

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 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 16, 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 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 18, 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)(A)(4) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(254) * * *

(i) * * *

(A) * * *

(4) Rule 4661, adopted on December 17, 1992.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 99-892 Filed 1-14-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 095-0107; FRL-6213-9]

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

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing a limited approval and limited disapproval of a revision to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) proposed in the **Federal Register** on August 3, 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 sulfur dioxide (SO₂) in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). The revised rule controls SO₂ emissions by establishing a limit on the sulfur content

of fuels. 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 these revisions, while strengthening the SIP, also do not fully meet the CAA provisions regarding plan submissions. There will be no sanctions clock as the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District is in attainment for SO₂.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action is effective on February 16, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the rule revisions 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 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, SW, Washington, DC 20460

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

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Drive, Ventura, CA 93003

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: Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD), Rule 64, Sulfur Content of Fuels. This rule was submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to EPA on July 13, 1994.

II. Background

On August 3, 1998 in 63 FR 41220, EPA proposed granting limited approval and limited disapproval of the following rule into the California SIP: VCAPCD, Rule 64, Sulfur Content of Fuels. Rule 64 was adopted by VCAPCD on June 14, 1994. This rule was submitted by the CARB to EPA on July 13, 1994. A detailed discussion of the background for the above rule 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 deficiency involving recordkeeping and record retention. A detailed discussion of the rule provisions and evaluation has been provided in the PR and in the technical support document (TSD) available at EPA's Region IX office (TSD dated 7/1/98 for VCAPCD Rule 64).

III. Response to Public Comments

A 30-day public comment period was provided in 63 FR 41220 dated August 3, 1998. EPA received no comment letters on the NPR.

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 deficiency which was 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 a deficiency. As stated in the proposed rule, there is no sanctions clock as VCAPCD is in attainment for SO₂. It should be noted that the rule covered by this FR has been adopted by the VCAPCD and is currently in effect in the VCAPCD. EPA's limited disapproval action will not prevent VCAPCD or EPA from enforcing this rule.

V. 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 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 16, 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, Reporting

and recordkeeping requirements, 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: December 10, 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) (198)(i)(J)(3) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(198) * * *

(i) * * *

(J) * * *

(3) Rule 64, amended June 14, 1994.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 99-891 Filed 1-14-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[IL161-1a; FRL-6216-4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The USEPA is approving a requested source specific revision to the Illinois State Implementation Plan (SIP) for ozone in the form of a variance from the otherwise applicable SIP requirements for DB Hess Company, Incorporated's lithographic printing plant which is located in Woodstock, in McHenry County, Illinois. The variance took effect on the State level on March 20, 1997 and expires on March 30, 1999. The State's plan request was submitted to USEPA on September 3, 1997. In the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register**, the USEPA is proposing approval of, and soliciting comments on, this approval. If adverse written comments are received on this action, the USEPA will withdraw this final rule

and address the comments received in response to this action in a final rule based on the related proposed rule. A second public comment period will not be held. Parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. This approval makes the State's rule federally enforceable.

DATES: This rule is effective on March 16, 1999, unless USEPA receives adverse written comments by February 16, 1999. If adverse comment is received, USEPA will publish a timely withdrawal of the rule in the **Federal Register** and inform the public that the rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Copies of the plan and USEPA's analysis are available for inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. (Please telephone Randolph O. Cano at (312) 886-6036 before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randolph O. Cano, Environmental Protection Specialist, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), USEPA, Region 5, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6036.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Description of the Affected Source

The DB Hess SIP revision request and USEPA's evaluation of it are summarized below. More detailed information is contained in a technical support document which was prepared in support of this action. It is available from the Region 5 office listed above.

DB Hess owns and operates a lithographic printing plant located in Woodstock (McHenry County), Illinois. The plant emits Volatile Organic Material¹ (VOM) and is located within the Chicago-Gary-Lake County ozone nonattainment area, which is classified as severe for the one-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS).

The production equipment at DB Hess's Woodstock plant (the Woodstock

¹ The USEPA generally uses the term "Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)" to refer to the hydrocarbon compounds that participate in the chemical formation of ozone in the lower Troposphere. The State of Illinois uses the term "Volatile Organic Material (VOM)" to refer to the same hydrocarbon compounds. The definition of VOM is identical to the definition of VOC. The two terms can be used interchangeably.