maintenance of pH above 3, and filtration will remove any particles which are formed.

Testing of the waste's effects on well components indicated that the well components exposed to the waste will not deteriorate as a result of contact.

B. *Model Demonstration of No Migration*—The grant of an exemption from the land disposal restrictions imposed by the HSWA of RCRA is based on a demonstration that disposed wastes will not migrate out of the waste management unit, which is defined in the background section of the final notice of the decision to grant BPCI an exemption from the HSWA, for a period of 10,000 years. The no migration demonstration is made through use of computer simulations which use geological information collected at the site or which is found to be appropriate for the site and mathematical models which have been proven to be capable of simulating natural responses to injection. The simulator is calibrated by matching simulator results against observations at the site.

In 1992, BPCI used the SWIFT II simulator to locate the greatest lateral extent of movement by the waste plume, defined at the 0.01 concentration level, due to advective flow during the wells' operational lives. The result, 14,325 feet, was multiplied by 1.2 to 17,190 feet in order to ensure that the plume would be bounded. Additional movement of waste constituents at hazardous levels was determined by calculating the extent of natural groundwater movement, including dispersion, and movement of hazardous molecules for the 10,000 year post operating period. The worst case for movement was determined by comparing the starting concentration and health-based limits for each constituent and calculating the reduction factor needed to bring the original concentration to the health-based limit. The greatest reduction factor was for acrylamide and the total distance of travel from the wells' centroid required to reduce the concentration of acrylamide to its health-based limit was 28,580 feet. This estimate does not take into account either adsorption of acrylamide to lithic materials or chemical transformations which might reduce the level of hazard associated with the wastes. The lateral extent of migration was shown to be significantly less than distances to features which might allow discharge of hazardous waste constituents into USDWs.

The limit of vertical movement was determined by a similar process. Although evidence exists that no waste has migrated upward beyond the lowermost Eau Claire just above 2,800 feet, it was assumed that it may have reached 2,640 feet and that depth was used as a starting point to calculate the distance to the health-based limit accounting for molecular diffusion through 10,000 years. This exercise found that the mobility and concentration of hydrogen cyanide in the waste stream make it the most conservative molecule to use in estimating the maximum vertical limits for the hazardous-waste plume. The depth at which the assumed maximum concentration of hydrogen cyanide would be reduced to its health-based limit was decreased from 2,484 (1992) feet to 2,456 (1994) feet due to an adjustment in the maximum concentration of hydrogen cyanide permitted in the injectate from 8,000 to 5,300 ppm. This adjustment was made because of a reduction in the health-based limit from 0.7 to 0.02 ppm. This vertical plume was contained with the waste management unit defined for BPCI's four injection wells. Therefore, the Agency accepted the demonstration and granted an exemption in 1992.

A modification of an existing exemption to allow injection of additional hazardous waste constituents must show that the waste constituents denoted by the codes for which the modification is requested behave similarly to those constituents for which the original demonstration of no migration was made. In this case, the new constituents are mostly organic molecules which are generally similar to those for which the original exemption was granted. The waste here proposed for exemption is similar to that currently exempted from land disposal restrictions although the concentrations of constituents in the injectate will be affected by the combination of waste streams. The plume boundary defined laterally by acrylamide and vertically by hydrogen cyanide in the exemption already granted will not be affected by the waste streams proposed for this modification. Accordingly, U.S. EPA proposes to grant the modification to the exemption as requested.

III. Conditions of Petition Approval

The existing exemption was granted with conditions. All of the original conditions remain in force. No new conditions are attached to this modification to the exemption.

Dated: July 10, 1995.

Richard J. Zdanowicz,

Acting Director, Water Division, Region 5, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

[FR Doc. 95–18118 Filed 7–21–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[FRL–5263–2]

Public Meeting on Drinking Water Paperwork Burden Reduction

Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is holding a public meeting to solicit ideas on reducing the ''paperwork'' burden associated with the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWR) and the Public Water System Supervision Program, on August 14, 1995, from 12:00 pm to 5:00 pm at the Washington Information Center (WIC), in Conference Room 17. The WIC is located on the mall level of the Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, Washington, DC, 20460.

The Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water has held a number of public meetings over the past few months to solicit ideas, suggestions and options for proceeding with or modifying various aspects of the drinking water program. The public meeting announced today is being held to solicit ideas, suggestions, and options for reducing the current ''paperwork'' burden placed on public water systems and State primacy agencies as a result of the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations.

In general, ''paperwork'' burden is any workload or cost associated with providing EPA or the State Primacy agency with data, information, or reports that are required by the federal regulations. This includes not only the burden associated with reporting the information but any burden associated with obtaining or collecting that information if it is not already available. For example, 40 CFR 141.31(a) requires public water systems to ''report to the State the results of any test measurement or analysis required by this part'' (40 CFR 141). The paperwork burden associated with reporting these results to the State includes the cost and burden of collection and analyses, as well as that of reporting. Likewise, the paperwork burden created by 40 CFR 142.15(a)(1), which requires States to report ''new violations by public water systems'' to EPA, includes the cost to the State of collecting the analytical information and calculating compliance as well as reporting non-compliance results to EPA. Paperwork burden does not, however, include the costs or burdens associated with installation of any treatment necessary to remedy non-compliance.

Other public meetings that have already been held have addressed some aspects of paperwork burden reduction. For example, there has been a public meeting to solicit ideas on EPA's current