

only some incidental and minimal amount of hydrotreatment of feeds (e.g., the second stage of a two-staged ISOCRACKING unit) are not listed hazardous wastes. As explained above, the scope of the hazardous waste listings for K171 and K172 includes spent catalysts removed from a reactor that performs a hydrotreating or hydrorefining function, including a spent catalyst from any dual purpose reactor designed and operated to hydrotreat or hydrorefine petroleum feedstock, as well as hydrocrack the feed in the same reactor. The scope of the listing is not limited to the specific units named above or in the background document to this notice, or to units with specific brand names.

The catalyst recyclers also commented that, when EPA promulgated the final hazardous waste listings for spent catalysts, EPA designated the listings as "specific source" listings, or "K" listings. The recyclers suggested that the Agency amend the listings by combining both listings into one "F," or non-specific source listing. In its comments, the catalyst recycling industry also encouraged EPA to undertake a listing investigation to determine whether or not spent hydrocracking catalysts should be listed as hazardous waste. The commenter points out that data previously collected by the Agency may support such a hazardous waste listing.

The issue regarding the designation of a "specific source" listing versus "non-specific source" listing (i.e., a "F-listing" versus a "K-listing") is addressed above. The request regarding a listing determination for spent hydrocracking catalyst is beyond the scope of today's notice.

### *C. Comments Related to Encouraging Recycling*

Commenters representing petroleum refineries argued that EPA should promulgate a conditional exemption from the hazardous waste listings for spent hydrotreating catalysts and spent hydrorefining catalysts that are recycled. Commenters argued that a conditional exemption from the hazardous waste listing would encourage more recycling of spent catalysts.

The consideration of a conditional exemption from the hazardous waste listing for spent catalysts that are recycled is beyond the scope of today's notice. A commenter representing the petroleum refining industry argued that the final listing determination resulted in significant increases in the cost of recycling spent catalysts. The commenter stated, that "the predicted

result of EPA's refusal to tailor the listings was that the costs related to reclamation rose substantially (up to \$500–800/ton) after the listings took effect in early 1999, while landfilling of the listed catalysts—in compliance with Subtitle C of RCRA—became relatively more practical and economical (about \$200/ton) than reclamation." The commenter provided no additional documentation of its claim.

Information available to EPA does not support this conclusion. Available information indicates that management costs for catalyst recyclers increased only slightly as a result of the 1998 final rulemaking due to the need to manage wastes generated as a result of the reclamation process as hazardous wastes. Almost all of the catalyst reclaimers had Subtitle C storage permits prior to the 1998 final rule because many catalysts exhibit one or more of the hazardous waste characteristics and, therefore, had to be managed as hazardous wastes prior to the final listing determination. Although we do not dispute that there is a significant cost differential between the costs associated with reclamation and disposal of spent catalysts, the cost differential is not a result of the final listing determination. In addition, we do not expect a regulatory amendment changing the listing status of spent catalysts that are reclaimed or recycled to have any significant effect upon the future costs of waste management practices.

In its comments, the association representing the catalyst reclaimers did not address the issue of a conditional exemption from the hazardous waste listing for spent catalysts that are recycled. However, the association has petitioned the Agency to amend the land disposal restrictions treatment standards promulgated as part of the final listing determination to require similar treatment requirements for both spent hydrotreating catalysts and spent hydrorefining catalysts. The catalyst reclaimers argue that the difference in treatment standards for spent hydrorefining catalysts discourage recycling of these wastes and result in significant levels of hazardous constituents being land disposed.

We believe it is important to encourage recycling and reclamation of hazardous wastes, as well as the conservation of resources. It is a particularly important goal for the Agency to encourage the reclamation of hazardous wastes containing significant quantities of recoverable metals. As commenters to the July 5, 2001 notice pointed out, spent petroleum hydroprocessing catalyst can contain

recoverable quantities of vanadium and other metals. Therefore, we continue to encourage all parties to identify ways in which the recycling of spent catalysts may be encouraged.

Dated: April 30, 2002.

**Marianne Lamont Horinko,**  
*Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.*

[FR Doc. 02–11451 Filed 5–7–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## **FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

### **47 CFR Part 73**

**[DA 02–975, MM Docket No. 01–128, RM–10133]**

### **Digital Television Broadcast Service; Charleston, SC**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission, at the request of WCSC, Inc., licensee of WCSC-TV, NTSC channel 5, substitutes DTV channel 47 for DTV channel 52 at Charleston. See 66 FR 34400, June 28, 2001. DTV channel 47 can be allotted to Charleston, South Carolina, in compliance with the principle community coverage requirements of Section 73.625(a) at reference coordinates 32–55–28 N. and 79–41–58 W. with a power of 1000, HAAT of 597 meters and with a DTV service population of 851 thousand.

With is action, this proceeding is terminated.

**DATES:** Effective June 17, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Pam Blumenthal, Media Bureau, (202) 418–1600.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's Report and Order, MM Docket No. 01–128, adopted April 26, 2002, and released May 2, 2002. The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW, Room CY–A257, Washington, DC. This document may also be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Qualex International, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW, CY–B402, Washington, DC, 20554, telephone 202–863–2893, facsimile 202–863–2898, or via e-mail [qualexint@aol.com](mailto:qualexint@aol.com).

**List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73**

Television, Digital television broadcasting.

Part 73 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

**47 CFR PART 73—[AMENDED]**

1. The authority citation for Part 73 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 47 U.S.C. 154, 303, 334 and 336.

**§ 73.622 [Amended]**

2. Section 73.622(b), the Table of Digital Television Allotments under South Carolina, is amended by removing DTV channel 52 and adding DTV channel 47 at Charleston.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Barbara A. Kreisman,**

*Chief, Video Division, Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 02–11389 Filed 5–7–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Federal Railroad Administration****49 CFR Part 214**

[Docket No. FRA–2001–10426]

RIN 2130–AA48

**Railroad Workplace Safety; Correction**

**AGENCY:** Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), (DOT).

**ACTION:** Interim final rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** In the **Federal Register** of Tuesday, January 15, 2002, (67 FR 1903), the FRA published an interim final rule prohibiting the use of body belts as permissible components of personal fall arrest systems and making technical changes. In the **Federal Register** of Tuesday, March 12, 2002, (67 FR 11055), the FRA published a correction to the interim final rule. Sections 214.105(b)(14) and 214.117(a) were incorrectly modified. This document corrects those modifications.

**DATES:** Effective on May 8, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Gordon A. Davids, Bridge Engineer, Office of Safety, FRA, 1120 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20590, Telephone: (202) 493–6320; or Cynthia Walters, Trial Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, 1120 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20590, Telephone: (202) 493–6027.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the **Federal Register** of January 15, 2002, (67 FR 1903), in an interim final rule, FRA incorrectly modified §§ 214.105(b)(14) and 214.117(a). In the **Federal Register** of March 12, 2002, (67 FR 11055), FRA published a correction to the interim final rule. Sections 214.105(b)(14) and 214.117(a) were incorrectly modified. This document corrects those modifications. In rule FR Doc. 02–723 published on January 15, 2002 (67 FR 1903), amend the following sections.

**§ 214.105 [Corrected]**

1. On page 1907, in the second column, in § 214.105, correct paragraph (b)(14) to read as follows:

(b)(14) Dee-rings and snap-hooks shall be capable of sustaining a minimum tensile load of 3,600 pounds without cracking, breaking, or taking permanent deformation.

**§ 214.117 [Corrected]**

2. On page 1908, in the second column, in § 214.117, correct paragraph (a) to read as follows:

(a) Railroad bridge workers shall be provided and shall wear eye and face protection equipment when potential eye or face injury may result from physical, chemical, or radiant agents.

Dated: May 2, 2002.

**S. Mark Lindsey,**

*Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration.*

[FR Doc. 02–11489 Filed 5–7–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–06–U**