§ 25.200 The interim sex offender registry.
(a) The Pam Lychner Act, 42 U.S.C. 14072(b), requires the Attorney General to establish a national database at the FBI to track the whereabouts and movement of:
(1) Each person who has been convicted of a criminal offense against a victim who is a minor, as defined in 42 U.S.C. 14071(a)(3)(A);
(2) Each person who has been convicted of a sexually violent offense, as defined in 42 U.S.C. 14071(a)(3)(B); and
(3) Each person who is a sexually violent predator, as defined in 42 U.S.C. 14071(a)(3)(C).
(b) In accordance with section 2 of the Pam Lychner Act, the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") has established an interim National Sex Offender Registry (the "Interim Registry") in the Fingerprint Identification Records System ("FIRS").
(c) The Interim Registry functions as a "pointer" system, indicating on an individual’s FBI Identification Record the fact that the individual is a registered sex offender and the name and location of the state agency that maintains the offender’s registration information.
(d) States may participate in the Interim Registry by submitting the following information to the FBI pertaining to individuals who are registered in state sex offender registries: the name under which the person is registered; the registering agency’s name and location; the date of registration; and the date registration expires. A notice indicating that an individual is a registered sex offender and listing the information described in this paragraph will be included on the individual’s FBI Identification Record. In order to obtain more detailed information regarding a particular offender, an inquiring agency must contact the registering agency indicated on the FBI Identification Record.

§ 25.201 The permanent sex offender registry.
(a) The FBI is in the process of modifying and improving its National Crime Information Center ("NCIC") to establish a new crime information system that will be known as "NCIC 2000." NCIC 2000, which is expected to go online in mid-1999, will include a Convicted Sexual Offender Registry File that will serve as the permanent National Sex Offender Registry (the "Permanent Registry").
(b) In the Permanent Registry, sex offender registration information will be entered directly, via the NCIC Convicted Sexual Offender Registry File by federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies, and will include such information as the offender’s name, address, and details regarding the conviction resulting in registration. This detailed information will be available to authorized agencies via the NCIC. The sex offender registration information will also be automatically posted to the individual’s FBI Identification Record.

§ 25.202 Release of information from the National Sex Offender Registry.
(a) The Pam Lychner Act, 42 U.S.C. 14072(j), requires the FBI to release the information contained in the National Sex Offender Registry to:
(1) Federal, state, and local criminal justice agencies for law enforcement purposes and community notification; and
(2) Federal, state, and local governmental agencies responsible for conducting employment-related background checks under the National Child Protection Act, 42 U.S.C. 5119a.
(b) Both the Interim and Permanent Registries are available for these purposes.

§ 25.203 Non-compliant offenders.
(a) The Pam Lychner Act, 42 U.S.C. 14072(g)(5), provides for state notification to the FBI if a state cannot verify the address of or locate a person required to register with the state’s registration program. The Act further provides that once the FBI receives such a notification, the FBI shall classify the offender as being in violation of the requirements of the National Sex Offender Registry and add a Wanted Person record to the NCIC Wanted Person File, provided that an arrest warrant meeting the requirements for entry into that File is issued in connection with the violation.
(b) The purpose of the requirement that states notify the FBI of non-compliant offenders is to permit the FBI to indicate on the national system that a sex offender is not complying with his or her registration obligations. States can comply with the notice requirement by obtaining an arrest warrant for non-compliant offenders and entering records for such offenders into the Wanted Person File, as described in paragraph (c) of this section. Upon entry of a wanted person record on the Wanted Person File, that fact will automatically be indicated on the offender’s FBI Identification Record and will be accessible on a search of the National Sex Offender Registry.
(c) Under existing FBI procedures, state and local law enforcement authorities add records of fugitives to the NCIC Wanted Person File upon issuance of a state or local arrest warrant. The FBI will continue to follow those same procedures with respect to registered sex offenders. Accordingly, if an offender fails to comply with a state registration program requirement, state or local authorities should, if appropriate, seek an arrest warrant for that offender and then add a record for the offender to the NCIC Wanted Person File.

§ 25.204 Notice of an offender’s move to another state.
(a) The Pam Lychner Act, 42 U.S.C. 14072(g), requires an offender who moves to a different state to notify both the FBI and the new state of residence so that his or her registration information may be included in the appropriate state and federal databases. No later than 10 days after the offender establishes a new residence, the offender should contact the local FBI office in his or her new state of residence. Once notified by an offender that he or she has moved to another state, the FBI will take the steps necessary to ensure that the offender’s new state of residence has also been notified.
(b) In the Permanent Registry, sex offender registries: the name under which the offender is registered; the registering agency’s name and location of the state agency that maintains the offender’s registration information; and
(c) The Interim Registry functions as a "pointer" system, indicating on an individual’s FBI Identification Record the fact that the individual is a registered sex offender and the name and location of the state agency that maintains the offender’s registration information.
(d) States may participate in the Interim Registry by submitting the following information to the FBI pertaining to individuals who are registered in state sex offender registries: the name under which the person is registered; the registering agency’s name and location; the date of registration; and the date registration expires. A notice indicating that an individual is a registered sex offender and listing the information described in this paragraph will be included on the individual’s FBI Identification Record. In order to obtain more detailed information regarding a particular offender, an inquiring agency must contact the registering agency indicated on the FBI Identification Record.
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SUMMARY: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), 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")
contributes 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 proposes to add one new site to the General Superfund section of the NPL. The site is Midnite Mine located in Wellpinit, Washington.

DATES: Comments regarding any of these proposed listings must be submitted (postmarked) on or before April 19, 1999.

ADDRESSES: By Postal Mail: Mail original and three copies of comments (no facsimiles or tapes) to Docket Coordinator, Headquarters; U.S. EPA; CERCLA Docket Office; 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway; Crystal Gateway 1, First Floor; Arlington, VA 22202.

By E-Mail: Comments in ASCII format only may be mailed directly to superfund.docket.epa.gov. E-mailed comments must be followed up by an original and three copies sent by mail or express mail.

For additional Docket addresses and further details on their contents, see section II, "Public Review/Public Comment," of the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION portion of this preamble.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Myers, phone (703) 603–8851, State, Tribal and Site Identification Center, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (Mail Code 5204G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460; 703/603–9232.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
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are generally evaluated and cleaned up by EPA (the "General Superfund section"), and one of sites that are owned or operated by other Federal agencies (the "Federal Facilities section"). With respect to sites in the Federal Facilities section, these sites are generally being addressed by other Federal agencies. Under Executive Order 12580 (52 FR 2923, January 29, 1987) and CERCLA section 120, each Federal agency is responsible for carrying out most response actions at facilities under its own jurisdiction, custody, or control, although EPA is responsible for preparing an HRS score and determining whether the facility is placed on the NPL. EPA generally is not the lead agency at Federal Facilities Section sites, and its role at such sites is accordingly less extensive than at other sites.

D. How Are Sites Listed on the NPL?

There are three mechanisms for placing sites on the NPL for possible remedial action (see 40 CFR 300.425(c) of the NCP): (1) A site may be included on the NPL if it scores sufficiently high on the Hazard Ranking System ("HRS"), which EPA promulgated as an appendix A of the NCP (40 CFR part 300). The HRS serves as a screening device to evaluate the relative potential of uncontrolled hazardous substances to pose a threat to human health or the environment. On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA promulgated revisions to the HRS partly in response to CERCLA section 105(c), added by SARA. The revised HRS evaluates four pathways: Ground water, surface water, soil exposure, and air. As a matter of Agency policy, those sites that score 28.50 or greater on the HRS are eligible for the NPL; (2) Each State may place a site on the NPL, regardless of the HRS score. This mechanism, provided by the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(2), requires that, to the extent practicable, the NPL include within the 100 highest priorities, one facility designated by each State representing the greatest danger to public health, welfare, or the environment among known facilities in the State (see 42 U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B)); (3) The third mechanism for listing, included in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(3), allows certain sites to be listed regardless of their HRS score, if all of the following conditions are met:

- The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) of the U.S. Public Health Service has issued a health advisory that recommends dissolution of individuals from the release.
- EPA determines that the release poses a significant threat to public health.
- EPA anticipates that it will be more cost-effective to use its remedial authority than to use its removal authority to respond to the release.

EPA promulgated an original NPL of 406 sites on September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40658). The NPL has been expanded since then, most recently on January 19, 1999 (64 FR 2942).

E. What Happens to Sites on the NPL?

A site may undergo remedial action financed by the Trust Fund established under CERCLA (commonly referred to as the "Superfund") only after it is placed on the NPL, as provided in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(b)(1). ("Remedial actions" are those "consistent with permanent remedy, taken instead of or in addition to removal actions." 42 U.S.C. 9601(24).) However, under 40 CFR 300.425(b)(2) placing a site on the NPL "does not imply that parties will be expended." EPA may pursue other appropriate authorities to remedy the releases, including enforcement action under CERCLA and other laws.

F. How Are Site Boundaries Defined?

The NPL does not describe releases in precise geographical terms; it would be neither feasible nor consistent with the limited purpose of the NPL (to identify releases that are priorities for further evaluation), for it to do so. Although a CERCLA "facility" is broadly defined to include any area where a hazardous substance release has "come to be located" (CERCLA section 101(9)), the listing process itself is not intended to define or reflect the boundaries of such facilities or releases. Of course, HRS data (if the HRS is used to list a site) upon which the NPL placement was based will, to some extent, describe the release(s) at issue. That is, the NPL would include all releases evaluated as part of that HRS analysis.

When a site is listed, the approach generally used to describe the relevant release(s) is to delineate a geographical area (usually the area within an installation or plant boundaries) and identify the site by reference to that area. As a legal matter, the site is not coextensive with that area, and the boundaries of the installation or plant are not the "boundaries" of the site. Rather, the site consists of all contaminated areas within the area used to identify the site, as well as any other location to which the contamination from that area has come to be located, or from which that contamination came.

In other words, while geographic terms are often used to designate the site (e.g., the "Jones Co. plant site") in terms of the property owned by a particular party, the site properly understood is not limited to that property (e.g., it may extend beyond the property due to contaminant migration), and conversely may not occupy the full extent of the property (e.g., where there are uncontaminated parts of the identified property, they may not be, strictly speaking, part of the "site"). The "site" is thus neither equal to nor confined by the boundaries of any specific property that may give the site its name, and the name itself should not be read to imply that this site is coextensive with the entire area within the property boundary of the installation or plant. The precise nature and extent of the site are typically not known at the time of listing. Also, the site name is merely used to help identify the geographic location of the contamination. For example, the "Jones Co. plant site," does not imply that Jones company is responsible for the contamination located on the plant site.

EPA regulations provide that the "nature and extent of the threat presented by a release" will be determined by a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study ("RI/FS") as more information is developed on site contamination (40 CFR 300.5). During the RI/FS process, the release may be found to be larger or smaller than was originally thought, as more is learned about the source(s) and the migration of the contamination. However, this inquiry focuses on an evaluation of the threat posed; the boundaries of the release need not be exactly defined. Moreover, it generally is impossible to discover the full extent of the contamination "has come to be located" before all necessary studies and remedial work are completed at a site. Indeed, the boundaries of the contamination can be expected to change over time. Thus, in most cases, it may be impossible to describe the boundaries of a release with absolute certainty.

Further, as noted above, NPL listing does not assign liability to any party or to the owner of any specific property. Thus, if a party does not believe it is liable for releases on discrete parcels of property, supporting information can be submitted to the Agency at any time after a party receives notice it is a potentially responsible party.

For these reasons, the NPL need not be amended as further research reveals more information about the location of the contamination or release.
G. How Are Sites Removed From the NPL?

EPA may delete sites from the NPL where no further response is appropriate under Superfund, as explained in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(e). This section also provides that EPA shall consult with states on proposed deletions and shall consider whether any of the following criteria have been met: (i) Responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required; (ii) All appropriate Superfund-financed response has been implemented and no further response action is required; or (iii) The remedial investigation has shown the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment, and taking of remedial measures is not appropriate. As of February 3, 1999, the Agency has deleted 181 sites from the NPL.

H. Can Portions of Sites Be Deleted From the NPL as They Are Cleaned Up?

In November 1995, EPA initiated a new policy to delete portions of NPL sites where cleanup is complete (55 FR 55465, November 1, 1995). Total site cleanup may take many years, while portions of the site may have been cleaned up and available for productive use. As of February 3, 1999, EPA has deleted portions of 15 sites.

I. What Is the Construction Completion List (CCL)?

EPA also has developed an NPL construction completion list (“CCL”) to simplify its system of categorizing sites and to better communicate the successful completion of cleanup activities (58 FR 12142, March 2, 1993). Inclusion of a site on the CCL has no legal significance.

Sites qualify for the CCL when: (1) Any necessary physical construction is complete, whether or not final cleanup levels or other requirements have been achieved; (2) EPA has determined that the response action should be limited to measures that do not involve construction (e.g., institutional controls); or (3) The site qualifies for deletion from the NPL.

Of the 181 sites that have been deleted from the NPL, 172 sites were deleted because they have been cleaned up (the other 9 sites were deleted based on deferral to other authorities and are not considered cleaned up). In addition, there are 413 sites also on the NPL CCL. Thus, as of February 3, 1999, the CCL consists of 585 sites. For the most up-to-date information on the CCL, see EPA’s Internet site at http://www.epa.gov/superfund.

II. Public Review/Public Comment

A. Can I Review the Documents Relevant to This Proposed Rule?

Yes, documents that form the basis for EPA’s evaluation and scoring of the Midnite Mine site in this rule are contained in dockets located both at EPA Headquarters in Washington, DC and in the Region 10 office.

B. How Do I Access the Documents?

You may view the documents, by appointment only, in the Headquarters or the Region 10 dockets after the appearance of this proposed rule. The hours of operation for the Headquarters dockets are from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding Federal holidays. Please contact the Region 10 docket for hours.

Following is the contact information for the EPA Headquarters docket:

Docket Coordinator, Headquarters, U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office, Crystal Gateway #1, 1st Floor, 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202, 703/603-9232. (Please note this is an address only. Mail comments to EPA Headquarters as detailed at the beginning of this preamble.)

The contact information for the Region 10 docket is as follows: David Bennett, Region 10 (AK, ID, OR, WA), U.S. EPA, 11th Floor, 1200 6th Avenue, Mail Stop ECL–113, Seattle, WA 98101, 206/553-2103.

You may also request copies from EPA Headquarters or the Region 10 docket. An informal request, rather than a formal written request under the Freedom of Information Act, should be the ordinary procedure for obtaining copies of any of these documents.

C. What Documents Are Available for Public Review at the Headquarters Docket?

The Headquarters docket for this rule contains: HRS score sheets for the proposed site; a Documentation Record for the site describing the information used to compute the score; information for any site affected by particular statutory requirements or EPA listing policies; and a list of documents referenced in the Documentation Record.

D. What Documents Are Available for Public Review at the Region 10 Docket?

The Region 10 docket for this rule contains all of the information in the Headquarters docket, plus, the actual reference documents containing the data principally relied upon and cited by EPA in calculating or evaluating the HRS score for the Midnite Mine site.

These reference documents are available only in the Region 10 docket.

E. How Do I Submit My Comments?

Comments must be submitted to EPA Headquarters as detailed at the beginning of this preamble in the “Addresses” section.

F. What Happens to My Comments?

EPA considers all comments received during the comment period. Significant comments will be addressed in a support document that EPA will publish concurrently with the Federal Register document if, and when, the site is listed on the NPL.

G. What Should I Consider When Preparing My Comments?

Comments that include complex or voluminous reports, or materials prepared for purposes other than HRS scoring, should point out the specific information that EPA should consider and how it affects individual HRS factor values or other listing criteria. (Northside Sanitary Landfill v. Thomas, 849 F.2d 1516 (D.C. Cir. 1988).) EPA will not address voluminous comments that are not specifically cited by page number and referenced to the HRS or other listing criteria. EPA will not address comments unless they indicate which component of the HRS documentation record or what particular point in EPA’s stated eligibility criteria is at issue.

H. Can I Submit Comments After the Public Comment Period Is Over?

Generally, EPA will not respond to late comments. EPA can only guarantee that it will consider those comments postmarked by the close of the formal comment period. EPA has a policy of not delaying a final listing decision solely to accommodate consideration of late comments.

I. Can I View Public Comments Submitted by Others?

During the comment period, comments are placed in the Headquarters docket and are available to the public on an “as received” basis. A complete set of comments will be available for viewing in the Regional docket approximately one week after the formal comment period closes.

J. Can I Submit Comments Regarding Sites Not Currently Proposed to the NPL?

In certain instances, interested parties have written to EPA concerning sites which were not at that time proposed to the NPL. If those sites are later proposed to the NPL, parties should review their
V. Unfunded Mandates

A. What Is the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)?

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), Public Law 104-4, establishes requirements for Federal Agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. Under section 202 of the UMRA, EPA generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost-benefit analysis, for proposed and final rules with “Federald mandates” that may result in expenditures by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any one year. Before EPA promulgates a rule for which a written statement is needed, section 205 of the UMRA generally requires EPA to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and adopt the least costly, most cost-effective, least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. The provisions of section 205 do not apply when they are inconsistent with applicable law. Moreover, section 205 allows EPA to adopt an alternative other than the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative if the Administrator publishes with the final rule an explanation why that alternative was not adopted. Before EPA establishes any regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, it must have developed under section 203 of the UMRA a small government agency plan. The plan must provide for notifying potentially affected small governments, enabling officials of affected small governments to have meaningful and timely input in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising small governments on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

B. Does UMRA Apply to This Proposed Rule?

No, EPA has determined that this rule does not contain any Federal mandate that may result in expenditures of $100 million or more for State, local, and tribal governments in the aggregate, or by the private sector in any one year. This rule will not impose any Federal intergovernmental mandates because it imposes no enforceable duty upon State, tribal or local governments. Listing a site on the NPL does not in itself impose any costs. Listing does not mean that EPA necessarily will undertake remedial action. Nor does listing require any action by a private party or determine liability for response costs. Costs that arise out of site responses result from site-specific decisions regarding what actions to take, not directly from the act of listing a site on the NPL.

For the same reasons, EPA also has determined that this rule contains no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments. In addition, as discussed above, the private sector is not expected to incur costs exceeding $100 million. EPA has fulfilled the requirement for analysis under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

VI. Effect on Small Businesses

A. What Is the Regulatory Flexibility Act?

Pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq., as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA) of 1996) whenever an agency is required to publish a notice of rulemaking for any proposed or final rule, it must prepare and make available for public comment a regulatory flexibility analysis that describes the effect of the rule on small entities (i.e., small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions). However, no regulatory flexibility analysis is required if the head of an agency certifies the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. SBREFA amended the Regulatory Flexibility Act to require Federal agencies to provide a statement of the factual basis for certifying that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

B. Has EPA Conducted a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis for This Rule?

No. While this rule proposes to revise the NPL, an NPL revision is not a typical regulatory change since it does not automatically impose costs. As stated above, adding sites to the NPL does not in itself require any action by any party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the cost of cleanup at the site. Further, no identifiable groups are affected as a whole. As a consequence, impacts on any group are hard to predict. A site’s inclusion on the NPL could increase the likelihood of adverse impacts on responsible parties in the form of cleanup costs, but at this time EPA cannot identify the potentially affected businesses or estimate the number of
small businesses that might also be affected.

The Agency does expect that placing the sites in this proposed rule on the NPL could significantly affect certain industries, or firms within industries, that have caused a proportionately high percentage of waste site problems. However, EPA does not expect the listing of these sites to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

In any case, economic impacts would occur only through enforcement and cost-recovery actions, which EPA takes at its discretion on a site-by-site basis. EPA considers many factors when determining enforcement actions, including not only a firm's contribution to the problem, but also its ability to pay. The impacts (from cost recovery) on small governments and nonprofit organizations would be determined on a similar case-by-case basis.

For the foregoing reasons, I hereby certify that this proposed rule, if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, this proposed regulation does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

VII. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

A. What Is the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act?

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note), directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA directs EPA to provide Congress, through OMB, explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

B. Does the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act Apply to This Proposed Rule?

No. This proposed rulemaking does not involve technical standards. Therefore, EPA did not consider the use of any voluntary consensus standards.

VIII. Executive Order 12898

A. What is Executive Order 12898?

Under Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," as well as through EPA's April 1995, "Environmental Justice Strategy, OSWER Environmental Justice Task Force Action Agenda Report," and National Environmental Justice Advisory Council, EPA has undertaken to incorporate environmental justice into its policies and programs. EPA is committed to addressing environmental justice concerns, and is assuming a leadership role in environmental justice initiatives to enhance environmental quality for all residents of the United States. The Agency's goals are to ensure that no segment of the population, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, bears disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects as a result of EPA's policies, programs, and activities, and all people live in clean and sustainable communities.

B. Does Executive Order 12898 Apply to This Proposed Rule?

No. This proposed rule proposes to revise the NPL, no action will result from this proposal that will have disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on any segment of the population.

IX. Executive Order 13045

A. What is Executive Order 13045?

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.

B. Does Executive Order 13045 Apply to This Proposed Rule?

This proposed rule is subject to E.O. 13045 because it is not an economically significant rule as defined by E.O. 12866, and because the Agency does not have reason to believe the environmental health or safety risks addressed by this section present a disproportionate risk to children.

X. Paperwork Reduction Act

A. What is the Paperwork Reduction Act?

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq., an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information that requires OMB approval under the PRA, unless it has been approved by OMB and displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations, after initial display in the preamble of the final rules, are listed in 40 CFR part 9. The information collection requirements related to this action have already been approved by OMB pursuant to the PRA under OMB control number 2070-0012 (EPA ICR No. 574).

B. Does the Paperwork Reduction Act Apply to This Proposed Rule?

No. EPA has determined that the PRA does not apply because this rule does not contain any information collection requirements that require approval of the OMB.

XI. Executive Order 12875

What Is Executive Order 12875 and Is It Applicable to This Proposed Rule?

Under Executive Order 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, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, Executive Order 12875 requires EPA to 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, any written communications from the governments, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 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."

This proposed 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 Executive Order 12875 do not apply to this rule.
XII. Executive Order 13084
What is Executive Order 13084 and Is It Applicable to this Proposed Rule?

Under Executive Order 13084, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute, that significantly 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, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to 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 officials 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.”

This proposed rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments because it does not significantly or uniquely affect their communities. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to this rule.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous substances, hazardous waste, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Water pollution control, Water supply.


Timothy Fields, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

[FR Doc. 99-3661 Filed 2-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

44 CFR Part 67

[Docket No. FEMA-7274]

Proposed Flood Elevation Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Technical information or comments are requested on the proposed base (1% annual chance) flood elevations and proposed base flood elevation modifications for the communities listed below. The base flood elevations and modified base flood elevations are the basis for the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of being already in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

DATES: The comment period is ninety (90) days following the second publication of this proposed rule in a newspaper of local circulation in each community.

ADDRESSES: The proposed base flood elevations for each community are available for inspection at the office of the Chief Executive Officer of each community. The respective addresses are listed in the following table.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matthew B. Miller, P.E., Chief, Hazards Study Branch, Mitigation Directorate, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-3461, or (e-mail) matt.miller@ema.gov.


These proposed base flood and modified base flood elevations, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own, or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities. These proposed elevations are used to meet the floodplain management requirements of the NFIP and are also used to calculate the appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings built after these elevations are made final, and for the contents in these buildings.

National Environmental Policy Act

This proposed rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR Part 10, Environmental Consideration. No environmental impact assessment has been prepared.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Associate Director for Mitigation certifies that this proposed rule is exempt from the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act because proposed or modified base flood elevations are required by the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and are required to establish and maintain community eligibility in the NFIP. No regulatory flexibility analysis has been prepared.

Regulatory Classification

This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under the criteria of Section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review, 58 FR 51735.

Executive Order 12612, Federalism

This proposed rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under Executive Order 12612, Federalism, dated October 26, 1987.

Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule meets the applicable standards of Section 2(b)(2) of Executive Order 12778.

List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 67

Administrative practice and procedure, Flood insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, 44 CFR Part 67 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 67—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 67 continues to read as follows: