

## I. Why is EPA issuing this proposed rule?

This action proposes to issue both a site-specific treatment variance to U.S. Ecology Nevada (USEN) located in Beatty, Nevada and withdraw an existing site-specific treatment variance issued to Chemical Waste Management, Inc. (CWM) located in Kettleman Hills, California. This proposal pertains to the treatment of a hazardous waste generated by the Owens-Brockway Glass Container Company in Vernon, California that is unable to meet the concentration-based treatment standard for selenium established under the Land Disposal Restrictions program. The site-specific treatment variance proposed to be issued to USEN would provide an alternative treatment standard of 59 mg/L for selenium as measured by the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure. EPA has determined that the treatment performed by USEN provides the best demonstrated treatment available for this waste by reducing the amount of selenium potentially released to the environment, while minimizing the total volume of hazardous waste land disposed.

In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, we have also published a direct final rule granting a site-specific treatment variance to USEN and withdrawing the site-specific treatment variance previously granted to CWM for this same waste. We are issuing a direct final rule for this action because we view this as noncontroversial and anticipate no adverse comment. We have explained our reasons for this in the preamble to the direct final rule.

If we receive no adverse comment, we will not take further action on this proposed rule and the direct final rule will become effective as provided in that action. If we do receive adverse comment, we will publish a timely notice in the **Federal Register** withdrawing the direct final rule and it will not take effect. We will address all public comments in any subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. We do not intend to institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. For further information about commenting on this rule, see the **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

## II. Does this action apply to me?

This proposal applies only to U. S. Ecology Nevada located in Beatty, Nevada and Chemical Waste Management located in Kettleman Hills, California.

## III. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?

1. *Submitting CBI.* Do not submit this information to EPA through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or e-mail. Clearly mark the part or all of the information that you claim to be CBI. For CBI information in a disk or CD ROM that you mail to EPA, mark the outside of the disk or CD ROM as CBI and then identify electronically within the disk or CD ROM the specific information that is claimed as CBI. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with the procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2.

2. *Tips for Preparing Your Comments.* When submitting comments, remember to:

- Identify the rulemaking by docket number and other identifying information (subject heading, **Federal Register** date and page number).
- Follow directions—The agency may ask you to respond to specific questions or organize comments by referencing a Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part or section number.
- Explain why you agree or disagree, suggest alternatives, and substitute language for your requested changes.
- Describe any assumptions and provide any technical information and/or data that you used.
- If you estimate potential costs or burdens, explain how you arrived at your estimate in sufficient detail to allow for it to be reproduced.
- Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns, and suggest alternatives.
- Explain your views as clearly as possible.
- Make sure to submit your comments by the comment period deadline identified.

### *Direct Final Rule Location of Regulatory Text for This Proposal*

The regulatory text for this proposal is identical to that for the direct final rule published in the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**. For further supplemental information, the detailed rationale for the proposal, and the regulatory revisions, see the information provided in the direct final rule published in the Rules and Regulations section of today's **Federal Register**.

### *Statutory and Executive Order Reviews*

For a complete discussion of all the administrative requirements applicable to this action, see the direct final rule in the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**.

### *Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to the notice and comment rulemaking requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This site-specific treatment variance, as proposed, does not create any new requirements. Rather, it proposes an alternative treatment standard for a specific waste that applies to only one facility, USEN and proposes to withdraw an existing site-specific treatment variance for the same waste at CWM in Kettleman Hills, California. Therefore, we hereby certify that this action, as proposed would not add any new regulatory requirements to small entities. This proposal rule, therefore, does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 268**

Environmental Protection, Hazardous Waste, Variances.

Dated: March 31, 2011.

### **Mathy Stanislaus,**

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

[FR Doc. 2011–8180 Filed 4–5–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

### **40 CFR Part 271**

[EPA–R06–RCRA–2010–0307; FRL–9290–9]

### **Oklahoma: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The State of Oklahoma 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 the State of Oklahoma. 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 receive 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 May 6, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Alima Patterson, Region 6, Regional Authorization Coordinator, (6PD-O), Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, at the address shown below. You can examine copies of the materials submitted by the State of Oklahoma during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, phone number (214) 665-8533; or Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, 707 North Robinson, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73101-1677, (405) 702-7180. Comments may also be submitted electronically or through hand delivery/courier; please follow the detailed instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section of the immediate final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alima Patterson (214) 665-8533.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

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

Dated: March 19, 2011.

**Al Armendariz,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 6.*

[FR Doc. 2011-8172 Filed 4-5-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-05-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Federal Emergency Management Agency**

**44 CFR Part 67**

[Docket ID FEMA-2011-0002; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1187]

**Proposed Flood Elevation Determinations**

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** Comments are requested on the proposed Base (1% annual-chance) Flood Elevations (BFEs) and proposed BFE modifications for the communities listed in the table below. The purpose of this proposed rule is to seek general information and comment regarding the proposed regulatory flood elevations for the reach described by the downstream and upstream locations in the table below. The BFEs and modified BFEs are a part of the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of having in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). In addition, these elevations, once finalized, will be used by insurance agents and others to calculate appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings and the contents in those buildings.

**DATES:** Comments are to be submitted on or before July 5, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** The corresponding preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the proposed BFEs for each community is available for inspection at the community's map repository. The respective addresses are listed in the table below.

You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. FEMA-B-1187, to Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-4064, or (e-mail) [luis.rodriquez1@dhs.gov](mailto:luis.rodriquez1@dhs.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-4064, or (e-mail) [luis.rodriquez1@dhs.gov](mailto:luis.rodriquez1@dhs.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Federal Emergency Management Agency

(FEMA) proposes to make determinations of BFEs and modified BFEs for each community listed below, in accordance with section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and 44 CFR 67.4(a).

These proposed BFEs and modified BFEs, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities. These proposed elevations are used to meet the floodplain management requirements of the NFIP and also are used to calculate the appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings built after these elevations are made final, and for the contents in those buildings.

Comments on any aspect of the Flood Insurance Study and FIRM, other than the proposed BFEs, will be considered. A letter acknowledging receipt of any comments will not be sent.

*National Environmental Policy Act.* This proposed rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR part 10, Environmental Consideration. An environmental impact assessment has not been prepared.

*Regulatory Flexibility Act.* As flood elevation determinations are not within the scope of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601-612, a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required.

*Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review.* This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under the criteria of section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, as amended.

*Executive Order 13132, Federalism.* This proposed rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

*Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform.* This proposed rule meets the applicable standards of Executive Order 12988.

**List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 67**

Administrative practice and procedure, Flood insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, 44 CFR part 67 is proposed to be amended as follows:

**PART 67—[AMENDED]**

1. The authority citation for part 67 continues to read as follows: