

Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)). A determination has been made that such decisions are categorically excluded from the NEPA process (516 DM 8.4.A).

#### *Paperwork Reduction Act*

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

#### *Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Department of the Interior has determined 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.*). The State submittal which is the subject of this rule is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously promulgated by OSM will be implemented by the State. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart Federal regulations.

#### *Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act*

This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804(2), the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. This rule:

- a. Does not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million.
- b. Will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, federal, state, or local government agencies, or geographic regions.
- c. Does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S. based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises.

This determination is based upon the fact that the State submittal which is the

subject of this rule is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

#### *Unfunded Mandates*

This rule will not impose a cost of \$100 million or more in any given year on any governmental entity or the private sector.

#### **List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 943**

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: August 10, 2001.

**Malcolm Ahrens,**

*Acting Regional Director, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center.*

[FR Doc. 01-23504 Filed 9-19-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-05-P**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

### **40 CFR Part 52**

**[CA246-0286; FRL-7058-4]**

### **Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the South Coast Air Quality Management District portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern recordkeeping requirements as well as volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from spray coating operations, metal parts and products coating operations, coating and ink manufacturing, surfactant manufacturing, and polyester resin operations. We are proposing to approve local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

**DATES:** Any comments must arrive by October 22, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail comments to Andrew 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; and,

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 21865 East Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 744-1185.

#### **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 rule revisions?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action.
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
  - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. EPA recommendations to further improve the rules.
  - D. Public comment and final action.
- III. Background Information.
  - 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 addressed by this proposal with the dates that they were adopted by the SCAQMD and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

**TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES**

Local agency	Rule #	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SCAQMD .....	109	Record Keeping for Volatile .....	11/17/00	3/14/01
		Organic Compound Emissions .....		
SCAQMD .....	481	Spray Coating Operations .....	11/17/00	3/14/01
SCAQMD .....	1107	Coating of Metal Parts & Products .....	11/17/00	3/14/01
SCAQMD .....	1141.1	Coating and Ink Manufacturing .....	11/17/00	3/14/01
SCAQMD .....	1141.2	Surfactant Manufacturing .....	11/17/00	3/14/01
SCAQMD .....	1162	Polyester Resin Operations .....	11/17/00	3/14/01

On May 25, 2001, EPA found these rule submittals met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V. These criteria must be met before formal EPA review may begin.

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

We approved versions of the following rules into the SIP on the dates listed: Rule 109, April 13, 1995; Rule 481, January 21, 1981; Rule 1107, August 19, 1999; Rule 1141.1, May 4, 1999; Rule 1141.2, January 15, 1987; and, Rule 1162, August 25, 1994. Between these SIP incorporations and today, CARB has made no intervening submittals of these rules.

#### *C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rule Revisions?*

The submitted rule revisions amend the record keeping requirements allowing monthly recordkeeping when sources use coatings that comply with their relevant SCAQMD Regulation XI rule. In some cases, this allowance for monthly recordkeeping is related to an exemption based on monthly coating use rather than daily coating use. Sources subject to daily use or VOC limits in any applicable SCAQMD rule may not use a monthly recordkeeping option. SCAQMD made other minor rule changes such as adding new definitions to Rule 109, deleting definitions from the subject rules if they are defined in Rule 102—Definitions, and deleting obsolete exemptions. The TSD for each rule explains its revisions in more detail.

## 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 SCAQMD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so these rules 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** Document," (Blue Book), notice of

availability published in the May 25, 1988 **Federal Register**.

3. "Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources Volume VI: Surface Coating of Miscellaneous Metal Parts and Products," USEPA, June 1978, EPA-450/2-78-015.

#### *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. SCAQMD did several studies to examine the probable effects of changing the recordkeeping threshold from a daily to a monthly threshold. These studies looked at the overall effects and rule specific effects of changing the recordkeeping requirements. The concern was whether or not a facility would change its daily activities and resulting emission patterns when allowed an option for a monthly recordkeeping regime as opposed to a daily requirement. From the results, it appeared that average daily usage did not change under either recordkeeping regime. Regarding rule specific emission increases, SCAQMD found that there would be little or no change to overall or daily VOC emissions for the subject rules. For further information, the TSD for each rule reviews the emissions analysis specific to that rule.

#### *C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules*

The TSDs for Rules 1107 and 1162 describe additional rule revisions concerning capture and control efficiency test methods that do not affect EPA's current action but are recommended for the next time the local agency modifies the rules.

#### *D. Public Comment and Final Action*

Because EPA believes the submitted rules fulfill all relevant requirements, we are proposing to fully approve them as described in section 110(k)(3) of the Act. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal for the next 30 days. Unless we receive convincing new information during the comment period, we intend to publish a final approval action that will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP.

## III. Background Information

#### *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. 101-549, 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposes to approve 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 Clean Air Act. This proposed 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 Clean Air 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 Clean Air 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 proposed 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 proposed 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.*).

#### 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 27, 2001.

**Sally Seymour,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 01-23478 Filed 9-19-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[Docket #OR-00-002b; FRL-7045-1]

#### Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes: Oregon

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposes to approve the revisions to Oregon's State Implementation Plan which were submitted on November 20, 2000. These revisions consist of the 1996 carbon monoxide periodic year emissions inventory for Klamath Falls, Oregon and the Klamath Falls carbon monoxide maintenance plan. EPA also proposes to approve Oregon's request for redesignation of Klamath Falls from nonattainment to attainment for carbon monoxide.

In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. If no adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated.

If the EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received in writing by October 22, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to Connie Robinson, Office of Air Quality (OAQ-107), at the EPA Regional Office listed below.

Copies of the State's request and other information supporting this action are available for inspection during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA, Office of Air Quality (OAQ-107), 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101, and State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality,

811 SW Sixth Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204-1390.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Connie Robinson, Office of Air Quality (OAQ-107), EPA, Seattle, Washington, (206) 553-1086.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information, see the Direct Final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 21, 2001.

**Charles E. Findley,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.*

[FR Doc. 01-23219 Filed 9-19-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 62

[CA-035-MSWb; FRL-7058-6]

#### Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: California

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve a revision to the California State Plan for implementing the emissions guidelines applicable to existing municipal solid waste landfills. The revision to the State Plan was submitted by the California Air Resources Board for the State of California to satisfy requirements of section 111(d) of the Federal Clean Air Act. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates that it will not receive any significant, material, and adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no significant, material, and adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action.

**DATES:** Comments must be received in writing by October 22, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne