

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 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). This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does 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). This action 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 “Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks” (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing 111(d)/129 plan 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 111(d)/129 plan submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be

inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a 111(d)/129 plan submission, to use VCS in place of a 111(d)/129 plan 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. 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.*).

#### *B. 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**. This rule is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

#### *C. 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 March 3, 2003. 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 approving the District of Columbia Department of Health, Environmental Health Administration, negative declaration for HMIWI units may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (*See* section 307(b)(2).)

#### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 62**

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Aluminum, Fertilizers, Fluoride, Intergovernmental relations, Paper and paper products industry, Phosphate, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Sulfur acid plants, Waste treatment and disposal.

Dated: December 20, 2002.

**Thomas C. Voltaggio,**  
*Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.*

40 CFR part 62 is amended as follows:

#### **PART 62—[AMENDED]**

1. The authority citation for part 62 continues to read as follows:

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

#### **Subpart J—District of Columbia**

2. Subpart J is amended by adding an undesignated center heading and § 62.2150 to read as follows:

#### **Emissions From Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator (HMIWI) Units**

##### **§ 62.2150 Identification of plan—negative declaration.**

Letter from the Department of Health, Environmental Health Administration, submitted to EPA on June 25, 1999, certifying that there are no known existing HMIWI units in the District of Columbia.

[FR Doc. 02–33098 Filed 12–31–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

##### **40 CFR Part 62**

[DC051–7001a; PA186–7001a; FRL–7434–9]

#### **Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; the District of Columbia, and the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Control of Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking direct final action to approve the section 111(d) negative declarations submitted by the District of Columbia, and the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Each negative declaration certifies that municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills, subject to the requirements of section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), do not exist within its air pollution control agency’s jurisdiction.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective March 3, 2003 unless within February 3, 2003 adverse or critical comments are received. If adverse comments are received, EPA 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 Walter Wilkie, Deputy Chief, Air Quality Planning and Information Services Branch, Mailcode 3AP21, 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.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** James B. Topsale at (215) 814-2190, or by e-mail at [topsale.jim@epa.gov](mailto:topsale.jim@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

##### I. Background

Section 111(d) of the CAA requires states to submit plans to control certain pollutants (designated pollutants) at existing facilities (designated facilities) whenever standards of performance have been established under section 111(b) for new sources of the same type, and EPA has established emission guidelines (EG) for such existing sources. A designated pollutant is any pollutant for which no air quality criteria have been issued, and which is not included on a list published under section 108(a) or section 112(b)(1)(A) of the CAA, but emissions of which are subject to a standard of performance for new stationary sources.

On March 12, 1996 (61 FR 9905), EPA promulgated MSW landfill new source performance standards and emission guidelines (EG). Later, EPA promulgated landfill rule amendments on June 16, 1998 (63 FR 32743), February 24, 1999 (64 FR 9258), April 10, 2000 (65 FR 18906), and proposed amendments on May 23, 2002 (67 FR 36476). The EG are applicable to existing municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills (*i.e.*, the designated facilities) that emit landfill gas (LFG), which consists primarily of carbon dioxide, methane, and nonmethane organic compounds (NMOC). MSW landfills are the largest manmade source of methane emissions in the United States. The designated pollutant, NMOC, is a mixture of more than 100 different compounds, including volatile organic compounds (VOC), and hazardous pollutants (HAPs), such as vinyl chloride, toluene, and benzene. A collateral benefit in the control of NMOC is the control of methane.

The designated facility to which the EG apply is each existing MSW landfill for which construction, reconstruction or modification was commenced before May 30, 1991, and has accepted

municipal solid waste at any time since November 8, 1987, or has additional design capacity available for future waste deposition. Landfill emission controls are not required, unless the designated facility has a capacity greater than or equal to 2.5 million megagrams (Mg) and 2.5 million cubic meters, and a calculated NMOC emissions rate of 50 Mg/Yr, or greater.

Subpart B of 40 CFR part 60 establishes procedures to be followed and requirements to be met in the development and submission of state plans to EPA for controlling designated pollutants. Also, 40 CFR part 62 provides the procedural framework for the submission of these plans. When designated facilities are located in a state, the state must develop and submit a plan for the control of the designated pollutant. However, 40 CFR 60.23(b) and 62.06 provide that if there are no existing sources of the designated pollutant in the state, the state may then submit a letter of certification to that effect (*i.e.*, negative declaration) in lieu of a plan. The negative declaration exempts the state from the requirements of subpart B that require the submittal of a 111(d) plan.

##### II. Final EPA Action

The District of Columbia, and the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania have determined that there are no existing designated facilities (MSW landfills), in their respective air pollution control jurisdiction. Each agency has submitted to EPA a negative declaration letter certifying this fact. The letters are dated September 11, 1997, and February 27, 1996, respectively.

Therefore, EPA is amending 40 CFR part 62 to reflect the receipt of these negative declaration letters from both air pollution control agencies. Amendments are being made to 40 CFR part 62, subparts J (District of Columbia), and NN (Pennsylvania). With respect to subpart NN, this action is only applicable to the City of Philadelphia air pollution control agency's jurisdiction. Allegheny County, Pennsylvania is covered by its own EPA approved plan (64 FR 13075), while the remainder of the state is covered by a Federal plan (64 FR 60689) until such time as EPA approves the submitted state plan from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection.

After publication of this **Federal Register** document, if a designated facility is found within either one of the two noted jurisdictions, then the overlooked landfill is subject to the requirements of the Federal landfill 111(d) plan, including the compliance

schedule, which was promulgated on November 8, 1999 (64 FR 60689). The Federal plan would no longer apply if EPA subsequently receives and approves a 111(d) plan from the jurisdiction with the overlooked designated landfill.

EPA is publishing this action without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. This action simply reflects already existing Federal requirement for state air pollution control agencies under 40 CFR parts 60 and 62. In the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register** publication, EPA is publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve each negative declaration should relevant adverse or critical comments be filed.

This rule will be effective March 3, 2003 without further notice unless the Agency receives relevant adverse comments by February 3, 2002. If EPA receives such comments, then EPA will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public that the rule did not take effect. EPA will address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

##### III. Administrative Requirements

###### A. General 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 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). This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does 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). This action 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 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing 111(d)/129 plan 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 111(d)/129 plan submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a 111(d)/129 plan submission, to use VCS in place of a 111(d)/129 plan 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. 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.*).

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

#### *C. 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 March 3, 2003. 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 approving the District of Columbia and City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania negative declarations for municipal solid waste landfills may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

#### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 62**

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Aluminum, Fertilizers, Fluoride, Intergovernmental relations, Paper and paper products industry, Phosphate, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Sulfuric acid plants, Waste treatment and disposal.

Dated: December 20, 2002.

**Thomas C. Voltaggio,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.*

40 CFR part 62 is amended as follows:

#### **PART 62—[AMENDED]**

1. The authority citation for part 62 continues to read as follows:

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

#### **Subpart J—District of Columbia**

2. Subpart J is amended by adding an undesignated center heading and § 62.2140 to read as follows:

#### **Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills**

##### **§ 62.2140 Identification of plan—negative declaration.**

Letter from the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

submitted September 11, 1997, certifying that there are no existing municipal solid waste landfills in the District of Columbia that are subject to 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cc.

#### **Subpart NN—Pennsylvania**

3. Section 62.9633 is added to Subpart NN, "Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills" to read as follows:

##### **§ 62.9633 Identification of plan—negative declaration.**

Letter from the City of Philadelphia, Department of Public Health, submitted February 27, 1996, certifying that there are no existing municipal solid waste landfills in the City of Philadelphia that are subject to 40 CFR part 60, subpart Cc.

[FR Doc. 02-33100 Filed 12-31-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

### **48 CFR Parts 904, 952, and 970**

**RIN 1991-AB42**

#### **Acquisition Regulation: Security Amendments To Implement Executive Order 12829, National Industrial Security Program**

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy (DOE).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Energy (DOE) is adopting as final without change an Interim Final Rule amending the Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) to ensure a uniform and simplified security system for contractors and others requiring access authorization for classified national security or restricted atomic energy information. The Final Rule also adopts the provision in the Interim Final Rule which allows the Secretary of Energy to waive the prohibition on award of a national security contract to an entity controlled by a foreign government if an environmental restoration requirement is involved.

**DATES:** This rule was effective May 28, 2002 pursuant to the interim final rule published March 28, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Richard B. Langston, Office of Procurement and Assistance Policy (ME-61), 202-586-8247; [richard.langston@pr.doe.gov](mailto:richard.langston@pr.doe.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** DOE is adopting as final the Interim Final Rule published on March 28, 2002, at 67 FR 14873 amending the DEAR to