

Actions	Compliance	Procedures
(1) Insert Raytheon Temporary Changes TC3 (Log of Temporary Changes) into the Limitations Section of the Pilot's Operating Handbook (POH).	Within the next 10 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD until compliance with paragraphs (d)(2) and (d)(3) of this AD.	Anyone who holds at least a private pilot certificate, as authorized by section 43.7 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7), may incorporate the pilot's operating handbook (POH) revision required by this AD. You must make an entry into the aircraft records that shows compliance with this AD, in accordance with section 43.9 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.9).
(2) Inspect the left-hand (LH) and right-hand (RH) nacelle and spar assembly for the existence of rivets and installed rivets that are the wrong size and/or type.	Within the next 400 hours time-in-service (TIS) or within 12 calendar months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first.	In accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions section of Raytheon Mandatory Service Bulletin SB 54-3308, Issued: October, 2000, and the applicable maintenance manual.
(3) Install rivets where rivets are missing and replace rivets that are the wrong size and/or type with the correct rivet.	Prior to further flight after the inspection required in paragraph (d)(2) of this AD.	In accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions section of Raytheon Mandatory Service Bulletin SB 54-3308, Issued: October, 2000, and the applicable maintenance manual.

Note 1: Although not required by this AD, Raytheon Mandatory Service Bulletin SB 54-3308, Issued: October, 2000, recommends inspecting the airplane in accordance with the Hard Landing Inspection procedure, Chapter 5-50-00, Beech King Air 90 Maintenance Manual, if the airplane should experience a hard landing prior to the repair required by this AD. If serious structural damage occurred, contact Raytheon Technical Support for assistance.

(e) *Can I comply with this AD in any other way?* You may use an alternative method of compliance or adjust the compliance time if:

- (1) Your alternative method of compliance provides an equivalent level of safety; and
- (2) The Manager, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), approves your alternative. Submit your request through an FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Wichita ACO.

Note 2: This AD applies to each airplane identified in paragraph (a) of this AD, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (e) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if you have not eliminated the unsafe condition, specific actions you propose to address it.

(f) *Where can I get information about any already-approved alternative methods of compliance?* Contact Steve Potter, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone: (316) 946-4124; facsimile: (316) 946-4407.

(g) *What if I need to fly the airplane to another location to comply with this AD?* The FAA can issue a special flight permit under sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and

21.199) to operate your airplane to a location where you can accomplish the requirements of this AD.

(h) *How do I get copies of the documents referenced in this AD?* You may get copies of the documents referenced in this AD from Raytheon Aircraft Company, P.O. Box 85, Wichita, Kansas 67201-0085. You may view these documents at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on November 15, 2001.

Michael K. Dahl,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01-29222 Filed 11-23-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 272

[FRL-7091-9]

Utah: Final Authorization of State-Initiated Changes and Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: During a review of Utah's regulations, EPA identified a variety of State-initiated changes to Utah's hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). We propose to grant Final authorization to Utah for these changes. In addition, EPA is proposing to codify, in the section of the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) entitled Approved

State Hazardous Waste Management Programs, Utah's authorized hazardous waste program. We will incorporate by reference those provisions of the State regulations that are authorized and federally enforceable. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, we are authorizing the changes to the Utah program and codifying and incorporating by reference the State's hazardous waste program as an Immediate Final Rule. We did not make a proposal prior to the Immediate Final Rule because we believe this action is noncontroversial and do not expect comments that oppose it. We have explained the reasons for this authorization and incorporation by reference in the preamble to the Immediate Final Rule. Unless we get written comments which oppose this authorization and incorporation by reference during the comment period, the Immediate Final Rule will become effective on the date established in the Final rule and we will not take further action on this proposal. If we get comments that oppose this action, we will withdraw the Immediate Final Rule and it will not take effect. We will then respond to public comments in a later Final rule based on this proposal. If you want to comment on this action, you must do so at this time, since you may not have another opportunity for comment.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before December 26, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Mail written comments to Kris Shurr, 8P-HW, U.S. EPA, Region VIII, 999 18th St., Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466, phone (303) 312-6139. You can examine copies of the

materials used buy EPA to make this determination during normal business hours at the following locations: Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste, 288 North 1460 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4880, phone (801) 538-6776 and EPA Region VIII, 999 18th St., Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466, phone (303) 312-6139.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kris Shurr at EPA Region VIII, 999 18th St., Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466, phone (303) 312-6139.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, please see the Immediate Final Rule published in the "Rules and Regulations" section of this *Federal Register*.

Dated: October 18, 2001.

Patricia D. Hull,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.

[FR Doc. 01-28851 Filed 11-23-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

45 CFR Part 1639

Welfare Reform

AGENCY: Legal Services Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking sets forth a proposed change to the Legal Services Corporation's rule relating to limitations on grantee activities challenging or seeking reform of a welfare system. The proposed change, to delete the prohibition on the representation of an individual seeking welfare benefits if any such representation involves an effort to amend or otherwise challenge existing law, is necessitated to conform the regulation to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision *Legal Services Corporation v. Velazquez, et al.*

DATES: Comments on this NPRM are due on January 25, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be submitted by mail, fax, or e-mail to Mattie C. Condray, Senior Assistant General Counsel, Office of Legal Affairs, Legal Services Corporation, 750 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20002-4250; 202-336-8817; mcondray@lsc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mattie C. Condray, 202-336-8817.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 28, 2001, the United States Supreme Court issued a decision in *Legal Services Corporation v. Velazquez, et al.*, Nos. 99-603 and 99-960, 121 S. Ct. 1043, 2001 WL 193738 (U.S.), striking down as unconstitutional

the restriction prohibiting LSC grantees from challenging welfare reform laws when representing clients seeking specific relief from a welfare agency. The stricken restriction was first imposed by Congress in § 504(a)(16) of the FY 1996 Legal Services Corporation appropriations legislation (the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996, Pub. L. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321-53 (1996)) and has been retained in each subsequent annual LSC appropriation. The relevant portion of § 504(a)(16) prohibits funding of any organization:

that initiates legal representation or participates in any other way, in litigation, lobbying, or rulemaking, involving an effort to reform a Federal or State welfare system, except that this paragraph shall not be construed to preclude a recipient from representing an individual eligible client who is seeking specific relief from a welfare agency if such relief does not involve an effort to amend or otherwise challenge existing law in effect on the date of the initiation of the representation.

This restriction was incorporated into LSC's regulations at 45 CFR part 1639. Specifically, 45 CFR 1639.3, Prohibition, provides that:

Except as provided in §§ 1639.4 and 1639.5, recipients may not initiate legal representation, or participate in any other way in litigation, lobbying or rulemaking, involving an effort to reform a Federal or State welfare system. Prohibited activities include participation in:

- (a) Litigation challenging laws or regulations enacted as part of an effort to reform a Federal or State welfare system.
- (b) Rulemaking involving proposals that are being considered to implement an effort to reform a Federal or State welfare system.
- (c) Lobbying before legislative or administrative bodies undertaken directly or through grassroots efforts involving pending or proposed legislation that is part of an effort to reform a Federal or State welfare system.

45 CFR 1639.4 Permissible representation of eligible clients, provides that:

Recipients may represent an individual eligible client who is seeking specific relief from a welfare agency, if such relief does not involve an effort to amend or otherwise challenge existing law in effect on the date of the initiation of the representation.¹

The Supreme Court in *Velazquez*, upholding the decision of the Court of Appeals, invalidated that portion of the statute which provides that representation of an individual eligible client seeking specific relief from a welfare agency may not involve an effort to amend or otherwise challenge existing law. The Court held that such

a qualification constitutes impermissible viewpoint discrimination under the First Amendment because it "clearly seeks to discourage challenges to the status quo." 121 S. Ct. 1043, 1047 (2001).

In determining specifically which language in the 1996 Act to strike as invalid, the Supreme Court noted that the Court of Appeals had concluded that congressional intent regarding severability was unclear. Since that "determination was not discussed in the briefs of either party or otherwise contested" in the appeal to the Supreme Court, the majority opinion noted that it was exercising its "discretion and prudential judgement" by declining to address the issue. *Id.* at 1053. Instead, the Supreme Court opted to simply affirm the decision of the Court of Appeals to "invalidate the smallest possible portion of the statute, excising only the viewpoint-based proviso rather than the entire exception of which it is a part." *Id.* at 1052.

The effect of the *Velazquez* decision has been to render the stricken language null and void. This means that the limitation on representation of an individual eligible client seeking specific relief from a welfare agency which prohibits any such representation from involving an effort to amend or otherwise challenge existing law is not valid and may not be enforced or given effect. An individual eligible client seeking relief from a welfare agency may be represented by a recipient without regard to whether the relief involves an effort to amend or otherwise challenge existing welfare reform law.

In light of foregoing, at its June 2001 meeting the LSC Board of Directors identified Part 1639 as an appropriate subject for rulemaking for the purpose of amending the regulation to make it conform to the decision in *Velazquez*.

For reasons set forth above, LSC proposes to amend 45 CFR Part 1639 as follows:

PART 1639—WELFARE REFORM

1. The authority citation continues to read as follows: 42 U.S.C. 2996g(e); Pub. L. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009; Pub. L. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321.

Section 1639.4 Permissible representation of eligible clients

2. Section 1639.4 would be amended by deleting the words "if such relief does not involve an effort to amend or otherwise challenge existing law in effect on the date of the initiation of the representation" and by changing the

¹ The exception at § 1639.5 regarding public rulemaking and responding to requests with non-LSC funds is not at issue here.