Signed: October 16, 1998.

John W. Magaw,

Director.

Approved: November 20, 1998.

John P. Simpson,

Deputy Assistant Secretary (Regulatory, Tariff & Trade Enforcement).

[FR Doc. 98–34843 Filed 12–31–98; 2:07 pm]

BILLING CODE 4810–31–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 211–0117; FRL–6211–9]

California State Implementation Plan Revision; Interim Final Determination That State Has Corrected Deficiencies

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Interim final determination.

SUMMARY: Elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**, EPA has published a notice of proposed rulemaking fully approving revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revisions concern a rule from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD): Rule 1150.1, Control of Gaseous Emissions from Municipal Solid Waste Landfills. Based on the proposed full approval, EPA is making an interim final determination by this action that the State has corrected the deficiencies for which sanctions clocks began on July 7, 1997. This action will defer the imposition of offsets and highway funding sanctions under the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). Although the interim final action is effective upon publication, EPA is taking public comment on this action. If no comments are received on EPA's proposed approval of the State's submittal, EPA will finalize its determination that the State has corrected the deficiencies that started the sanctions clocks by publishing a final rulemaking in the **Federal Register**. If comments are received on EPA's proposed approval and this interim final action, EPA will publish a final action taking into consideration any comments received.

DATE: This determination is effective on January 6, 1999. Comments must be received by February 5, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

The state submittal and EPA's analysis for that submittal, which are the basis for this action, are available for public review at the above address and at the following locations:

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 21865 E. Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765–4182

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 ''L'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia A. Bowlin, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901, (415) 744–1188.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On October 16, 1985 and February 10, 1986, the State submitted Rule 1150.1, Control of Gaseous Emissions from Active Landfills, and Rule 1150.2, Control of Gaseous Emissions from Inactive Landfills, respectively. EPA published a limited approval/limited disapproval for these rules in the **Federal Register** on May 6, 1997. 62 FR 24574. EPA's disapproval action started an 18-month clock for the imposition of one sanction (followed by a second sanction 6 months later) under section 179 of the Clean Air Act (Act) and a 24-month clock for promulgation of a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) under section 110(c) of the Act. The State subsequently submitted a revised rule [1] on June 23, 1998. The revised rule was adopted by SCAQMD on April 10, 1998. In the Proposed Rules section of today's **Federal Register**, EPA has proposed full approval of the State of California's submittal of SCAQMD's Rule 1150.1, Control of Gaseous Emissions from Municipal Solid Waste Landfills.

Based on the proposed approval set forth in today's **Federal Register**, EPA believes that it is more likely than not that the State has corrected the original disapproval deficiencies. Therefore, EPA is taking this interim final rulemaking action, effective on publication, finding that the State has corrected the deficiencies. However, EPA is also providing the public with an opportunity to comment on this final action. If, based on any comments on this action and any comments on EPA's proposed full approval of the State's submittal, EPA determines that the State's submittal is not fully approvable and this final action was inappropriate, EPA will either propose or take final action finding that the State has not corrected the original disapproval deficiencies. As appropriate, EPA will also issue an interim final determination or a final determination that the deficiencies have not been corrected. Until EPA takes such action, the application of sanctions will continue to be deferred.

This action does not stop the sanctions clocks that started for this area on July 7, 1997. However, this action will defer the imposition of the offsets sanction and will defer the imposition of the highway sanction. See 59 FR 39832 (Aug. 4, 1994). If EPA publishes a final rulemaking fully approving the State's submittal, such action will permanently stop the sanctions clock and will permanently lift any imposed, stayed, or deferred sanctions. If EPA must withdraw the proposed full approval based on adverse comments and EPA subsequently determines that the State did not in fact correct the disapproval deficiencies, the sanctions consequences described in the sanctions rule will apply. See 59 FR 39832, codified at 40 CFR 52.31.

II. EPA Action

EPA is taking interim final action finding that the State has corrected the disapproval deficiencies that started the sanctions clocks. Based on this action, imposition of the offsets and highway funding sanctions will be deferred until EPA's final action fully approving the State's submittal becomes effective or until EPA proposes or takes final action disapproving in whole or in part the State submittal. If EPA's proposed rulemaking action fully approving the State submittal becomes final, all sanctions clocks will be permanently stopped and any imposed, stayed, or deferred sanctions will be permanently lifted.

Because EPA has preliminarily determined that the State has corrected the deficiencies identified in EPA's limited disapproval action, relief from sanctions should be provided as quickly as possible. Therefore, EPA is invoking the good cause exception under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) in not providing an opportunity for comment before this action takes effect.[2] 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3). EPA believes that

[1] Submitted SCAQMD Rule 1150.1, Control of Gaseous Emissions from Municipal Waste Landfills, is intended to replace both Rule 1150.1, Control of Gaseous Emissions from Active Landfills, and Rule 1150.2, Control of Gaseous Emissions from Inactive Landfills.

[2] As previously noted, however, by this action EPA is providing the public with a chance to comment on EPA's determination after the effective date, and EPA will consider any comments received in determining whether to reverse such action.

notice-and-comment rulemaking before the effective date of this action is impracticable and contrary to the public interest. EPA has reviewed the State's submittal and, through its proposed action, is indicating that it is more likely than not that the State has corrected the deficiencies that started the sanctions clocks. Therefore, it is not in the public interest to initially impose sanctions or to keep applied sanctions in place when the State has most likely done all it can to correct the deficiencies that triggered the sanctions clocks. Moreover, it would be impracticable to go through notice-and-comment rulemaking on a finding that the State has corrected the deficiencies prior to the rulemaking approving the State's submittal. Therefore, EPA believes that it is necessary to use the interim final rulemaking process to temporarily stay or defer sanctions while EPA completes its rulemaking process on the approvability of the State's submittal. Moreover, with respect to the effective date of this action, EPA is invoking the good cause exception to the 30-day notice requirement of the APA because the purpose of this notice is to relieve a restriction. See 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1).

III. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

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

B. Executive Order 12875

Under E.O. 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute and that creates a mandate upon a State, local or tribal government, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by those governments, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, E.O. 12875 requires EPA to provide to the OMB a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected State, local and tribal governments, the nature of their concerns, copies of any written communications from the governments, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, E.O. 12875 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected officials and other representatives of State, local and tribal governments ''to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory proposals containing significant unfunded mandates.'' Today's rule does not create a mandate on State, local or tribal governments. The rule does not impose any enforceable duties on these entities. Accordingly, the requirements of section 1(a) of E.O. 12875 do not apply to this rule.

C. Executive Order 13045

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 E.O. 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 E.O. 13045 because it is does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

D. Executive Order 13084

Under E.O. 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, E.O. 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, E.O. 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 rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of E.O. 13084 do not apply to this 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 action temporarily relieves sources of an additional burden potentially placed on them by the sanctions provisions of the Act. Therefore, I certify that it does not have an impact on any small entities.

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 annual costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to 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 approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs of $100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves 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. 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).

H. 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 8, 1999. 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 may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: December 18, 1998.

Laura Yoshii,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 99–13 Filed 1–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–W

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[IL178–1a, I1179–1a; FRL–6216–2]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois

AGENCY: United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The USEPA is approving two negative declarations submitted by the State of Illinois. The first indicates there is no need for regulations covering the industrial wastewater category in the Metro-East St. Louis (Metro-East) ozone nonattainment area. The Metro-East ozone nonattainment area includes Madison, Monroe and St. Clair Counties which are located in southwest Illinois, adjacent to St. Louis, Missouri. The second negative declaration indicates there is no need for regulations covering the industrial cleaning solvents category in the Metro-East ozone nonattainment area. The State's negative declarations regarding industrial wastewater category sources and industrial cleaning solvent sources were submitted to USEPA in two letters dated October 2, 1998. In the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register**, the USEPA is proposing approval of, and soliciting comments on, the approval of these two negative declarations. If adverse written comments are received on this action, the USEPA will withdraw this final rule based and address the comments received in response to this action in a final rule based on the related proposed rule. A second public comment period will not be provided. Parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: This rule is effective on March 8, 1999, unless USEPA receives adverse written comments by February 5, 1999. If adverse comment is received, USEPA will publish a timely withdrawal of the rule in the **Federal Register** and inform the public that the rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Copies of the negative declarations are available for inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. (Please telephone Randolph O. Cano at (312) 886–6036 before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randolph O. Cano, Environmental Protection Specialist, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), USEPA, Region 5, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–6036.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background-Emission Control Requirements

Under the Clean Air Act (Act), as amended in 1977, ozone nonattainment areas were required to adopt emission controls reflective of reasonably available control technology (RACT) for sources of volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions. USEPA issued three sets of control technique guidelines (CTGs) documents, establishing a ''presumptive norm'' for RACT for various categories of VOC sources. The three sets of CTGs were (1) Group I—issued before January 1978 (15 CTGs); (2) Group II—issued in 1978 (9 CTGs); and (3) Group III—issued in the early 1980's (5 CTGs). Those sources not covered by a CTG were called non-CTG sources. USEPA determined that an area's State Implementation Plan (SIP) approved attainment date established which RACT rules the area needed to adopt and implement. In those areas where the State sought an extension of the attainment date under section 172(a)(2) to as late as December 31, 1987, RACT was required for all CTG sources and for all major (100 tons per year or more of VOC emissions under the pre-amended Act) non-CTG sources. Illinois sought and received such an extension for the Metro-East area.

Section 182(b)(2) of the Act as amended in 1990 requires States to adopt RACT rules for all areas designated nonattainment for ozone and classified as moderate or above. There are three parts to the section 182(b)(2) RACT requirement: (1) RACT for sources covered by an existing CTG—i.e., a CTG issued prior to the enactment of the amended Act of 1990; (2) RACT for sources covered by a post-enactment CTG; and (3) all major sources not covered by a CTG. These section 182(b)(2) RACT requirements are referred to as the RACT ''catch-up'' requirements.

Section 183 of the amended Act requires USEPA to issue CTGs for 13 source categories by November 15, 1993. A CTG was published by this date for the following source categories—Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry (SOCMI) Reactors and Distillation, aerospace manufacturing coating operation, shipbuilding and ship repair coating operations, and wood furniture coating operation; however, the CTGs for the remaining source categories have not been completed. The amended Act requires States to submit rules for sources covered by a post-enactment CTG in accordance with a schedule specified in a CTG document.

The USEPA created a CTG document as Appendix E to the *General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.* (57 FR 18070, 18077, April 28, 1992). In Appendix E, USEPA interpreted the Act to allow a State to submit a non-CTG rule by November 15, 1992, or to defer submittal of a RACT rule for sources that the State anticipated would be covered by a post-enactment CTG, based on the list of CTGs USEPA expected to issue to meet the requirement in section 183. Appendix E states that if USEPA fails to issue a CTG by November 15, 1993 (which it did for 11 source categories), the responsibility shifts to the State to submit a non-CTG RACT rule for those sources by November 15, 1994. In accordance with section 182(b)(2), implementation of that RACT rule should occur by May 31, 1995.