

Register on July 2, 2001 (66 FR 34841), adding temporary § 165.T09–930.

Need for Correction

As published, that section number was incorrect. That section number is assigned to another CFR section. This document corrects the section number.

Correction of Publication

In rule FR Doc. 01–16586 published on July 2, 2001 (66 FR 34841). Make the following corrections. On page 34842, in the second column, on lines 43 and 45, change the section number of the temporary safety zone to read § 165.T09–974.

M.R. DeVries,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI.

[FR Doc. 01–21355 Filed 8–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MO 0133–1133a; FRL–7041–8]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Correction

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Correcting amendments.

SUMMARY: On March 23, 2001 (66 FR 16137), EPA published a final action approving revisions to the Missouri State Implementation Plan (SIP). In the March 23, 2001, rule, EPA inadvertently omitted a statement in the Explanation column for rule 10 CSR 10–6.065. We are making a correction to the explanation in this document.

DATES: This action is effective August 23, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne Kaiser at (913) 551–7603.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA published a SIP revision for Missouri that included a revision to rule 10 CSR 10–6.065 on March 23, 2001. In § 52.1320(c), Chapter 6, the Explanation column for this rule should have included a statement that Section (6), Part 70 Operating Permits, has been approved as an integral part of the operating permit program and has not been approved as part of the SIP. Therefore, in this correction notice we are adding this information to the table for Chapter 6.

Section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), provides that, when an agency for good

cause finds that notice and public procedures are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, the agency may issue a rule without providing notice and an opportunity for public comment. We have determined that there is such good cause for making today's rule final without prior proposal and opportunity for comment because we are merely reinserting an explanation which was included in a previous action. Thus, notice and public procedure are unnecessary.

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. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, “Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use” (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). 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 merely corrects an incorrect citation in a previous action, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 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 corrects a citation in 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 (CAA). 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, our role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. In this context, in the absence

of a prior existing requirement for the state to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), we have 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 CAA. 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, we have 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 (CRA), 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. Section 808 allows the issuing agency to make a rule effective sooner than otherwise provided by the CRA if the agency makes a good cause finding that notice and public procedure is impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest. This determination must be supported by a brief statement. As stated previously, we made such a good cause finding, including the reasons therefore and established an effective date of August 23, 2001. We will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. This correction to the Missouri SIP table is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804 *et seq.* (2).

Dated: August 10, 2001.
William W. Rice,
Acting Regional Administrator, Region 7.
 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 AA—Missouri

2. In § 52.1320(c) the table is amended under Chapter 6 by revising the entry for rule “10–6.065” to read as follows:

§ 52.1320 Identification of plan.
 * * * * *
 (c) * * *

EPA-APPROVED MISSOURI REGULATIONS

Missouri citation	Title	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Missouri Department of Natural Resources				
Chapter 6—Air Quality Standards, Definitions, Sampling and Reference Methods, and Air Pollution Control Regulations for the State of Missouri				
*	*	*	*	*
10–6.065 ...	Operating Permits	5/30/00	3/23/01, 66 FR 16139	The state rule has sections (4)(A), (4)(B), and (4)(H)–Basic State Operating Permits. EPA has not approved those sections. Section (6), Part 70 Operating Permits, has been approved as an integral part of the operating permit program and has not been approved as part of the SIP.
*	*	*	*	*

[FR Doc. 01–21196 Filed 8–22–01; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 81

[Docket ID–01–003; FRL–7042–5]

Finding of Attainment for PM–10; Shoshone County (City of Pinehurst and Pinehurst Expansion Area)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA has determined that two areas in Shoshone County, Idaho, have attained the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than, or equal to a nominal ten micrometers (PM–10) by the respective attainment dates for the areas. One area is the City of Pinehurst, which has an attainment date of December 31, 1994. The other area is an area immediately adjacent to the City of Pinehurst, known as the “Pinehurst expansion area,” which has an attainment date of December 31, 2000.

DATES: This direct final rule will be effective October 22, 2001, unless EPA receives adverse comment by September 24, 2001. If adverse comments are

received, EPA will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule in the **Federal Register** informing the public that the rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed to Steven K. Body, Office of Air Quality, Mailcode OAQ–107, EPA Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington, 98101. Copies of documents relevant to this action are available for public review during normal business hours (8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) at this same address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven K. Body, Office of Air Quality, EPA Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle Washington, 98101 (206) 553–0782.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this notice, the words “we,” “us,” or “our” means the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The words “Pinehurst PM–10 nonattainment area” means the City of Pinehurst in Shoshone County, Idaho, that is designated nonattainment for PM–10 in 40 CFR 81.313. The words “Pinehurst expansion area” or “Pinehurst expansion PM–10 nonattainment area” mean that portion of Shoshone County, Idaho, immediately adjacent to the City of Pinehurst, that is designated nonattainment for PM–10 in 40 CFR 81.313.

Table of Comments

- I. Background
 - A. Designation and Classification of PM–10 Nonattainment Areas
 - B. How Does EPA Make Attainment Determinations?
 - C. What PM–10 Planning has Occurred for the Pinehurst PM–10 Nonattainment Area and the Pinehurst Expansion PM–10 Nonattainment Area?
 - D. What Does the Monitoring Data Show?
 - 1. Hi-Vol SSI Sampler
 - 2. TEOM Sampler
- II. EPA’s Action
 - A. Pinehurst PM–10 Nonattainment Area
 - B. Pinehurst Expansion PM–10 Nonattainment Area
 - C. Effect of EPA’s Findings
- III. Administrative Requirements

I. Background

A. Designation and Classification of PM–10 Nonattainment Areas

Areas meeting the requirements of section 107(d)(4)(B) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) were designated nonattainment for PM–10 by operation of law and classified “moderate” upon enactment of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. *See generally* 42 U.S.C. 7407(d)(4)(B). These areas included all former Group I PM–10 planning areas identified in 52 FR 29383 (August 7, 1987), as further clarified in 55 FR 45799 (October 31, 1990), and any other areas violating the NAAQS for PM–10 prior to January 1, 1989. A **Federal Register** document announcing the areas designated