

perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

I. 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 20, 2000. 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, Carbon monoxide,

Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides.

Dated: August 26, 1999.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

Part 52 of chapter I, title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations* is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart—RR—Tennessee

2. Section 52.2239 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(167) to read as follows:

§ 52.2239 Original Identification of Plan Section.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(167) The adoption of the credible evidence regulations, which were submitted on November 16, 1994, into the Nashville/Davidson County portion of the Tennessee SIP.

(i) Incorporation by reference. Section 10.56.290 Measurement and Reporting of Emissions effective on October 6, 1994.

(ii) Other material. None.

3. Section 52.2220(c) is amended by adding the entry for section 1200–3–10–.04 to read as follows:

§ 52.2220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) EPA approved regulations.

EPA-APPROVED TENNESSEE REGULATIONS

State citation	Title/subject	Adoption date	EPA approval date	Federal Register notice
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
Section 1200–3–10–04	Sampling Recording and Reporting Required For Major Stationary Sources.	09/12/94	January 19, 2000	[Insert citation of this Federal Register Notice when published.]
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *

[FR Doc. 00–964 Filed 1–18–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[FL–74–1–9941a; FRL–6524–7]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans, Florida: Approval of Revisions to the Florida State

Implementation Plan
AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving a revision to the Florida State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted on December 26, 1996, by the State of Florida through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). This source-specific revision amends the SIP to include a variance granted to the Harry S. Truman Animal Import Center (HSTAIC) for its incinerator facility located in Monroe County, Florida. The variance allows HSTAIC to operate under the particulate

matter standard applicable to biological waste combustion facilities.

DATES: This direct final rule is effective March 20, 2000, without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comment by February 18, 2000. If adverse comment is 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: All comments should be addressed to Joey LeVasseur at the EPA, Region 4 Air Planning Branch, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

Copies of the state submittal are available at the following addresses for inspection during normal business hours:

Environmental Protection Agency, Atlanta Federal Center, Region 4 Air Planning Branch, 61 Forsyth Street S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–3104.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Twin Towers Office Building, 2600 Blair Stone Road, Tallahassee, Florida 32399–2400.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joey LeVasseur at 404/562–9035 (E-mail: levasseur.joey@epa.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The State of Florida through the FDEP submitted a source-specific revision to the Florida SIP for the HSTAIC on December 26, 1996. The HSTAIC is operated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services and is located on Fleming Key on the grounds of the Key West Naval Air Station. The HSTAIC serves as a quarantine station for animal herds imported into the U.S. from foreign countries and operates an incineration facility for disposal of bedding material and animal carcasses. In addition, should a public health emergency occur, the incinerator facility would be used to cremate infected animal carcasses. Such an emergency has never occurred in the history of the Center.

Florida's biological waste incinerator rule includes standards applicable to three categories of biological and medical waste incinerators. The first category, incinerators with a feed rate of 500 pounds per hour (lbs/hr) or less, is subject to Rule 62–296(4)(a)1., which includes emissions limiting standards and operating requirements applicable to medical waste incinerators and animal crematories and has a particulate

matter emission limit of .080 grains per dry standard cubic foot (gr/ft³). Because it was assumed that all animal crematories would have capacities less than 500 lbs/hr, the second category (500 to 2000 lbs/hr, subject to Rule 62–296(4)(c)1., 030 gr/ft³) and third category (greater than 2000 lbs/hr, subject to Rule 62–296(4)(d)1., 020 gr/ft³) contain standards developed only for medical waste incinerators. The HSTAIC's incinerator facility consists of three units with a potential capacity of over 2000 lbs/hr which would make the HSTAIC subject to the stricter standard, however the HSTAIC incinerator facility routinely only uses one unit with the other two units providing emergency backup capacity. The usual operating capacity of the Center, operating a single unit, is equal to or less than 500 lbs/hr.

The variance being approved allows the HSTAIC to operate under Rule 62–296.401(4)(a)1. This variance addresses solely the particulate matter emission limitation and does not apply to all other emission limitations to which the HSTAIC is subject under Rule 62–296.401(4) which remain applicable to the facility. As a condition of this variance, FDEP requires that the applicant properly install, operate and maintain a continuous opacity monitor and recording device on each combustion unit, to document compliance with the 5 percent opacity limit established under Rule 62–296.401(1)(a). These monitoring records shall be kept at the facility and shall be made available to FDEP for inspection, as required by FDEP rules.

Final Action

EPA is approving the aforementioned changes to the SIP without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. However, in the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register** publication, EPA is publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve the SIP revision should relevant adverse comments be filed. This rule will be effective March 20, 2000, without further notice unless the agency receives relevant adverse comments by February 18, 2000.

If the EPA receives such comments, then EPA will publish a document withdrawing the final rule and informing the public that the rule will not take effect. All public comments received will then be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period. Parties interested in commenting should do so at this time. If no such comments

are received, the public is advised that this rule will be effective on March 20, 2000, and no further action will be taken on the proposed rule.

Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

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

B. Executive Order 13132

Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Order 12612 (Federalism) and Executive Order 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 final 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. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order 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 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.

D. Executive Order 13084

Under Executive Order 13084, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute, that significantly affects 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. If the mandate is unfunded, EPA must provide to the Office of Management and Budget, 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 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 Executive Order 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 final 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 approve 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.

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 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. Section 804, however, exempts from section 801 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 non-agency 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.

H. 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.

The EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to this action. Today’s action does not require the public to

perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

I. 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 20, 2000. 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, Intergovernmental relations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: January 3, 2000.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

Part 52 of chapter I, title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations* is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority for citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart K—Florida

2. Section 52.520(d) is amended by removing the word “None” and adding an entry to the table for the variance for the Harry S. Truman Animal Import Center to read as follows:

§ 52.520 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(d) EPA-approved State source-specific requirements.

EPA-APPROVED FLORIDA SOURCE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Name of source	Permit No.	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Harry S. Truman, animal import center	NA	November 26, 1996 ...	January 19, 2000	