

personnel from the IRS and Treasury Department participated in their development.

List of Subjects in 26 CFR Part 1

Income taxes, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Adoption of Amendments to the Regulations

Accordingly, 26 CFR part 1 is amended as follows:

PART 1—INCOME TAXES

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

Authority: 26 U.S.C. 7805 * * *

Par. 2. Section 1.401(b)–1 is amended by:

1. Revising paragraphs (b)(3), (c), and (d)(1)(iv).
2. Adding paragraph (d)(1)(v).

The addition and revisions read as follows:

§ 1.401(b)–1 Certain retroactive changes in plan.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) A plan provision designated by the Commissioner, at the Commissioner's discretion, as a disqualifying provision that either—

- (i) Results in the failure of the plan to satisfy the qualification requirements of the Internal Revenue Code by reason of a change in those requirements; or
- (ii) Is integral to a qualification requirement of the Internal Revenue Code that has been changed.

(c) *Special rules applicable to disqualifying provisions*—(1) *Absence of plan provision.* For purposes of paragraphs (b)(2) and (3) of this section, a disqualifying provision includes the absence from a plan of a provision required by, or, if applicable, integral to the applicable change to the qualification requirements of the Internal Revenue Code, if the plan was in effect on the date the change became effective with respect to the plan.

(2) *Method of designating disqualifying provisions.* The Commissioner may designate a plan provision as a disqualifying provision pursuant to paragraph (b)(3) of this section only in revenue rulings, notices, and other guidance published in the Internal Revenue Bulletin. See § 601.601(d)(2) of this chapter.

(3) *Authority to impose limitations.* In the case of a provision that has been designated as a disqualifying provision by the Commissioner pursuant to paragraph (b)(3) of this section, the Commissioner may impose limits and provide additional rules regarding the amendments that may be made with

respect to that disqualifying provision during the remedial amendment period. The Commissioner may provide guidance in revenue rulings, notices, and other guidance published in the Internal Revenue Bulletin. See § 601.601(d)(2) of this chapter.

(d) * * *

(1) * * *

(iv) In the case of a disqualifying provision described in paragraph (b)(3)(i) of this section, the date on which the change effected by an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code became effective with respect to the plan; or

(v) In the case of a disqualifying provision described in paragraph (b)(3)(ii) of this section, the first day on which the plan was operated in accordance with such provision, as amended, unless another time is specified by the Commissioner in revenue rulings, notices, and other guidance published in the Internal Revenue Bulletin. See § 601.601(d)(2) of this chapter.

§ 1.401(b)–1T [Removed]

Par. 3. Section 1.401(b)–1T is removed.

John M. Dalrymple,

Acting Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Approved: January 19, 2000.

Jonathan Talisman,

Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

[FR Doc. 00–1893 Filed 2–3–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–4

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA236–0204; FRL–6528–5]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revisions concern Rule 207 (Review of New or Modified Sources) from the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD), which is being revised to add an emission offsets exemption for pollution control projects that are mandated by District, state, or federal regulation. This approval action will incorporate the

revised rule into the federally approved SIP. The intended effect of approving this rule is to regulate emissions from stationary sources of air pollution subject to District new source review (NSR) regulation in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). EPA is finalizing the approval of these revisions into the California SIP under provisions of the CAA regarding EPA action on SIP submittals, SIPs for national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards and plan requirements for nonattainment areas.

DATES: This rule is effective on April 4, 2000 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by March 6, 2000. If EPA receives such comment, it will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public that this rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Written comments must be submitted to Roger Kohn at the Region IX office listed below. Copies of the rule revision and EPA's Technical Support Document (TSD) with the Agency's evaluation of the rule are available for public inspection at EPA's Region 9 office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule revisions are also available for inspection at the following locations:

Permits Office (AIR–3), Air Division,
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne
Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

California Air Resources Board,
Stationary Source Division, Rule
Evaluation Section, 2020 “L” Street,
Sacramento, CA 95812.

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution
Control District, 24580 Silver Cloud
Court, Monterey, CA 93940.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Roger Kohn, Permits Office (AIR–3), Air
Division, U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne
Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901,
Telephone: (415) 744–1238, E-mail:
kohn.roger@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Applicability

The rule being approved into the California SIP is MBUAPCD Rule 207, Review of New or Modified Sources.

II. Background

The CAA requires States to observe certain procedural requirements in developing implementation plans and plan revisions for submission to EPA. Section 110(a)(2) and section 110(l) of the Act provide that each

implementation plan or revision to an implementation plan submitted by a State must be adopted after reasonable notice and public hearing. Section 172(c)(7) of the Act provides that plan provisions for nonattainment areas shall meet the applicable provisions of section 110(a)(2).

The rule was adopted by the District Board of Directors on September 15, 1999. The rule was subsequently submitted to EPA by the California Air Resources Board to EPA as a proposed revision to the California SIP on October 29, 1999.

III. EPA Evaluation and Action

MBUAPCD submitted Rule 207 for adoption into the applicable SIP. This rule is intended to replace the existing SIP rule of the same number and title. MBUAPCD's most recent submittal of Rule 207 contains the following changes from the current SIP:

- A new provision has been added that provides an exemption from the offset provisions of the rule for projects in which an emission increase results from the installation of control equipment pursuant to District, state, or federal regulations.
- The rule has been modified to require an opportunity for public comment on projects using the new exemption.

EPA has evaluated the submitted rule and has determined that it is consistent with the CAA, EPA regulations, and EPA policy. In correspondence with the District, EPA informed MBUAPCD that this rule change would be an acceptable SIP revision, provided that the District made a commitment to revise its Maintenance Plan if new air quality data indicates that the District has violated or may violate the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). This correspondence, along with the rule adoption resolution in which the MBUAPCD board of directors makes this commitment, can be found in the docket for this rulemaking. Therefore, MBUAPCD Rule 207 is being approved under section 110(k)(3) of the CAA as meeting the requirements of section 110(a) and parts C and D.

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

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

B. Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132, Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes

and replaces Executive Orders 12612, Federalism and 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership. Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that 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." Under Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This final rule will not 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. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order 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 Executive Order 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 Executive Order 13045 because it does not involve

decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

D. Executive Order 13084

Under Executive Order 13084, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, 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. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 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**. 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. 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 a new regulation. To comply with NTTAA, EPA 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.

The EPA 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.

I. 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 April 4, 2000. 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.

Dated: January 7, 2000.

Felicia Marcus,

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 (270)(i)(B) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

(i) * * *

(270) * * *

(i) * * *

(B) Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 207, amended on September 15, 1999.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 00-2183 Filed 2-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL-6532-7]

National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), as amended, requires that the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP") include a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. The National Priorities List ("NPL") constitutes this list. The NPL is intended primarily to guide the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "the Agency") in determining which sites warrant further investigation to assess the nature and extent of public health and environmental risks associated with the site and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate. This rule adds 10 new sites to the NPL; all to the General Superfund Section of the NPL.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date for this amendment to the NCP March 6, 2000.

ADDRESSES: For addresses for the Headquarters and Regional dockets, as well as further details on what these dockets contain, see Section II, "Availability of Information to the Public" in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** portion of this preamble.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yolanda Singer, phone (703) 603-8835, State, Tribal and Site Identification Center, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (mail code 5204G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Ariel Rios Building; 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW; Washington, DC 20460, or the Superfund Hotline, phone (800)