the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative if the Administrator publishes with the final rule an explanation why that alternative was not adopted. Before EPA establishes any regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, including tribal governments, it must have developed under section 203 of the UMRA a small government agency plan. The plan must provide for notifying potentially affected small governments, enabling officials of affected small governments to have meaningful and timely input in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising small governments on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

Today's rule contains no Federal mandates (under the regulatory provisions of Title II of the UMRA) for State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector, and does not impose any Federal mandate on State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector within the meaning of the Unfunded Mandates

Reform Act of 1995. This final rule does not create new regulatory requirements; rather, it provides a temporary alternative means to comply with the treatment standards already promulgated. EPA has determined that this rule does not contain a Federal mandate that may result in expenditures of \$100 million or more for State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or the private sector in any one year. Thus, today's rule is not subject to the requirements of sections 202 and 205 of the UMRA. For the same reasons, EPA has determined that this rule contains no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

EPA has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. EPA recognizes that small entities may own and/or operate carbamate pesticide manufacturing operations or TSDFs that will become subject to the requirements of the land disposal restrictions program. However, since such small entities are already subject to the requirements in 40 CFR part 268, this rule does not impose any additional burdens on these small entities, because this rule does not create new regulatory requirements. Rather, it provides a temporary alternative means to comply with the treatment standards already promulgated.

Therefore, EPA provides the following certification under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. Pursuant to the provision at 5 U.S.C. 605(b), I hereby certify that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. It does not impose any new burdens on small entities. This rule, therefore, does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

Today's rule does not contain any new information collection requirements subject to OMB review under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq. Because there are no new information collection requirements in today's rule, an Information Collection Request has not been prepared.

VII. Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office

Under section 801(a)(1)(A) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, EPA submitted a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Comptroller

General of the General Accounting Office prior to publication of the rule in today's **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by section 804(2) of the APA as amended.

VIII. State Authority

A. Applicability of Rule in Authorized States

Under section 3006 of RCRA, EPA may authorize qualified States to administer and enforce the RCRA program within the State. Following authorization, EPA retains enforcement authority under sections 3008, 3013, and 7003 of RCRA, although authorized States have primary enforcement responsibility. The standards and requirements for authorization are found in 40 CFR part 271.

Prior to HSWA, a State with final authorization administered its hazardous waste program in lieu of EPA administering the Federal program in that State. The Federal requirements no longer applied in the authorized State, and EPA could not issue permits for any facilities that the State was authorized to permit. When new, more stringent Federal requirements were promulgated or enacted, the State was obliged to enact equivalent authority within specified time frames. New Federal requirements did not take effect in an authorized State until the State adopted the requirements as State law.

In contrast, under RCRA section 3006(g) (42 U.S.C. 6926(g)), new requirements and prohibitions imposed by HSWA take effect in authorized States at the same time that they take effect in unauthorized States. EPA is directed to carry out these requirements and prohibitions in authorized States, including the issuance of permits, until the State is granted authorization to do so.

Today's rule is being promulgated pursuant to section 3004(m), of RCRA (42 U.S.C. 6924(m)). Therefore, the Agency is adding today's rule to Table 1 in 40 CFR 271.1(j), which identifies the Federal program requirements that are promulgated pursuant to HSWA. States may apply for final authorization for the HSWA provisions in Table 1, as discussed in the following section of this preamble.

B. Effect on State Authorization

As noted above, EPA will implement today's rule in authorized States until they modify their programs to adopt these rules and the modification is approved by EPA. Because today's rule is promulgated pursuant to HSWA, a State submitting a program modification may apply to receive interim or final

authorization under RCRA section 3006(g)(2) or 3006(b), respectively, on the basis of requirements that are substantially equivalent or equivalent to EPA's. The procedures and schedule for State program modifications for final authorization are described in 40 CFR 271.21. All HSWA interim authorizations will expire January 1, 2003. (See section 271.24 and 57 FR 60132, December 18, 1992.)

In general, EPA recommends that States pay close attention to the sunset date for today's rule. If States are adopting the Phase III rule before the sunset date of today's rule, and applying for authorization, EPA strongly encourages these States to adopt today's rule when they adopt the April 8, 1996, Phase III rule. States should note that after the sunset date, the provisions of this rule may be considered less stringent if the Agency decides to disallow use of the alternative treatment standards. If so, States would be barred under section 3009 of RCRA from adopting this rule after August 26, 1998, and would not be able to receive authorization for it. States that are planning to adopt and become authorized for today's rule and the Phase III rule should factor the sunset date into their rulemaking activities.

Appendix to the Preamble—List of Regulated Constituents

- K156—Organic waste (including heavy ends, still bottoms, light ends, spent solvents, filtrates, and decantates) from the production of carbamates and carbamoyl oximes. (This listing does not apply to wastes generated from the manufacture of 3-iodo-2-propynyl n-butylcarbamate)
- K157—Wastewaters (including scrubber waters, condenser waters, washwaters, and separation waters) from the production of carbamates and carbamoyl oximes. (This listing does not apply to wastes generated from the manufacture of 3-iodo-2-propynyl n-butylcarbamate.)
- K158—Bag house dust, and filter/separation solids from the production of carbamates and carbamoyl oximes. (This listing does not apply to wastes generated from the manufacture of 3-iodo-2-propynyl n-butylcarbamate.)

- K159—Organics from the treatment of thiocarbamate wastes.
- K161—Purification solids (including filtration, evaporation, and centrifugation solids), baghouse dust, and floor sweepings from the production of dithiocarbamate acids and their salts. (This listing does not include K125 or K126.)
- P203 Aldicarb sulfone
- P127 Carbofuran
- P189 Carbosulfan
- P202 m-Cumenyl methylcarbamate
- P191 Dimetilan
- P198 Formetanate hydrochloride
- P197 Formparanate
- P192 Isolan
- P196 Manganese dimethyldithiocarbamate
- P199 Methiocarb
- P066 Methomyl
- P190 Metolcarb
- P128 Mexacarbate
- P194 Oxamyl
- P204 Physostigmine
- P188 Physostigmine salicylate
- P201 Promecarb
- P185 Tirpate
- P205 Ziram
- U394 A2213
- U280 Barban
- U278 Bendiocarb
- U364 Bendiocarb phenol
- U271 Benomyl
- U279 Carbaryl
- U372 Carbendazim
- U367 Carbofuran phenol
- U395 Diethylene glycol, dicarbamate
- U373 Proptham
- U411 Propoxur
- U387 Prosulfocarb
- U410 Thiodicarb
- U409 Thiophanate-methyl
- U389 Triallate
- U404 Triethylamine

Additional chemicals from carbamate production regulated in 40 CFR 268.48
 Butylate
 EPTC
 Dithiocarbamates, total
 Molinate
 Pebulate
 o-Phenylenediamine
 Vernolate

List of Subjects

40 CFR part 268

Environmental protection, Hazardous waste, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

40 CFR part 271

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Hazardous materials transportation, Hazardous waste, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: August 21, 1997.

Carol M. Browner,
Administrator.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, title 40, chapter I of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 268—LAND DISPOSAL RESTRICTIONS

1. The authority citation for part 268 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 6905, 6912(a), 6921, and 6924.

SUBPART D—TREATMENT STANDARDS

2. Section 268.40 is amended by revising the dates in paragraph (g) to read "Between August 26, 1997 and August 26, 1998".

3. Section 268.48(a) is amended by revising the dates in footnote 6 to the table—Universal Treatment Standards to read "Between August 26, 1997 and August 26, 1998".

PART 271—REQUIREMENTS FOR AUTHORIZATION OF STATE HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAMS

4. The authority citation for part 271 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 9602; 33 U.S.C. 1321 and 1361.

SUBPART A—REQUIREMENTS FOR FINAL AUTHORIZATION

5. Section 271.1(j) is amended by adding the following entry to Table 1 in chronological order by date of publication in the **Federal Register** to read as follows:

§ 271.1 Purpose and scope.

* * * * *
 (j) * * * * *

TABLE 1.—REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING THE HAZARDOUS AND SOLID WASTE AMENDMENTS OF 1984

Promulgation date	Title of Regulation	Federal Register reference	Effective date
August 28, 1997	Second Emergency Revision of the Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Phase III Treatment Standards for Listed Hazardous Wastes from Carbamate Production.	62 FR [Insert page numbers].	August 26, 1997 until August 26, 1998.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 97-22949 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

44 CFR Part 65

[Docket No. FEMA-7224]

Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Interim rule.

SUMMARY: This interim rule lists communities where modification of the base (1% annual chance) flood elevations is appropriate because of new scientific or technical data. New flood insurance premium rates will be calculated from the modified base flood elevations for new buildings and their contents.

DATES: These modified base flood elevations are currently in effect on the dates listed in the table and revise the Flood Insurance Rate Map(s) in effect prior to this determination for each listed community.

From the date of the second publication of these changes in a newspaper of local circulation, any person has ninety (90) days in which to request through the community that the Associate Director for Mitigation reconsider the changes. The modified elevations may be changed during the 90-day period.

ADDRESSES: The modified base flood elevations for each community are available for inspection at the office of the Chief Executive Officer of each community. The respective addresses are listed in the following table.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frederick H. Sharrocks, Jr., Chief, Hazard Identification Branch, Mitigation Directorate, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-2796.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The modified base flood elevations are not listed for each community in this interim rule. However, the address of the Chief Executive Officer of the community where the modified base flood elevation determinations are available for inspection is provided.

Any request for reconsideration must be based upon knowledge of changed conditions, or upon new scientific or technical data.

The modifications are made pursuant to Section 201 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4105, and are in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*, and with 44 CFR Part 65.

For rating purposes, the currently effective community number is shown and must be used for all new policies and renewals.

The modified base flood elevations are the basis for the floodplain management measures that the community is required to either adopt or to show evidence of being already in effect in order to qualify or to remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

These modified elevations, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own, or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities.

The changes in base flood elevations are in accordance with 44 CFR 65.4.

National Environmental Policy Act

This rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR Part 10, Environmental Consideration. No environmental impact assessment has been prepared.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Associate Director for Mitigation certifies that this rule is exempt from the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act because modified base flood elevations are required by the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4105, and are required to maintain community eligibility in the NFIP. No regulatory flexibility analysis has been prepared.

Regulatory Classification

This interim rule is not a significant regulatory action under the criteria of Section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review, 58 FR 51735.

Executive Order 12612, Federalism

This rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under Executive Order 12612, Federalism, dated October 26, 1987.

Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets the applicable standards of Section 2(b)(2) of Executive Order 12778.

List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 65

Flood insurance, Floodplains, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, 44 CFR part 65 is amended to read as follows:

PART 65—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 65 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 329; E.O. 12127, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp., p. 376.

§ 65.4 [Amended]

2. The tables published under the authority of § 65.4 are amended as follows:

State and county	Location	Dates and name of newspaper where notice was published	Chief executive officer of community	Effective date of modification	Community No.
Arizona: Mohave ..	City of Bullhead City.	June 17, 1997, June 24, 1997, <i>Mohave Valley Daily News</i> .	The Honorable Norm Hicks, Mayor, City of Bullhead City, 1255 Marina Boulevard, Bullhead City, Arizona 86442.	June 5, 1997	040125
California: Riverside	City of Banning	June 20, 1997, June 27, 1997, <i>The Record-Gazette</i> .	The Honorable Gary Reynolds, Mayor, City of Banning, P.O. Box 998, Banning, California 92220.	June 5, 1997	060246
Marin	City of Novato	July 1, 1997, July 8, 1997, <i>Marin Independent Journal</i> .	The Honorable Pat Eklund, Mayor, City of Novato, 900 Sherman Avenue, Novato, California 94945.	June 13, 1997	060178