

**§ 104.32 Procedure for requesting indemnification.**

(a) After being served with process or pleadings in such an action or proceeding, the employee shall within five (5) calendar days of receipt, deliver to the General Counsel all such process and pleadings or an attested true copy thereof, together with a fully detailed report of the circumstances of the incident giving rise to the court action or proceeding.

(b)(1) An employee may request indemnification to satisfy a verdict, judgment, or award entered against that employee only if the employee has timely satisfied the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section.

(2) No request for indemnification will be considered unless the employee has submitted a written request through the employee's supervisory chain to the General Counsel with:

- (i) Appropriate documentation, including copies of the verdict, judgment, appeal bond, award, or settlement proposal;
- (ii) The employee's explanation of how the employee was acting within the scope of the employee's employment; and
- (iii) The employee's statement of whether the employee has insurance or any other source of indemnification.

**Subpart E—Tort Claims**

**Authority:** 28 U.S.C. 2672; 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); 44 U.S.C. 3101; 28 CFR Part 14.

**§ 104.41 Procedure for filing claims.**

Administrative claims against the Office filed pursuant to the administrative claims provision of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2672) and the corresponding Department of Justice regulations (28 CFR Part 14) shall be filed with the General Counsel as indicated in § 104.2.

**§ 104.42 Finality of settlement or denial of claims.**

Only a decision of the Director or the General Counsel regarding settlement or denial of any claim under this subpart

may be considered final for the purpose of judicial review.

Dated: September 6, 2001.  
**Nicholas P. Godici,**  
*Acting Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Acting Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

[FR Doc. 01–22854 Filed 9–11–01; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 3510–16–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**  
**[CA 249–0290a; FRL–7045–9]**

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District and South Coast Air Quality Management District**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).  
**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from adhesives and sealants and from other solvent containing materials. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on November 13, 2001 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by October 12, 2001. If we receive such comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this rule will not take effect.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection

Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions and EPA's technical support documents (TSDs) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

- Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20460.
- California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 "I" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, 21865 E. Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Yvonne Fong, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 744–1199.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to EPA.

**Table of Contents**

- I. The State's Submittal
  - A. What rules did the State submit?
  - B. Are there other versions of these rules?
  - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rules?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
  - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. Public comment and final action.
- III. Background information.
  - A. Why were these rules submitted?
- IV. Administrative Requirements

**I. The State's Submittal**

**A. What Rules Did the State Submit?**

Table 1 lists the rules we are approving with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule #	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
BAAQMD .....	8–51	Adhesive and Sealant Products.	05/02/01	05/31/01
SCAQMD .....	443.1	Labeling of Materials Containing Organic Solvent.	12/05/86	06/09/87

On July 20, 2001, submitted Rule 8–51 was found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR Part 51 Appendix V,

which must be met before formal EPA review. Completeness was not required

for rules like 443.1 that were submitted prior to 1988.

### B. Are There Other Versions of These Rules?

We finalized a limited approval and limited disapproval of BAAQMD Rule 8–51 on November 4, 1999 (64 FR 60109). The limited approval portion of that rulemaking incorporated BAAQMD Rule 8–51 into the federally enforceable SIP and the limited disapproval portion of that rulemaking triggered sanctions and FIP clocks under sections 179(a) and 110(c) of the CAA. There are no previous versions of SCAQMD Rule 443.1 in the SIP. SCAQMD Rule 443.1 was originally proposed for approval on September 14, 1988 (53 FR 35528). Although we received no adverse comments, we are reproposing to approve the rule due to the length of time that has elapsed since our original action.

### C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rules?

The amendments to Rule 8–51 adopted by the BAAQMD on May 2, 2001 and submitted to the EPA on May 31, 2001 were intended to address deficiencies in the version of Rule 8–51 adopted on January 7, 1998. SCAQMD Rule 443.1 was adopted to institute labeling requirements for materials containing VOCs. The TSDs have more information about these rules.

## II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

### A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rules?

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (*see* section 110(a) of the Act), must require Reasonably Available

Control Technology (RACT) for major sources in nonattainment areas (*see* section 182(a)(2)(A)), and must not relax existing requirements (*see* sections 110(l) and 193). The BAAQMD and SCAQMD regulate ozone nonattainment areas (*see* 40 CFR part 81), so BAAQMD Rule 8–51 and SCAQMD Rule 443.1 must fulfill RACT.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to define specific enforceability and RACT requirements include the following:

1. Portions of the proposed post-1987 ozone and carbon monoxide policy that concern RACT, 52 FR 45044, November 24, 1987.

2. "Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations; Clarification to Appendix D of November 24, 1987 **Federal Register** Notice," (Blue Book), notice of availability published in the May 25, 1988 **Federal Register**.

3. The State of California Air Resources Board's *Determination of Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) and Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT) for Adhesives and Sealants*, December 1998.

### B. Do the Rules Meet the Evaluation Criteria?

We believe these rules are consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. The TSDs have more information on our evaluation.

### C. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving the submitted rules because we believe they fulfill all relevant requirements. We do not think anyone will object to this approval, so we are finalizing it without proposing it in advance. However, in the Proposed Rules section of this **Federal Register**, we are simultaneously proposing approval of the same submitted rules. If we receive adverse comments by October 12, 2001, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that the direct final approval will not take effect and we will address the comments in a subsequent final action based on the proposal. If we do not receive timely adverse comments, the direct final approval will be effective without further notice on November 13, 2001. This will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP and will permanently terminate all sanctions and FIP clocks associated with our November 1999 action relating to Rule 8–51.

## III. Background Information

### A. Why Were These Rules Submitted?

VOCs help produce ground-level ozone and smog, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control VOC emissions. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of these local agency VOC rules.

TABLE 2.—OZONE NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES

Date	Event
March 3, 1978 .....	EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1977. 43 FR 8964; 40 CFR 81.305.
May 26, 1988 .....	EPA notified Governors that parts of their SIPs were inadequate to attain and maintain the ozone standard and requested that they correct the deficiencies (EPA's SIP-Call). See section 110(a)(2)(H) of the pre-amended Act.
November 15, 1990 .....	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted. Pub. L. 101–540, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.
May 15, 1991 .....	Section 182(a)(2)(A) requires that ozone nonattainment areas correct deficient RACT rules by this date.

## IV. Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 32111, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and imposes no additional

requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.). Because this rule approves pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4). This rule also does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor will it have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or

on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it merely approves a state rule implementing a federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Act. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), in issuing this rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the "Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings" issued under the executive order. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. section 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**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**.

This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. section 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by November 13, 2001. 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, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: August 3, 2001.

**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 adding paragraphs (c)(173)(i)(F) and (c)(282) to read as follows:

##### § 52.220 Identification of plan.

(c) \* \* \*  
(173) \* \* \*  
(i) \* \* \*

(F) South Coast Air Quality Management District.

(1) Rule 443.1, adopted on December 5, 1986.

\* \* \* \* \*

(282) New and amended regulations for the following APCDs were submitted on May 31, 2001, by the Governor's designee.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

(1) Rule 8–51, adopted on May 2, 2001.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 01–22736 Filed 9–11–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 180

[OPP–301163; FRL–6798–2]

RIN 2070–AB70

### Bromoxynil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes a time-limited tolerance for residues of bromoxynil in or on timothy, hay and timothy, forage. This action is in response to EPA's granting of an emergency exemption under section 18 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) authorizing use of the pesticide on timothy. This regulation establishes a maximum permissible level for residues of bromoxynil in these commodities. These tolerances will expire and are revoked on June 30, 2003.

**DATES:** This regulation is effective September 12, 2001. Objections and requests for hearings, identified by docket control number OPP–301163, must be received by EPA on or before November 13, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Written objections and hearing requests may be submitted by mail, in person, or by courier. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit VII. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, your objections and hearing requests must identify docket control number OPP–301163 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** By mail: Barbara Madden, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 305–6463; and e-mail address: madden.barbara@epa.gov.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. General Information

##### A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected categories and entities may include, but are not limited to: