and 604. Alternatively, EPA may certify that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000.

SIP approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not impose any new requirements, the Administrator certifies that it does not have a significant impact on any small entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the CAA, preparation of a flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its 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).

C. 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 approval action promulgated 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 Federal action approves 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.

D. Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office

Under section 801(a)(1)(A) as added 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).

E. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by July 29, 1997. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: April 22, 1997.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator.

Part 52 of chapter I, title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations*, is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Subpart RR—Tennessee

2. Section 52.2220 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(152) to read as follows:

§ 52.2220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(C) * * *

(152) On December 28, 1995, the State submitted revisions to the Nashville/Davidson portion of the Tennessee SIP on behalf of Nashville/Davidson County. These were revisions to the permit requirements for major sources of air pollution, including revisions to the general definitions, the permit requirements, and the exemptions. Also included was a revision to the regulations for internal combustion engines. These revisions incorporate changes to Nashville's Chapter 10.56 which are required in the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 and 40 CFR part 51, subpart I.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Code of Laws of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee, Chapter 10.56 Air Pollution Control, approved on December 14, 1995.

(I) Section 10.56.010, definitions for ''Potential Emissions,'' ''Regulated Pollutant,'' and ''Volatile Organic Compound.''

(II) Section 10.56.040, Paragraph B.

(III) Section 10.56.050, Paragraphs A and F.

(IV) Section 110.56.240, Paragraph C.

(ii) Other material. None.

[FR Doc. 97–14194 Filed 5–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL–5832–8]

Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program; Missouri

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Immediate final rule.

SUMMARY: Missouri has applied for final authorization of revisions to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, as amended (hereinafter RCRA). The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed Missouri's application and has made a decision, subject to review and comment, that Missouri's hazardous waste program revisions satisfy all of the requirements necessary to qualify for final authorization. Thus, EPA intends to approve Missouri's hazardous waste program revisions, subject to authority retained by EPA under the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (hereinafter HSWA). Missouri's application for program revision is available for public review and comment.

DATES: Final authorization for Missouri shall be effective July 29, 1997, unless the EPA publishes a prior **Federal Register** action withdrawing this immediate final rule. All comments on the Missouri program revision application must be received by the close of business June 30, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to Mr. Aaron Zimmerman, Iowa RCRA and State Programs Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

Region 7, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101 (913/551–7333). Copies of the Missouri program revision application are available for inspection and copying during normal business hours at the following addresses: Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Quality, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 (314/751–4422); U.S. EPA Headquarters Library, PM 211A, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460 (202/382–5926); U.S. EPA Region 7 Library, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101 (913/551–7241).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Aaron Zimmerman, U.S. EPA Region 7, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101 (913/551–7333).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

States with final authorization under section 3006(b) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6926(b), have a continuing obligation to maintain a hazardous waste program that is equivalent to, consistent with, and no less stringent than the federal hazardous waste program. The Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendment of 1984 (Pub. L. 98–616, November 8, 1984, hereinafter HSWA) allows states to revise their programs to become substantially equivalent instead of equivalent to RCRA requirements promulgated under HSWA authority. States exercising the latter option receive ''interim authorization'' for the HSWA requirements under section 3006(g) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6926(g), and later apply for final authorization for the HSWA requirements.

In accordance with 40 CFR 271.21, revisions to state hazardous waste programs are necessary when federal or state statutory or regulatory authority is modified or when certain other changes occur. Most commonly, state program revisions are necessitated by changes to the EPA's regulations in 40 CFR Parts 124, 260–266, 268, 270, 273, and 279.

B. Missouri

Missouri initially received final authorization for its base RCRA Program effective December 4, 1985 (50 FR 47740). Missouri received authorization for a revision to its program effective on April 28, 1989 for Non-HSWA Cluster I, II, III, IV, VI, and HSWA Cluster I (54 FR 8190). Missouri received additional approval for a revision to its program effective on March 12, 1993, for Non-HSWA Cluster III, IV, V, and HSWA Cluster I and II (58 FR 3497). On September 30, 1993, Missouri submitted a program revision to its authorized program. This application includes rules in Non-HSWA Cluster II, V, and VI, and HSWA Cluster I and II and RCRA Cluster I. A final application was submitted for program approval to include rules in Non-HSWA Cluster V, VI, and HSWA Cluster II on January 16, 1997. Missouri is seeking approval of its program revisions in accordance with 40 CFR 271.21 (b)(3).

The EPA has reviewed the Missouri application and has made an immediate final decision that the Missouri hazardous waste program revision satisfy all of the requirements necessary to qualify for final authorization. Consequently, the EPA intends to grant final authorization to Missouri for its additional program modification. The public may submit written comments on EPA's immediate final decision up until June 30, 1997. Copies of the Missouri application for program revision are available for inspection and copying at the locations indicated in the ''**ADDRESSES**'' section of this document.

Approval of the Missouri program revision shall become effective in sixty (60) days, unless an adverse comment pertaining to the state's revisions discussed in this document is received by the end of the comment period. If an adverse comment is received, the EPA will publish either: (1) a withdrawal of the immediate final decision, or (2) a notice containing a response to comments which either affirms that the immediate final decision takes effect or reverses the decision.

On July 29, 1997, Missouri will be authorized to carry out, in lieu of the federal program, those provision of the state's program which are analogous to the following provisions of the federal program.

Federal requirement	Missouri regulation
Checklist 17H—Double Liners, May 9, 1990, 55 FR 19262	10 CSR 25–7.264(1) 10 CSR 25–7.264(2)(K)1.A. 10 CSR 25–7.264(2)(K)1.B. 10 CSR 25–7.264(2)(K)1.C. 10 CSR 25–7.264(2)(K)1.D. 10 CSR 25–7.264(2)(N)2.A. 10 CSR 25–7.264(2)(N)2.C. 10 CSR 25–7.265(1) 10 CSR 25–7.265(2)(K)
Checklist 24A—Financial Responsibility; Settlement Agreement, May 2, 1986, 55 FR 25976.	10 CSR 25–7.264(1) 10 CSR 25–7.265(1)
Checklist 31—Exports of Hazardous Waste, August 8, 1986, 51 FR 28664–28686.	10 CSR 25–4.261(1) 10 CSR 25–5.262(1) 10 CSR 25–5.262(5)(B) 10 CSR 25–6.263(1) 10 CSR 25–6.263(2)(B)1.A.(IV) 10 CSR 25–6.263(2)(B)1.
Checklist 39—California List Waste Restrictions, July 8, 1987, 52 FR 25760, as amended on October 27, 1987, 52 FR 41295–41296.	10 CSR 25–3.260(1), 10 CSR 25–5.262(1), 10 CSR 25–7.264(1), 10 CSR 25–7.265(1), 10 CSR 25–7.268(1), 10 CSR 25–7.270(1)
Checklist 42—Exception Reporting for Small Quantity Generators of Hazardous Waste, September 23, 1987, 52 FR 35894–35899.	10 CSR 25–5.262(2)(D)2. 10 CSR 25–5.262(2)(D)3.
Checklist 48—Farm Exemptions; Technical Corrections, July 19, 1988, 3 FR 27164—27165.	10 CSR 25–5.262(1), 10 CSR 25–7.264(1), 10 CSR 25–7.265(1), 10 CSR 25–7.268(1), 10 CSR 25–7.270(1)

Federal requirement	Missouri regulation
Checklist 50—Land Disposal Restrictions for First Third Scheduled Waste, August 17, 1988, 53 FR 31138–31222, as amended on February 27, 1989, 54 FR 8264–8266.	10 CSR 25–7.264(1) 10 CSR 25–7.265(1) 10 CSR 25–7.266(2)(C) 10 CSR 25–7.268(1) 10 CSR 25–7.268(2)(C)1. 10 CSR 25–7.268(2)(C)2. 10 CSR 25–7.268(2)(D)1. 10 CSR 25–7.268(2)(D)2.
Checklist 52—Hazardous Waste Management System: Standards for Hazardous Waste Storage and Treatment Tank Systems, September 2, 1988, 53 FR 34079–34087.	10 CSR 25–3.260(1) 10 CSR 25–7.264(1) 10 CSR 25–7.264(2)(J)4. 10 CSR 25–7.265(1) 10 CSR 25–7.265(2)(J)2.
Checklist 54—Permit Modifications for Hazardous Waste Management Facilities, September 28, 1988, as amended on October 24, 1988, 53 FR 41649.	10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(L)5. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(L)1. 10 CSR 25–7.264(1) 10 CSR 25–7.265(1) 10 CSR 25–7.270(1) 10 CSR 25–7.270(2)(D)1.
Checklist 61—Changes to Interim Status Facilities for Hazardous Waste Management; Modification of Hazardous Waste Mgmt. Permit; Procedures for Post Closure Permitting, March 7, 1989, 54 FR 9596–9609.	10 CSR 25–7.270(1) 10 CSR 25–8.0109(1)(J) 10 CSR 25–7(2)(G)2.
Checklist 62—Land Disposal Restriction Amendments to First Third Scheduled Wastes; May 2, 1989, 54 FR 18836–18838.	10 CSR 25–7.268(1)
Checklist 63—Land Disposal Restrictions for Second Third Scheduled Waste, June 23, 1989, 54 FR 26594–26652.	10 CSR 25–7.268(1)
Checklist 64—Delay of Closure Period for Hazardous Waste Management Facilities, August 14, 1989, 54 FR 3376.	10 CSR 25–7.264(1) 10 CSR 25–7.265(1) 10 CSR 25–7.270(1)
Checklist 65—Mining Waste Exclusion I, September 1, 1989, 54 FR 36592.	10 CSR 25–4.261(1)
Checklist 66—Land Disposal Restrictions; Correction to the First Third Scheduled Wastes; September 6, 1989, 54 FR 36967, as amended on June 13, 1990, 55 FR 23935.	10 CSR 25–7.266(2)(C) 10 CSR 25–7.268(1)
Checklist 67—Testing and Monitoring Activities, September 29, 1989, 54 FR 40260.	10 CSR 25–3.260(1) 10 CSR 25–4.261(1)
Checklist 68—Reportable Quantity Adjustment Methyl Bromide Production Wastes, October 6, 1989, 54 FR 41402–41408.	10 CSR 25–4.261(1)
Checklist 69—Reportable Quantity Adjustment, December 11, 1989, 54 FR 50968–50979.	10 CSR 25–4.261(1)
Checklist 70—Changes to Part 124 Not Accounted for by Present Checklists, April 1, 1983, 48 FR 14146–14295; June 30, 1983, 48 FR 30113–30115; July 26, 1988, 53 FR 28118–28157; September 26, 1988, 53 FR 37396–37414; January 4, 1989, 54 FR 246–258.	10 CSR 25–7.270(2)(A)1. 10 CSR 25–7.270(2)(B)7. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(B)2. 10 CSR 25–7.270(2)(A)1. 10 CSR 25–7.270(2)(B)7. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(L)2. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(M)1. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(L)1. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(L)8. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(M)4. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(E)2.A. 10 CSR 25–8.010(B)4.G. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(E)2B.(VI) 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(B)4.C. 10 CSR 25–8.010(1)(B)4.E. 10 CSR 25–8010(1)(H)
Checklist 71—Mining Waste Exclusion II, January 23, 1990, 55 FR 2322–2354.	10 CSR 25–3.270(1) 10 CSR 25–7.25–80 10(1)(J) 10 CSR 25–5.272(1)
Checklist 72—Modifications of F019 Listing	10 CSR 25–4.261(1)
Checklist 73—Testing and Monitoring Activities; Technical Corrections, March 9, 1990, 55 FR 8948–8950.	10 CSR 25–3.260(1)
Checklist 74—Toxicity Characteristics Revisions, March 29, 1990, 55 FR 11798–11877, as amended on June 29, 1990, 55 FR 26986–26998.	10 CSR 25–4.261(1) 10 CSR 25–7.264(1) 10 CSR 25–7.265(1) 10 CSR 25–7.268(1)
Checklist 75—Listing of 1, 1-Dimethylhydrazine Production Waste, May 2, 1990, 55 FR 18496–18506.	10 CSR 25–4.261(1)
Checklist 76—Criteria for Listing Toxic Waste; Technical Amendment, May 4, 1990, 55 FR 18726.	10 CSR 25–4.261(1)

Federal requirement	Missouri regulation
Checklist 77—HSWA Codification Rule 2, Double Liners; Correction, May 9, 1990, 55 FR 19262–19264.	10 CSR 25–7.264(1) 10 CSR 25–7.264(2)(K) 10 CSR 25–7.264(2)(N)2.A.
Checklist 78N & 78H—Land Disposal Restrictions for Third Third Scheduled Wastes, June 1, 1990, 55 FR 22520–22720.	10 CSR 25–4.261(1), 10 CSR 25–5.262(1), 10 CSR 25–7.264(1), 10 CSR 25–7.265(1), 10 CSR 25–7.268(1), 10 CSR 25–7.270(1)
Checklist 79—Organic Air Emission Standard for Process Vents and Equipment Leaks, June 21, 1990, 55 FR 25454–25519.	10 CSR 25–3.260(1), 10 CSR 25–4.261(1), 10 CSR 25–7.264(1), 10 CSR 25–7.265(1), 10 CSR 25–7.270(1)
Checklist 83—Land Disposal Restrictions for Third Third Scheduled Wastes; Technical Amendments, January 31, 1991, 56 FR 3864–3928.	10 CSR 25–4.261(1) 10 CSR 25–5.262(1) 10 CSR 25–5.262(2)(C)2. 10 CSR 25–7.268(1)

The state will assume lead responsibility for issuing permits for those program areas authorized today. For those HSWA provisions for which the state is not authorized, the EPA will retain lead responsibility. For those permits which will now change to state lead from the EPA, the EPA will transfer copies of any pending applications, completed permits, or pertinent file information to the state within 30 days of the effective date of this authorization. The EPA will be responsible for enforcing the terms and conditions of federally issued permits while they remain in force. The EPA will also be responsible for enforcing the terms and conditions of RCRA permits regarding HSWA requirements until the state has the authority to address the HSWA requirements.

The state has agreed to review all state-issued permits and to modify or reissue them as necessary to require compliance with the currently approved state law and regulations. When the states reissues federally issued permits as state permits, the state will take the lead in enforcing such permits, with the exception of those HSWA requirements for which the state has not received authorization. Missouri is not authorized to operate the Federal Program on Indian Lands. This authority remains with the EPA unless provided otherwise in a future statute or regulation.

C. Decision

We conclude that the Missouri application for program revision meets all of the statutory and regulatory requirements established by RCRA and its amendments. Missouri now has responsibility for permitting, treatment, storage, and disposal facilities within its borders and carrying out other aspects of the RCRA program described in its revised program application, subject to the limitations of the HSWA. Missouri also has primary enforcement responsibilities, although the EPA retains the right to conduct inspection under section 3007 of RCRA and to take enforcement actions under sections 3008, 3013, and 7003 of RCRA.

Incorporation by Reference

The EPA incorporates by reference, authorized state programs in 40 CFR Part 272, to provide notice to the public of the scope of the authorized program in each state. Incorporation by reference of the Missouri program will be completed at a later date.

Compliance With Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 6 of Executive Order 12866.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

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, the 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 the 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 the 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 the 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 the 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 for state, local or tribal governments or the private sector. The Act excludes from the definition of a ''federal mandate'' duties that arise from participation in a voluntary federal program, except in certain cases where a ''federal intergovernmental mandate'' affects an annual federal entitlement program of $500 million or more that are not applicable here. The Missouri request for approval of revisions to its authorized hazardous waste program is voluntary and imposes no federal mandate within the meaning of the Act. Rather, by having its hazardous waste program approved, the state will gain the authority to implement the program within its jurisdiction, in lieu of the EPA thereby eliminating duplicative state and federal requirements. If a state chooses not to seek authorization for administration of a hazardous waste program under RCRA Subtitle C, RCRA regulation is left to the EPA.

In any event, the 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. The EPA does not anticipate that the approval of the Missouri hazardous waste program referenced in today's notice will result in annual costs of $100 million or more. The EPA's approval of state programs generally may reduce, not increase, compliance costs for the private sector since the state, by virtue of the approval, may now administer the program in lieu of the EPA and exercise primary enforcement. Hence, owners and operators of treatment, storage, or disposal facilities (TSDFs) generally no longer face dual federal and state compliance requirements, thereby reducing overall compliance costs. Thus, today's rule is not subject to the requirements of section 202 and 205 of the UMRA.

The EPA has determined that this rule contains no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The Agency recognizes that small governments may own and/or operate TSDFs that will become subject to the requirements of an approved state hazardous waste program. However, such small governments which own and/or operate TSDFs are already subject to the requirements in 40 CFR Parts 264, 265, and 270 and are not subject to any additional significant or unique requirements by virtue of this program approval. Once the EPA authorizes a state to administer its own hazardous waste program and any revisions to that program, these same small governments will be able to own and operate their TSDFs under the approved state program, in lieu of the federal program.

Certification Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act

The EPA has determined that this authorization will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The EPA recognizes that small entities may own and/or operate TSDFs that will become subject to the requirements of an approved state hazardous waste program. However, since such small entities which own and/or operate TSDFs are already subject to the requirements in 40 CFR Parts 264, 265, and 270, this authorization does not impose any additional burdens on these small entities. This is because the EPA's authorization would result in an administrative change (i.e., whether the EPA or the state administers the RCRA Subtitle C program in that state), rather than result in a change in the substantive requirements imposed on small entities. Once the EPA authorizes a state to administer its own hazardous waste program and any revisions to that program, these same small entities will be able to own and operate their TSDFs under the approved state program, in lieu of the federal program. Moreover, this authorization, in approving a state program to operate in lieu of the federal program, eliminates duplicative requirements for owners and operators of TSDFs in that particular state.

Therefore, the 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 authorization will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This authorization effectively approves the Missouri program to operate in lieu of the federal program, thereby eliminating duplicative requirements for handlers of hazardous waste in the state. It does not impose any new burdens on small entities. This rule, therefore, does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office

Under section 801(a)(1)(A) of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, the 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.

Paperwork Reduction Act

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. § 3501 *et seq.*, federal agencies must consider the paperwork burden imposed by any information request contained in a proposed rule or a final rule. This rule will not impose any information requirements upon the regulated community.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 271

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Confidential business information, Hazardous materials transportation, Hazardous waste, Indian lands, Intergovernmental relations, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Water pollution control, and Water supply.

Authority: This rulemaking is issued under the authority of sections 2002(a), 3006, and 7004(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6912(a), 6926, 6974(b)).

Dated: May 9, 1997.

William Rice,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–14197 Filed 5–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P