

E. Information From Subcategory B/D Facilities on Number of Operating Days per Week

EPA is requesting information from Subcategory B/D facilities concerning the number of days per week of operation at these facilities (does the facility operate five days per week or seven days per week.) The Agency needs this information in order to perform accurate compliance cost estimates and economic impact analyses. Subcategory B/D facilities should supply this information as well as facilities whose hours of operation have changed since 1990.

F. Proposed Exclusion for Organic Chemicals, Plastics, and Synthetic Fibers (OCPSF) Manufacturers of Bulk Pharmaceutical Intermediates and Active Ingredients With Less Than 50% Pharmaceutical Wastewater

EPA requests comment on the exclusion of organic chemical manufacturers covered by the OCPSF regulation (40 CFR 414) that manufacture pharmaceutical intermediates and active ingredients from the final pharmaceutical regulation provided that the pharmaceutical portion of the process wastewater is less than 50 percent of the total process wastewater. The Agency believes it may not be necessary to cover the pharmaceutical wastewater at these facilities because most of the pollutants that would be controlled by pharmaceutical limitations and standards are already being controlled by the OCPSF limitations and standards. The pollutants found in pharmaceutical facility discharges and not specifically regulated such as some of the water soluble organics by the OCPSF regulations are either not present in wastewaters being discharged from the type of pharmaceutical operations occurring at these facilities or are well treated by the biological treatment systems found at these facilities or their POTWs. The Agency emphasizes that any process wastewater covered by such an exclusion must be covered by OCPSF effluent limitations guidelines and standards. EPA requests comments concerning such an exclusion and any information regarding the bases that EPA has suggested to justify an exclusion for these facilities.

G. Wastewater From Pilot Plant Operations

EPA has received a number of comments on its proposal to consider wastewater from pilot plant operations as production wastewater and not as subcategory E (Research) wastewater.

The Agency solicits comments specifically from facilities that will experience difficulty with having to treat pilot plant wastewater with their normal production wastewater. EPA is specifically interested in learning details of the problems that might be encountered in complying with the proposal definition of pilot plant wastewater.

H. Basis for Determining Which Cyanide Standards Apply

EPA has developed two sets of cyanide limitations and standards based on hydrogen peroxide oxidation and alkaline chlorination technologies. The Agency is requesting suggestions from commenters concerning what parameter levels describing cyanide wastestreams should be used to determine which standards are appropriate. Individual commenters have suggested that cyanide wastestreams with high organic content as evidenced by high COD and TOC (total organic carbon) would be more appropriately controlled by standards based on alkaline chlorination. EPA invites information and comments concerning the parameters and levels which could determine which set of standards will be appropriate for individual facilities.

Dated: August 1, 1997.

Robert Perciasepe,

Assistant Administrator for Water.

[FR Doc. 97-20979 Filed 8-7-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 721

[OPPTS-50620C; FRL-5735-3]

RIN 2070-AB27

Butanamide, 2,2'-[3',dichloro[1,1'-biphenyl]-4,4'-diyl]bisazobis N-2,3-dihydro-2-oxo-1H-benzimidazol-5-yl)-3-oxo-; Proposed Significant New Use Rule; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: EPA is extending the comment period for the proposed significant new use rule (SNUR) for butanamide, 2,2'-[3',dichloro[1,1'-biphenyl]-4,4'-diyl]bisazobis N-2,3-dihydro-2-oxo-1H-benzimidazol-5-yl)-3-oxo-. As initially published in the **Federal Register** of June 26, 1997 (62 FR 34424) (FRL-5723-4), the comments were to be received on or before July 28,

1997. One commenter requested additional time to research and submit comments. EPA is therefore extending the comment period 30 days in order to give all interested persons the opportunity to comment fully.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to EPA by August 27, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Each comment must bear the appropriate docket control number OPPTS-50620B. All comments should be sent in triplicate to: OPPT Document Control Officer (7407), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Rm. G-099, East Tower, Washington, DC 20460.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: oppt-ncic@epamail.epa.gov. Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by (OPPTS-50620B). No confidential business information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail. Electronic comment on this document may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

All comments which are claimed confidential must be clearly marked as such. Three additional sanitized copies of any comments containing CBI must also be submitted. Nonconfidential versions of comments on the proposed rule will be placed in the rulemaking record and will be available for public inspection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Susan B. Hazen, Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E-543B, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, telephone: (202) 554-1404, TDD: (202) 554-0551; e-mail: TSCA-Hotline@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This extension of the comment period will allow interested parties who intend to comment on the proposed rule additional time to consider their response.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 721

Environmental protection, Chemicals, Hazardous materials, Recordkeeping and reporting requirements.

Dated: August 1, 1997.

Ward Penberthy,

*Acting Director, Chemical Control Division,
Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics.*

[FR Doc. 97-20981 Filed 8-7-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

49 CFR Part 213

[FRA Docket No. RST-90-1, Notice No. 6]

RIN 2130-AA75

Track Safety Standards

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking; date and location of public hearing.

SUMMARY: By notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) published on July 3, 1997 (62 FR 36138), FRA proposed a rule to revise the Federal track safety standards. In that notice, FRA announced that it would soon schedule a public hearing to allow interested parties the opportunity to comment on issues addressed in the NPRM.

DATES: *Public Hearings:* The date of the public hearing is Thursday, September 4, 1997 at 9:00 a.m. in Washington, D.C. Any person wishing to participate in the public hearing should notify the Docket Clerk by telephone (202-632-3198) or by mail at the address provided below at least five working days prior to the date of the hearing and submit three copies of the oral statement that he or she intends to make at the hearing. The notification should identify who the person represents and the particular subject(s) the person plans to address. The notification should also provide the Docket Clerk with the participant's mailing address. FRA reserves the right to limit participation in the hearings of persons who fail to provide such notification.

ADDRESSES: (1) *Docket Clerk:* Written notification should identify the docket number and must be submitted in triplicate to the Docket Clerk, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, RCC-10, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Mail Stop 10, Washington, D.C. 20590.

(2) *Public Hearings:* The hearing will be held in Room 2230 of U.S. Department of Transportation headquarters, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Allison H. MacDowell, Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance, Federal Railroad Administration, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Mail Stop 25, Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone number: 202-632-3344), or Nancy Lummen Lewis, Esq., Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Mail Stop 10, Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone: 202-632-3174).

S. Mark Lindsey,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 97-21011 Filed 8-7-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

49 CFR Part 234

[FRA Docket No. RSGC-6; Notice No. 4]

RIN 2130-AA92

Selection and Installation of Grade Crossing Warning Systems; Termination of Rulemaking

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Termination of rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice terminates rulemaking action in FRA Docket No. FSGC-6. In its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), FRA proposed to prohibit railroads from unilaterally selecting and installing highway-rail grade crossing warning systems at public highway-rail crossings. FRA also proposed to require that railroads furnish state highway authorities with information necessary for state grade crossing project planning and prioritization purposes. Termination of this rulemaking is based on public comments and FRA's determination that railroad safety will not be best served by issuance of such a regulation at this time.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Bruce F. George, Director, Highway-Rail Crossing and Trespasser Programs Division, Office of Safety, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone 202-632-3305), or Mark Tessler, Trial Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone 202-632-3171).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 2, 1995, FRA published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 11649) an NPRM which was meant to clarify the respective responsibilities of railroads and state and local governments regarding the

selection and installation of highway-rail grade crossing warning systems. Public hearings were held on the proposal on June 6 and 7, 1995. The public comment period closed on June 14, 1995. However, FRA continued to receive comments and to date has received in excess of 3,000 comments in this rulemaking. All comments have been considered by FRA, including those received after June 14, 1995, in accord with FRA's policy to consider late filed comments to the extent possible. A wide range of views were expressed in the public hearings and in written comments submitted to the public docket. A high proportion of the comments were form letters and preprinted postcards expressing opposition to the proposal.

Subsequent to issuance of the NPRM, a school bus stopped at a highway-rail grade crossing in Fox River Grove, Illinois, was struck by a commuter train. Seven students died. Following the accident the Secretary of Transportation established a Grade Crossing Safety Task Force (Task Force) to build upon the Department's 1994 Rail-Highway Crossing Safety Action Plan. The Task Force reported its findings to the Secretary on March 1, 1996. The Executive Summary of the report stated in part:

[T]he report recommends 24 specific follow-on actions to address both physical and procedural deficiencies. In practice, the responsibility for public grade crossings resides with State and local governments, railroads, and transit agencies. Recognizing the constrained budgets that are available to the private sector and State and local authorities, the report emphasizes rethinking existing practices—not requiring new ones from a regulatory approach. This reliance on existing opportunities is emphasized by recommendations that encourage grade crossing safety through coordinated inspections, law enforcement, and driver education.

As the Task Force Report states, "[t]his * * * report should not be viewed as a surrogate for the Action Plan, but as a supplement which focuses on the planning, construction, maintenance, operation, and inspection activities involving rail crossings. The Task Force directed its attention to those grade crossing issues for which there were no well-defined standards, practices, or information. It was in these five problem areas outside the scope of the Action Plan, that the Task Force felt additional improvements in grade crossing safety could be made."

FRA is continuing its implementation of the Action Plan's recommendations while at the same time it works to ensure that the recommendations of the Safety Task Force are carried out.