

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 083-0243; FRL-6733-7]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District and Kern County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the El Dorado County (EDCAPCD) Air Pollution Control District, and Kern County Air Pollution Control District (KCAPCD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). The actions were proposed in the **Federal Register** on May 5, 1999, and March 22, 2000, respectively, and concern control of emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) from Industrial,

Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters, and Stationary Piston Engines. Under authority of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act), this action simultaneously approves local rules that regulate these emission sources and directs California to correct rule deficiencies.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This rule is effective on August 21, 2000.

ADDRESSES: You can inspect copies of the administrative record for this action at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule

Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95812.

El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, Air Pollution Control District, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667, or

Kern County Air Pollution Control District, 2700 "M" Street, Suite 302, Bakersfield, CA 93301

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ed Addison, Rulemaking Office, AIR-4, Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901 Telephone: (415) 744-1160.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to EPA.

I. Proposed Action

On May 5, 1999 (64 FR 24119), and March 22, 2000 (65 FR 15287), respectively, EPA proposed a limited approval and limited disapproval of the following rules that were submitted for incorporation into the California SIP.

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
EDCAPCD	229	Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters.	09/27/94	10/20/94
KCAPCD	427	Stationary Piston Engines (Oxides of Nitrogen)	07/2/98	08/21/98

We proposed a limited approval because we determined that these rules improve the SIP and are largely consistent with the relevant CAA requirements. We simultaneously proposed a limited disapproval because some rule provisions conflict with section 110 and part D of the Act. These provisions include the following:

- Alternate Emission Control Plan (AECPL) in Section 229.3 (D) and Rule 427 Section VIII C.2.d.
- Compliance schedule in Section 229.4 (A) and Rule 427 Section VIII C.1.
- Heat input language in Section 229.3 (A).
- Flow rate meter language in Section 229.3 (C).
- Group testing of engines in Rule 427 Section VIII C.2.d.
- Exemption of engines between 25 and 250 bhp in Rule 427 Section V.

Our proposed action contains more information on the basis for this rulemaking and on our evaluation of the submittals.

II. Public Comments and EPA Responses

EPA's proposed action provided a 30-day public comment period. No comments were submitted regarding our proposed action on EDCAPCD Rule 229.

KCAPCD Rule 427: KCAPCD commented orally that EPA should not object to exempting engines between 50 and 250 bhp from NO_x emission limits or testing requirements. KCAPCD argued that these engines are not likely to emit greater than 50 tons/year of NO_x and are therefore not major sources subject to the RACT requirement in serious ozone nonattainment areas like Southeastern Kern County. EPA concurs with this comment and withdraws this as a basis for disapproving Rule 427 at this time. We note, however, that Southeastern Kern County may soon be reclassified as severe nonattainment and thus be subject to a 25 ton/year major source threshold. If and when that occurs, this exemption will need to be modified since engines smaller than 250 bhp are capable of emitting more than 25 tons/year NO_x.

III. EPA Action

No comments were submitted that change our assessment of the rules as described in our proposed action except for the comment discussed above. Therefore, as authorized in sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the Act, EPA is finalizing a limited approval of the submitted rules. This action incorporates the submitted rules into

the California SIP, including those provisions identified as deficient. As authorized under section 110(k)(3), EPA is simultaneously finalizing a limited disapproval of the rules. As a result, sanctions will be imposed unless EPA approves subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rules deficiencies within 18 months of the effective date of this action. These sanctions will be imposed under section 179 of the Act according to 40 CFR 52.31. In addition, EPA must promulgate a federal implementation plan (FIP) under section 110(c) unless we approve subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rules deficiencies within 24 months. Note that the submitted rules have been adopted by the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District and Kern County Air Pollution Control District, and EPA's final limited disapproval does not prevent the local agency from enforcing them.

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866, entitled "Regulatory Planning and Review."

B. Executive Order 13045

Executive Order 13045, entitled 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 rules on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency.

The rules are not subject to Executive Order 13045 because they do not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

C. Executive Order 13084

Under Executive Order 13084, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, 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 rules do not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to the rules.

D. Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13121, entitled 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.

The rules 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 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it merely approves a 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 the rules.

E. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This final rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals under section 110 and

subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply act on requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

EPA's disapproval of the state request under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act does not affect any existing requirements applicable to small entities. Any pre-existing federal requirements remain in place after this disapproval. Federal disapproval of the state submittal does not affect state enforceability. Moreover, EPA's disapproval of the submittal does 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.

Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co., v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255-66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

F. Unfunded Mandates

Under Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under Section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal

governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

G. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. The rules are not "major" rules as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

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

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 September 19, 2000. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of the final rules does not affect the finality of the rules for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference,

Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: June 7, 2000.

Felicia Marcus,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Part 52, chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart F—California

2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraphs (c) (203)(i)(A)(2) and (c) (230)(i)(C)(2) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(203) * * *

(i) * * *

(A) * * *

(2) Rule 229 adopted on September 27, 1994.

* * * * *

(230) * * *

(i) * * *

(C) * * *

(2) Rule 427 adopted on July 2, 1998.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 00-18436 Filed 7-20-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

41 CFR Chapter 301

[FTR Amendment 93]

RIN 3090-AH27

Federal Travel Regulation; Maximum Per Diem Rates in Minnesota

AGENCY: Office of Governmentwide Policy, GSA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule amends the Federal Travel Regulation (FTR) Amendment 87, published in the **Federal Register** on Thursday, December 2, 1999 (64 FR 67670). In order to provide adequate per diem reimbursement for Federal employee travel in Duluth, Minnesota, the maximum lodging allowance is changed to reflect seasonal rates.

DATES: This final rule is effective July 21, 2000, and applies to travel performed on or after July 21, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Joddy Garner, Office of Governmentwide Policy, Travel and Transportation Management Policy Division, at 202-501-1538.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

The General Services Administration (GSA), after an analysis of additional data, has determined that the current lodging allowance for Duluth, Minnesota, does not adequately reflect the cost of lodging in this area. To provide adequate per diem reimbursement for Federal employee travel for this area, the maximum lodging allowance is changed to reflect seasonal rates.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

This final rule is not required to be published in the **Federal Register** for notice and comment; therefore, the Regulatory Flexibility Act does not apply.

C. Executive Order 12866

GSA has determined that this rule is not a significant regulatory action for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993.

D. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act does not apply because the rule does not impose recordkeeping or information collection requirements, or the collection of information from offerors, contractors, or members of the public which require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 501 *et seq.*

E. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

This final rule is also exempt from congressional review prescribed under 5 U.S.C. 801 since it relates solely to agency management and personnel.

List of Subjects in 41 CFR Chapter 301

Government employees, Travel and transportation expenses.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, under 5 U.S.C. 5701-5709, 41 CFR chapter 301 is amended as follows:

CHAPTER 301—TEMPORARY DUTY (TDY) TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

1. Appendix A to chapter 301 is amended by revising the entry in the table under the State of Minnesota, city of Duluth, St. Louis County. The page of the table beginning with Frankfort and ending with Gulfport, which includes the Duluth revision, reads as follows:

BILLING CODE 6820-34-M