the near future. Accordingly, this final rule does not make changes regarding anesthesia services. They remain subject to the payment provisions for those cases not covered by the Medicare formula (i.e., lesser of the actual amount billed or the amount calculated using the 75th percentile methodology; or the usual and customary rate if there are fewer than 8 treatment occurrences for a procedure during the previous fiscal year).

## Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Secretary hereby certifies that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as they are defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 through 612. The rule would not cause a significant economic impact on health care providers, suppliers, or entities since only a small portion of the business of such entities concerns VA beneficiaries. Therefore, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), the rule is exempt from the initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis requirements of sections 603 and 604.

### **Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers**

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers are 64.009, 64.010 and 64.011.

#### List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 17

Administrative practice and procedure, Alcohol abuse, Alcoholism, Claims, Day care, Dental health, Drug abuse, Foreign relations, Government contracts, Grant programs—health, Grant programs—veterans, Health care, Health facilities, Health professions, Health records, Homeless, Medical and dental schools, Medical devices, Medical research, Mental health programs, Nursing home care, Philippines, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Scholarships and fellowships, Travel and transportation expenses, Veterans.

Approved: May 8, 1998.

# Togo D. West, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 38 CFR part 17 is amended as follows:

#### PART 17—MEDICAL

1. The authority citation for part 17 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 38 U.S.C. 501, 1721, unless otherwise noted.

#### §17.55 [Amended]

2. In § 17.55, in the introductory text remove "38 U.S.C. 1703 or 38 CFR

17.52" and add, in its place "38 U.S.C. 1703 and 38 CFR 17.52 of this part or under 38 U.S.C. 1728 and 38 CFR 17.120"; paragraph (h) is removed; and paragraphs (i), (j) and (k) are redesigned as paragraphs (h), (i) and (j), respectively.

3. Section 17.56 is redesignated as § 17.57 and a new § 17.56 is added to read as follows:

# § 17.56 Payment for non-VA physician services associated with outpatient and inpatient care provided at non-VA facilities.

(a) Except for anesthesia services, payment for non-VA physician services associated with outpatient and inpatient care provided at non-VA facilities authorized under § 17.52, or made under § 17.120 of this part, shall be the lesser of the amount billed or the amount calculated using the formula developed by the Department of Health & Human Services, Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) under Medicare's participating physician fee schedule for the period in which the service is provided (see 42 CFR Parts 414 and 415). This payment methodology is set forth in paragraph (b) of this section. If no amount has been calculated under Medicare's participating physician fee schedule or if the services constitute anesthesia services, payment for such non-VA physician services associated with outpatient and inpatient care provided at non-VA facilities authorized under § 17.52, or made under § 17.120 of this part, shall be the lesser of the actual amount billed or the amount calculated using the 75th percentile methodology set forth in paragraph (c) of this section; or the usual and customary rate if there are fewer than 8 treatment occurrences for a procedure during the previous fiscal year.

(b) The payment amount for each service paid under Medicare's participating physician fee schedule is the product of three factors: a nationally uniform relative value for the service; a geographic adjustment factor for each physician fee schedule area; and a nationally uniform conversion factor for the service. The conversion factor converts the relative values into payment amounts. For each physician fee schedule service, there are three relative values: An RVU for physician work; an RVU for practice expense; and an RVU for malpractice expense. For each of these components of the fee schedule, there is a geographic practice cost index (GPCI) for each fee schedule area. The GPCIs reflect the relative costs of practice expenses, malpractice insurance, and physician work in an area compared to the national average.

The GPCIs reflect the full variation from the national average in the costs of practice expenses and malpractice insurance, but only one-quarter of the difference in area costs for physician work. The general formula calculating the Medicare fee schedule amount for a given service in a given fee schedule area can be expressed as: Payment =  $[(RVUwork \times GPCIwork) + (RVUpractice expense \times GPCIpractice expense) + (RVUmalpractice \times GPCImalpractice)] \times CF.$ 

- (c) Payment under the 75th percentile methodology is determined for each VA medical facility by ranking all occurrences (with a minimum of eight) under the corresponding code during the previous fiscal year with charges ranked from the highest rate billed to the lowest rate billed and the charge falling at the 75th percentile as the maximum amount to be paid.
- (d) Payments made in accordance with this section shall constitute payment in full. Accordingly, the provider or agent for the provider may not impose any additional charge for any services for which payment is made by VA.
- 4. Section 17.128 is revised to read as follows:

#### § 17.128 Allowable rates and fees.

When it has been determined that a veteran has received public or private hospital care or outpatient medical services, the expenses of which may be paid under § 17.120 of this part, the payment of such expenses shall be paid in accordance with §§ 17.55 and 17.56 of this part.

(Authority: Section 233, Pub. L. 99-576)

[FR Doc. 98–19682 Filed 7–22–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 8320–01–U

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

# 40 CFR Part 52

[WI76-02-7305; FRL-6128-4]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan; Wisconsin; Site-Specific SIP Revision for Amron Corporation

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This rulemaking finalizes the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) disapproval of a site-specific State Implementation Plan (SIP)

revision for the Amron Corporation facility located at 525 Progress Avenue

in Waukesha. The SIP revision was submitted by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) on February 21, 1997, and would exempt the facility from the volatile organic compound (VOC) emission limits applicable to miscellaneous metal coating operations. The EPA proposed to disapprove this request on April 28, 1998. No negative comments were submitted during the comment period.

**DATES:** This disapproval is effective August 24, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. (Please telephone Kathleen D'Agostino at (312) 886–1767 before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen D'Agostino, Environmental Engineer, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–1767.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

# I. Background

On April 28, 1998, EPA proposed to disapprove the site-specific SIP revision for Amron Corporation (63 FR 23239). This proposed disapproval was based on numerous factors which are discussed in detail in the proposed disapproval. EPA received no negative comments during the public comment period. Therefore, EPA is finalizing the disapproval proposed on April 28, 1998.

## II. Miscellaneous

# A. Applicability to Future SIP Decisions

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting, allowing or establishing a precedent for any future request for revision to any SIP. The EPA shall consider each request for revision to the SIP in light of specific technical, economic, and environmental factors and in relation to relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

#### B. Executive Orders 12866 and 13045

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 review.

The final rule is not subject to E.O. 13045, entitled "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks," because it is not an "economically significant" action under E.O. 12866.

#### C. Regulatory Flexibility

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 final rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because this disapproval only affects one source, Amron Corporation. Therefore, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Furthermore, as explained in this document, the request does not meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act and EPA cannot approve the request. EPA has no option but to disapprove the submittal.

EPA's 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.

# D. Unfunded Mandates

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, 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 costeffective 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 this disapproval 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 Federal disapproval action imposes no

new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result.

#### E. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

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. Section 804, however, exempts from section 891 the following types of rules: rules of particular applicability; rules relating to agency management or personnel; and rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties. 5 U.S.C. 804(3). EPA is not required to submit a rule report regarding this action under section 801 because this is a rule of particular applicability.

#### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52**

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

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q

Dated: July 9, 1998.

David A. Ullrich,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 98–19656 Filed 7–22–98; 8:45 am]

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[AD-FRL-6112-7]

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Industrial Process Cooling Towers

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: This action corrects and clarifies regulatory text of the "National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Industrial Process Cooling Towers," which was issued as a final rule on September 8, 1994. The rule is being revised to clarify that the owner or operator of a source that ceases use of chromium-based chemicals may demonstrate compliance with the standard through recordkeeping.