

comments to this action. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this action. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed action. 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 on this proposed action must be received in writing by November 27, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Wayne Kaiser, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne Kaiser at (913) 551-7603.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: October 6, 2000.

William Rice,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 7.

[FR Doc. 00-27149 Filed 10-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-6889-6]

Tennessee: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Tennessee has applied to EPA for Final authorization of the changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). EPA proposes to grant final authorization to Tennessee. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is authorizing the changes by an immediate final rule. EPA did not make a proposal prior to the immediate final rule because we believe this action is not controversial and do not expect comments that oppose it. We have explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the immediate final rule. Unless we get written comments which oppose this authorization during the comment

period, the immediate final rule will become effective on the date it establishes, 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. You may not have another opportunity for comment. If you want to comment on this action, you must do so at this time.

DATES: Send your written comments by November 27, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Narindar Kumar, Chief, RCRA Programs Branch, Waste Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, The Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3104. You can examine copies of the materials submitted by Tennessee during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA Region 4 Library, The Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3104, Phone number: (404) 562-8190; or Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, Division of Solid Waste Management, 5th Floor, L & C Tower, 401 Church Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37243-1535, Phone number: (615) 532-0850.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Narindar Kumar, Chief, RCRA Programs Branch, Waste Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency at the above address and phone number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, please see the immediate final rule published in the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 29, 2000.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 00-27141 Filed 10-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-6892-7]

Vermont: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Vermont has applied to EPA for final authorization of certain changes to its hazardous waste program under

the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). EPA proposes to grant final authorization to Vermont. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is authorizing the changes by an immediate final rule. EPA did not make a proposal prior to the immediate final rule because we believe this action is not controversial and do not expect comments that oppose it. We have explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the immediate final rule. Unless we get written comments which oppose this authorization during the comment period, the immediate final rule will become effective on the date it establishes, 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. You may not have another opportunity for comment. If you want to comment on this action, you must do so at this time.

DATES: Send your written comments by November 27, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Geri Mannion, EPA New England, One Congress Street, Suite 1100 (CHW), Boston, MA 02114-2023; Phone number: (617) 918-1648. You can examine copies of the materials submitted by Vermont during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA New England Library, One Congress Street, Suite 1100 (LIB), Boston, MA 02114-2023; Phone number: (617) 918-1990; Business hours: 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.; or the Agency of Natural Resources, 103 South Main Street—West Office Building, Waterbury, VT 05671-0404; Phone number: (802) 241-3888; Business hours: 7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Geri Mannion at (617) 918-1648.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In addition to proposing the authorization for changes to Vermont's hazardous waste program, EPA is making a technical correction to provisions referenced in its immediate final rule published in the **Federal Register** on May 3, 1003 (58 FR 31911) which authorized the State for revisions to its hazardous waste program. This proposed rule relates only to the immediate final rule to authorize the State's program changes and not to the technical corrections to the 1993 **Federal Register**.

For additional information, please see the immediate final rule published in

the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: October 18, 2000.

Mindy S. Lubber,

Regional Administrator, EPA New England.

[FR Doc. 00-27577 Filed 10-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

45 CFR Parts 80, 84, 86, 90, and 91

RIN 0991-AB10

Office for Civil Rights; Amending the Regulations Governing Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Race, Color, National Origin, Handicap, Sex, and Age to Conform to the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Secretary proposes to amend the Department of Health and Human Services regulations implementing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 to conform with certain statutory amendments made by the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (CRRRA). The principal proposed conforming change is to amend the regulations to add definitions of "program or activity" or "program" that correspond to the statutory definitions enacted under the CRRRA.

DATES: Comments will be considered if we receive them at the appropriate address, as provided below, no later than 5 p.m. on November 27, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Mail written comments or deliver them to the following address: Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health and Human Services, 200 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 509-F, Washington, DC 20201.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathryn A. Ellis, (202) 619-0403; Kathleen O'Brien, (202) 619-2829; TDD 1-800-537-7697.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Health and Human Services (Department or HHS) proposes to amend its civil rights regulations to conform to certain provisions of the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (Pub. L. 100-259) (CRRRA), regarding the scope of coverage under civil rights statutes administered by the Department. These statutes include Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2000d, *et seq.* (Title

VI), Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1681, *et seq.* (Title IX), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 794 (Section 504), and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6101, *et seq.* (Age Discrimination Act). Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in all programs or activities that receive Federal financial assistance; Title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs or activities that receive Federal financial assistance; section 504 prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in all programs or activities that receive Federal financial assistance; and the Age Discrimination Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in all programs or activities that receive Federal financial assistance.

The principal proposed conforming change is to amend each of these regulations to add a definition of "program or activity" or "program" that adopts the statutory definition of "program or activity" or "program" enacted as part of the CRRRA. We believe that adding this statutory definition to the regulatory language is the best way to avoid confusion on the part of recipients, beneficiaries, and other interested parties about the scope of civil rights coverage.

The Department's civil rights regulations, when originally issued and implemented, were interpreted by the Department to mean that acceptance of Federal assistance by an entity resulted in broad institutional coverage. In *Grove City College v. Bell*, 465 U.S. 555, 571-72 (1984) (*Grove City College*), the Supreme Court held, in a Title IX case, that the provision of Federal student financial assistance to a college resulted in Federal jurisdiction to ensure Title IX compliance in the specific program receiving the assistance, *i.e.*, the student financial aid office, but that the Federal student financial assistance would not provide jurisdiction over the entire institution. Following the Supreme Court's decision in *Grove City College*, the Department changed its interpretation, but not the language, of the governing regulations to be consistent with the Court's restrictive, "program specific" definition of "program or activity" or "program". Since Title IX was patterned after Title VI, *Grove City College* significantly narrowed the coverage of Title VI and two other statutes based on it: The Age Discrimination Act and Section 504. *See* S. Rep. No. 100-64, at 2-3, 11-16 (1987).

Then, in 1988, the CRRRA was enacted to "restore the prior consistent and long-

standing executive branch interpretation and broad, institution-wide application of those laws as previously administered." 20 U.S.C. 1687 note 1. Congress enacted the CRRRA in order to remedy what it perceived to be a serious narrowing by the Supreme Court of a longstanding administrative interpretation of the coverage of the regulations. At that time, the Department reinstated its broad interpretation to be consistent with the CRRRA, again without changing the language of the regulations. It was and remains the Department's consistent interpretation that—with regard to the differences between the interpretation of the regulations given by the Supreme Court in *Grove City College* and the language of the CRRRA—the CRRRA, which took effect upon enactment, superseded the *Grove City College* decision and, therefore, the regulations must be read in conformity with the CRRRA in all their applications.

This interpretation reflects the understanding of Congress, as expressed in the legislative history of the CRRRA, that the statutory definition of "program or activity" or "program" would take effect immediately, by its own force, without the need for Federal agencies to amend their existing regulations. S. Rep. No. 100-64, at 32. The legislative history also evidences congressional concern about the Department's immediate need to address complaints and findings of discrimination in federally assisted schools under the CRRRA definition of "program or activity", and includes examples demonstrating why the CRRRA was "urgently" needed. *See* S. Rep. No. 100-64, at 11-16.

The proposed regulatory change described in the previous paragraph would address an issue recently raised by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in *Cureton v. NCAA*, 198 F.3d 107, 115-16 (1999) (*Cureton*). That court determined that, because the Department did not amend its Title VI regulation after the enactment of the CRRRA, application of the Department's Title VI regulation to disparate impact discrimination claims is "program specific" (*i.e.*, limited to specific programs in an institution affected by the Federal funds), rather than institution-wide (*i.e.*, applicable to all of the operations of the institution regardless of the use of the Federal funds). In the court's view, the regulations should clarify the application of the broad institutional coverage to disparate impact claims, because the disparate impact analysis appears in regulation, and not in a statute. We disagree with the *Cureton* decision for the reasons described in