

contained in 26 CFR part 1 revised as of April 1, 2000) applies.

* * * * *

PARTS 1 AND 31—[AMENDED]

Par. 7. In the table below, for each section indicated in the left column,

remove the language in the middle column and add the language in the right column:

| Section | Remove | Add |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1.401(a)–20, Q&A–8, paragraph (d), first sentence. | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | § 1.411(a)–11(c)(3)(ii). |
| 1.401(a)–20, Q&A–24, paragraph (a)(1), fourth sentence. | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | § 1.411(a)–11(c)(3)(ii). |
| 1.401(a)(4)–4, paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(C) | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | § 1.411(a)–11(c)(3)(ii). |
| 1.401(a)(26)–4, paragraph (d)(2), last sentence | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | § 1.411(a)–11(c)(3)(ii). |
| 1.401(a)(26)–6, paragraph (c)(4), first sentence | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | § 1.411(a)–11(c)(3)(ii). |
| 1.411(a)–11, paragraph (b), first sentence | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | paragraph (c)(3)(ii) of this section. |
| 1.411(a)–11, paragraph (c)(7), third sentence ... | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | paragraph (c)(3)(ii) of this section. |
| 1.411(d)–4, Q&A–2, paragraph (b)(2)(v), second, third, and fourth sentences. | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | § 1.411(a)–11(c)(3)(ii). |
| 1.411(d)–4, Q&A–4, paragraph (a), eighth sentence. | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | § 1.411(a)–11(c)(3)(ii). |
| 1.417(e)–1, paragraph (b)(2)(i), first, fourth, and fifth sentences. | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | § 1.411(a)–11(c)(3)(ii). |
| 31.3121(b)(7)–2, paragraph (d)(2)(i), last sentence. | § 1.411(a)–11T(c)(3)(ii) | § 1.411(a)–11(c)(3)(ii). |

Approved: July 10, 2000.

Robert E. Wenzel,
Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Jonathan Talisman,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Tax Policy).

[FR Doc. 00–18119 Filed 7–18–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–U

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

28 CFR Part 0

[Order No. 2314–2000]

Delegation of Authority: Settlement Authority

AGENCY: Department of Justice.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule delegates authority to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to settle administrative claims presented pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), where the amount of the settlement does not exceed \$50,000. Currently, the Director of the FBI has authority to settle FTCA claims not exceeding \$10,000. This rule will alert the general public to the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s new authority and is being codified in the Code of Federal Regulations to provide a permanent record of this delegation.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 19, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Larry R. Parkinson, General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, 935 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20535; (202) 324–3000.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This rule has been issued to delegate settlement authority and is a matter solely related to the division of responsibility within the Department of Justice. It relates to matters of agency policy, management, or personnel, and is therefore exempt from the usual requirements of prior notice and comment, and a 30-day delay in the effective date. *See* 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2), (b)(A).

Executive Order 12866

This rule falls within a category of actions that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined not to constitute “significant regulatory actions” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and, accordingly, was not reviewed by OMB.

Executive Order 13132

This regulation 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. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 13132 the Department of Justice has determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Attorney General, in accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 605(b), has reviewed this regulation and, by approving it, certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities. This rule pertains to delegations of

authority within the Department of Justice and does not affect the Department of Justice’s overall authority to act on tort claims.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 251 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, 5 U.S.C. 804. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation; or on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets.

Plain Language Instructions

We try to write clearly. If you can suggest how to improve the clarity of these regulations, call or write Larry R. Parkinson at the address and telephone number given above.

List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 0

Authority delegations (Government agencies), Government employees,

Organization and functions (Government agencies), Whistleblowing.

Accordingly, part 0 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 0—ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

1. The authority for part 0 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 515–519.

2. Section 0.89a of part 0, subpart P, is amended by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 0.89a Delegations respecting claims against the FBI.

(a) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is authorized to exercise the power and authority vested in the Attorney General Under 28 U.S.C. 2672 to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and settle any claim thereunder not exceeding \$50,000 in any one case caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

* * * * *

Dated: July 11, 2000.

Janet Reno,

Attorney General.

[FR Doc. 00–18213 Filed 7–18–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–02–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[VA099–5048; FRL–6837–5]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Approval of Revision to Opacity Limit for Drier Stacks at Georgia-Pacific Corporation Softboard Plant in Jarratt, VA

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving a revised opacity limit for drier zone stacks #1 and #2 associated with the softboard drier at the Jarratt Softboard Plant. The plant is owned by Georgia-Pacific Corporation (GP) and is located in Jarratt, VA. The new opacity limit is contained in a consent agreement between the Commonwealth of Virginia and GP. The consent agreement was submitted by the Department of Environmental Quality of the Commonwealth of Virginia (VADEQ) as a revision to its State Implementation

Plan (SIP) on February 3, 1999. The increased opacity limit only applies to the drier zone stacks which emit particulate emissions while drying the softboard. Mass emission limits from the drier are not being changed.

DATES: This rule is effective on September 18, 2000 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse written comment by August 18, 2000. If EPA receives such comments, it 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: Written comments should be mailed to Ms. Makeba A. Morris, Chief, Technical Assessment Branch, Mailcode 3AP22, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103; and Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia, 23219.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ruth E. Knapp, (215) 814–2191, or by e-mail at knapp.ruth@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document wherever “we”, “us” or “our” are used we mean EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. What is EPA approving?
- II. What facilities/operations does this action apply to?
- III. What are the provisions of the new opacity limit?
- IV. What are the current limits on this source?
- V. What supporting materials did Virginia provide?
- VI. What are the environmental effects of this action?
- VII. Special provisions related to Virginia.
- VIII. EPA rulemaking action.
- IX. Administrative Requirements.

I. What Is the EPA Approving?

We are approving Consent Order No. 50253 (effective September 28, 1998) signed by John M. Daniels for Dennis H. Treacy, Director of the Department of Environmental Quality of the Commonwealth of Virginia and Mr. John Masaschi, Vice President, Industrial Wood Products, Georgia-Pacific Corporation, as a SIP revision. The consent order was submitted, as a SIP revision, to EPA on February 3, 1999. The consent order provides a revised opacity limit for the two drier

zone stacks from the drier located at the Jarratt Softboard Plant located in Jarratt, Virginia. The revised limit allows for a higher opacity limit; however, mass emission rates are not being changed.

II. What Facilities/Operations Does This Action Apply To?

We are approving a revised opacity limit for a process at a GP Softboard plant. The plant manufactures softboard used in construction. Manufacturing begins with refining wood chips from pine and hardwood to produce wood fiber. Wax is added to the fiber to give it water resistance and then asphalt slurry is added as a binder. A continuous ribbon of wet mat is formed and conveyed through a press to remove water. The mat is then cut and placed into the drier. Dried mats are then re-sawn to construction dimensions. Particulate emissions from the drier are emitted from two drier zone stacks and nine roof vents. The revised opacity limit applies to emissions from drier zone stack #1 and drier zone stack #2 only.

III. What Are the Provisions of the New Opacity Limit?

The new limit is contained in the consent agreement which states “GP shall not exceed 50% opacity from the Softboard drier zone stacks one and two except for one six-minute period in any one hour of not more than 60% opacity * * *” Although the language of the Commonwealth’s consent order provides that the source may also have an exemption from the opacity limit during startup, shutdown and malfunction, the Commonwealth of Virginia has not included these provisions as part of its SIP revision request. Therefore, the portion of the text of Provision 1 of Section E of Consent Order No. 50253 which reads “* * * and during periods of start-up, shutdown and malfunction.” are not being approved or incorporated into the Virginia SIP. GP must conduct quarterly visible emission evaluations of drier zone stacks #1 and #2. Stack tests must be performed on drier zone stacks #1 and #2 every two years. GP must provide stack tests results to VADEQ in addition to maintaining visible emission records.

IV. What Are the Current Limits on These Sources?

The drier zone stacks #1 and #2 are currently subject to Virginia Regulations 9 VAC 5–40–80 Standard for Visible Emissions which provides for visible emissions up to 20% opacity except for one six-minute period in any one hour of not more than 60% opacity. The mass