

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

**§ 71.1 [Amended]**

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9], Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 31, 2001, and effective September 16, 2001, is amended as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

*Paragraph 6005 Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**AGL MI E5 Lapeer, MI [Revised]**

Dupont-Lapeer Airport, MI  
(Lat. 43°04'00"N., long. 83°16'20"W.)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6.4-mile radius of the Dupont-Lapeer Airport.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on April 22, 2002.

**Nancy B. Shelton,**

*Manager, Air Traffic Division, Great Lakes Region.*

[FR Doc. 02–13216 Filed 5–24–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–M**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

[MD132 & MD133–3087b; FRL–7210–2]

**Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Maryland; Revised Definitions and Recordkeeping Provisions**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA proposes to approve State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Maryland. The revisions adopt by reference the EPA definition of volatile organic compounds (VOC), update the Federal citation of the prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) requirements references in Maryland's definitions and general emission standards provisions, and revise the general records and information requirements for installations and sources. In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving these revisions to the State of Maryland's SIP as a direct final rule in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act. If EPA receives no

adverse comments on the direct final rule, EPA will not take further action. If EPA receives adverse comments on the direct final rule, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will address all public comments 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 June 27, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to Harold A. Frankford, Office of Air Programs, Mailcode 3AP20, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103; and the Maryland Department of the Environment, 2500 Broening Highway, Baltimore, Maryland, 21224.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Harold A. Frankford at (215) 814–2108, or by e-mail at [frankford.harold@epa.gov](mailto:frankford.harold@epa.gov). Please note that while questions may be posed via telephone and e-mail, formal comments must be submitted in writing, as indicated in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For further information, please see the information provided in the direct final action, with the same title, that is located in the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register** publication. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of the direct final rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the direct final rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the direct final rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

Dated: May 1, 2002.

**Thomas C. Voltaggio,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.*

[FR Doc. 02–13111 Filed 5–24–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 268**

[FRL–7217–3]

**Land Disposal Restrictions: Site-Specific Treatment Variance to Chemical Waste Management, Inc.**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency) is today proposing to grant a site-specific treatment variance from the Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) treatment standards for two selenium-bearing hazardous wastes. EPA is proposing to grant this variance because: the chemical properties of these two wastes differ significantly from the waste used to establish the current LDR standard for selenium (5.7 mg/L, as measured by the TCLP); and Chemical Waste Management, Inc. (CWM) has adequately demonstrated that the two wastes cannot be treated to meet this treatment standard.

CWM intends to stabilize the wastes at their Kettleman City, California facility. If this proposal is finalized, CWM may treat these two specific wastes to alternate treatment standards of 51 mg/L, as measured by the TCLP, for the Owens-Brockway waste and 25 mg/L, as measured by the TCLP, for the St. Gobain waste. After treatment to these alternative selenium standards, CWM may dispose of the treated wastes in a RCRA Subtitle C landfill provided they meet the applicable LDR treatment standards for the other hazardous constituents in the wastes. We are proposing to grant this variance for three years.

In the "Rules and Regulations" section of the **Federal Register**, we are publishing a direct final rule that would grant this site-specific treatment variance without prior proposal because we view this action as noncontroversial and we anticipate no significant adverse comment. We have explained our reasons for this approach in the preamble to the direct final rule. If we receive significant adverse comment on the direct final rule, however, we will withdraw the direct final action and the treatment variance will not take effect. We will address all public comments, as appropriate, based on this proposed rule. We will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this proposed variance must do so at this time.