The screening must be within the limits of this section and without opening mail that is sealed against inspection or revealing the contents of correspondence within mail that is sealed against inspection. The screening is conducted according to these requirements.

(1) Screening of mail authorized by paragraph (a) of this section must be limited to the least quantity of mail necessary to respond to the threat.

(2) Such screening must be done in a manner that does not avoidably delay the screened mail.

(3) The Chief Postal Inspector may authorize screening of mail by postal employees and by persons not employed by the Postal Service under such instruction that require compliance with this part and protect the security of the mail. No information obtained from such screening may be disclosed unless authorized by this part.

(4) Mail of insufficient weight to pose a hazard to air or surface transportation or to contain firearms which are not mailable under section C024 of the Domestic Mail Manual and international transit mail must be excluded from such screening.

(5) After screening conducted under paragraph (a) of this section, mail that is reasonably suspected of posing an immediate and substantial danger to life or limb, or an immediate and substantial danger to property, may be treated by postal employees as provided in paragraph (b) of this section.

(6) After screening, mail sealed against inspection that presents doubt about whether its contents are hazardous, that cannot be resolved without opening, must be reported to the Postal Inspection Service. Such mail must be disposed of under instructions promptly furnished by the Inspection Service.

(b) *Threatening pieces of mail.* Mail, sealed or unsealed, reasonably suspected of posing an immediate danger to life or limb or an immediate and substantial danger to property may, without a search warrant, be detained, opened, removed from postal custody, and processed or treated, but only to the extent necessary to determine and eliminate the danger and only if a complete written and sworn statement of the detention, opening, removal, or treatment, and the circumstances that prompted it, signed by the person purporting to act under this section, is promptly forwarded to the Chief Postal Inspector.

(c) *Reports.* Any person purporting to act under this section who does not report his or her action to the Chief Postal Inspector under the requirements of this section, or whose action is determined after investigation not to have been authorized, is subject to disciplinary action or criminal prosecution or both.

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 96–4552 Filed 2–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[DE013–5915b; FRL–5425–1]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Delaware; Emission Statement Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Delaware. This revision consists of an emission statement program for stationary sources that emit volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and/or nitrogen oxides (NO_x) at or above specified actual emission threshold levels within the state of Delaware (Kent, New Castle, and Sussex Counties). In the Final Rules section of this Federal Register, EPA is approving the Delaware's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing by March 29, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Marcia L. Spink, Associate Director, Air Programs, Mailcode 3AT00, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the EPA office listed above; and the Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control, 89 Kings Highway, P.O. Box 1401, Dover, Delaware 19903.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rose Quinto, (215) 597–3164, at the EPA Region III address.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title (Delaware Emission Statement Program) which is located in the Rules and Regulations section of this Federal Register.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: February 2, 1996.

W. T. Wisniewski,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 96–4446 Filed 2–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 52

[FRL–5328–6]

Revision to the Maryland State Implementation Plan—Continuous Emission Monitoring

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Maryland. This revision establishes and requires continuous emission monitoring requirements for certain sources of air pollution. In the Final Rules section of this Federal Register, EPA is approving the State's SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule described in item (Conclusion) in the Technical Support document. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing by March 29, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to Marcia Spink, Associate Director, Air, Radiation, and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air, Radiation, and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107; the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460; and State of Maryland Department of the Environment, Air Management Association, 2500 Broening Highway, Baltimore, Maryland, 21224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Miller (215) 597–7547.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title which is located in the Rules and Regulations Section of this Federal Register.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: October 24, 1995.

Stanley L. Laskowski,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 96–4443 Filed 2–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

40 CFR Part 764

[OPPTS–62089A; FRL–5349–4]

RIN 2070–AC17

Re-opening of Rulemaking Record on Proposed Ban of Acrylamide and N-methylolacrylamide Grouts

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Re-opening of rulemaking record and request for comment.

SUMMARY: This Notice re-opens the rulemaking record for 30 days on the proposed rule banning acrylamide and NMA grouts. The rulemaking record is being re-opened in order to obtain data bearing on the durability of NMA grouts relative to acrylamide grouts.

DATES: Submitted data must be received on or before March 29, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments and data should be sent to: Document Control Office (7407), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Rm. E–G99, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. The envelope should be marked attention: ''Grout Durability Data.''

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan B. Hazen, Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E-543, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, Telephone: (202) 554-1404, TDD: (202) 554-0551, e-mail: TSCA-Hotline@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA proposed a rule in the Federal Register of October 2, 1991 (FR 56 49863), that would have ultimately banned all manufacture, importation, distribution and use of acrylamide and N-methylolacrylamide (NMA) grouts. The public comment period closed in March of 1992, and a Public Hearing was held on March 2, 1992. The Agency is now considering dropping NMA from the regulation.

Both acrylamide and NMA grouts are used mainly to prevent the infiltration of ground and surface water into sewer systems, in order to maintain the functional capacity of sewer water treatment works. The grouts are injected into joints, cracks and fissures in sewer lines and manholes. Following application, these grouts solidify into a stiff impervious gel. Sewer line sealing entails sealing main and lateral sewer line pipes and joints remotely using closed-circuit video cameras, an inflatable packer, and a grout delivery system. Manhole sealing is accomplished manually by a worker using a hand-held device to inject grouts into holes that have been drilled into the sides of manholes. Grouts have two additional minor uses: structural water control and geotechnical applications.

Acrylamide grouts generally consist of a 19:1 mixture of acrylamide and a cross-linking agent. The grout is prepared by adding water and small amounts of other chemicals, including catalysts, activators or accelerators, and inhibitors. In gel form, the grout contains less than 0.05 percent free acrylamide. These grouts were first introduced into U.S. commerce about 40 years ago, and quickly became popular because of their low cost and superior performance. Acrylamide grouts are first mixed into a solution formed by combining the grout with triethanolamine, an activator, and water. A separate solution of ammonium persulfate, an initiator, and water is also required. When the grout solution and the initiator solution are mixed together, they react to form a stiff polymerized gel.

NMA grouts were explicitly developed as a substitute for the more hazardous acrylamide grouts, and have been in use for about 9 years. Commercial NMA is a chemical mixture consisting of about 90 percent N-methylolacrylamide monomer and small amounts of acrylamide, formaldehyde, and methylene bisacrylamide. NMA grouts are mixed in the same way as acrylamide grouts, except that sodium persulfate is used as the initiator rather than ammonium persulfate. They are applied in the same manner as acrylamide grouts, using the same equipment for generally the same applications.

Although the rule proposed in 1991 would have ultimately banned both acrylamide grouts and NMA grouts, the Agency is now leaning heavily toward dropping NMA from the rule because of: (1) NMA's lower toxicity relative to acrylamide; (2) a lowered estimate of the size of the population at risk; (3) NMA's efficacy as a substitute for acrylamide grouts; and (4) NMA's low cost relative to other potential substitutes. Based upon these four factors, EPA is re-considering its earlier conclusion that NMA grouts present an unreasonable risk. Of the four factors, the only one about which there may be some doubt is the third--the efficacy of NMA as a substitute for acrylamide. The only question in this regard, moreover, has to do with the relative durability of NMA--i.e., will joints, cracks, and other fissures sealed with NMA grouts remain sealed as long as those sealed with acrylamide grouts, all else being equal.

Although the information presently available to the Agency suggests that the two grouts are equally durable, some have questioned whether this is the case. Specifically, the National Association of Sewer Service Companies (NASSCO) submitted two letters, dated August 15 and 17, 1995, that they asserted call into question the relative durability of NMA grouts. Both submissions are being made a part of the rulemaking record, and are available for inspection in the public docket. At a subsequent meeting held with NASSCO on October 3, 1995, however, they agreed that the submitted data do not indicate that NMA grouts are less durable than acrylamide grouts. Although the NASSCO representatives then agreed to submit such data, none has been received to date. A summary of that meeting has also been placed into the public docket. In view of the foregoing, and in order to obtain the best information available on this specific issue, the Agency is re-opening the rulemaking record for 30 days, and requesting any empirical and reliable