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).

*C. 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 costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the 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 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.

*D. 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 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).

*E. 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 October 13, 1998. 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: July 30, 1998.

**Patricia D. Hull,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.*

40 CFR part 52 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 TT—Utah

2. Section 52.2320 is amended by adding paragraph (c) (40) to read as follows:

**§ 52.2320 Identification of plan.**

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(40) The Governor of Utah submitted revisions to the Utah State Implementation Plan to revise Utah's definition of a volatile organic compound (VOC) and to include nonsubstantive wording changes regarding VOC emissions from air strippers and soil venting operations. The revisions to the VOC definition, found in UACR R307–1–1, were submitted by the Governor on November 8, 1995, February 12, 1996, November 20, 1996, May 15, 1997, and June 10, 1998. The revisions submitted November 8, 1995, February 12, 1996, November 20, 1996, and May 15, 1997, deleted volatile methyl siloxanes, parachlorobenzotrifluoride (PCBTF), acetone, perchloroethylene (PERC), HFC 43–10mee, HCFC 225ca and HCFC 225cb from the definition of VOCs. The June 10, 1998 submittal incorporated the deletion of 16 more pollutants from the federal list that were determined to have a negligible contribution to tropospheric ozone formation; the compounds are: HFC–32, HFC–161, HFC–236fa, HFC–245ca, HFC–245ea, HFC–245eb, HFC–245fa, HFC–236ea, HFC–365mfc, HCFC–31, HCFC–123a, HCFC–151a, $C_4F_9OCH_3$, $(CF_3)_2CFCF_2OCH_3$, $C_4F_9OC_2H_5$, and $(CF_3)_2CFCF_2OC_2H_5$ (compound names only are listed here, refer to 62 FR 44901, August 25, 1997 for the chemical name and 62 FR 44903, August 25, 1997 for the complete list of exempted VOCs). A second February 12, 1996 Governor's submittal contained minor wording revisions which were made to UACR R307–6–1 regarding VOC emissions from air strippers and soil venting operations. The revision submitted November 20, 1996 also repealed UACR R307–14–8 which had addressed requirements for perchloroethylene dry cleaning plants located in ozone nonattainment and maintenance areas.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) UACR R307–1–1, a portion of Forward and Definitions, definition of VOC, as adopted by the Utah Air Quality Board on January 7, 1998, effective January 8, 1998.

(B) UACR R307–6, a portion of *De minimis* Emissions from Air Strippers and Soil Venting Projects, nonsubstantive wording changes, effective October 1, 1995.

[FR Doc. 98–21748 Filed 8–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

**[CA 037–0080; FRL–6142–1]**

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, South Coast Air Quality Management District

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is finalizing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) proposed in the **Federal Register** on April 30, 1998. This final action will incorporate this rule into the federally approved SIP. The intended effect of finalizing this action is to regulate emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of sulfur ($SO_X$) in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). The rule controls VOC and $SO_X$ emissions from petroleum refinery vacuum-producing devices or systems. Thus, EPA is finalizing a simultaneous limited approval and limited disapproval under CAA provisions regarding EPA action on SIP submittals and general rulemaking authority because the rule, while strengthening the SIP, also does not fully meet the CAA provisions regarding plan submissions and requirements for nonattainment areas. As a result of this limited disapproval EPA will be required to impose highway funding or emission offset sanctions under the CAA unless the State submits and EPA approves corrections to the identified deficiencies within 18 months of the effective date of this disapproval. Moreover, EPA will be required to promulgate a Federal implementation plan (FIP) unless the deficiencies are corrected within 24 months of the effective date of this disapproval.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This action is effective on September 14, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the rule and EPA's evaluation report for the rule are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule 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, DC 20460

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

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 21865 E. Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765–4182.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stanley Tong, Rulemaking Office, (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, Telephone: (415) 744–1191.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## I. Applicability

The rule being approved into the California SIP is: South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), Rule 465, Vacuum-Producing Devices or Systems. This rule was submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to EPA on June 19, 1992.

## II. Background

On April 30, 1998 in 63 FR 23707, EPA proposed granting limited approval and limited disapproval of the following rule into the California SIP: SCAQMD, Rule 465, Vacuum-Producing Devices or Systems. Rule 465 was adopted by SCAQMD on November 1, 1991. This rule was submitted by the CARB, to EPA on June 19, 1992. This rule was submitted in response to EPA's 1988 SIP Call and the CAA section 182(a)(2)(A) requirement that nonattainment areas fix their reasonably available control technology (RACT) rules for ozone in accordance with EPA guidance that interpreted the requirements of the pre-amendment Act. A detailed discussion of the background for the above rule and nonattainment area is provided in the proposed rule (PR) cited above.

EPA has evaluated the above rule for consistency with the requirements of the CAA and EPA regulations and EPA's interpretation of these requirements as expressed in the various EPA policy guidance documents referenced in the PR. EPA is finalizing the limited approval of this rule in order to strengthen the SIP and finalizing the limited disapproval requiring the correction of the remaining deficiencies. These deficiencies include updating a listing of compounds exempt from the definition of volatile organic compounds to remove carbon tetrachloride and the need to explicitly state recording, reporting and record retention requirements in the rule. These corrections are needed to ensure consistency with EPA's definition of exempt compounds and for enforceability of emission limits provided in the rule. A detailed discussion of the rule provisions and evaluations has been provided in the PR and in the technical support document (TSD) available at EPA's Region IX office (TSD dated 3/23/98 for SCAQMD Rule 465).

## III. Response to Public Comments

A 30-day public comment period was provided in 63 FR 23707 dated April 30, 1998. EPA received no comment letters on the proposed rule.

## IV. EPA Action

EPA is finalizing a limited approval and a limited disapproval of the above-referenced rule. The limited approval of this rule is being finalized under section 110(k)(3) in light of EPA's authority pursuant to section 301(a) to adopt regulations necessary to further air quality by strengthening the SIP. The approval is limited in the sense that the rule strengthens the SIP. However, the rule does not meet the section 182(a)(2)(A) CAA requirement because of the rule deficiencies which were discussed in the PR. Thus, in order to strengthen the SIP, EPA is granting limited approval of this rule under sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the CAA. This action approves the rule into the SIP as federally enforceable rule.

At the same time, EPA is finalizing the limited disapproval of this rule because it contains deficiencies that have not been corrected as required by section 182(a)(2)(A) of the CAA, and, as such, the rule does not fully meet the requirements of Part D of the Act. As stated in the Proposed Rule (PR), upon the effective date of this Final Rule (FR), the 18 month clock for sanctions and the 24 month FIP clock will begin. Sections 179(a) and 110(c). If the State does not submit the required corrections and EPA does not approve the submittal within 18 months of the effective date of the FR, either the highway sanction or the offset sanction will be imposed at the 18 month mark. It should be noted that the rule covered by this FR has been adopted by the SCAQMD and is currently in effect in the SCAQMD. EPA's limited disapproval action will not prevent SCAQMD or EPA from enforcing this rule.

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting or allowing or establishing a precedent for any future request for revision to any state implementation plan. Each request for revision to the state implementation plan shall be considered separately in light of specific technical, economic, and environmental factors and in relation to relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

## V. Administrative Requirements

### *A. Executive Orders 12866 and 13045*

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from E.O. 12866 review.

The final rule is not subject to E.O. 13045, entitled ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks,'' because it is not an

''economically significant'' action under E.O. 12866.

*B. Regulatory Flexibility Act*

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 *et seq.*, EPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Alternatively, EPA may certify that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000.

SIP approvals under sections 110 and 301, and subchapter I, part D of the CAA do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not impose any new requirements, I certify that it does not have a significant impact on any small entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the CAA, preparation of a flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its action 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).

*C. 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 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 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 Federal requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

*D. Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office*

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).

*E. 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 October 13, 1998. 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, Sulfur oxides.

**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: July 29, 1998.

**Nora L. McGee,**

*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)(188)(i)(C)(*2*) to read as follows:

**§ 52.220 Identification of plan.**

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(188) * * *

(i) * * *

(C) * * *

(*2*) Rule 465, amended on November 1, 1991.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 98–21895 Filed 8–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 180

**[OPP–300693A; FRL–6021–9]**

**RIN 2070–AB78**

### Spinosad; Pesticide Tolerance

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes a time-limited tolerance for residues of spinosad in or on coffee at 0.02 parts per million (ppm). This action is being initiated by EPA under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), as amended by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–170). The United States Department of Agriculture/Agricultural Research Service (USDA/ARS) has requested that EPA establish a time-limited tolerance on coffee in order for USDA/ARS to conduct efficacy testing of spinosad to control the Mediterranean Fruit Fly. This testing will be conducted on 80 acres in Hawaii under an Experimental Use Permit (EUP).

**DATES:** This regulation is effective August 14, 1998. Objections and requests for hearings must be received by EPA on or before Ocotber 13, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Written objections and hearing requests, identified by the docket control number, [OPP–300693A], must be submitted to: Hearing Clerk (1900), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm M3708, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Fees accompanying objections and hearing requests shall be labeled ''Tolerance Petition Fees'' and forwarded to: EPA Headquarters Accounting Operations Branch, OPP (Tolerance Fees, P.O. Box 360277M, Pittsburgh, PA 15251. A copy of any objections and hearing requests