

actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co. v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255–66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

G. Unfunded Mandates

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (“Unfunded Mandates Act”), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the proposed action does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This proposed Federal action acts on pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

H. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing a new regulation. To comply with NTTAA, EPA must consider and use “voluntary consensus standards” (VCS) if available and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to today’s proposed action because it does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: November 6, 2001.

Wayne Nastri,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 01–28859 Filed 11–16–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[FRL–7105–1]

RIN 2060–AH75

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Hydrochloric Acid Production

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: The EPA is announcing the extension of the public comment period on the proposed national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for hydrochloric acid (HCl) production facilities, including HCl production at fume silica facilities. The EPA originally requested comments on the proposed rule by November 19, 2001 (66 FR 48174, September 18, 2001). We are extending the deadline to December 19, 2001, and are now requesting written comments by that date because we have received requests for a 30-day extension from the Chlorine Institute, Incorporated, and the Dow Chemical Company. The reasons given for these requests were: to assess comprehensively the implications of the many nuances of the proposed rule; and the need for HCl producers to address increased security issues resulting from the incidents of September 11 which kept key personnel from focusing on the proposed rule within the original 60-day period. We find these requests reasonable.

DATES: Comments may be submitted by December 19, 2001.

ADDRESSES: *Comments.* By U.S. Postal Service, send comments (in duplicate if possible) to: Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (6102), Attention Docket Number A–99–41, U.S. EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20460. In person or by courier, deliver comments (in duplicate if possible) to: Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (6102), Attention Docket Number A–99–41, U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. The EPA requests a separate copy also be sent to the contact person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

Comments may be submitted by electronic mail (e-mail) to: *a-and-r-docket@epa.gov*. Comments submitted by e-mail must be submitted as an ASCII file to avoid the use of special characters and encryption problems. Comments will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect® version 5.1, 6.1, or 8 file format. All comments and data submitted in electronic form must be identified by the docket number A–99–41. No confidential business information (CBI) should be submitted by e-mail. Electronic comments may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

Commenters wishing to submit proprietary information for consideration must clearly distinguish such information from other comments and clearly label it as CBI. Send submissions containing such proprietary information directly to the following address, and not to the public docket, to ensure that proprietary information is not inadvertently placed in the docket: OAQPS Document Control Officer, C404–02, Attention: Mr. Bill Maxwell, U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711. The EPA will disclose information identified as CBI only to the extent allowed by the procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. If no claim of confidentiality accompanies a submission when it is received by EPA, the information may be made available to the public without further notice to the commenter.

Docket. Information related to the proposed standards is available for inspection at the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, Docket No. A–99–41. The docket is located at the U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Room M–1500 (ground floor, Waterside Mall), Washington, DC 20460, telephone (202) 260–7548. The docket is available for public inspection and copying between 8:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Bill Maxwell, Combustion Group, Emission Standards Division, C439–01, U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number (919) 541–5430; facsimile number (919) 541–5450; electronic mail address: *maxwell.bill@epa.gov*.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 63

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Hazardous substances, Intergovernmental relations, Recordkeeping and reporting requirements.

Dated: November 9, 2001.

Robert Brenner,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 01-28857 Filed 11-16-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 261

[FRL-7103-6]

Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Proposed Exclusion

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency) today is proposing to grant a petition submitted by Nissan North America, Inc., Smyrna, Tennessee (Nissan), to exclude (or "delist") a certain hazardous waste from the list of hazardous wastes under RCRA regulation. Nissan will generate the petitioned waste by treating wastewater from Nissan's automobile assembly plant when aluminum is one of the metals used to manufacture automobile bodies. The waste so generated is a wastewater treatment sludge that meets the definition of F019. Nissan petitioned EPA to grant a generator-specific delisting, because Nissan believes that its F019 waste does not meet the criteria for which this type of waste was listed. EPA reviewed all of the waste-specific information provided by Nissan, performed calculations, and determined that the waste could be disposed in a landfill without harming human health and the environment. Today's proposed rule proposes to grant Nissan's petition to delist its F019 waste, and requests public comment on the proposed decision. If the proposed delisting becomes a final delisting, Nissan's petitioned waste will no longer be classified as F019, and will not be subject to regulation as a hazardous waste under Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The waste will still be subject to local, State, and Federal regulations for nonhazardous solid wastes.

DATES: EPA is requesting public comments on this proposed decision. Comments will be accepted until January 3, 2002. Comments postmarked after the close of the comment period will be stamped "late." These "late" comments may not be considered in formulating a final decision.

Any person may request a hearing on this proposed decision by filing a request with Richard D. Green, Director of the Waste Management Division, EPA, Region 4, whose address appears below, by December 4, 2001. The request must contain the information prescribed in section 260.20(d).

ADDRESSES: Send two copies of your comments to Jewell Grubbs, Chief, RCRA Enforcement and Compliance Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303. Send one copy to Nina Vo, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 5th Floor, L & C Tower, 401 Church Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37243-1535. Identify your comments at the top with this regulatory docket number: R4-01-01-NissanP. Comments may also be submitted by e-mail to sophianopoulos.judy@epa.gov. If files are attached, please identify the format.

Requests for a hearing should be addressed to Richard D. Green, Director, Waste Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

The RCRA regulatory docket for this proposed rule is located at the EPA Library, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30303, and is available for viewing from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. The docket contains the petition, all information submitted by the petitioner, and all information used by EPA to evaluate the petition.

The public may copy material from any regulatory docket at no cost for the first 100 pages, and at a cost of \$0.15 per page for additional copies.

Copies of the petition are available during normal business hours at the following addresses for inspection and copying: U.S. EPA, Region 4, Library, Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303, (404) 562-8190; and Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, 5th Floor, L & C Tower, 401 Church Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37243-1535. The EPA, Region 4, Library is located near the Five Points MARTA station in Atlanta. The Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation is located in downtown Nashville near the intersection of Church Street and 4th Avenue North, about 0.2 mile northwest of Riverfront Park and 0.2 mile southwest of Bicentennial Park. Documents are also

available for viewing and downloading at the Web site of EPA, Region 4: <http://www.epa.gov/region4/index.html>. At this site, click on "Waste," "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)," "RCRA Program, and then on "New" under "Enforcement and Compliance."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general and technical information about this proposed rule, contact Judy Sophianopoulos, South Enforcement and Compliance Section, (Mail Code 4WD-RCRA), RCRA Enforcement and Compliance Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303, (404) 562-8604, or call, toll free, (800) 241-1754, and leave a message, with your name and phone number, for Ms. Sophianopoulos to return your call.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The contents of today's preamble are listed in the following outline:

- I. Background
 - A. What Laws and Regulations Give EPA the Authority to Delist Wastes?
 - B. How did EPA Evaluate this Petition?
 1. What is the EPACML model that EPA used in the past for determining delisting levels?
 2. What is the DRAS that uses the new EPACMTP model to calculate not only delisting levels, but also to evaluate the effects of the waste on human health and the environment?
 3. Why is the EPACMTP an improvement over the EPACML?
 4. Where can technical details on the EPACMTP be found?
 5. What methods is EPA proposing to use to determine delisting levels for this petitioned waste?
- II. Disposition of Delisting Petition
 - A. Summary of Delisting Petition Submitted by Nissan North America, Inc., Smyrna, Tennessee (Nissan)
 - B. What Delisting Levels Did EPA Obtain with DRAS and EPACMTP?
 - C. Should the Multiple Extraction Procedure (MEP) be Used to Evaluate this Delisting Petition?
 - D. Conclusion
- III. Limited Effect of Federal Exclusion Will this Rule Apply in All States?
- IV. Effective Date
- V. Paperwork Reduction Act
- VI. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
- VII. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
- VIII. Regulatory Flexibility Act, as Amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement and Fairness Act
- IX. Executive Order 12866
- X. Executive Order 13045
- XI. Executive Order 13084 Affecting Indian Tribal Governments
- XII. Submission to Congress and General Accounting Office
- XIII. Executive Order 13132