

The OCA is expected to maintain regular contact with consumer advocacy or public interest groups that may wish to participate, either on a full or limited basis, in proceedings before the Commission. The OCA may consult with such groups and shall facilitate, through informational or logistical means, the ability of such groups to present their positions to the Commission. The OCA also shall serve as a resource to assist individuals and otherwise unrepresented entities to understand how they may best present their views to the Commission.

#### Other Responsibilities

In addition to the duty to participate in Commission proceedings, the OCA staff is expected to stay abreast of the body of published information germane to postal rate and classification matters, as well as regulatory and non-regulatory developments in related fields such as public utilities, telecommunications, and transportation. The OCA staff is expected to increase its understanding of mailer needs and postal operations by appropriate field study, including the use of surveys where appropriate. Public contacts and informational undertakings of this nature are appropriately related to the OCA's function.

#### Impact on Existing Policy Statement

The mission statement that has been developed supersedes the "Policy Guidelines for Representation of the Interests of the General Public in Commission Proceedings," which currently appears as Appendix A to 39 CFR Part 3002. Adoption of the mission statement also requires a minor conforming editorial change in 39 CFR 3002.7(c).

#### Effective Date

The Commission has determined that the mission statement shall take effect upon publication of this notice and order.

#### List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 3002

Administrative practice and procedure, Organization and functions, Postal Service.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Postal Rate Commission amends part 3002 of title 39 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

#### PART 3002—ORGANIZATION

1. The authority citation for part 3002 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 39 U.S.C. 404(b), 3603, 3622–24, 3661, 3662.

2. In § 3002.7(c) remove the phrase "policy statement" and add in its place the phrase "mission statement."

3. Revise Appendix A to part 3002 as follows:

#### Appendix A to Part 3002—Postal Rate Commission, Mission Statement of the Office of the Consumer Advocate

The mission of the Office of the Consumer Advocate is to be a vigorous, responsive, and effective advocate for reasonable and equitable treatment of the general public in proceedings before the Postal Rate Commission.

In furtherance of this mission, the Office of the Consumer Advocate will:

1. Give a strong and consistent voice to the views of consumers, especially those that are not otherwise represented in Commission proceedings;
2. Argue for equity on behalf of individuals and small businesses, both as senders and as recipients of mail and mail services;
3. Utilize all means and procedures available under the Commission's rules and applicable law to present evidence and arguments on behalf of consumers in Commission proceedings;
4. Assist in the development of a complete record on issues pending before the Commission;
5. Engage in dialogue with parties or participants in proceedings before the Commission to advance the interests of consumers;
6. Encourage the equitable settlement of issues among the parties and participants in proceedings whenever possible;
7. Promote fair competition between the United States Postal Service and its competitors for the ultimate benefit of consumers;
8. Seek out responsible advocates of consumer interests and encourage their participation in Commission cases;
9. Maintain the highest standards of competence and quality in all evidence and pleadings submitted to the Commission; and
10. Maintain separation and independence from the Commission and its advisory staff in the course of proceedings before the Commission.

Dated: July 7, 1999.

**Cyril J. Pittack,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99–17638 Filed 7–9–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[OH 125–1a; FRL–6375–4]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio

**AGENCY:** United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** USEPA is approving a June 1, 1999 request from Ohio for a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision of the Dayton/Springfield, Ohio ozone maintenance plan. The maintenance plan revision establishes a new transportation conformity mobile source emissions budget for the year 2005. We are also approving the revision of the maintenance plan which reestimates point source growth and allots a larger volatile organic compounds (VOCs) budget to the area's 2005 mobile source sector for transportation conformity purposes. This allocation will still maintain the total emissions for the area at or below the attainment level required by the transportation conformity regulations. We are also correcting a typographical error in the original maintenance plan approval.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on August 26, 1999, unless USEPA receives adverse written comments by August 11, 1999. If adverse comment is received, USEPA will publish a timely withdrawal of the rule in the **Federal Register** and inform the public that the rule will not take effect.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to: J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604. You may inspect copies of the documents relevant to this action during normal business hours at the following location: Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604. Please contact Patricia Morris at (312) 353–8656 before visiting the Region 5 office.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Patricia Morris, Environmental Scientist, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353–8656.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This Supplementary Information section is organized as follows:

What action is USEPA taking today?  
Who is affected by this action?  
How did the State support its request?  
What is transportation conformity?  
What is an emissions budget?  
What is a safety margin?  
How does this action change the Dayton/Springfield, Ohio maintenance plan?  
Why is the request approvable?

### What Action Is USEPA Taking Today?

In this action, we are approving a revision to the maintenance plan for the Dayton/Springfield, Ohio, ozone maintenance area. The Dayton/Springfield, Ohio ozone maintenance area includes the Counties of Montgomery, Clark, Greene and Miami Counties. The revision will change the mobile source emission budget that is used for transportation conformity purposes. The revision will also change the projected growth in industrial sources (point sources) from the projections in the currently approved maintenance plan. The revision will keep the projected total emissions for the area at or below the attainment level required by law. This action will allow State or local agencies to maintain air quality while providing for transportation growth and growth in point and area sources.

We are also correcting a typographical error in the original maintenance plan approval. The original **Federal Register** approval on May 5, 1995, (60 FR 22289) contained a typographical error in Table 1 showing the VOC emissions from the source categories in the Dayton/Springfield area. The 2005 VOC emissions for point and area sources are incorrect in Table 1. The correct number for point source VOC emissions in 2005 should be 98.0 and the correct number for area sources in 2005 should be 63.8 tons of VOC. These corrected numbers match the original submittal from the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) and are documented in the docket materials. This correction does not change the substance of the maintenance plan approval.

### Who Is Affected by This Action?

Primarily, the transportation sector represented by the Ohio Department of Transportation and the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (the metropolitan planning organization) will benefit from this revision. Although, the long range transportation plan for the Dayton/Springfield area projects higher emissions than currently allowed in the maintenance plan, the conformity rule provides that the maintenance plan can be revised. The Dayton/Springfield maintenance plan does not currently have a "safety margin" which can be allocated to the transportation sector. In a **Federal Register** notice (62 FR 44903) published on August 25, 1997, all of the VOC safety margin was allocated to the mobile source budget. Therefore, there is no safety margin to allocate.

Instead, the OEPA and the Regional Air Pollution Control Agency have

reestimated the projected growth from industrial sources. Current projections of industrial growth are less than the projections estimated in the approved maintenance plan. The maintenance plan and the projections in the maintenance plan were approved on May 5, 1995, in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 22289). These projections allowed for substantial growth in industrial sources. The growth in industrial sources was offset by reductions from the mobile source sector through implementation of the inspection and maintenance program and cleaner automobiles. If source growth or population growth were to increase as initially projected, the OEPA would need to offset the emissions by implementing a reduction strategy to keep the maintenance plan emissions at the air quality attainment level.

### How Did the State Support This Request?

The State provided updated emissions projections and budget numbers to support their request. On June 1, 1999, Ohio formally submitted to USEPA a SIP revision request for the Dayton/Springfield ozone maintenance area. A public hearing on this proposal was held on June 3, 1999. No one from the public commented on the proposed revisions.

In the submittal, Ohio requested to allocate 5.5 tons per day to establish a new 2005 mobile source emissions budgets for VOC for the Dayton, Ohio, ozone maintenance area. The State recalculated the stationary source growth between the years 1990 and 2005 (the last year of the maintenance plan). Stationary sources in 1990 were estimated to contribute 37.4 tons per day of VOC. In 2005 stationary sources were allowed to grow up to 98.0 (this is the corrected number) tons per day of VOC. This is a significant increase in industrial emissions over a 15 year time frame. Growth of stationary source emissions was not as large as earlier anticipated. Based on the revised projections, stationary source growth will be reduced to 92.5 tons per day which is still a significant potential increase. The State requested that 5.5 tons per day of VOC be allocated to the mobile source sector for the conformity budget. The mobile source budgets are used for transportation conformity purposes.

### What Is Transportation Conformity?

Transportation conformity means that the level of emissions from the transportation sector (cars, trucks and buses) must be consistent with the requirements in the SIP to attain and

maintain the air quality standards. The Clean Air Act, in section 176(c), requires conformity of transportation plans, programs and projects to an implementation plan's purpose of attaining and maintaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. On November 24, 1993, USEPA published a final rule establishing criteria and procedures for determining if transportation plans, programs and projects funded or approved under Title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Act conform to the SIP.

The transportation conformity rules require an ozone maintenance area, such as Dayton/Springfield, to compare the actual projected emissions from cars, trucks and buses on the highway network, to the mobile source emissions budget established by the maintenance plan. The Dayton/Springfield area has an approved maintenance plan. Our approval of the maintenance plan on May 5, 1995, established the mobile source emissions budgets for transportation conformity purposes. The transportation conformity budget was changed on August 25, 1997, when USEPA approved a revision to the maintenance plan which allocated the 2.4 tons per day VOC safety margin to the mobile source budget. At that time, the mobile source budget changed from 31.7 tons per day of VOC to 34.1 tons per day of VOC.

### What Is an Emissions Budget?

An emissions budget is the projected level of controlled emissions from the transportation sector (mobile sources) that is estimated in the SIP. The SIP controls emissions through regulations, for example, on fuels and exhaust levels for cars. The emissions budget concept is further explained in the preamble to the November 24, 1993, transportation conformity rule (58 FR 62188). The preamble also describes how to establish the mobile source emissions budget in the SIP and how to revise the emissions budget. The transportation conformity rule allows the mobile source emissions budget to be changed as long as the total level of emissions from all sources remains below the attainment level.

### What Is a Safety Margin?

A "safety margin" is the difference between the attainment level of emissions (from all sources) and the projected level of emissions (from all sources) in the maintenance plan. The attainment level of emissions is the level of emissions during one of the years in which the area met the air quality health standard. For example: the Dayton/Springfield area attained the

one hour ozone standard during the 1989–1991 time period. The State uses 1990 as the attainment level of emissions for the area. The emissions from point, area and mobile sources in 1990 equaled 131.1 tons per day of VOC. The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency projected emissions out to the year 2005 and projected a total of 131.1 tons per day of VOC. The safety margin is calculated to be the difference between these amounts or, in this case, 0 tons per day of VOC. Table 1 gives detailed information on the estimated emissions from each source category and the safety margin calculation.

The 2005 emission projections reflect the point, area and mobile source changes and reductions and are illustrated in Table 1. Please note that these numbers reflect the corrected typographical error to the point and area source 2005 numbers.

TABLE 1.—NO<sub>x</sub> AND VOC EMISSIONS BUDGET; AND SAFETY MARGIN DETERMINATIONS, STARK COUNTY  
[Tons/day]

Source category	1990	2005
VOC Emissions:		
Point .....	37.4	98.0
Mobile (on-road) .....	103.6	34.1
Biogenic .....	105.2	105.2
Area .....	54.9	63.8
Totals .....	301.1	301.1

Safety Margin = 1990 total emissions – 2005 total emissions = 0 tons/day VOC

The emissions are projected to maintain the area's air quality consistent with the air quality health standard. The safety margin credit can be allocated to the transportation sector. The total emission level, must stay below the attainment level or safety level and to be acceptable. The safety margin is the extra safety [points] that can be allocated as long as the total level is maintained.

#### How Does This Action Change the Dayton/Springfield Maintenance Plan?

It raises the budget for mobile sources and lowers the amount of expected growth in industrial source (point source) emissions. The maintenance plan is designed to provide for future growth while still maintaining the ozone air quality standard. Growth in industries, population, and traffic is offset with reductions from cleaner cars and other emission reduction programs. Through the maintenance plan the State and local agencies can manage and maintain air quality while providing for growth.

In the submittal, Ohio requested to change the projected growth of stationary source emissions and to use the difference to add 5.5 tons per day of VOC to the mobile source emissions budget. The SIP revision requests the allocation of 5.5 tons/day VOC, into the area's mobile source emissions budget. The 2005 mobile source emissions budget showing the maintenance plan changes to stationary and area sources are in Table 2. The mobile source emissions budget in Table 2 will be used for transportation conformity purposes.

Table 2 below illustrates that the requested changes can be made to the 2005 mobile source budget and that total emissions will still remain at the 1990 attainment level of total emissions for the Dayton/Springfield maintenance area. Since the area would still be at or below the 1990 attainment level for the total emissions, this allocation is allowed by the conformity rule.

TABLE 2.—MAINTENANCE PLAN CHANGES TO THE 2005 EMISSIONS BUDGET, DAYTON/SPRINGFIELD  
[Tons/day]

Source category	1990	2005
VOC Emissions:		
Point .....	37.4	92.5
Mobile (on-road) .....	103.6	39.6
Biogenic .....	105.2	105.2
Area .....	54.9	63.8
Totals .....	301.1	301.1

Remaining Safety Margin = 1990 total emissions – 2005 total emissions = 0 tons/day VOC

#### Why is the Request Approvable?

After review of the SIP revision request, USEPA finds that the requested change in the maintenance plan for the Dayton/Springfield area is approvable. The revised growth estimates for stationary sources are reasonable because the past data between 1990 and 1998 indicate a slower growth rate than in the original maintenance plan. The 5.5 tons per day allocated to mobile sources still allows sufficient growth margin for the stationary sources and maintains the total emissions for the area at the attainment year inventory level as required by the transportation conformity regulations.

#### USEPA Action

USEPA is approving the requested change to the growth estimates in the maintenance plan and the change to the mobile source budget for the Dayton/Springfield ozone maintenance area.

USEPA is publishing this action without prior proposal because USEPA views this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipates no adverse comments. However, in a separate document in this **Federal Register** publication, USEPA is proposing to approve the SIP revision should adverse written comments be filed. This action will be effective without further notice unless USEPA receives relevant adverse written comment by August 11, 1999. Should the Agency receive such comments, it will publish a final rule informing the public that this action will not take effect. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If no such comments are received, the public is advised that this action will be effective on August 26, 1999.

#### Administrative Requirements

Administrative Requirements are organized as follows:

- A. Executive Order 12866
- B. Executive Order 12875
- C. Executive Order 13045
- D. Executive Order 13084
- E. Regulatory Flexibility Act
- F. Unfunded Mandates
- G. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller
- H. Paperwork Reduction Act
- I. Executive Order 12898: Environmental Justice
- J. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
- K. Petitions for Judicial Review

#### A. Executive Order 12866

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

#### B. Executive Order 12875: Enhancing Intergovernmental Partnerships

Under E.O. 12875, USEPA 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. If the mandate is unfunded, USEPA must provide to the Office of Management and Budget a description of the extent of USEPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected state, local, and tribal governments, the nature of their concerns, copies of written communications from the governments, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, E.O. 12875 requires USEPA 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 USEPA 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 considered by the Agency. USEPA interprets E.O. 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that are based on health or safety risks, such that the analysis required under section 5-501 of the Order has the potential to influence the regulation.

This action is not subject to E.O. 13045 because it approves a state rule implementing a previously promulgated health or safety-based Federal standard, and preserves the existing level of pollution control for the affected areas.

#### D. Executive Order 13084: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

Under E.O. 13084, USEPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute, that significantly affects 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. If the mandate is unfunded, USEPA must 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 USEPA'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, E.O. 13084 requires USEPA to develop an effective

process permitting elected 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 USEPA 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, USEPA 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, USEPA 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 USEPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be

significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

USEPA 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. USEPA 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**. 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).

#### H. Paperwork Reduction Act

This action does not contain any information collection requirements which requires OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

#### I. Executive Order 12898: Environmental Justice

Under E.O. 12898 each Federal agency must make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minorities and low-income populations. Today's action (revising the emissions budgets in Ohio's maintenance plan for Stark County) does not adversely affect minorities and low-income populations because the new, more stringent 8-hour ozone standard is in effect and provides increased protection to the public, especially children and other at-risk populations.

### *J. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act*

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing new regulations. To comply with NTTAA, USEPA must consider and use "voluntary consensus standards" (VCS) if available and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

USEPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to this action. Today's action does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

### *K. 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 September 10, 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, Ozone, Nitrogen oxides, Transportation conformity.

Dated: June 29, 1999.

**Francis X. Lyons**,  
*Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

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 KK—Ohio**

2. Section 52.1885 is amended by adding paragraph (a)(12) to read as follows:

#### **§ 52.1885 Control Strategy: Ozone**

(a) \* \* \*

(12) Approval—On June 1, 1999, Ohio submitted a revision to the ozone maintenance plan for the Dayton/

Springfield area. The revision consists of revising the point source growth estimates and allocating 5.5 tons per day of VOCs to the transportation conformity mobile source emissions budget. The mobile source VOC budget for transportation conformity purposes for the Dayton/Springfield area is now: 39.6 tons per day of volatile organic compound emissions for the year 2005. The approval also corrects a typographical error in the maintenance plan point and area source numbers for 2005.

[FR Doc. 99-17491 Filed 7-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

#### **40 CFR Part 52**

[CA 192-0160 FRL-6376-4]

#### **Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule for Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District and Tehama County Air Pollution Control District**

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

**ACTION:** Withdrawal of direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** Due to an adverse comment, EPA is withdrawing the direct final rule for the approval of revisions to the California State Implementation Plan. EPA published the direct final rule on May 13, 1999 (64 FR 25822), approving revisions to rules from the following air pollution control districts: Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and Tehama County Air Pollution Control District (TCAPCD). As stated in that **Federal Register** document, if adverse or critical comments were received by June 14, 1999, the rule would not take effect and notice of withdrawal would be published in the **Federal Register**. EPA subsequently received adverse comments on that direct final rule. EPA will address the comments received in a subsequent final action in the near future. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action.

**DATES:** The direct final rule published at (64 FR 25822) is withdrawn as of July 12, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA

94105-3901, Telephone: (415) 744-1135.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** See the information provided in the direct final rule located in the final rules section of the May 13, 1999 **Federal Register**, and in the proposed rule located in the proposed rule section of the May 13, 1999 (64 FR 25854) **Federal Register**.

### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52**

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Particulate Matter.

Dated: June 29, 1999.

**Laura 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 removing paragraphs (b)(3)(ii) and (c)(6)(xv)(B).

[FR Doc. 99-17634 Filed 7-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

#### **40 CFR Parts 52 and 81**

[TN-217-1-9920a; FRL-6373-9]

#### **Implementation Plan and Redesignation Request for the Williamson County, Tennessee Lead Nonattainment Area**

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is simultaneously approving the lead state implementation plan (SIP) and redesignation request for the Williamson County, Tennessee, lead nonattainment area. Both plans, dated May 12, 1999, were submitted by the State of Tennessee for the purpose of demonstrating that the Williamson County area has attained the lead national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS).

**DATES:** This direct final rule is effective September 10, 1999 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse