to public comment. OSM is, therefore, reopening the comment period at this time.

''Procedures for Assessment of Civil Penalties'' replaces the June 15, 1994, version and includes a general description of the assessment process, an explanation of the assessment factors, the assessment mechanism, and the application of the assessment factors to specific violations. Specific changes include the following. Chapter I: at section B(1), the provision that a penalty may be assessed if the violation is noncorrectable is deleted. At section D(1), the language is revised to require that the penalty for a cessation order issued for failure to abate be assessed pursuant to 405 KAR 7:092, section 13(2). At section D(2), the language is revised to require that the penalty for an imminent danger cessation order be issued pursuant to 405 KAR 7:092 section 13(1). The assessment shall be based on the four criteria in 405 KAR 7:095 section 3. Additional penalties shall be assessed in the event a failure to abate cessation order is issued. At section D(3), the language is revised to require that the penalty for an illegal mining cessation order be assessed pursuant to 405 KAR 7:092 section 13(3). Chapter IV: at section B(5)b, the ''Topsoil Affected'' damage point chart is revised.

III. Public Comment Procedures

In accordance with the provisions of 30 CFR 732.17(h), OSM is seeking comments on whether the proposed amendment satisfies the applicable program approval criteria of 30 CFR 732.15. Specifically, OSM is seeking comments on the revision to the State's regulation that was submitted on July 19, 1994 (Administration Record No. KY–1304), with the subsequent revisions and additions as noted above. Comments should address whether the proposed amendment satisfies the applicable program approval criteria of 30 CFR 732.15. If the amendment is deemed adequate, it will become part of the Kentucky program.

Written Comments

Written comments should be specific, pertain only to the issues proposed in this rulemaking, and include explanations in support of the commenter's recommendations. Comments received after the time indicated under **DATES** or at locations other than the Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center will not necessarily be considered in the final rulemaking or included in the Administrative Record.

IV. Procedural Determinations

Executive Order 12866

This rule is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review).

Executive Order 12988

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 2 of Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform) and has determined that, to the extent allowed by law, this rule meets the applicable standards of subsections (a) and (b) of that section. However, these standards are not applicable to the actual language of State regulatory programs and program amendments since each such program is drafted and promulgated by a specific State, not by OSM. Under sections 503 and 505 of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1253 and 1255) and 30 CFR 730.11, 732.15, and 732.17(h)(10), decisions on proposed State regulatory programs and program amendments submitted by the States must be based solely on a determination of whether the submittal is consistent with SMCRA and its implementing Federal regulations and whether the other requirements of 30 CFR Parts 730, 731, and 732 have been met.

National Environmental Policy Act

No environmental impact statement is required for this rule since section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that agency decisions on proposed State regulatory program provisions do not constitute major Federal actions within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). The State submittal which is the subject of this rule is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously promulgated by OSM will be implemented by the State. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart Federal regulations.

Unfunded Mandates

This rule will not impose a cost of $100 million or more in any given year on any governmental entity or the private sector.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 917

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: October 16, 1996.

Allen D. Klein,

Regional Director, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 96–27404 Filed 10–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 166

[CGD 93–044]

Port Access Routes off the Coast of California

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of study results.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is publishing the results of a port access route study which evaluated the need for vessel routing measures in the approaches to California ports. The study concluded that the southern approach lanes of the existing traffic separation scheme (TSS) off San Francisco should be shifted seven miles seaward; the existing TSS in the Santa Barbara Channel should be extended from Point Conception to Point Arguello; and a precautionary area should be established at the northwest end of the Santa Barbara Channel TSS. The remaining TSS approach lanes, precautionary areas, areas to be avoided, and the shipping safety fairways within the studied area should remain as presently configured. No navigational need for additional offshore routing measures was identified.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: CDR Chip Sharpe, Project Officer, Eleventh Coast Guard District at (510) 437–2975 or Margie G. Hegy. Project Manager, Coast Guard Headquarters at (202) 267–0415

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The Study

The Coast Guard has concluded its port access route study to review and analyze the vessel routing measures in the approaches to California ports and within the offshore California national marine sanctuaries. The study was announced in a notice published in the Federal Register on August 24, 1993 (58 FR 44634).

The study consisted of two parts: (1) a port access route study to evaluate the need for vessel routing measures; and (2) a joint study with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) mandated by the National Marine Sanctuaries Program Amendments Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102–587) (NMSPA Act of 1992) to determine what, if any, vessel regulations are needed to protect resources in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. This notice publishes only the results of the port access route part of the study. The results of the second part of the study will be contained in a report to Congress as required by the NMSPA Act of 1992. The Coast Guard will announce the completion of that report in a separate Federal Register notice.

A number of vessel routing measures, i.e., traffic separation schemes (TSSs), precautionary areas (PA), areas to be avoided (ATBA), and a shipping safety fairway (SSF), currently exist to mitigate navigation safety problems for vessels entering or departing the entrances to San Francisco Bay, Santa Barbara Channel, and the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

A *traffic separation scheme* is an internationally recognized routing measure intended to minimize the risk of collision by separating vessels into separate, opposing lanes of traffic. Vessel use of a TSS is voluntary; however, vessels operating in or near an IMO approved TSS are subject to Rule 10 of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972 (72 COLREGS).

A *precautionary area* is a routing measure comprising an area within defined limits where ships must navigate with particular caution. Direction of traffic flow may be recommended with a precautionary area.

An *area to be avoided* is a voluntary routing measure comprising an area within defined limits in which either navigation is particularly hazardous or it is exceptionally important to avoid casualties. All ships, or certain classes of ships, may be advised to avoid the area.

A *shipping safety fairway* is a lane or corridor in which no fixed structures, either temporary or permanent, are permitted. Shipping safety fairways are routing measures which provide safe port access routes for vessels where the primary risk to vessels is collision with offshore structures. Vessel use of shipping safety fairways is voluntary and the direction of traffic flow within a shipping safety fairway may be recommended.

Existing Routing Measures

The TSS off San Francisco consists of three approaches, a main ship channel, and a precautionary area with a separation zone in the center. The northern approach consists of north-westbound and south-eastbound traffic lanes and a separation zone. The southern approach consists of northbound and southbound traffic lanes and a separation zone. The western approach, consists of south-westbound and north-eastbound traffic lanes and a separation zone. The main ship channel consists of eastbound and westbound traffic lanes, and a precautionary area with a separation zone in the center.

The TSS in the Santa Barbara Channel consists of north-westbound and south-eastbound traffic lanes and a separation zone. The south-eastbound traffic lanes link the Santa Barbara Channel TSS to the western approach of the Los Angeles/Long Beach TSS.

The Los Angeles/Long Beach TSS consists of western and southern approaches and a precautionary area. The western approach consists of northbound and southbound traffic lanes and a separation zone. The southern approach consists of southbound and northbound traffic lanes and a separation zone. The two approaches converge into a precautionary area immediately offshore from the port complex.

A shipping safety fairway provides unobstructed vessel access to Port Hueneme.

Study Data

The Coast Guard reviewed studies and data collected both in-house and by other organizations on vessel traffic patterns and density. Coast Guard sources included: The Coast Guard's ''Evaluation of Oil Tanker Routing'' (Tanker Free Zone Study) report to Congress mandated by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA 90); the draft report to Congress on ''Regulating Vessel Traffic in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary'' prepared by the Coast Guard and the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA); and the Eleventh Coast Guard District's collection of vessel position information during law enforcement patrols (''Operation Crystal Ball'').

The Coast Guard's Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) in San Francisco recorded the number of vessels transiting the three approaches to the TSS when entering and leaving the ports in San Francisco Bay in 1994.

In addition to Coast Guard efforts, the Western States Petroleum Association's (WSPA) 1992 report, ''Tanker and Barge Movements Along the California Coast'' provided general information regarding vessel transit routes. Crowley Marine Services, Inc. and Pacific Gas and Electric Company also provided information on their vessel transits.

Vessel density data were obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' publications ''Waterborne Commerce of the United States,'' and ''Pacific Region Freight Traffic Tables'' for calendar years 1990–1992. Lastly, the California Coastal Commission made several local area reports available for review.

The Center for Marine Conservation's ''Safe Passage: Preventing Oil Spills in Our Marine Sanctuaries'' and ''Unsafe Havens: The Threat to California's Marine Sanctuaries From Vessel Traffic'' provided environmental information and recommendations for vessel traffic measures. CMC's recommendations were also addressed by the Council of American Master Mariners, San Francisco Chapter (CAMMSF) and WSPA. California's Office of Oil Spill Protection and Response (OSPR) completed a statewide coastal protection review which focused on the risk to California's coastline and the overall state of response preparedness.

Public Comments

Over 400 written comments were received in response to the notice of study. Of these comments, approximately one-third focused exclusively on sanctuary issues not related to vessel routing. These comments will be discussed in the report to Congress on ''Regulating Vessel Traffic in Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary''.

Several comments addressed user fees, increased fines for violations and spills, and increased regulation of vessels and vessel traffic. These comments did not address the specific routing of vessels between ports and are not discussed.

Public comments frequently recommended additional regulation of vessels and the routing of tankers, or all vessels, from 10 to 60 miles offshore. These comments expressed the belief

that keeping vessels further offshore would provide more time for response in the event of an oil spill. These comments also suggested that greater distances offshore naturally improved navigational safety. However, the comments contained no specific recommendations for increased navigational safety or spill prevention.

Vessel Regulation

There currently exists an extensive body of regulation governing the operation of tankers and other commercial vessels. These regulations include licensing of vessel operators and vessel crews, equipment carriage and training requirements, vessel response plans, and numerous operating requirements. The Coast Guard inspects vessels to ensure compliance and has initiated a Port State Control Program to target their inspection efforts on high risk vessels, often those under foreign flag.

In addition, the Coast Guard's Prevention Through People (PTP) program focuses on the human element, which has been found to be the cause of 80 percent of vessel casualties. In PTP, industry and the Coast Guard establish cooperative relationships to identify and implement effective human element programs which address: (1) management's commitment to safe operations; (2) external factors in the work environment that influence worker's capabilities, judgment, and effectiveness; (3) behavior influenced by factors such as stress, attitude, knowledge, awareness, health and experience; and, (4) the application of new technology with human capability and limitations in mind.

The existing regulations are adequate, and no additional regulations are needed at this time.

Offshore Routing

The coastwise transit between California ports is not navigationally difficult or hazardous. The areas that do involve significant navigational risk, the port approaches, have numerous effective waterways management measures, i.e. VTS, TSS, pilotage, and regulated navigation areas (RNA) in place. Simply defining an outer limit or minimum offshore distance that vessels must transit, as was often suggested by the comments, would increase collision risk by reducing the water area available for transit and artificially constricting the conventional coastwise traffic streams.

CMC Recommendations

Over fifty percent of the public comments supported the recommendations made by the Center for Marine Conservation (CMC) in its ''Safe Passage: Preventing Oil Spills in Our Marine Sanctuaries'' report. CMC's significant navigational recommendations include: (1) establishing an ATBA along the northern and central California coast; (2) reconfiguring the TSS in the approaches to San Francisco Bay to contain only one set of lanes approaching the bay from the southwest and extending seaward of the Farallon Islands; (3) making VTS San Francisco mandatory; (4) extending VTS authority and area of responsibility to include the entire area of the California national marine sanctuaries; and, (5) requiring transponders and automated dependent surveillance shipboard equipment (ADSSE) on all large commercial vessels.

Through advocating resource protection, the CMC report does not address the international, statutory, and economic ramifications of their comments, or the impact on navigation safety. These are discussed below.

(1) Coastal ATBA

An ATBA, encompassing the northern and central California coast, is inappropriate because transit through these areas is necessary to access ports between San Francisco and Port Hueneme. Such an ATBA would, in effect, shut off access to major ports such as San Francisco. It would also increase navigation risk by concentrating vessels along the outer boundary of an ATBA because vessels would not be expected to transit further off the coast than required by ATBA boundaries.

(2) Reducing traffic lanes in San Francisco TSS

Reconfiguring the San Francisco TSS from three approaches to one approach would also increase risk of collision. Such a reconfiguration would create a convergence zone approximately 50 miles offshore, in open ocean, and beyond VTS and shore station radar range. The existing scheme is within the coverage of VTS San Francisco, as well as the San Francisco Bar Pilots. This system provides several layers of monitoring and radar coverage, and forms a natural boundary before vessels make the more difficult transit into the bay. In addition, vessel speeds are controlled naturally in the precautionary area as vessels must slow to embark or disembark their pilot.

Vessel density data obtained by VTS San Francisco shows a relatively even distribution of vessel traffic between the three approaches. Reducing these three approaches to one would cause a convergence zone out of VTS and pilot coverage, increasing the risk of collision in the offshore area, as well as in the TSS itself because traffic from three approaches would be in one approach.

(3) Mandatory VTS Participation

The recommendation regarding mandatory participation in VTS San Francisco is no longer relevant as this requirement has been in place since 1994 (59 FR 36324).

(4) Expansion of VTS

The comments regarding expansion of VTS authority and area of responsibility to include the entire areas of the California national marine sanctuaries are not persuasive. VTS expansion into these open ocean areas will not significantly increase navigational safety due to lower traffic densities and the amount of sea room in which to navigate, when compared with port approaches.

One suggested alternative to expanded VTS coverage was for commercial vessels to record their positioning data during transit, which could then be inspected to ensure compliance with vessel routing measures. Another suggested alternative was the real-time reporting of vessel positioning information at strategically placed waypoints along common routes. These suggestions may have merit and the Coast Guard will continue to consider various vessel reporting systems.

(5) Transponder-Based Technology

Transponders and ADSSE are useful navigational tools and international performance standards for these technologies are currently under development by the International Maritime Organization (IMO). Once developed, we anticipate the transponders will be used, not only for reporting, but for collision avoidance as well. Absent the international performance standards applicable to all vessels, foreign and domestic, and absent a compelling navigation need to track vessels during the low risk coastwise transit, it is premature to mandate any transponder-based technology.

Summary

The public comments and recommendations illustrate an ever growing concern for the protection of the environment and the natural resources of the California coastline. There exists a wide divergence of opinion: public, industry, environmental, and government on

what, if any, additional action is necessary or warranted to mitigate both real and perceived risks to the California marine resources.

Findings

Offshore routing for Coastwise Transit

In light of the data, the existing body of operating requirements, the requirements imposed on tankers as a result of OPA 90, state of California initiatives such as the requirement for tug escorts, and the existing waterways management measures in the major port approaches, the Coast Guard finds that the coastwise transit does not present significant risk to navigation safety, and does not warrant new offshore vessel routing measures.

In 1992, nearly 9000 tanker, cargo and barge vessels called on California's major ports, with 90 percent of these vessels calling on the ports of San Francisco Bay and Los Angeles/Long Beach. It is important to note that VTS and VTIS systems are already in place in these two ports. Other commercial interests, such as fishing vessels and passenger carriers, were not included in the data.

Information collected from a variety of sources shows that the distances vessels transit offshore, especially between the major ports of Los Angeles/Long Beach and San Francisco Bay, are widely varied. Of the 2,837 crude oil tanker, petroleum product tanker, and barge trips along the California coast during 1992, over 82 percent occurred at least 25 miles off the coast.

The Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA) has coordinated an agreement between 10 shipping companies to remain at least 50 miles from shore when transiting from Alaska to California. Of the two major barge companies which operate off the coast, one operates 50 miles offshore, while the other remains 8–10 miles from shore.

San Francisco TSS

Vessel transit data gathered by the Vessel Traffic Service Center (VTS) in San Francisco in 1994, showed a fairly even distribution of traffic amongst the TSS approaches. The northern approach lanes accommodated 38 percent of the traffic, followed by the southern (35 percent) and western (27 percent) approaches, respectively. These data strongly support the need for three approaches to San Francisco Bay. However, the current configuration of the southern approach lanes of the San Francisco TSS does not make the best use of available water.

Rotating the southern approach seaward would increase transit distance from shore without crowding the western approach. Centering the southern approach between shore and the western approach would strike a reasonable balance between reducing the risk of grounding and the risk of collision.

In a typical coastwise transit inbound for the San Francisco Bay via the southern approach lanes, a vessel would pass within four nautical miles of Point Montara and within seven nautical miles of Pigeon Point. Shifting the southern approach lanes to the west would encourage vessels to transit further offshore when entering or departing San Francisco, increase the minimum transit distance off Point Montara by six nautical mile to ten nautical miles.

The northern and western TSS approaches to San Francisco meet the traffic routing needs between Pt. Reyes and Cordell Bank, and near the Farallones, respectively. Therefore, the Coast Guard is not recommending any changes to these two approaches.

Santa Barbara Channel TSS

The current configuration of the northwestern end of the TSS in the Santa Barbara Channel encourages vessels to transit close to the offshore platforms of Hidalgo, Harvest, and Hermosa, as they round Point Conception. In addition, west bound vessels leaving the scheme are put into crossing situations with vessels entering the lanes from the north.

Extending the TSS eighteen miles westward would increase the distance vessels transit from the platforms and Point Conception, and encourage greater offshore distances for coastwise transits, thereby decreasing the risk of allision and grounding.

Adding a precautionary area at the northwest end of the TSS would add order and predictability to the crossing traffic streams, thereby decreasing collision risk.

Los Angeles/Long Beach TSS

Vessel transit data gathered by the Vessel Traffic Information System (VTIS) in Los Angeles/Long Beach for 1994 also showed a fairly even distribution of traffic using the two approach lanes. Vessels transiting the north and west routes rely on the northern TSS (in the Santa Barbara Channel) and its exit at Point Conception. Comments did not suggest any changes to the TSS, nor did the study data suggest that changes were needed.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The transit data support the Coast Guard's decision not to implement additional routing measures along California's coastline. Traffic lanes are established to facilitate port access. Establishing traffic lanes parallel to the coast would not facilitate port access and would compress vessels of different types, sizes, and speeds into a confined area where the risk of collision would increase significantly. Present International Regulations for Prevention of Collisions at Sea are sufficient to regulate offshore vessel traffic and ensure safe passage between vessels.

The study data does, however, support the following recommended changes to existing routing measures.

San Francisco TSS

(1) That the southern approach lanes of the TSS off San Francisco be shifted seven miles seaward as follows:

Part II: Southern Approach

(a) A separation zone bounded by a line connecting the following geographical positions:

Latitude	Longitude
37°39.10′ N	122°40.40′ W
37°27.00′ N	122°40.40′ W
37°27.00′ N	122°43.00′ W
37°39.10′ N	122°43.00′ W

(b) A traffic lane for northbound traffic between the separation zone and a line connecting the following geographical positions:

Latitude	Longitude
37°39.30′ N	122°39.10′ W
37°27.00′ N	122°39.10′ W

(c) A traffic lane for southbound traffic between the separation zone and a line connecting the following geographical positions:

Latitude	Longitude
37°27.00′ N	122°44.30′ W
37°39.40′ N	122°44.30′ W

Santa Barbara Channel TSS

(1) That the TSS in the Santa Barbara Channel be extended from Point Conception to Point Arguello as follows:

(a) A separation zone bounded by a line connecting the following geographical positions:

Latitude	Longitude
34°20.90′ N	120°30.10′ W
34°18.90′ N	120°30.90′ W
34°25.70′ N	120°51.75′ W

Latitude	Longitude
34°23.75′ N	120°52.45′ W

(b) A traffic lane for westbound traffic between the separation zone and a line connecting the following geographical positions:

Latitude	Longitude
34°21.80′ N	120°29.90′ W
34°26.60′ N	120°51.45′ W

(c) A traffic lane for eastbound traffic between the separation zone and a line connecting the following geographical positions:

Latitude	Longitude
34°18.00′ N	120°31.10′ W
34°22.80′ N	120°52.70′ W

(d) A precautionary area be established, bounded to the west by the arc of a circle of radius four miles centered upon the following geographical positions:

Latitude	Longitude
34°25.80′ N	120°56.50′ W

and connecting the following geographical position:

34°22.80′ N	120°52.70′ W
34°26.60′ N	120°51.45′ W

The precautionary area be bounded to the east by a line connecting the following geographical positions:

Latitude	Longitude
34°22.80′ N	120°52.70′ W
34°26.60′ N	120°51.45′ W

In addition to the recommended changes to the San Francisco and Santa Barbara Channel TSS's, nautical charts depicting the San Francisco TSS should be amended to conform with approved IMO descriptions as follows:

(1) Rename the Main Approach TSS segment as the Western Approach;

(2) Redesignate the separation zone in the center of the circular precautionary area as an ATBA; and

(3) Define the eastern boundary of the precautionary area by a line connecting the following geographic positions:

Latitude	Longitude
37°42.70′ N	122°34.60′ W
37°45.90′ N	122°38.00′ W
37°50.30′ N	122°38.00′ W

Datum: NAD 83.

The Coast Guard will publish a notice of proposed rulemaking in the Federal Register to solicit public comment on the recommended changes to the existing routing measures, and take necessary action at IMO.

Dated: October 15, 1996.

J.C. Card,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 96–27486 Filed 10–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Chapter I

[FRL–5640–6]

Definition of Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Recycling; Notice of Public Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will hold a public meeting on November 19, 1996 to make information available on a project underway to revise the RCRA regulations governing hazardous waste recycling. Under the authority of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has promulgated regulations governing management of hazardous waste. Parts of these regulations govern hazardous waste recycling. Specifically, the portion of the regulations known as the Definition of Solid Waste (DSW) (40 CFR 261.2) specifies whether hazardous materials that are recycled are more ''waste-like'' (i.e., solid wastes) and thus subject to RCRA regulation, or whether such materials are more ''product-like'' and not subject to regulation. Other parts of the regulations set forth requirements for regulating hazardous waste recycling (40 CFR 261.6, Part 266). The current hazardous waste recycling regulations were first promulgated on January 4, 1985 (50 FR 614).

EPA is working on a rulemaking to modify the current federal hazardous waste recycling scheme to meet two goals: develop a clearer, simpler regulatory system for hazardous waste recycling that adequately protects human health and the environment; and to remove disincentives to the safe recycling of hazardous waste. The intended result of this project is a simpler RCRA program, where definitions and requirements more precisely capture the materials and practices Congress intended to regulate in passing the Act.

The purpose of this meeting is for EPA to present and explain the draft rulemaking options the Agency is currently considering. The intent is to allow parties outside the government to begin as early in the process as possible, to formulate its thoughts on the proposal in order to allow time for interested parties to fully develop comments to be completed during the comment period. The Agency believes that the issues involved in this project are complex and difficult enough that this early introduction to the Agency's direction will benefit the regulated community by allowing early discussion among interested parties and will benefit the Agency by resulting in more fully formulated reactions to the proposal in comments. EPA will answer clarifying questions. Time may be limited, however, depending on the number of participants and questions. EPA anticipates publishing the proposed rulemaking in Spring of 1997. Because the Agency believes that a full dialog among the members of the regulated community is critical to receiving the best comment possible, EPA plans to allow a 90 day comment period for proposal and to hold public meetings during the comment period to discuss the proposal in detail. Written materials will be handed out at the meeting. These materials will not be available prior to the meeting.

DATES: The Public meeting will be held on November 19, 1996 from 8:30 am to 12:30 pm.

ADDRESSES: The public meeting will be held at the Airport Hilton, 2399 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington Virginia, 22202, 703 418–6800.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information, contact the RCRA Hotline at 800 424–9346 or TDD 800 553–7672 (hearing impaired). In the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, call 703 412–9810 or TDD 703 412–3323.

Dated: October 17, 1996.

Michael Shapiro,

Director, Office of Solid Waste.

[FR Doc. 96–27469 Filed 10–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P–M

40 CFR Parts 51 and 52

[AD-FRL–5641–2]

Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NSR)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).