

National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior 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.*). The State submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart Federal regulations.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804(2), the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. This rule: (a) Does not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million; (b) will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; and (c) does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S.-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises. This determination is based upon the fact that the state submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

Unfunded Mandates

This rule will not impose an unfunded mandate on state, local, or tribal governments or the private sector of \$100 million or more in any given year. This determination is based upon the fact that the state submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the federal regulation did not impose an unfunded mandate.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 926

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: June 3, 2002.

Brent Wahlquist,

Regional Director, Western Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 02-17653 Filed 7-12-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 70

[Petition IV-2001-4; FRL-7245-5]

Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to State Operating Permit for CITGO Petroleum Corporation—Doraville Terminal; Doraville (DeKalb County), GA

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of final order on petition to object to a state operating permit.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Clean Air Act section 505(b)(2) and 40 CFR 70.8(d), the EPA Administrator signed an order, dated June 5, 2002, denying a petition to object to a state operating permit issued by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) to CITGO Petroleum Corporation—Doraville Terminal (CITGO-Doraville) for its facility, located in Doraville, DeKalb County, Georgia. This order constitutes final action on the petition submitted by the Georgia Center for Law in the Public Interest (GCLPI or Petitioner) on behalf of the Sierra Club. Pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act (the Act) any person may seek judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of this notice under section 307 of the Act.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the final order, the petition, and all pertinent information relating thereto are on file at the following location: EPA Region 4, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. The final order is also available electronically at the following address: http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitions/citgo_decision2001.pdf.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Art Hofmeister, Air Permits Section, EPA Region 4, at (404) 562-9115 or hofmeister.art@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Act affords EPA a 45-day period to review

and, as appropriate, object to operating permits proposed by state permitting authorities under title V of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7661-7661f. Section 505(b)(2) of the Act and 40 CFR 70.8(d) authorize any person to petition the EPA Administrator to object to a title V operating permit within 60 days after the expiration of EPA's 45-day review period if EPA has not objected on its own initiative. Petitions must be based only on objections to the permit that were raised with reasonable specificity during the public comment period provided by the state, unless the petitioner demonstrates that it was impracticable to raise these issues during the comment period or the grounds for the issues arose after this period.

GCLPI submitted a petition on behalf of the Sierra Club to the Administrator on August 30, 2001, requesting that EPA object to a state title V operating permit issued by EPD to CITGO-Doraville. The Petitioner maintains that the CITGO-Doraville permit is inconsistent with the Act because the permit: (1) Does not contain adequate monitoring; (2) does not contain adequate reporting requirements related to monitoring; (2) impermissibly limits the use of credible evidence; (3) does not ensure the source's synthetic minor source status; and (4) did not undergo adequate public notice procedures.

On June 5, 2002, the Administrator issued an order denying this petition. The order explains the reasons behind EPA's conclusion that the Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the CITGO-Doraville permit is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act on the grounds raised.

Dated: June 24, 2002.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 02-17692 Filed 7-12-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 70

[Petition IV-2001-3; FRL-7245-6]

Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to State Operating Permit for Seminole Road Landfill; Ellenwood (DeKalb County), GA

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of final order on petition to object to a state operating permit.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Clean Air Act section 505(b)(2) and 40 CFR 70.8(d), the EPA Administrator signed an order, dated June 5, 2002, denying a petition to object to a state operating permit issued by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) to Seminole Road Landfill (Seminole Landfill) located in Ellenwood, Dekalb County, Georgia. This order constitutes final action on the petition submitted by the Georgia Center for Law in the Public Interest (GCLPI or Petitioner) on behalf of the Sierra Club. Pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act (the Act) any person may seek judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of this notice under section 307 of the Act.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the final order, the petition, and all pertinent information relating thereto are on file at the following location: EPA Region 4, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. The final order is also available electronically at the following address: <http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitions/seminole—decision2001.pdf>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Art Hofmeister, Air Permits Section, EPA Region 4, at (404) 562-9115 or hofmeister.art@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Act affords EPA a 45-day period to review and, as appropriate, object to operating permits proposed by state permitting authorities under title V of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7661-7661f. Section 505(b)(2) of the Act and 40 CFR 70.8(d) authorize any person to petition the EPA Administrator to object to a title V operating permit within 60 days after the expiration of EPA's 45-day review period if EPA has not objected on its own initiative. Petitions must be based only on objections to the permit that were raised with reasonable specificity during the public comment period provided by the state, unless the petitioner demonstrates that it was impracticable to raise these issues during the comment period or the grounds for the issues arose after this period.

GCLPI submitted a petition on behalf of the Sierra Club to the Administrator on August 22, 2001, requesting that EPA object to a state title V operating permit issued by EPD to Seminole Landfill. The Petitioner maintains that the Seminole Landfill permit is inconsistent with the Act because of: (1) the inaccuracy of the permit application; (2) the incompleteness of the permit narrative and the permit itself; (3) the permit's

apparent limitation of enforcement authority and credible evidence; (4) inadequate reporting requirements relating to monitoring; and (5) inadequate public notice procedures.

On June 5, 2002, the Administrator issued an order denying this petition. The order explains the reasons behind EPA's conclusion that the Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the Seminole Landfill permit is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act on the grounds raised.

Dated: June 24, 2002.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 02-17693 Filed 7-12-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Notice of Availability of a Draft Recovery Plan for the Northern Idaho Ground Squirrel (*Spermophilus brunneus brunneus*), for Review and Comment

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of document availability.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce the availability for public review of the Draft Recovery Plan for the Northern Idaho Ground Squirrel (*Spermophilus brunneus brunneus*; squirrel). The draft plan includes specific recovery criteria and measures to be taken in order to delist the squirrel. We solicit review and comment from local, State, and Federal agencies, and the public on this draft recovery plan.

DATES: Comments on the draft recovery plan must be received on or before September 13 2002, to receive consideration by the Service.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the draft recovery plan are available for inspection, by appointment, during normal working hours at the following location: Snake River Fish and Wildlife Office, 1387 S. Vinnell Way, Suite 368, Boise, Idaho 83709 (Phone: 208-378-5243). Requests for copies of the draft recovery plan, and written comments and materials regarding this plan should be addressed to Robert Ruesink, Field Supervisor, at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rich Howard, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, at the above address.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Recovery of endangered or threatened animals and plants is a primary goal of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's endangered species program. A species is considered recovered when the species' ecosystem is restored and/or threats to the species are removed so that self-sustaining and self-regulating populations of the species can be supported as persistent members of native biotic communities. Recovery plans describe actions considered necessary for the conservation of the species, establish criteria for downlisting or delisting listed species, and estimate time and cost for implementing the measures needed for recovery.

The Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended in 1988 (Act) (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), requires the development of recovery plans for listed species unless such a plan would not promote the conservation of a particular species. Section 4(f) of the Act requires that public notice and an opportunity for public review and comment be provided during recovery plan development. We will consider all information presented during the public comment period prior to approval of this recovery plan. Substantive technical comments may result in changes to the plan. Substantive comments regarding recovery plan implementation will be forwarded to appropriate Federal or other entities for consideration during the implementation of recovery actions.

The squirrel was listed as a threatened species on April 5, 2000. This subspecies is endemic to the Weiser and Little Salmon River Basins in western Idaho. It is distributed in small, isolated populations across two U.S. Forest Service Districts, and State and private lands in Adams and Valley Counties of western Idaho. It formerly occurred in Long Valley and Round Valley of Valley County, but no viable populations have been documented there within the past 5 years. Twenty-three population sites are considered extant; another 14 have unknown status or have become extirpated.

Declines in extant population sites and numbers of squirrels are attributed to the loss and fragmentation of habitat. The squirrel is dependent on meadow and shrub/grassland, and does well in habitat bordered by coniferous forests. However, the species becomes extirpated from areas that develop high densities of small trees. Conifers have displaced the species' food base, and inhibited or prevented dispersal of yearlings and adults between population sites. Land conversion from