

The RMA also claimed that even if HCB is present in emissions from some mixing processes, EPA's calculation of total HCB emissions from the source category were overestimated. They provided revised calculation assumptions and procedures for determining the total amount of HCB emitted.

D. What Did We Learn During the Review of HCB Emissions From Tire Manufacturing and Subsequent Emission Testing?

To address the questions concerning the validity of the 1994 testing data, the RMA, in the interest of its member tire manufacturers, offered to retest the emissions from mixing processes using rubber Compound No. 3. The RMA proposed to conduct a test of a larger rubber compound mixer and a larger batch of the original compound formulation under conditions very similar to those used in the testing conducted in 1994. The RMA then developed the testing protocol for our review, conducted the test under our observation, and submitted the findings of the tests for our review and discussion. We found the test protocol and the manner in which the test was conducted to be acceptable for the purpose of determining the presence of HCB. The test was also structured to determine the quantity of HCB in the event that HCB was detected. The analytical procedure had a lab quantitation limit which was an order of magnitude better than the limit for the procedure used in 1994.

The new testing and analysis of air samples have indicated to our satisfaction that HCB is not present in the compounding of rubber as previously reported. The data showed that HCB is not emitted from rubber Compound No. 3 (the original and only suspect compound). As a result of this new test information, the improved method quantitation limit, and the probable contamination of the original sample, we have concluded that the previous rubber compound mixing test results should be rejected. In addition, the emission factors (estimated based on the mixing test of 1994) for tire calendaring and extruding processes are invalid since these were extrapolated from the 1994 mixing test data.

Today's document only changes our findings with respect to HCB emissions from tire manufacturing sources as identified in Table 1 of the April 10, 1998 notice, and their percent contribution as provided in Table 2 of the notice. We are notifying the public that the HCB emission information associated with the tire manufacturing

source category, specifically the 0.435 tons per year, should be 0.0 tons per year. We are also advising the public that the two remaining source categories, chlorinated solvent production and pesticide manufacture, therefore, comprise 100 percent of the contribution of HCB.

II. Administrative Requirements

Today's document is not a rule, it imposes no regulatory requirements or costs on any sources, including small businesses. Therefore, the requirements of Executive Order 13045 (Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risk and Safety Risks), Executive Order 13084 (Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments), Executive Order 13132 (Federalism), the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act, and the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act do not apply to today's notice. Also, this notice does not contain any information collection requirements and, therefore, is not subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735), October 4, 1993, the Agency must determine whether a regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to OMB review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines "significant" regulatory action as one that is likely to result in a rule that may either:

- (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities;
- (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;
- (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs, or the rights and obligation of recipients thereof; or
- (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

It has been determined that this regulatory action is not a "significant regulatory action" under the terms of Executive Order 12866 and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

Dated: July 27, 2000.

Robert Perciasepe,

Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 00-19680 Filed 8-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[CO-001-0040; FRL-6844-2]

Adequacy Status of Submitted State Implementation Plans for Transportation Conformity Purposes

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of adequacy determination.

SUMMARY: In this document, EPA is notifying the public that we have found that the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the following submitted Colorado maintenance plans are adequate for conformity purposes: The Denver carbon monoxide maintenance plan, the Pagosa Springs PM₁₀ maintenance plan, and the Telluride PM₁₀ maintenance plan, all submitted on May 10, 2000. On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for conformity determinations until EPA has affirmatively found them adequate. As a result of our finding, the Denver Regional Council of Governments, the Colorado Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation are required to use the motor vehicle emissions budgets from these submitted maintenance plans for future conformity determinations.

DATES: This document is effective August 18, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Megan Williams, Air & Radiation Program (8P-AR), United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466, ph. (303) 312-6431 The letter documenting our finding is available at EPA's conformity website: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/transp/conform/adequacy.htm>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region 8 sent a letter to the Colorado Air Pollution Control Division on July 12, 2000 stating that the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the submitted Denver carbon monoxide maintenance plan, Pagosa Springs PM₁₀ maintenance plan, and Telluride PM₁₀ maintenance plan are adequate. This finding has also been announced on EPA's conformity website: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/transp/conform/adequacy.htm>.

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to SIPs and establishes

the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which we determine whether a SIP's motor vehicle emission budgets are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review, and it also should not be used to prejudice EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved, and vice versa.

We've described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in guidance (May 14, 1999 memo titled "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision"). We followed this guidance in making our adequacy determination.

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

Dated: July 26, 2000.

Jack McGraw,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.

[FR Doc. 00-19683 Filed 8-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6844-4]

Underground Injection Control Program; Hazardous Waste Injection Restrictions; Petition for Exemption—Class I Hazardous Waste Injection; Amoco Petroleum Products

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of final decision on no migration petition reissuance.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that an exemption to the land disposal restrictions under the 1984 Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act has been granted to Amoco Petroleum Products (Amoco) for three Class I injection wells located at Texas City, Texas. As required by 40 CFR Part 148, the company has adequately demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Environmental Protection Agency by the petition and supporting documentation that, to a reasonable degree of certainty, there will be no migration of hazardous constituents from the injection zone for as long as the waste remains hazardous. This final decision allows the

underground injection by Amoco, of the specific restricted hazardous wastes identified in the exemption, into three Class I hazardous waste injection wells Nos. WDW-80, WDW-127, and WDW-128 at the Texas City, Texas facility, until December 31, 2010, unless EPA moves to terminate the exemption under provisions of 40 CFR 148.24. As required by 40 CFR 148.22(b) and 124.10, a public notice was issued May 24, 2000. The public comment period closed on July 10, 2000. No comments were received. This decision constitutes final Agency action and there is no Administrative appeal.

DATES: This action is effective as of July 25, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the petition and all pertinent information relating thereto are on file at the following location: Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Water Quality Protection Division, Source Water Protection Branch (6WQ-S), 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Philip Dellinger, Chief Ground Water/UIC Section, EPA—Region 6, telephone (214) 665-7165.

Jayne Fontenot,

Acting Division Director, Water Quality Protection Division (6WQ).

[FR Doc. 00-19682 Filed 8-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Farm Credit Administration Board; Special Meeting

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), of the forthcoming special meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board).

DATE AND TIME: The special meeting of the Board will be held at the offices of the Farm Credit Administration in McLean, Virginia, on August 8, 2000, from 9:00 a.m. until such time as the Board concludes its business.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeanette C. Brinkley, Acting Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, (703) 883-4009, TDD (703) 883-4444.

ADDRESSES: Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102-5090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This meeting of the Board will be open to the public (limited space available). In order to increase the accessibility to Board meetings, persons requiring assistance

should make arrangements in advance. The matters to be considered at the meeting are:

Open Session

A. Approval of Minutes

July 20, 2000 (Open and Closed).

Dated: August 1, 2000.

Jeanette C. Brinkley,

Acting Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 00-19831 Filed 8-1-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6705-01-P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Emergency Management Agency has submitted the following proposed information collection to the Office of Management and Budget for review and clearance in accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507).

Title: Hazard Mitigation Planning/State Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Type of Information Collection: Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

OMB Number: 3067-0212.

Abstract: To obtain federal grant assistance through Federal programs such as the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program or the Fire Suppression Programs, States are required to conduct an evaluation of existing natural hazards to identify beneficial hazard mitigation measures. Plans must be updated and submitted for FEMA approval after a major disaster or emergency declaration before a State can request and receive Federal Financial assistance.

Affected Public: State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Respondents: 16 States.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 1.6 responses per State.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 4,160 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasions.

Comments: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed information collection to the Desk Officer for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget,