

customer jobs, pursuant to a federal warrant or otherwise pursuant to applicable law, the USPS itself will not review, disclose, or release the content of electronic materials submitted to NetPost Mailing Online. No other NetPost Mailing Online users are permitted to access a customer's documents, nor does the USPS make independent use of them. Once the documents are printed in hardcopy form, they are treated in accordance with E110 and E611.

6.0 REFUNDS AND LIMITATION OF LIABILITIES

6.1 Refunds

At the discretion of the USPS, refunds for NetPost Mailing Online postage and fees are available under P014.2. This standard provides the sole remedy available when matter submitted to NetPost Mailing Online is not delivered, not entered as hardcopy, or is not entered in the form specified by the NetPost Mailing Online customer.

6.2 NetPost Mailing Online Disclaimer

The USPS disclaims any responsibility for loss or negligent transmission of electronic files and mail on exactly the terms specified by the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. § 2680(b)) for traditional mail. Under no circumstances is the USPS liable for special or consequential changes that result from use or inability to use NetPost Mailing Online, which is provided "as is" and without warranties of any kind either express or implied. The terms and conditions upon which NetPost Mailing Online is provided to the public are governed solely by the applicable regulations and standards; as such, the USPS disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including, but not limited to, implied warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, and good faith and fair dealing.

As provided by 39 CFR 111.3, notice of issuance will be published in the **Federal Register**.

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 00-22044 Filed 8-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 240-0254a; FRL-6856-4]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve a revision to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District's (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from the use of organic solvents. We are approving a local rule that regulates this emission source under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on October 30, 2000 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by September 28, 2000. If we receive such comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revision and EPA's technical support document (TSD) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revision at the following locations:

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

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95812.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1999 Tuolumne Street, Suite #200, Fresno, CA 93721.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yvonne Fong, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 744-1199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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

Table of Contents

- I. The State's Submittal
 - A. What rule did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revision?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?
 - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. Public comment and final action.
- III. Background Information
 - Why was this rule submitted?
- IV. Administrative Requirements

I. The State's Submittal

A. What Rule Did the State Submit?

Table 1 lists the rule we are approving with the date that it was adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SJVUAPCD	4661	Organic Solvents	12/09/99	02/23/00

On March 7, 2000, this rule submittal was found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

B. Are There Other Versions of This Rule?

We finalized a limited approval and limited disapproval of Rule 4661 on January 15, 1999 (64 FR 2573). The

limited approval portion of that rulemaking incorporated Rule 4661 into the federally enforceable SIP and the limited disapproval portion of triggered sanctions and FIP clocks under sections 179(a) and 110(c) of the CAA. The SJVUAPCD adopted a revision to the SIP-approved version and CARB submitted it to us on the dates indicated in Table 1. This revision was submitted

to correct the deficiency noted in EPA's January 15, 1999 rulemaking.

C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rule Revision?

The rule revision identifies prohibitory rules referenced in the Exemptions section of the rule, thereby correcting the only rule deficiency noted in our January 15, 1999 rulemaking. The revision also adds

definitions of terms used in the rule and specifies recordkeeping, testing and compliance requirements. The TSD has more information about this rule.

II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rule?

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the Act) and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193).

Guidance and policy documents that we used to define specific requirements include the following:

1. "Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations; Clarification to Appendix D of November 24, 1987 **Federal Register** document," (Blue Book), notice of availability published in the May 25, 1988 **Federal Register**.

B. Does the Rule Meet the Evaluation Criteria?

We believe this rule is consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability and SIP relaxations. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving the submitted rule because we believe it fulfills all relevant requirements. We do not think anyone will object to this, so we are finalizing the approval without proposing it in advance. However, in the Proposed Rules section of this **Federal Register**, we are also proposing approval of the same submitted rule. If we receive adverse comments by September 28, 2000, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that the

direct final approval will not take effect and we will address the comments in a subsequent final action based on the proposal. If we do not receive timely adverse comments, the direct final approval will be effective without further notice on October 30, 2000. This will incorporate the rule into the federally enforceable SIP and permanently terminate any sanctions or FIP clocks associated with our January 15, 1999 action.

III. Background Information

Why Was This Rule Submitted?

VOCs help produce ground-level ozone and smog, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control VOC emissions. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of this local agency VOC rule.

TABLE 2.—OZONE NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES

Date	Event
March 3, 1978	EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1977. 43 FR 8964; 40 CFR 81.305.
May 26, 1988	EPA notified Governors that parts of their SIPs were inadequate to attain and maintain the ozone standard and requested that they correct the deficiencies (EPA's SIP-Call). See section 110(a)(2)(H) of the pre-amended Act.
November 15, 1990	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted. Pub. L. 101-549, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

IV. Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. This action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule approves pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-4). For the same reason, this rule also does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of tribal governments, as specified by Executive Order 13084 (63 FR 27655, May 10, 1998). This 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 (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. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61

FR 4729, February 7, 1996), in issuing this rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the "Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings" issued under the executive order. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

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**. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

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 October 30, 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).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: August 8, 2000.

Laura Yoshii,

Acting 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)(276)(i)(B)(1) to read as follows:

52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(276) * * *

(i) * * *

(B) San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 4661, adopted on December 9, 1999.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 00-21909 Filed 8-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[IN98-1a, IN125-1a; FRL-6854-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana Source-Specific Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving revisions to air pollutant emission limitations for two facilities in Lake County, Indiana. These limitations concern particulate matter emissions from a Lever Brothers facility and both particulate matter and sulfur dioxide emissions from Northern Indiana Public Service Company's (NIPSCO's) Dean Mitchell Station. Indiana requested these revisions on February 3, 1999, and December 28, 1999, respectively.

DATES: This rule is effective on October 30, 2000, unless EPA receives written adverse comments by September 28, 2000. If adverse comments are received, timely notice will be published in the **Federal Register** withdrawing the rule and informing the public that the rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to: J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), United States Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Copies of the State's submittal are available for inspection at the following address:

(We recommend that you telephone John Summerhays at (312) 886-6067, before visiting the Region 5 Office.) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division (AR-18J), 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Summerhays, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6067.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This rulemaking approves revisions to limits in the Indiana State Implementation Plan (SIP) for two companies in Lake County, Indiana. The first company is Lever Brothers, for which the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) requested emission limit revisions for particulate matter on February 3, 1999. The second company is Northern Indiana Public Service Company (NIPSCO), for which IDEM

requested emission limit revisions for both particulate matter and sulfur dioxide limits on December 28, 1999.

This document is organized according to the following table of contents:

I. Lever Brothers

1. What revisions did IDEM request?

2. What is EPA's evaluation of this request?

II. NIPSCO-Dean Mitchell Station

1. What revisions did IDEM request?

2. What is EPA's evaluation of this request?

III. EPA Action

IV. Administrative Requirements

I. Lever Brothers

1. What Revisions Did IDEM Request?

The principal revision IDEM requested for Lever Brothers concerned a limit on pounds of particulate matter emissions per hour for one emission point, specifically the milling and pelletizer soap dust collection system. This emission point is also subject to a limit on particulate matter emissions per standard cubic foot of air, but IDEM did not request that this latter limit be revised. Indiana included emission limits for this facility in the Lake County SIP for small particles ("PM₁₀") that EPA approved on June 15, 1995, at 60 FR 31413. According to the State, while the emissions per volume limit was correctly set, an erroneous multiplication of emissions per volume times capacity air volume flow rate yielded a mistakenly low value for the emissions per hour value. IDEM requested that the emissions per hour limit be raised to the corrected value.

2. What Is EPA's Evaluation of This Request?

The requested revision must be evaluated as a relaxation of the Lake County PM₁₀ plan. As such, the principal criterion EPA must use is given in section 110(l) of the Clean Air Act, requiring that revisions must not "interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment and reasonable further progress * * * or any other applicable requirement."

To address this criterion, IDEM performed a dispersion modeling analysis of PM₁₀ concentrations attributable to Lever Brothers and other Lake County sources. IDEM used virtually the same inputs and procedures as the attainment plan that EPA approved in 1995, except that IDEM used ISC3, a more current dispersion model, as well as the revised emission rate for Lever Brothers. This analysis demonstrated that, despite the slightly increased allowable emissions for Lever Brothers, the plan was still adequate to attain and maintain the air quality standards in the vicinity.

EPA believes the modeling analysis satisfies applicable guidance. EPA