

d-35. Q. *Through what medium may a payor provide the notice required under section 3405 to a payee?*

A. A payor may provide the notice required under section 3405 (including the abbreviated notice described in d-27 and the annual notice described in d-31) to a payee either on a written paper document or through an electronic medium reasonably accessible to the payee. A notice provided through an electronic medium must be provided under a system that satisfies the following requirements:

(a) The system must be reasonably designed to provide the notice in a manner no less understandable to the payee than a written paper document.

(b) At the time the notice is provided, the payee must be advised that the payee may request and receive the notice on a written paper document at no charge, and, upon request, that document must be provided to the payee at no charge.

d-36. Q. *Are there examples that illustrate the provisions of d-35 of this section?*

A. The provisions of d-35 of this section are illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1. (i) An employer deferred compensation plan (Plan A) permits participants to request distributions by e-mail. Under Plan A's system for such transactions, a participant must enter his or her account number and personal identification number (PIN); this information must match that in Plan A's records in order for the transaction to proceed. The plan administrator is the payor. If a participant requests a distribution from Plan A by e-mail, the plan administrator provides the participant with the notice required under section 3405 by e-mail. The plan administrator also advises the participant by e-mail that he or she may request the notice on a written paper document and that, if the participant requests the notice on a written paper document, it will be provided at no charge. To proceed with the distribution by e-mail, the participant must acknowledge receipt, review, and comprehension of the notice.

(ii) In this *Example 1*, the plan administrator does not fail to satisfy the notice requirement of section 3405 merely because the notice is provided to the participant other than through a written paper document.

Example 2. (i) An employer deferred compensation plan (Plan B) permits participants to request distributions through the Plan B web site (Internet or intranet). Under Plan B's system for such transactions, a participant must enter his or her account number and personal identification number (PIN); this information must match that in Plan B's records in order for the transaction to proceed. The plan administrator is the payor. A participant may request a distribution from Plan B by following the

applicable instructions on the Plan B web site. After the participant has requested a distribution, the participant is automatically shown a page on the web site containing the notice required by section 3405. Although this page of the web site may be printed, the page also advises the participant that he or she may request the notice on a written paper document and that, if the participant requests the notice on a written paper document, it will be provided at no charge. To proceed with the distribution through the web site, the participant must acknowledge receipt, review, and comprehension of the notice.

(ii) In this *Example 2*, the plan administrator does not fail to satisfy the notice requirement of section 3405 merely because the notice is provided to the participant other than through a written paper document.

Example 3. (i) An employer deferred compensation plan (Plan C) permits participants to request distributions through Plan C's automated telephone system. Under Plan C's system for such transactions, a participant must enter his or her account number and personal identification number (PIN); this information must match that in Plan C's records in order for the transaction to proceed. The plan administrator is the payor. A participant may request a distribution from Plan C by following the applicable instructions on the automated telephone system. After the participant has requested a distribution, the automated telephone system reads the notice required by section 3405 to the participant. The automated telephone system also advises the participant that he or she may request the notice on a written paper document and that, if the participant requests the notice on a written paper document, it will be provided at no charge. Before proceeding with the distribution transaction, the participant must acknowledge receipt, review, and comprehension of the notice.

(ii) In this *Example 3*, the plan administrator does not fail to satisfy the notice requirement of section 3405 merely because the notice is provided to the participant other than through a written paper document.

Example 4. (i) Same facts as *Example 3*, except that, pursuant to the system for processing such transactions, a participant who so requests is transferred to a customer service representative whose conversation with the participant is recorded. The customer service representative provides the notice required by section 3405 by reading from a prepared text.

(ii) In this *Example 4*, the plan administrator does not fail to satisfy the notice requirement of section 3405 merely because the notice is provided to the participant other than through a written paper document.

Example 5. (i) Same facts as *Example 1*, except that Participant D requested a distribution by e-mail and then terminated employment. Participant D no longer has access to e-mail.

(ii) In this *Example 5*, Plan A does not satisfy the notice requirement of section 3405 because the electronic medium through which the notice is provided is not

reasonably accessible to Participant D. Plan A must provide the notice required by section 3405 to Participant D in a written paper document or by an electronic medium that is reasonably accessible to Participant D.

PART 602—OMB CONTROL NUMBERS UNDER THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

Par. 6. The authority citation for part 602 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 26 U.S.C. 7805.

Par. 7. In § 602.101, paragraph (b) is amended by adding the following entry in the table in numerical order to read as follows:

§ 602.101 OMB Control numbers.

CFR part or section where identified and described	Current OMB control No.
* * * * *	
(b) * * *	
1.402(f)-1	1545-1632
1.411(a)-11	1545-1632
* * * * *	

Robert E. Wenzel,
Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue.
Approved: January 20, 2000.

Jonathan Talisman,
Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.
[FR Doc. 00-1897 Filed 2-7-00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4830-01-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[Docket No. NH040-7167a; FRL-6532-2]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; Plan for Controlling Emissions From Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approves the Sections 111(d)/129 State Plan submitted by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) on June 2, 1999. This State Plan is for implementing and enforcing provisions at least as protective as the Emissions Guidelines (EG) applicable to

existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators (HMIWIs) for which construction commenced on or before June 20, 1996.

DATES: This direct final rule is effective on April 10, 2000 without further notice unless EPA receives significant, material and adverse comment by March 9, 2000. If EPA receives adverse comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule in the **Federal Register** and inform the public that the rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: You should address your written comments to: Mr. Brian Hennessey, Acting Chief, Air Permits Unit, Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. EPA-New England, Region 1, One Congress Street, Suite 1100 (CAP), Boston, Massachusetts 02114-2023.

Documents which EPA has incorporated by reference are available for public inspection at the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. You may examine copies of materials the NHDES submitted to EPA relative to this action during normal business hours at the following locations. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the day of the visit.

Environmental Protection Agency-New England, Region 1, Air Permits Unit, Office of Ecosystem Protection, Suite 1100, One Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02114-2023.

New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, Air Resources Division, 6 Hazen Drive, Concord, New Hampshire 03301, (603) 271-1370.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Courcier at (617) 918-1659.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. What action is EPA taking today?
- II. Why Does EPA Want To Regulate Air Emissions From HMIWIs?
- III. When did EPA first publish these requirements?
- IV. Who must comply with the requirements?
- V. Are any sources exempt from the requirements?
- VI. By what date must HMIWIs in New Hampshire achieve compliance?
- VII. What happens if an HMIWI does not/cannot meet the requirements by the final compliance date?
- VIII. What options are available to operators if they cannot achieve compliance within one year of the effective date of the State Plan?
- IX. What Is a State Plan?
- X. What did the state submit as part of its State Plan?
- XI. Why Is EPA Approving New Hampshire's State Plan?

XII. Why does EPA need to approve State Plans?

XIII. Administrative Requirements

I. What Action Is EPA Taking Today?

EPA is approving New Hampshire's State Plan submitted on June 2, 1998 for the control of air emissions from HMIWIs throughout the State. When EPA developed the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for HMIWIs, the Agency simultaneously developed the Emission Guidelines (EG) to control air emissions from older HMIWIs (see 62 FR 48348-48391, September 15, 1997). New Hampshire developed a State Plan, as required by sections 111(d) and 129 of the Clean Air Act (the Act), to adopt the EG into its body of regulations, and EPA is acting today to approve New Hampshire's State Plan.

Under section 129 of the Act, the EG are not federally enforceable. Section 129(b)(2) of the Act requires states to submit to EPA for approval State Plans that implement and enforce the EG. State Plans must be at least as protective as the EG, and they become federally enforceable upon approval by EPA. The procedures for adopting and submitting State Plans are located in 40 CFR part 60, subpart B.

EPA originally issued the subpart B provisions on November 17, 1975. EPA amended subpart B on December 19, 1995, to allow the subparts developed under section 129 to include specifications that supersede the general provisions in subpart B regarding the schedule for submittal of State Plans, the stringency of the emission limitations, and the compliance schedules, see 60 FR 65414 (December 19, 1995). This action approves the State Plan submitted by New Hampshire to implement and enforce the EG, as it applies to older HMIWI units.

EPA is publishing this approval action without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. However, in the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register** publication, EPA is publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve the State Plan should relevant adverse comments be filed. If EPA receives no significant, material, and adverse comments by March 9, 2000, this action will be effective April 10, 2000.

If EPA receives significant, material, and adverse comments by the above date, the Agency will withdraw this action before the effective date by publishing a subsequent document in the **Federal Register** that will withdraw this final action. EPA will address all

public comments received in a subsequent final rule based on the parallel proposed rule published in today's **Federal Register**. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

II. Why Does EPA Want To Regulate Air Emissions From HMIWIs?

When burned, hospital waste and medical/infectious waste emit various air pollutants, including hydrochloric acid, dioxin/furan, toxic metals (lead, cadmium, and mercury) and particulate matter. Mercury is highly hazardous and is of particular concern because it persists in the environment and bioaccumulates through the food web. Serious developmental and adult effects in humans, primarily damage to the nervous system, have been associated with exposures to mercury. Harmful effects in wildlife have also been reported; these include nervous system damage and behavioral and reproductive deficits. Human and wildlife exposure to mercury occur mainly through eating of fish. When inhaled, mercury vapor attacks also the lung tissue and is a cumulative poison. Short-term exposure to mercury in certain forms can cause hallucinations and impair consciousness. Long-term exposure to mercury in certain forms can affect the central nervous system and cause kidney damage.

Exposure to particulate matter can aggravate existing respiratory and cardiovascular disease and increase risk of premature death. Hydrochloric acid is a clear colorless gas. Chronic exposure to hydrochloric acid has been reported to cause gastritis, chronic bronchitis, dermatitis, and photosensitization. Acute exposure to high levels of chlorine in humans may result in chest pain, vomiting, toxic pneumonitis, pulmonary edema, and death. At lower levels, chlorine is a potent irritant to the eyes, the upper respiratory tract, and lungs.

Exposure to dioxin and furan can cause skin disorders, cancer, and reproductive effects such as endometriosis. These pollutants can also affect the immune system.

III. When Did EPA First Publish These Requirements?

The EPA proposed the EG in the **Federal Register** on June 20, 1996. On September 15, 1997, according to sections 111 and 129 of the Clean Air Act (Act), the EPA published the final form of the EG applicable to existing HMIWIs. The EG are at 40 CFR Part 60,

Subpart Ce. See 62 FR 48348 and the Background section.

IV. Who Must Comply With The Requirements?

All HMIWIs that commenced construction on or before June 20, 1996 must comply with these requirements.

V. Are Any Sources Exempt From the Requirements?

The following incinerator source categories are exempt from the federal requirements for HMIWIs:

(1) Incinerators that burn only pathological, low-level radiation, and/or chemotherapeutic waste (all defined in section 60.51c). However, the owner or operator must notify the EPA Administrator of an exemption claim and the owner or operator must keep records of the periods of time when only pathological, low-level radioactive, and/or chemotherapeutic waste is burned.

(2) Any unit required to have a permit under section 3005 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

(3) Incinerators that are subject to the NSPS and/or EG for Municipal Waste Combustors.

(4) Existing incinerators, processing operations, or boilers that co-fire medical/infectious waste or hospital waste with other fuels or wastes and that combust less than ten percent or less medical/infectious waste and hospital waste by weight (on a calendar quarter basis). However, the owner or operator must notify the EPA Administrator of an exemption claim and the owner or operator must keep records of the amount of each fuel and waste fired.

VI. By What Date Must HMIWIs in New Hampshire Achieve Compliance?

All existing HMIWIs in the state of New Hampshire must comply with these requirements within one year of the effective date of EPA approval of this plan, unless NHDES grants an extension. However, final compliance must be achieved by September 15, 2002.

VII. What Happens If an HMIWI Does Not/Cannot Meet the Requirements by the Final Compliance Date?

Any existing HMIWI that fails to meet the requirements by September 15, 2002 must shut down. The unit will not be allowed to start up until the owner/operator installs the controls necessary to meet the requirements.

VIII. What Options Are Available to Operators If They Cannot Achieve Compliance Within One Year of the Effective Date of the State Plan?

If an HMIWI cannot achieve compliance within one year of the effective date of EPA approval of the State Plan, the operator must agree to meet certain increments of progress until they achieve compliance. The State Rule details the increments of progress for the affected HMIWIs.

IX. What Is a State Plan?

Section 111(d) of the Act requires that pollutants controlled under NSPS must also be controlled at older sources in the same source category. Once an NSPS is issued, EPA then publishes an EG applicable to the control of the same pollutant from existing (designated) facilities. States with designated facilities must then develop State Plans to adopt the EG into their body of regulations. States must also include in their State Plans other elements, such as inventories, legal authority, and public participation documentation, to demonstrate their ability to enforce the State Plans.

X. What did the state submit as part of its State Plan?

The State of New Hampshire submitted its Sections 111(d)/129 State Plan to EPA for approval on June 2, 1999 and supplemented it on November 1, 1999. The State adopted the EG requirements into the New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules Env-A-3500, "Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incineration" on January 29, 1999 and promulgated certain revisions on October 30, 1999. The State Plan contains:

1. A demonstration of the State's legal authority to implement the State Plan.
2. New Hampshire Rule CHAPTER Env-A-3500, "Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incineration" as the enforceable mechanism.
3. An inventory of the sources on pages 4 and 5 of the State Plan.
4. An emissions inventory on pages 5 and 6 of the State Plan.
5. Emission limits, at least as protective as the EG, that are contained in Env-A-3505. (Please note that the State's mercury limit of 0.055 "g/dscm is more stringent than EPA's EG.)
6. Provisions for compliance schedules that are contained in Env-A-3507.
7. Testing, monitoring, and inspection requirements that are contained in Env-A-3510, 3511, and 3512.
8. Reporting and Recordkeeping requirements that are contained in Env-A-3513.

9. Operator training and qualification requirements that are contained in Env-A-3506.

10. Requirements for the development of a Waste Management Plan that are contained in Env-A-3509.

11. A record of the public notice and hearing requirements that are contained in Appendices D and E of the State Plan.

12. Provisions for state progress reports to EPA that are contained on page 10 of the State Plan.

13. Title V permit application due date requirements that are contained in Env-A-3514 and are due on September 1, 2000.

14. A final compliance date of September 15, 2002.

XI. Why Is EPA Approving New Hampshire's State Plan?

EPA has evaluated the HMIWI State Plan submitted by New Hampshire for consistency with the Act, EPA guidelines and policy. EPA has determined that New Hampshire's State Plan meets all requirements and, therefore, EPA is approving New Hampshire's Plan to implement and enforce the EG, as it applies to older HMIWIs.

EPA's approval of New Hampshire's State Plan is based on our findings that:

(1) NHDES provided adequate public notice of public hearings for the proposed rule-making that allows New Hampshire to carry out and enforce provisions that are at least as protective as the EG for HMIWIs, and

(2) NHDES demonstrated legal authority to adopt emission standards and compliance schedules applicable to the designated facilities; enforce applicable laws, regulations, standards and compliance schedules; seek injunctive relief; obtain information necessary to determine compliance; require record keeping; conduct inspections and tests; require the use of monitors; require emission reports of owners and operators; and make emission data publicly available.

A detailed discussion of EPA's evaluation of the State Plan is included in the technical support document (TSD) located in the official file for this action and available from the EPA contact listed above. The State Plan meets all of the applicable approval criteria.

XII. Why Does EPA Need to Approve State Plans?

Under section 129 of the Act, emission guidelines are not federally enforceable. Section 129(b)(2) of the Act requires states to submit State Plans to EPA for approval. Each state must show that its State Plan will carry out and

enforce the emission guidelines. State Plans must be at least as protective as the emission guidelines, and they become federally enforceable upon EPA's approval.

The procedures for adopting and submitting State Plans are in 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart B. EPA originally issued the Subpart B provisions on November 17, 1975. EPA amended Subpart B on December 19, 1995, to allow the subparts developed under Section 129 to include specifications that supersede the general provisions in Subpart B regarding the schedule for submittal of State Plans, the stringency of the emission limitations, and the compliance schedules. See 60 FR 65414.

XIII. 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 13132

Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Orders 12612 (Federalism) and 12875 (Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership). Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have "substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government." Under Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This final rule will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national

government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132, because it merely approves an existing state rule implementing a federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this rule.

C. Executive Order 13045

Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), applies to any rule that: (1) Is determined to be "economically significant" as defined under 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 that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children.

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, E. O. 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 action does not create any new requirements on any entity affected by this State Plan. Thus, the action will not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of E.O. 13084 do not apply to this rule.

E. 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.

State Plan approvals under section 111(d) and section 129(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements on any entity affected by this rule, including small entities. They simply approve requirements that the state is already imposing. Furthermore, in developing the HMIWI emission guidelines and standards, EPA prepared a written statement pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act which it published in the 1997 promulgation notice (see 62 FR 48348). In accordance with EPA's determination in issuing the 1997 HMIWI emission guidelines, this State Plan does not include any new requirements that will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, because the Federal 111(d) Plan approval does not impose any new requirements and pursuant to section 605(b) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Regional Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant 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 on by the rule.

In developing the HMIWI emission guidelines and standards, EPA prepared a written statement pursuant to section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Act which it published in the 1997 promulgation notice (*see* 60 FR 48374 to 48378). The EPA has determined that this State Plan does not include any new Federal mandates above those previously considered during promulgation of the 1997 HMIWI guidelines. The State Plan does include an emission limitation for mercury that will be more stringent than the limit required by the EG. However, that limit is not the result of a Federal mandate. In approving the State Plan, EPA is approving pre-existing requirements under State law and imposing no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from EPA's approval of State Plan provisions that may be more stringent than the EG requirements, nor will EPA's approval of the State Plan significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Thus, this action is not subject to the requirements of sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Act.

G. Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office

Under 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, EPA submitted 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 General Accounting Office prior to publication of the rule in today's **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

H. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12(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 bodies. The NTTAA directs EPA to provide

Congress, through OMB, explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

In approving or disapproving State Plans under section 129 of the Clean Air Act, EPA does not have the authority to revise or rewrite the State's rule, so the Agency does not have authority to require the use of particular voluntary consensus standards. Accordingly, EPA has not sought to identify or require the State to use voluntary consensus standards. Furthermore, New Hampshire's Plan incorporates by reference test methods and sampling procedures for existing HMIWI units already established by the emissions guidelines for HMIWIs at 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart Ce, and does not establish new technical standards for HMIWIs. Therefore, the requirements of the NTTAA are not applicable to this final rule.

I. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by April 10, 2000. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review, nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2), 42 U.S.C. 7607(b)(2). EPA encourages interested parties to comment in response to the proposed rule rather than petition for judicial review, unless the objection arises after the comment period allowed for in the proposal.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 62

Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Environmental protection, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides.

Dated: January 20, 2000.

Mindy S. Lubber,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 1.

40 CFR Part 62 is amended as follows:

PART 62—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 62 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7642.

Subpart EE—New Hampshire

2. Section 62.7325 is amended by adding paragraphs (b)(2) and (c)(2) to read as follows:

§ 62.7325 Identification of plan.

(b) * * *

(2) Control of air emissions from existing hospital/medical/infectious waste incinerators, submitted on June 2, 1999.

(c) * * *

(2) Hospital/medical/infectious waste incinerators.

3. Part 62 is amended by adding a new § 62.7450 and a new undesignated center heading to Subpart EE to read as follows:

Air Emissions From Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators

§ 62.7450 Identification of sources.

(a) The plan applies to existing hospital/medical/infectious waste incinerators for which construction commenced on or before June 20, 1996.

(b) [Reserved].

[FR Doc. 00-2472 Filed 2-7-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

43 CFR Part 11

RIN 1090-AA72

Natural Resource Damage Assessments—Type A Procedures

AGENCY: Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Final rule; correcting amendments.

SUMMARY: On May 7, 1996, the Department of the Interior published a final rule establishing two simplified, or "type A," procedures for assessing natural resource damages under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. 61 FR 20559. Those procedures incorporated two computer models. The Department made a number of technical corrections to the models on November 10, 1997. 62 FR 60457. This rule makes additional technical corrections to those models.

DATES: This final rule is effective February 8, 2000. The incorporation by reference of the publications listed in this rule was approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of February 8, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Rosenberger at (202) 208-3301.