

Paragraph 5000 Class D airspace area designated for an airport that contains at least one primary airport around which the airspace is designated.

* * * * *

ACE KS D Garden City, KS [New]

Garden City Regional Airport, KS (Lat. 37°55'39"N., long. 100°43'28"W.) Garden City VORTAC (Lat. 37°55'09"N., long. 100°43'30"W.)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 5400 feet MSL within a 4.3-mile radius of the Garden City Regional Airport. This Class D airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

* * * * *

Paragraph 6002 Class E airspace area designated as a surface area for an airport.

* * * * *

ACE KS E2 Garden City, KS [Revised]

Garden City Regional Airport, KS (Lat. 37°55'39"N., long. 100°43'28"W.) Garden City VORTAC (Lat. 37°55'09"N., long. 100°43'30"W.)

That airspace within a 4.3-mile radius of the Garden City Regional Airport and within 2.2 miles each side of the Garden City VORTAC 004° radial extending from the 4.3-mile radius of the Garden City Regional Airport to 7 miles north of the VORTAC and within 2.2 miles each side of the Garden City VORTAC 171° radial extending from the 4.3-mile radius of the Garden City Regional Airport to 5 miles south of the VORTAC. This Class E airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

* * * * *

Paragraph 6004 Class E airspace area designated as an extension to a Class D airspace area.

* * * * *

ACE KS E2 Garden City, KS [New]

Garden City Regional Airport, KS (Lat. 37°55'39"N., long. 100°43'28"W.) Garden City VORTAC (Lat. 37°55'09"N., long. 100°43'30"W.)

That airspace extending upward within 2.2 miles each side of the Garden City VORTAC 004° radial extending from the 4.3-mile radius of the Garden City Regional Airport to 7 miles north of the VORTAC and within 2.2 miles each side of the Garden City VORTAC 171° radial extending from the 4.3-mile radius of the Garden City Regional Airport to 5 miles south of the VORTAC. This Class E airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

* * * * *

Issued in Kansas City, MO, on July 27, 2000.

Herman J. Lyons, Jr., Manager, Air Traffic Division, Central Region. [FR Doc. 00-20166 Filed 8-8-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 224-0253; FRL-6848-5]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing a limited approval and limited disapproval of a revision to the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District's (VCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from surface cleaning and degreasing. We are proposing action on a local rule that regulates this emission source under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by September 8, 2000.

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 revisions 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 revisions at the following locations:

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

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Dr., 2nd Fl., Ventura, CA 93003-5417.

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?
II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?
B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
C. What are the rule deficiencies?
D. EPA recommendations to further improve the rule.
E. Proposed action and public comment.
III. Background Information
A. 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 addressed by this proposal 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

Table with 5 columns: Local agency, Rule #, Rule title, Adopted, Submitted. Row 1: VCAPCD, 74.6, Surface Cleaning and Degreasing, 11/10/98, 02/16/99

On April 23, 1999, 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 approved a version of Rule 74.6 into the SIP on December 13, 1994. The VCAPCD adopted a revision to the SIP-approved version on July 9, 1996 and CARB submitted it to us on October 18,

1996. While we can act on only the most recently submitted version, we have reviewed materials provided with the previous submittal.

C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rule?

Rule 74.6 limits surface cleaning and degreasing activities performed with solvents containing VOCs. 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), must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for major sources in nonattainment areas (see section 182(a)(2)(A)), and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). The VCAPCD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so Rule 74.6 must fulfill RACT.

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

1. Portions of the proposed post-1987 ozone and carbon monoxide policy that concern RACT, 52 FR 45044, November 24, 1987.

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

3. The Control Technique Guideline (CTG) entitled, *Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Solvent Metal Cleaning* (November 1977; EPA-450/2-77-022),

4. The CARB document entitled, *Determination of Reasonably Available Control Technology and Best Available Control Technology for Organic Solvent Cleaning and Degreasing Operations* (July 18, 1991)

B. Does the Rule Meet the Evaluation Criteria?

This rule improves the SIP by establishing more stringent emission limits and specifying appropriate cleaning devices and methods. This rule is largely consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT and SIP relaxations. Rule provisions which do not meet the evaluation criteria are summarized below and discussed further in the TSD.

C. What Are the Rule Deficiencies?

These provisions conflict with section 110 and part D of the Act and prevent full approval of the SIP revision.

1. Rule 74.6 contains two director's discretion clauses. Under Section C, a person is allowed to petition the Board

for a variance from specific provisions of the rule. Under Section C2a the APCO is given authority to approve alternative cleaning devices. These two sections of Rule 74.6 are unapprovable because they allow the APCO to change SIP requirements.

2. Section C1f contains a reference to Rule 74.32, Electronic Manufacturing Operations. Rule 74.32 has never been submitted for approval into the SIP. The reference creates confusion over the rule's applicability.

3. Section D requires that records of a solvent's intended uses, content, mix ratio be recorded. Although the types of records that must be maintained are specified, the frequency of records is not but should be specified.

D. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rule

The TSD describes additional rule revisions that do not affect EPA's current action but are recommended for the next time the local agency modifies the rules.

E. Proposed Action and Public Comment

As authorized in sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the Act, EPA is proposing a limited approval of the submitted rule to improve the SIP. If finalized, this action would incorporate the submitted rule into the SIP, including those provisions identified as deficient. This approval is limited because EPA is simultaneously proposing a limited disapproval of the rule under section 110(k)(3). If this disapproval is finalized, sanctions will be imposed under section 179 of the Act unless EPA approves subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rule deficiencies within 18 months. These sanctions would be imposed according to 40 CFR 52.31. A final disapproval would also trigger the federal implementation plan (FIP) requirement under section 110(c). Note that the submitted rule has been adopted by the VCAPCD, and EPA's final limited disapproval would not prevent the local agency from enforcing it.

We will accept comments from the public on the proposed limited approval and limited disapproval for the next 30 days.

III. Background Information

A. 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.
May 15, 1991	Section 182(a)(2)(A) requires that ozone nonattainment areas correct deficient RACT rules by this date.

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review.

B. Executive Order 13045

Executive Order 13045, entitled Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), 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 rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

C. Executive Order 13084

Under Executive Order 13084, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not

required by statute, that significantly or uniquely affects the communities of Indian tribal governments, and that imposes substantial direct compliance costs on those communities, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by the tribal governments, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to provide to the OMB in a separately identified section of the preamble to the rule, a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected tribal governments, a summary of the nature of their concerns, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected officials and other representatives of Indian tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory policies on matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities."

Today's proposed rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to this proposed rule.

D. Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132, entitled Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Orders 12612, Federalism and 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership. Executive Order 13132 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" is 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 the various levels of government." Under Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a

regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This proposed 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, because it merely acts on 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. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this proposed rule.

E. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements 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 not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This proposed rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply act on requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

EPA's proposed disapproval of the state request under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act does not affect any existing requirements applicable to small entities. Any pre-existing federal requirements remain in place after this disapproval. Federal disapproval of the state submittal does not affect state enforceability. Moreover, EPA's disapproval of the submittal does not impose any new Federal requirements. Therefore, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic

reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co., v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255-66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

F. Unfunded Mandates

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the proposed action does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This proposed Federal action acts on pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

G. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing a new regulation. To comply with NTTAA, EPA must consider and use "voluntary consensus standards" (VCS) if available and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to today's proposed action because it does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compound.

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

Dated: July 28, 2000.

Felicia Marcus,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 00-20123 Filed 8-8-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

41 CFR Parts 101-11, 102-193, 102-194, and 102-195

[FPMR Amendment B-]

RIN 3090-AG02

Federal Records Management Program, Interagency Reports Management Program, and Standard and Optional Forms Management Program

AGENCY: Office of Governmentwide Policy, GSA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The General Services Administration (GSA) is revising the Federal Property Management Regulations (FPMR) by moving coverage on creation, maintenance, and use of records into the Federal Management Regulation (FMR). A cross-reference is added to the FPMR to direct readers to the coverage in the FMR. The FMR coverage is written in plain language to provide agencies with updated regulatory material that is easy to read and understand.

DATES: Comments must be submitted October 10, 2000 to be considered in the formulation of a final rule.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Ms. Shari Kiser, Regulatory Secretariat (MVR), General Services Administration, 1800 F Street, NW., Washington, DC 20405. E-mail comments may be sent to *RIN.3090-AG02@gsa.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: R. Stewart Randall, Emerging IT Policy Division (MKE), telephone 202-501-4469.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

This proposed rule encourages Federal agencies to conduct business electronically. Part 102-193, Creation, Maintenance, and Use of Records, is being added to the FMR to provide a foundation for GSA programs that help address problems in the management of contemporary records. Both the General Services Administration (GSA) and the National Archives Records

Administration (NARA) have responsibilities for records management. This proposed rule references appropriate NARA regulations.

This proposed rule also makes changes in the operation of the Standard and Optional Forms Program. The Federal Government is moving toward greater use of information technology to allow improved customer service and Governmental efficiency. The Government Paperwork Elimination Act requires agencies to adopt electronic transactions of information by October, 2003, when practicable. This vision contemplates widespread use of the Internet, with Federal agencies transacting business electronically as commercial enterprises are doing. Members of the public who want to do business this way can avoid traveling to Government offices, waiting in line, or mailing paper forms. The Federal Government can also save significant time and money by transacting business electronically.

Therefore, this proposed rule is intended to facilitate the movement of the Federal Government toward greater automation of the information exchanged using standard and optional forms. This proposed rule also addresses management of standard and optional forms (in either paper or electronic form) and defines standard and optional automated formats. Normally, the most efficient exchange of information is done using automated forms. Thus, this proposed rule encourages agencies, where appropriate, to use automated formats.

Often, an important intermediate step in the Federal Government's evolution to transacting business electronically is the development and use of electronic standard and optional forms. Such forms, while not fully electronic business transactions, can make paper-based information exchanges substantially easier and introduce significant efficiencies for the Federal Government. The proposed part on standard and optional forms encourages the use of electronic forms by Federal agencies to facilitate paper-based transactions, pending their automation. To do that, this proposed rule establishes the policy that agencies should promote the use of electronic standard forms whenever practicable. To assist agencies assessing practicability, GSA is proposing that paper transactions continue when standard forms are for specialized use (*e.g.*, labels), when there are special security or integrity concerns (*e.g.*, classification cover sheets), and when there are unusual production costs (*e.g.*, special envelopes). The "Standard and

Optional Forms Procedural Handbook" includes a list of those forms that have been exempted from the policy in accordance with these criteria.

This proposed rule also makes changes to the Interagency Reports Management Program to shorten the time between when an agency determines a need for interagency information and when the agency can initiate an interagency report to obtain that information. Agencies will no longer have to get GSA's approval before initiating an interagency report. This change lets agencies take advantage of information technology to get the information they need to accomplish their missions.

When authorized by law and regulation, agencies are encouraged to share information, particularly as an alternative to collecting additional information from the public. This change is intended to facilitate agencies sharing needed information.

As a general rule, it is more efficient for agencies to share information in electronic form. While paper-based reporting, including electronic forms, may still be used, it is preferable that interagency reports be provided electronically between agencies. Agencies, however, are asked to give GSA information such as the name and the cost of each of their interagency reporting requirements. This information will be placed on our web site at *www.itpolicy.gsa.gov* and made available to Federal agencies.

B. Executive Order 12866

This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

A regulatory flexibility analysis is not required under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*, because there is no requirement that this proposed rule be published in the **Federal Register** for notice and comment.

D. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act does not apply because this proposed rule does not impose recordkeeping or information collection requirements, or the collection of information from offerors, contractors, or members of the public which require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under 44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*