

taken herein does not express or imply any viewpoint on the question of whether there are legal deficiencies in this or any Ohio Clean Air Act program resulting from the effect of the audit privilege and immunity law. As a consequence of the review process, the regulations subject to the action taken herein may be disapproved, federal approval for the Clean Air Act program under which they are implemented may be withdrawn, or other appropriate action may be taken, as necessary.

H. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major" rule as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

I. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by August 9, 1999. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: May 20, 1999.

Francis X. Lyons,

Regional Administrator, Region 5.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, part 52, chapter I, and part 81 subpart c of title 40 of the Code of

Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

2. Section 52.1870 is amended by adding (c)(119) and (c)(120) to read as follows:

§ 52.1870 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(119) On September 21, 1998, Ohio submitted revisions to its Permit to Operate rules as a revision to the State implementation plan.

(i) Incorporation by reference

(A) Ohio Administrative Code 3745–35–02, adopted April 4, 1994, effective April 20, 1994.

(120) On January 3, 1999, Ohio submitted, as a State implementation plan revision, de minimus exemption provisions for its permitting rules.

(i) Incorporation by reference

(A) Ohio Administrative Code 3745–15–05, adopted April 4, 1994, effective April 20, 1994.

[FR Doc. 99–14052 Filed 6–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 011–0146; FRL–6353–1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, South Coast Air Quality Management District, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District, and Bay Area Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing limited approvals of revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) proposed in the **Federal Register** on March 18, 1999. This final action will incorporate these rules into the federally approved SIP. The intended effect of finalizing this action is to regulate emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). The rules control the

sulfur content of fuels within the South Coast Air Quality Management District and the Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District, emissions of sulfuric acid mist within the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District and emissions of sulfur dioxide in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Thus, EPA is finalizing a limited approval under CAA provisions regarding EPA action on SIP submittals and general rulemaking authority because these revisions, while strengthening the SIP, also do not fully meet the CAA provisions regarding plan submissions. There will be no sanctions clock as South Coast Air Quality Management District, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District, and Bay Area Air Quality Management District are in attainment for SO₂.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action is effective on July 8, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the rule revisions and EPA's evaluation report for each rule are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule revisions are also available for inspection at the following locations:

Rulemaking Office, (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), 401 "M" Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109–7714.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1990 E. Gettysburg Ave., Fresno, CA 93726.

Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District, 525 South Foothill Dr., Yreka, CA 96097

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 21865 E. Copley Dr., Diamond Bar, CA 91765–4182.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stanley Tong, Rulemaking Office, (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, Telephone: (415) 744–1191.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Applicability

The rules being approved into the California SIP include: South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 431.2, Sulfur Content of Liquid Fuels, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) Rule 4802, Sulfuric Acid Mist, Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District (SCAPCD) Rule 4.14, Sulfur Content of Fuels and Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Regulation 9 Rule 1, Sulfur Dioxide. SCAQMD Rule 431.2 and SCAPCD Rule 4.14 were submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to EPA on December 31, 1990, BAAQMD Regulation 9 Rule 1 was submitted by CARB to EPA on September 14, 1992, and SJVUAPCD Rule 4802 was submitted by CARB to EPA on November 18, 1993.

II. Background

On March 18, 1999 in 64 FR 13379, EPA proposed granting limited approval of the following rules into the California SIP: SCAQMD Rule 431.2, SJVUAPCD Rule 4802, SCAPCD Rule 4.14, and BAAQMD Regulation 9 Rule 1. SCAQMD Rule 431.2 was adopted by SCAQMD on May 4, 1990 and SCAPCD Rule 4.14 was adopted by SCAPCD on July 11, 1989. These rules were submitted by the CARB to EPA on December 31, 1990. SJVUAPCD Rule 4802 was adopted by SJVUAPCD on December 17, 1992 and was submitted by the CARB to EPA on November 18, 1993. BAAQMD Regulation 9 Rule 1 was adopted on May 20, 1992 and was submitted by the CARB to EPA on September 14, 1992. A detailed discussion of the proposed action for each of the above rules is provided in the proposed rule¹ (PR).

EPA has evaluated all of the above rules for consistency with the requirements of the CAA and EPA regulations and EPA's interpretation of these requirements as expressed in the various EPA policy guidance documents referenced in the PR. EPA is finalizing the limited approval of these rules in order to strengthen the SIP. The PR identified the following rule deficiencies which should be corrected.

SCAQMD's Rule 431.2 should be corrected to remove Executive Officer discretion in approving alternate test methods. EPA also recommends that a reference to a CARB specification for motor vehicle diesel fuel be updated.

SJVUAPCD's Rule 4802 should be corrected to incorporate recordkeeping

requirements. EPA also recommends correction of a typographical error found in the rule.

SCAPCD's Rule 4.14 should be corrected to incorporate recordkeeping requirements and test methods to determine compliance.

BAAQMD's Regulation 9 Rule 1 should be corrected to incorporate recordkeeping requirements, update the ground level sulfur dioxide limits and to update a cited test method which has been deleted.

SCAQMD, SJVUAPCD and SCAPCD should also include information on the length of time records are to be retained. A detailed discussion of the rule provisions and evaluations has been provided in the PR and in technical support documents (TSDs) available at EPA's Region IX office (TSD dated 2/12/99 for SCAQMD Rule 431.2 and TSD dated 2/19/99 for SJVUAPCD Rule 4802, SCAPCD Rule 4.14 and BAAQMD Regulation 9 Rule 1.)

III. Response to Public Comments

A 30-day public comment period was provided in 64 FR 13379. EPA received one comment letter on the PR from the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The comment has been evaluated by EPA and EPA's response is set forth below.

Comment: SCAQMD indicated that staff will address EPA's comments and consider the suggestions for strengthening the rule.

Response: EPA will work with SCAQMD in response to EPA's comments.

IV. EPA Action

EPA is finalizing a limited approval of the above-referenced rules. The limited approval of these rules is being finalized under section 110(k)(3) in light of EPA's authority pursuant to section 301(a) to adopt regulations necessary to further air quality by strengthening the SIP. The approval is limited in the sense that the rules strengthen the SIP. However, the rules do not meet the section 182(a)(2)(A) CAA requirement because of the rule deficiencies which were discussed in the PR. Thus, in order to strengthen the SIP, EPA is granting limited approval of these rules under sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the CAA. This action approves the rules into the SIP as federally enforceable rules.

As stated in the proposed rule, there is no sanctions clock as SCAQMD, SJVUAPCD, SCAPCD, and BAAQMD are in attainment for SO₂. It should be noted that the rules covered by this FR have been adopted by the SCAQMD, SJVUAPCD, SCAPCD, and BAAQMD and are currently in effect in those

districts. EPA's limited approval action will not prevent SCAQMD, SJVUAPCD, SCAPCD, BAAQMD or EPA from enforcing these rules.

V. Administrative Requirements**A. Executive Order 12866**

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order (E.O.) 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review.

B. Executive Order 12875

Under Executive Order 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute and that creates a mandate upon a State, local or tribal government, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by those governments, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies with consulting, Executive Order 12875 requires EPA to provide to the Office of Management and Budget a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected State, local and tribal governments, the nature of their concerns, copies of any written communications from the governments, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 12875 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected officials and other representatives of State, local and tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory proposals containing significant unfunded mandates." Today's rule does not create a mandate on State, local or tribal governments. The rule does not impose any enforceable duties on these entities. Accordingly, the requirements of section 1(a) of E.O. 12875 do not apply to this rule.

C. Executive Order 13045

Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), applies to any rule that: (1) is determined to be "economically significant" as defined under E.O. 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives

¹ The proposed rule was published on March 18, 1999 in 64 FR 13379.

considered by the Agency. This rule is not subject to E.O. 13045 because it does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

D. Executive Order 13084

Under Executive Order 13084, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute, that significantly or uniquely affects the communities of Indian tribal governments, and that imposes substantial direct compliance costs on those communities, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by the tribal governments, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to provide to the Office of Management and Budget, in a separately identified section of the preamble to the rule, a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected tribal governments, a summary of the nature of their concerns, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected officials and other representatives of Indian tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory policies on matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities." Today's rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of E.O. 13084 do not apply to this rule.

E. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements 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 not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions. This final rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant

economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co., v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255-66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

F. Unfunded Mandates

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

G. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major" rule as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

H. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by August 9, 1999. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

Note: Incorporation by reference of the State Implementation Plan for the State of California was approved by the Director of the **Federal Register** on July 1, 1982.

Laura K. Yoshii,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart F—California

2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(182)(i)(A)(5) and (c)(182)(i)(G), (c)(189)(i)(C)(2), and (c)(194)(i)(C)(3) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *
(182) * * *
(i) * * *
(A) * * *

(5) Rule 431.2, amended on May 4, 1990.

* * * * *

(G) Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District.

(I) Rule 4.14, adopted on July 11, 1989.

* * * * *

(189) * * *
(i) * * *
(C) * * *

(2) Regulation 9 Rule 1, amended on May 20, 1992.

* * * * *

(194) * * *
(i) * * *
(C) * * *

(3) Rule 4802, adopted on May 21, 1992, and amended on December 17, 1992.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 99-14222 Filed 6-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P