

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." Today's proposed rule would not create a mandate on State, local or tribal governments. The rule would 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.

#### C. 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 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 proposed 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, 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 proposed rule would not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. EPA is proposing disapproval of a State rule revision, which will have no impact on 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 proposed rule would not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because EPA's proposed disapproval of the State request under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act, would not affect any existing requirements applicable to small entities. Any pre-existing Federal requirements would remain in place after this disapproval. Federal disapproval of the State submittal would not affect State-enforceability. Moreover, EPA's disapproval of the submittal would not impose any new Federal requirements. Therefore, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

#### 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 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 disapproval action being proposed 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. The proposed disapproval would not change existing requirements and would include no Federal mandate. If EPA were to disapprove the State's SIP submittal, pre-existing requirements would remain in place and State enforceability of the submittal would be unaffected. The action would impose no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, would result from this proposed action.

#### G. 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 proposed action. Today's proposed action does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, and Sulfur oxides.

Dated: August 19, 1999.

**Jack W. McGraw,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.*

[FR Doc. 99-22937 Filed 9-1-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-6431-3]

### Hazardous Waste Management Program: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions for State of Louisiana

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule and request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA (also, "the Agency" in this preamble) is proposing to grant final authorization to the hazardous waste program revisions submitted by the State of Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) for its hazardous waste program revisions, specifically, revisions needed to meet the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Cluster VII, which contains Federal rules promulgated between July 1, 1996 to June 30, 1997. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register** (FR), EPA is authorizing the State's program revisions as an immediate final rule without prior proposal because the EPA views this action as noncontroversial and anticipates no adverse comments. The Agency has explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the immediate final rule. If the EPA does not receive adverse written comments, the immediate final rule will become effective and the Agency will not take further action on this proposal. If the EPA receives adverse written comments, a second **Federal Register** document will be published before the time the immediate final rule takes effect. The second document may withdraw the immediate final rule or identify the issues raised, respond to the comments and affirm that the immediate final rule will take effect as scheduled. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before October 4, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail written comments to Alima Patterson, Region 6, Regional Authorization Coordinator, Grants and Authorization Section (6PD-G), Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, at the address shown below. You can examine copies of the materials submitted by the State of Louisiana during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA Region 1445

Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, (214) 665-6444; or Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, H.B. Garlock Building, 7290 Bluebonnet, Baton Rouge Louisiana 70810, (225) 765-0617.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alima Patterson at (214) 665-8533.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information, please see the immediate final rule published in the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: June 15, 1999.

**Jerry Clifford,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.*

[FR Doc. 99-22628 Filed 9-1-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

**46 CFR Parts 10, 15, 90, 98, 125-134, 170, 174, and 175**

[USCG-1999-5951]

### Offshore Supply Vessels

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Correction to Notice of meeting; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** This document contains corrections to the notice of meeting and request for comments [USCG-1999-5951], which was published on July 22, 1999 (64 FR 39455). The meeting was held on August 26, 1999. The purpose of the public meeting was to discuss potential revisions to the Offshore Supply Vessel (OSV) regulations. The meeting focused on the possible establishment of International Tonnage Convention (ITC) tonnage values for OSVs; additional standards for larger OSVs including licensing and manning; and standards for crewboats as a new category of OSVs. Because the Coast Guard also requests written comments from interested public on this issue, this

document clarifies the docket number for this project where interested persons can submit their comments. The proper docket number is "USCG-1999-5951."

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For information concerning this notice or public meeting, contact Mr. James Magill, Project Manager, Office of Operating and Environmental Standards (G-MSO), U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, telephone 202-267-1082 or LT Charles Srioudom, Office of Operating and Environmental Standards (G-MSO), U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, telephone 202-267-2498. For questions on viewing, or submitting material to the docket, contact Dorothy Walker, Chief, Documentary Services Division, U.S. Department of Transportation, telephone 202-366-9329.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Need for Correction

As published, the notice of meeting and request for comments used three separate docket numbers that may prove to be confusing and misleading, and is in need of correction.

#### Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication on July 22, 1999, of the notice of meeting; request for comments (64 FR 39455) is corrected as follows:

1. On page 39455, in the third column, under **ADDRESSES:** section, third paragraph, remove the docket number "(USCG-1999-4974)", and add in its place, the docket number "(USCG-1999-5951)".

2. On page 39456, in the first column, under "Request for comments" section, remove the docket number "(USCG-1999-XXXX)", and add in its place, the docket number "(USCG-1999-5951)".

Dated: August 27, 1999.

**Joseph J. Angelo,**

*Director of Standards, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.*

[FR Doc. 99-22940 Filed 9-1-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P