under this agreement, Eastman may propose to the State one or more alternative projects that would achieve equivalent emissions reductions. TCEQ will evaluate alternative proposals under 30 TAC Chapter 115, Subchapter J.

IX. Proposed Action

EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the Texas SIP pertaining to the Northeast Texas area. These revisions pertain to (1) the CAAP for the Northeast Texas EAC area and the related attainment demonstration of the 8-hour ozone standard for the EAC area and (2) Agreed Orders regarding control of air pollution for the Northeast Texas area. The revisions will contribute to improvement in air quality and continued attainment of the NAAQS for ozone in Northeast Texas. We have evaluated the State’s submittal and have determined that it meets the applicable requirements of the CAA and EPA air quality regulations, and is consistent with EPA policy and the EAC protocol.

X. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this proposed action is not a “significant regulatory action” and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason and because this action will not have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy, 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 proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this proposed 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 proposes to approve 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 (Pub. L. 104–4).

This proposed 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 proposes to approve 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 proposed 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 SIP submissions under the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note), EPA’s role is to approve state actions, 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 do not apply. This proposed 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.).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: May 6, 2005.

Richard E. Greene,
Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 05–9720 Filed 5–13–05; 8:45 am]
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Idaho: Proposed Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Idaho has applied to EPA for final authorization of certain changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). EPA has reviewed Idaho’s application, has preliminarily determined that these changes satisfy all requirements needed to qualify for final authorization, and is proposing to authorize the state’s changes.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by June 15, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Jeff Hunt, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, Office of Waste and Chemicals (WCM–122), 1200 Sixth Ave., Seattle, Washington 98101, or via e-mail to hunt.jeff@epa.gov. You can view and copy Idaho’s application during normal business hours at the following addresses: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, Office of Waste and Chemicals, 1200 Sixth Ave., Seattle, Washington, contact: Jeff Hunt, phone number: (206) 553–0256; or Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, 1410 N. Hilton, Boise, Idaho, contact: John Brueck, phone number (208) 373–0458.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Hunt, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, Office of Waste and Chemicals (WCM–122), 1200 Sixth Ave., Seattle, Washington 98101, phone number: (206) 553–0256, e-mail: hunt.jeff@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Why Are Revisions to State Programs Necessary?

States which have received final authorization from EPA under RCRA section 3006(b), 42 U.S.C. 6926(b), must maintain a hazardous waste program that is equivalent to, consistent with, and no less stringent than the Federal program. As the Federal program changes, states must change their programs and ask EPA to authorize the changes. Changes to state programs may be necessary when Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority is
modified or when certain other changes occur. Most commonly, states must change their programs because of changes to EPA’s regulations in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) parts 214, 260 through 266, 268, 270, 273 and 279.

B. What Decisions Have We Made in This Rule?

EPA has preliminarily determined that Idaho’s application to revise its authorized program meets all of the statutory and regulatory requirements established in 40 CFR part 272. Therefore, we are proposing to grant Idaho final authorization to operate its hazardous waste program with the changes described in the authorization application. Idaho will have responsibility for permitting Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDFs) within its borders (except in Indian country) and for carrying out the aspects of the RCRA program described in its revised program application, subject to the limitations of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA). New Federal requirements and prohibitions imposed by Federal regulations that EPA promulgates under authority of HSWA take effect in authorized states before the states are authorized for the requirements. Thus, EPA will implement those requirements and prohibitions in Idaho, including issuing permits, until the State is granted authorization to do so.

C. What Will Be the Effect if Idaho Is Authorized for These Changes?

If Idaho is authorized for these changes, a facility in Idaho subject to RCRA will have to comply with the authorized State requirements in lieu of the corresponding federal requirements in order to comply with RCRA. Additionally, such persons will have to comply with any applicable federally-issued requirements, such as, for example, HSWA regulations issued by EPA for which the State has not received authorization, and RCRA requirements that are not supplanted by authorized State-issued requirements.

EPA has enforcement responsibilities under its state hazardous waste management program for violations of such program, but EPA retains its authority under RCRA sections 3007, 3008, 3013, and 7003, which include, among others, the authority to:
- Conduct inspections; require monitoring, tests, analyses or reports;
- Enforce RCRA requirements; suspend or revoke permits; and
- Take enforcement actions regardless of whether the State has taken its own actions.

The action to approve these revisions would not impose additional requirements on the regulated community because the regulations for which Idaho will be authorized are already effective under State law and are not changed by the act of authorization.

D. What Happens if EPA Receives Comments on This Action?

If EPA receives comments on this action, we will address those comments in a later final rule. You may not have another opportunity to comment. If you want to comment on this authorization, you must do so at this time.

E. What Has Idaho Previously Been Authorized For?


F. What Changes Are We Proposing?

On September 27, 2004, Idaho submitted a final program revision application, seeking authorization for all delegable federal hazardous waste regulations codified as of July 1, 2003, as incorporated by reference in IDAPA 58.01.05(002)–(016) and 58.01.05.997. We have preliminarily determined that Idaho’s hazardous waste program revision satisfies all of the requirements necessary to qualify for final authorization, and EPA is proposing to authorize the State’s changes. These changes include all delegable regulatory changes to the Federal hazardous waste program promulgated between July 1, 2000 and July 1, 2003, as well as the remaining portions of the October 22, 1998 Federal rule “Standards Applicable to Owners and Operators of Closed and Closing Hazardous Waste Management Facilities: Post-Closure Permit Requirement and Closure Process; Final Rule” (63 FR 56710) that were not previously authorized.

G. Who Handles Permits After the Authorization Takes Effect?

Idaho will continue to issue permits for all the provisions for which it is authorized and will administer the permits it issues. If EPA issued permits prior to authorizing Idaho for these revisions, these permits would continue in force until the effective date of the State’s issuance or denial of a State hazardous waste permit, at which time EPA would modify the existing EPA permit to expire at an earlier date, terminate the existing EPA permit for cause, or allow the existing EPA permit to otherwise expire by its term, except for those facilities located in Indian Country. EPA will not issue new permits or new portions of permits for provisions for which Idaho is authorized after the effective date of this authorization. EPA will continue to implement and issue permits for HSWA requirements for which Idaho is not yet authorized.

H. What Is Codification and Is EPA Codifying Idaho’s Hazardous Waste Program as Authorized in This Rule?

Codification is the process of placing the State’s statutes and regulations that comprise the State’s authorized hazardous waste program into the Code of Federal Regulations. This is done by referencing the authorized State rules in 40 CFR part 272. Through four codification actions dated December 6, 1990 (55 FR 50327), June 11, 1992 (57 FR 24757), June 25, 1999 (64 FR 34180), and March 8, 2005 (70 FR 11132) the EPA codified at 40 CFR part 272, subpart N all previous authorization actions for the State of Idaho program. EPA is reserving the amendment of 40 CFR part 272, subpart N for codification of this current revision to Idaho’s program at a later date.

I. How Would Authorizing Idaho for These Revisions Affect Indian Country (18 U.S.C. 1151) in Idaho?

Idaho is not authorized to carry out its hazardous waste program in Indian country, as defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151. Indian country includes:
1. All lands within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations within or abutting the State of Idaho;
2. Any land held in trust by the U.S. for an Indian tribe; and
3. Any other land, whether on or off an Indian reservation that qualifies as Indian country. Therefore, this action has no effect on Indian country. EPA will continue to implement and administer the RCRA program in these lands.

J. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

1. Executive Order 12866

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), the Agency
must determine whether the regulatory action is “significant,” and therefore subject to OMB review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines “significant regulatory action” as one that is likely to result in a rule that may: (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more, or adversely affect in a material way, the economy, the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local or tribal governments or communities; (2) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs, or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order. It has been determined that this proposed Rule is not a “significant regulatory action” under the terms of Executive Order 12866 and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

2. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501, et seg., is intended to minimize the reporting and recordkeeping burden on the regulated community, as well as to minimize the cost of Federal information collection and dissemination. In general, the Act requires that information requests and record-keeping requirements affecting ten or more non-Federal respondents be approved by OPM. 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 seg.).

3. Regulatory Flexibility

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 et seq., generally requires Federal agencies to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute 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 organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions. For purposes of assessing the impacts of today’s rule on small entities, small entity size is defined as: (1) A small business, as codified in the Small Business Size Regulations at 13 CFR part 121; (2) a small governmental jurisdiction that is a government of a city, county, town, school district or special district with a population of less than 50,000; and (3) a small organization that is any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field. EPA has determined that this action will not have a significant impact on small entities because the proposed Rule will only have the effect of authorizing pre-existing requirements under State law. After considering the economic impacts of today’s proposed rule, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. We continue to be interested in the potential impacts of the proposed rule on small entities and welcome comments on issues related to such impacts.

4. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4) establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local and tribal governments and the private sector. Under section 202 of the UMRA, EPA generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost-benefit analysis, for proposed and final rules with “Federal mandates” that may result in expenditures to State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or to the private sector, of $100 million or more in any year. Before promulgating an EPA rule for which a written statement is needed, section 205 of the UMRA generally requires EPA to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and adopt the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. The provisions of section 205 do not apply when they are inconsistent with applicable law. Moreover, section 205 allows EPA to adopt an alternative other than the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative if the Administrator publishes with the final rule an explanation why the alternative was not adopted. Before EPA establishes any regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, including tribal governments, it must have developed under section 203 of the UMRA a small government agency plan. The plan must provide for notifying potentially affected small governments, enabling officials of affected small governments to have meaningful and timely input in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising small governments on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

This proposed rule contains no Federal mandates (under the regulatory provisions of Title II of the UMRA) for State, local or tribal governments or the private sector. The proposed rule authorizes pre-existing requirements under State law and imposes no new enforceable duty on any State, local or tribal governments or the private sector. Similarly, EPA has also determined that this proposed rule contains no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small government entities. Thus, the requirements of section 203 of the UMRA do not apply to this rule.

5. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

Executive Order 13132, entitled “Federalism” (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), 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” 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 various levels of government.”

This proposed rule does not have federalism implications. It 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 various levels of government.

This proposed rule only authorizes existing State rules as part of the State hazardous waste program.

6. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

Executive Order 13175, entitled “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments” (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure “meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications.” This proposed rule does not have tribal implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175. The rule proposes to authorize existing state rules and does not establish any regulatory policy with tribal implications. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this proposed
rule. EPA welcomes comment on this proposed rule from tribal officials.

7. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks

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

This proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it is not economically significant as defined in Executive Order 12866 and because the Agency does not have reason to believe the environmental health or safety risks addressed by this proposed action present a disproportionate risk to children.

8. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, “Actions Concerning Regulations that Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use” (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) because it is not a “significant regulatory action” as defined under Executive Order 12866.

9. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (“NTAA”). Public Law 104–113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus bodies. The NTAA directs EPA to provide Congress, through the OMB, explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards. Under RCRA 3006(b), EPA grants a State’s application for authorization as long as the State meets criteria required by RCRA. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a State authorization application, to require the use of any particular voluntary consensus standard in place of another standard that otherwise satisfies the requirements of RCRA. 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.

10. Executive Order 12988

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.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 271

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Confidential business information, Hazardous materials transportation, Hazardous waste, Indians-lands, Intergovernmental relations, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: This proposed action is issued under the authority of sections 2002(a), 3006 and 7004(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act as amended 42 U.S.C. 6912(a), 6926, 6974(b).

Julie Hagensen,
Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.
[FR Doc. 05–9317 Filed 5–13–05; 8:45 am]
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