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. This action does not involve or impose any requirements that affect Indian Tribes. 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 March 1, 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, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compound.

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.

Dated: December 4, 1998.

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 paragraph (c)(254)(i)(G)(*1*) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(254) * * *

(i) * * *

(G) Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

(*1*) Rule 431, adopted on December 17, 1997.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 98–34552 Filed 12–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA–207–0088; FRL; 6211–2]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action on a revision to the California State Implementation Plan. This action is an administrative change that revises three administrative rules in the Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District (AVAPCD or District). The intended effect of approving this action is to federally recognize the newly established AVAPCD and to notify the public that the AVAPCD has assumed all air pollution control responsibilities from the South Coast Air Quality Management District in the Los Angeles County portion of the Mojave Desert Air Basin effective July 1, 1997.

DATES: This action is effective on March 1, 1999 unless adverse or critical comments are received by February 1, 1999. If EPA receives such comments,

then it will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public that this rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the rule revisions and EPA's evaluation report are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule revisions are 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, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460

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

Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District, 315 West Pondera Street, Suite C, Lancaster, CA 93539–1409

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cynthia G. Allen, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, Telephone (415–744–1189).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Applicability

The rules being approved into the California SIP are: AVAPCD Rule 101, Title, Rule 102, Definition of Terms, and Rule 103, Definition of Geographical Areas, submitted on March 10, 1998, by the California Air Resources Board.

II. Background

Portions of the South Coast Air Basin are currently nonattainment for ozone, particulate matter, and other national ambient air quality standards (40 CFR 81.305). As a result, the South Coast AQMD has submitted and EPA has approved many rules to fulfill the requirements for nonattainment areas described in section 110 and elsewhere in the Clean Air Act.

The AVAPCD assumed all air pollution control responsibilities from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) in the Los Angeles County portion of the Mojave Desert Air Basin (previously in a portion of the former Southeast Desert Air Basin) effective July 1, 1997. The AVAPCD adopted the SCAQMD Rulebook on July 1, 1997 when it assumed the air pollution control responsibilities from SCAQMD in the Antelope Valley. The amendments reflect Antelope Valley's air quality designation and classification.

This document addresses EPA's direct-final action for the following AVAPCD rules: Rule 101, Title; Rule 102, Definition of Terms; and Rule 103, Definition of Geographical Areas. The amendments to Rules 101 and 102 remove references to the SCAQMD and Executive Officer, and provide certain cross-references in the AVAPCD Rule Book. These rules were adopted by AVAPCD on August 19, 1997 and September 16, 1997, and submitted by the State of California for incorporation into its SIP on March 10, 1998. These rules were found to be complete on May 21, 1998, pursuant to EPA's completeness criteria that are set forth in 40 CFR part 51, Appendix V[1] and is being finalized for approval into the SIP. These rules were originally adopted as part of efforts to achieve the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone and in response to EPA's SIP-Call and the section 182(a)(2)(A) CAA requirement. The following is EPA's evaluation and final action for these rules.

III. EPA Evaluation and Action

In determining the approvability of a rule, EPA must evaluate the rule for consistency with the requirements of the CAA and EPA regulations, as found in section 110 and part D of the CAA and 40 CFR part 51 (Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans). The EPA interpretation of these requirements appears in various EPA policy guidance documents.[2]

EPA has previously reviewed many rules from AVAPCD's predecessor agency, SCAQMD, and incorporated them into the federally approved SIP for SCAQMD pursuant to section 110(k)(3) of the CAA. The AVAPCD recognizes that all SIP revisions submitted by its predecessor agency SCAQMD and approved by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) prior to July 1, 1997, remain in effect and are fully enforceable in the AVAPCD jurisdiction until USEPA approves SIP revisions submitted by AVAPCD to supersede them.

In a Resolution dated July 1, 1997, the AVAPCD Board affirms that the Rules and Regulations of the SCAQMD will be effective in the AVAPCD until AVAPCD adopts rules and regulations that supercede them.

EPA has evaluated the submitted rules and has determined that they are consistent with the CAA, EPA regulations, and EPA policy. Therefore, AVAPCD Rule 101, Title; Rule 102, Definition of Terms; and Rule 103, Definition of Geographical Areas, are being approved under section 110(k)(3) of the CAA as meeting the requirements of section 110(a) and part D.

EPA is publishing this rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. However, in the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register** publication, EPA is publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve the SIP revision should relevant adverse comments be filed. This rule will be effective March 1, 1999 without further notice unless the Agency receives relevant adverse comments by February 1, 1999.

If the EPA receives such comments, then EPA will publish a document withdrawing the final rule and informing the public that the rule will not take effect. All public comments received will then be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on the rule. Any parties interested in commenting on the rule should do so at this time. If no such comments are received, the public is advised that this rule will be effective on March 1, 1999, and no further action will be taken on the proposed rule.

IV. Administrative Requirements

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

Under E.O. 12875, 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. If the mandate is unfunded, EPA must provide to the Office of Management and Budget a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of

---

[1] EPA adopted the completeness criteria on February 16, 1990 (55 FR 5830) and, pursuant to section (110)(k)(1) of the CAA, revised the criteria on August 26, 1991 (56 FR 42216).

[2] Among other things, the pre-amendment guidance consists of those portions of the proposed post-1987 ozone and carbon monoxide policy that concern RACT, 52 FR 45044 (November 24, 1987). ''Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviation, Clarification to Appendix D of November 24, 1987 **Federal Register** Notice'' (Blue Book) (notice of availability was published in the **Federal Register** on May 25, 1988); and the existing control technique guidelines (CTGs).

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 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 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 E.O. 13084, EPA 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, EPA 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 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 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. This action does not involve or impose any requirements that affect Indian Tribes. 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 March 1, 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, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

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.

Date: December 4, 1998.

Laura Yoshii,

Acting Regional Administrator, EPA, Region IX.

Part 52, chapter I, title of 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)(254)(i)(E) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(254) * * *

(i) * * *

(E) Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District.

(*1*) Resolution No. 97–01 dated July 1, 1997.

(*2*) Rules 101 and 102 amended on August 19, 1997 and Rule 103 amended on September 16, 1997.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 98–34698 Filed 12–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 141 and 143

[WH–FRL–6212–4]

RIN 2040–AC77

Withdrawal of the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Analytical Methods for Regulated Drinking Water Contaminants; Direct Final Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Withdrawal of direct final rule.

SUMMARY: Because EPA received adverse comments, we are withdrawing the direct final rule entitled ''National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Analytical Methods for Regulated Drinking Water Contaminants''. We published the direct final rule on September 3, 1998 (63 FR 47097–47114). We stated in the direct final rule that if we received adverse comment by November 2, 1998, we would publish a timely notice of withdrawal in the **Federal Register**. We subsequently received adverse comments on the direct final rule. We will address those comments in a subsequent final action based on the parallel proposal also published on September 3, 1998 (63 FR 47115). We will not institute a second comment period on this action.

DATES: As of December 31, 1998, EPA withdraws the direct final rule published at 63 FR 47097–47114 on September 3, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jitendra Saxena, Ph.D., Standards and Risk Management Division, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (MC–4607), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 260–9579.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA published the analytical methods direct final and companion proposed rule on September 3, 1998. The rule proposed the use of 93 analytical methods for measurement of chemical and microbiological contaminants in drinking water; of these 43 are updated versions of American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), Standard Methods for Examination of Water and Wastewater (Standard Methods or SM) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) methods, and 50 are ASTM and SM methods with minor editorial or nomenclature changes. EPA proposed to withdraw earlier versions of the EPA methods but earlier versions of ASTM and SM would continue to be approved. The rule also provided for corrections of method citations and minor correction or clarification changes to current regulations. Additional methods for monitoring secondary drinking water contaminants were recommended.

The companion proposed rule (63 FR 47115) section of the September 3, 1998, package invited comment on the substance of the direct final rule and stated that if adverse comments were received by November 2, 1998, the rule would not become effective and a notice would be published in the **Federal Register** to withdraw the direct final rule before the January 4, 1999, effective date. The EPA subsequently received adverse comments on the final rule.

List of Subjects

40 CFR Part 141

Environmental protection, Analytical methods, Chemicals, Incorporation by reference, Indians—lands, Intergovernmental relations, Radiation protection, Reporting and record keeping requirements, Water supply.

40 CFR Part 143

Environmental protection, Analytical methods, Chemicals, Incorporation by reference, Indians—lands, Water supply.

Dated: December 22, 1998.

Carol M. Browner,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 98–34421 Filed 12–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 622

[Docket No. 980804203–8406–01; I.D. 122298A]

RIN 0648–AK97

Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Bag Limit Reduction

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Emergency interim rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This emergency interim rule reduces the daily bag limit for red snapper possessed in or from the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of the Gulf of Mexico from five fish to four fish. The intended effects are to avoid angler confusion and excessive fishing mortality, slow the rate of harvest, extend the recreational fishing season, and help ensure that more of the recreational quota is available during a later period for recreational fishing. This will provide for better management, minimize the potential for significant economic losses that would occur with an earlier closure of the recreational fishery, and increase social and economic benefits derived from the available recreational quota.

DATES: This rule is effective January 1, 1999, through June 29, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this emergency interim rule must be mailed to, and copies of documents supporting this action, such as the economic analysis and environmental assessment, may be obtained from, the Southeast Regional Office, NMFS, 9721 Executive Center Drive N., St. Petersburg, FL 33702. Requests for copies of a minority report submitted by seven members of the Council and/or a minority report submitted by one member of the Council should be sent to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Suite 1000, 3018 U.S. Highway 301 North, Tampa, FL 33619, Phone: 813–228–2815; Fax: 813-225-7015.