

preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For propellers that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent propeller blade cracks and propagation, which could result in propeller blade separation and possible aircraft loss of control, accomplish the following:

Visual Inspections

(a) Perform initial and repetitive visual inspections of propeller blades for cracks across the camber face in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Dowty Aerospace Propellers Service Bulletin (SB) No. S2000-61-75, Revision 3, dated September 30, 1999, as follows:

(1) Initially, conduct a visual inspection within 50 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of the original AD.

(2) Thereafter, inspect at intervals not to exceed 300 hours TIS since last inspection.

(3) Replace cracked propeller blades prior to further flight with serviceable blades.

Ultrasonic Inspections

(b) Perform initial and repetitive ultrasonic inspections of propeller blades for cracks across the camber face in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Dowty Aerospace Propellers SB No. S2000-61-75, Revision 3, dated September 30, 1999, as follows:

(1) Initially inspect within 200 hours TIS after the effective date of the original AD.

(2) Thereafter, inspect at intervals not to exceed 600 hours TIS since last inspection.

(3) Replace cracked propeller blades prior to further flight with serviceable blades.

Alternative Method of Compliance

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Boston Aircraft Certification Office (ACO). Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Boston ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Boston ACO.

Special Flight Permits

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the aircraft to a location where the inspection requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on August 14, 2000.

David A. Downey,

Assistant Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00-21167 Filed 8-18-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 139

[Docket No. FAA-2000-7479; Notice No. 00-05]

RIN 2120-AG96

Certification of Airports; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document makes corrections to the proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** on June 21, 2000 (65 FR 38639), which proposes to revise the current airport certification regulation and to establish certification requirements for airports serving scheduled air carrier operations in aircraft with 10-30 seats.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Bruce, 202-267-8553, or E-mail: linda.bruce@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Correction

In proposed rule FR Doc. 00-14524, published on June 21, 2000 (65 FR 38636), make the following corrections:

1. On page 38654, in the second column, fifth full paragraph, line one, correct "Similar to proposed § 139.317(1)" to read "Similar to proposed § 139.317(k)."

2. On page 38673, in the second column, correct § 139.111 by revising paragraphs (s), (b), and (c) to read as follows:

§ 139.111 Exemptions.

(a) An applicant or a certificate holder may petition the Administrator under 14 CFR 11, General Rulemaking Procedures, of this chapter for an exemption from any requirement of this part.

(b) Under 49 U.S.C. 44706(c), the Administrator may exempt an applicant or a certificate holder that enplanes annually less than one-quarter of 1 percent of the total number of passengers enplaned at all air carrier airports from all, or part, of the aircraft rescue and firefighting equipment requirements of this part, on the grounds that compliance with those requirements is, or would be,

unreasonably costly, burdensome, or impractical. An applicant for, or holder of, an airport operating certificate filing for such an exemption shall use the format prescribed under § 139.321.

(c) Each petition filed under section must be submitted in duplicate to the—

(1) Regional Airports Division

Manager; and

(2) U.S. Department of Transportation's Docket Management System, per 14 CFR 11.

3. On page 38677, in the first and second columns correct § 139.137 by removing paragraph (f); and by redesignating paragraphs (g) through (1) as (f) through (k); and by revising newly designated paragraph (f)(3) to read as follows:

§ 139.317 Aircraft rescue and firefighting: Equipment and agents.

* * * * *

(f) * * *

(3) Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (f) of this section, any certificate holder whose aircraft rescue and firefighting vehicles are not equipped with turrets or do not have the discharge capacity required in this section, but otherwise met the requirements of this part on December 31, 1987, need not comply with paragraph (f) of this section for a particular vehicle until that vehicle is replaced or rehabilitated.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC on August 14, 2000.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

[FR Doc. 00-20947 Filed 8-18-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MA078-01-7211a; A-1-FRL-6854-9]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Revisions to Stage II Vapor Recovery Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This submittal contains a revised Stage II vapor recovery regulation. The intended effect of this action is to propose approval of Massachusetts' revised

Stage II rule. This action is being taken under the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before September 20, 2000. Public comments on this document are requested and will be considered before taking final action on this SIP revision.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to David Conroy, Unit Manager, Air Quality Planning, Office of Ecosystem Protection (mail code CAQ), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress Street, Suite 1100, Boston, MA 02114-2023. Copies of the State submittal are available for public inspection during normal business hours, by appointment at the Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress Street, 11th floor, Boston, MA and the Business Compliance Division, Bureau of Waste Prevention, Department of Environmental Protection, One Winter Street, 7th Floor, Boston, MA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anne E. Arnold, (617) 918-1047.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This section is organized as follows:

- What action is EPA taking?
- What are the CAA requirements for Stage II programs?
- What revisions did Massachusetts make to its Stage II rule?
- Why is EPA approving Massachusetts' revised Stage II rule?
- What is the process for EPA's approval of this SIP revision?

What Action is EPA Taking?

EPA is proposing to approve Massachusetts' revised 310 CMR 7.24(6) "Dispensing of Vehicle Fuel" and incorporate this rule into the Massachusetts SIP. The revised rule was proposed by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in January 2000 and was submitted to EPA for parallel processing on August 9, 2000.

What Are the CAA Requirements for Stage II Programs?

Section 182(b)(3) of the Clean Air Act (as modified by EPA's rulemaking under section 202(a)(6)) requires that States with serious or above ozone nonattainment areas adopt Stage II vapor recovery rules for gasoline dispensing facilities. In addition, section 184(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) requires that states in the Ozone Transport Region adopt Stage II or comparable measures. EPA approved an early version of Massachusetts' Stage II rule 310 CMR 7.24(6) as strengthening the SIP. See 57 FR 58993 (December 14, 1992). EPA later approved a revised version of 310 CMR 7.24(6) as meeting the requirements of section 182(b)(3) and section 184(b)(2) of the CAA. See 58 FR 48315 (September 15, 1993).

What Revisions Did Massachusetts Make to its Stage II Rule?

In order to justify the level of emission reductions claimed in its SIP, Massachusetts is currently adding the following new provisions to its Stage II rule: (1) A provision explicitly requiring the installation of CARB (California Air Resources Board) approved Stage II systems; (2) a provision requiring annual Stage II system compliance testing and certification; and (3) a provision explicitly requiring weekly visual inspections of the Stage II system components. In addition, a provision addressing the direct refueling of a motor vehicle from a tank truck is included in Massachusetts' revised Stage II rule. This provision was adopted by DEP and submitted to EPA as a SIP revision in 1995 but has not yet been approved into the Massachusetts SIP. Each of the four new provisions is discussed below in more detail.

(1) Installation of CARB Approved Stage II Systems

The version of 310 CMR 7.24(6) which is currently in the SIP requires

that subject facilities install and operate a vapor collection and control system that recovers at least 95 percent of the vapors generated during the refueling of a motor vehicle. Although this version of the rule does not explicitly reference CARB approved Stage II systems, requiring CARB approved systems is the method used by the DEP to implement the 95 percent control requirement. See 57 FR 58993 (December 14, 1992). The revised rule submitted on August 9, 2000 explicitly requires CARB approved Stage II systems. In addition, revised 310 CMR 7.24(6)(g) contains a list of the DEP approved CARB Stage II Executive Orders. Also, the revised rule states that facilities must comply with the conditions of any new or modified Executive Order upon DEP revision to 310 CMR 7.24(6)(g) to incorporate such new or modified Executive Order. When the DEP revises the 310 CMR 7.24(6)(g) listing of Executive Orders, the DEP will need to submit those revisions to EPA in order for those new orders to be compliance methods under the federal SIP.

(2) Annual Stage II System Compliance Testing and Certification

The revised rule requires installation testing and compliance certification, as well as annual in-use compliance testing and certification, for all Stage II systems. The revised rule also requires 120 day in-use compliance testing and certification for vacuum assist systems. In addition, the revised rule allows facilities the choice of submitting an alternative annual in-use compliance certification if the facility has passed its tests on the first try for two consecutive years. In this case, an annual certification attesting that the system is correctly operated and maintained is required but compliance tests may be conducted on an every other year schedule. The specific compliance tests to be conducted are outlined in the table below.

STAGE II SYSTEM COMPLIANCE TESTING

	Vapor balance system	Vacuum assist system
Installation	Pressure Decay Test and Dynamic Pressure/Liquid Blockage Test.	Pressure Decay Test; Dynamic Pressure/Liquid Blockage Test; and Air-to-Liquid Ratio Test.
120-day in-use	Not applicable	Pressure Decay Test and Air-to-Liquid Ratio Test.
Annual in-use	Pressure Decay Test annually and Dynamic Pressure/Liquid Blockage Test every third year.	Pressure Decay Test and Air-to-Liquid Ratio test annually and Dynamic Pressure/Liquid Blockage Test every third year.
Alternative Annual in-use	Pressure Decay Test and Dynamic Pressure/Liquid Blockage Test.	Pressure Decay Test; Dynamic Pressure/Liquid Blockage Test; and Air-to-Liquid Ratio Test.

Furthermore, the revised rule also includes requirements regarding the Stage II compliance testing company. On or after November 15, 2000, any person who owns, leases, operates or controls a company that performs Stage II compliance tests must submit to the DEP a Stage II compliance testing company notification prior to performing any Stage II compliance tests. The revised rule requires that the testing company submit, at least once every two weeks, a written list to the DEP identifying the dates and addresses of scheduled tests to be performed over the next 14 day period. The revised rule also requires that persons conducting the tests be trained in accordance with the applicable testing protocols and procedures. In addition, the revised rule cites the specific CARB test procedures to be followed. The testing company must certify that each compliance test performed was conducted in accordance with these test procedures and must maintain records of compliance test results for a minimum of five years.

(3) Weekly Visual Inspections of the Stage II System Components

The version of 310 CMR 7.24(6) that is currently in the SIP contains several provisions regarding maintenance of the Stage II system. Specifically, the rule requires that the system be maintained such that it recovers at least 95 percent by weight of the vapors displaced during the dispensing of motor vehicle fuel and requires "Out of Order" signs to be placed on above ground parts of the Stage II system which are not fully operative until the system has been repaired. In addition, the rule requires that records of any failure or malfunction of the system, as well as records of any maintenance performed, be kept. The revised rule submitted on August 9, 2000 includes similar provisions but also explicitly requires weekly visual inspections of a specific list of Stage II system components to be conducted by a person who is trained to operate and maintain the system in accordance with the conditions of the applicable CARB Executive Order. In addition, the revised rule requires that malfunctioning equipment that has been taken out of service be repaired or replaced within 14 days.

(4) Direct Refueling of a Motor Vehicle From a Tank Truck

The revised rule requires that a tank truck engaged in the direct dispensing of motor vehicle fuel to a motor vehicle or a portable container install a CARB approved Stage II system. Tank trucks dispensing motor vehicle fuel to emergency motor vehicles or portable

containers during fire fighting activities or a declared emergency situation are exempt from this requirement. This provision was adopted by DEP and submitted to EPA as a SIP revision in 1995 but has not yet been approved into the Massachusetts SIP.

Why is EPA Approving Massachusetts' Revised Stage II Rule?

EPA is approving Massachusetts' revised Stage II rule because the revisions will significantly improve the enforceability and emission reductions associated with the rule. Previously, the resources DEP devoted to Stage II enforcement and the wording of the existing rule called into question the Stage II reductions assumed in the Massachusetts SIP. In its attainment demonstration SIP submittal, DEP committed to submit a revised Stage II rule. EPA's proposed rulemaking on the western Massachusetts attainment demonstration noted that the Stage II SIP submittal was one of two outstanding SIP elements that must be approved into the Massachusetts SIP in order for EPA to be able to fully approve the western Massachusetts attainment demonstration. See 64 FR 70319 (December 16, 1999). With the revised Stage II rule, along with the resources DEP is currently devoting to Stage II enforcement, EPA believes that the assumed level of SIP credit will be achieved.

What is the Process for EPA's Approval of This SIP Revision?

EPA is soliciting public comments on the issues discussed in this document or on other relevant matters. These comments will be considered before taking final action. Interested parties may participate in the Federal rulemaking procedure by submitting written comments to the EPA Regional office listed in the ADDRESSES section of this document.

Furthermore, EPA's proposal is based on the submittal received by EPA on August 9, 2000 that contains Massachusetts' preliminary final amendments to its Stage II rule. DEP must submit to EPA the final adopted version of this rule before EPA can take final action. This administrative procedure, known as "parallel processing," is permitted under EPA's rules for processing SIPs in Appendix V to 40 CFR part 51.

Proposed Action

EPA is proposing to approve Massachusetts' revised 310 CMR 7.24(6) "Dispensing of Motor Vehicle Fuel" and incorporate this rule into the Massachusetts SIP.

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting or allowing or establishing a precedent for any future request for revision to any State Implementation Plan. Each request for revision to the State Implementation Plan shall be considered separately in light of specific technical, economic, and environmental factors and in relation to relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. This action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this 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 approves 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 (Public Law 104-4). For the same reason, this rule also does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of tribal governments, as specified by Executive Order 13084 (63 FR 27655, May 10, 1998). This 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 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it merely approves 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 rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, 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 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. 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. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the "Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings" issued under the executive order. 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 seq.*).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Ozone.

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

Dated: August 11, 2000.

Mindy Lubber,

Regional Administrator, EPA New England.

[FR Doc. 00-21196 Filed 8-18-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 61

[FRL-6855-3]

RIN 2060-A190

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Standard for Emissions of Radionuclides Other Than Radon From Department of Energy Facilities; Standard for Radionuclide Emissions From Federal Facilities Other Than Nuclear Regulatory Commission Licensees and Not Covered by Subpart H

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking; reopening of public comment period.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, Radiation Protection Division, Center for Waste Management is extending the comment period on the proposed rule to amend 40 CFR part 61, subpart H as it applies to operations at any facility owned or operated by the Department of Energy (DOE) that emits

any radionuclide other than radon-222 and radon-220 into the air and subpart I as it applies to non-DOE federal facilities in the radionuclide National Emission Standards Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) (65 FR 29934, May 9, 2000). A public hearing was held on Wednesday, July 12, 2000, from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm. The comment period for this hearing was to end on August 14, 2000. This comment period is extended to October 6, 2000.

DATES: EPA will continue to accept public comments on this proposed rule until October 6, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments must be submitted, in duplicate, to: Central Docket (6102), Attn: Docket No. A-94-60, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Room M1500, Washington, DC 20460. The docket is available for public inspection between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm, Monday thru Friday, in Room M1500 of Waterside Mall at the above address. A reasonable fee may charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Eleanor Thornton-Jones, Center for Waste Management, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Mailstop 6608J, Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20460, by email: thornton.eleanord@epa.gov or by phone (202) 564-9773. Comments can also be faxed to Ms. Thornton-Jones at (202) 565-2065.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

On May 9, 2000 (65 FR 29934) EPA proposed to amend 40 CFR part 61, subpart H (subpart H) as it applies to operations at any facility owned or operated by the Department of Energy (DOE) that emits any radionuclide other than radon-222 and radon-220 into the air and subpart I as it applies to non-DOE federal facilities in the radionuclide National Emission Standards Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs). Subparts H and I require emission sampling, monitoring and calculations to identify compliance with the standard. To sample and monitor these radionuclide air emissions, subpart H in § 61.93(b)(2)(ii), and subpart I in § 61.107(b)(2)(ii), both require radionuclide emissions from point sources to be measured in accordance with the guidance presented in the American National Standard Guide to Sampling Airborne Radioactive Materials in Nuclear Facilities, ANSI N13.1-1969. In 1999, this ANSI standard was revised and replaced by the new ANSI N13.1-1999 standard, entitled "Sampling and Monitoring Releases of Airborne Radioactive

Substances from the Stacks and Ducts of Nuclear Facilities." This proposed amendment was to amend subpart H and subpart I to incorporate the new ANSI N13.1-1999 standard.

On July 12, 2000, a public hearing was held on the proposed rule to amend 40 CFR part 61, subpart H and subpart I. At the time of the hearing, EPA verbally gave an extension for the public to submit comments until August 14, 2000. EPA received a request to extend the comment period from August 14 to August 21, 2000 from the ANSI N13.1 NESHAPs Comment Group. After considering this request, EPA has decided to extend the comment period an additional 45 days for this proposal. Comments should be submitted on or before October 6, 2000.

Dated: August 15, 2000.

Mary T. Smith,

Acting Director, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 00-21198 Filed 8-18-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018-AF97

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reopening of Comment Period and Notice of Availability of Draft Economic Analysis on Proposed Critical Habitat Determination for the San Diego Fairy Shrimp

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of comment period and notice of availability of draft economic analysis.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service announces the availability of a draft economic analysis for the proposed designation of critical habitat for the San Diego fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta sandiegonensis*). We also provide notice of the reopening of the comment period for the proposal to allow all interested parties to submit written comments on the proposal and on the draft economic analysis. Comments previously submitted need not be resubmitted as they will be incorporated into the public records as a part of this reopening and will be fully considered in the final rule.

DATES: The original comment period on the critical habitat proposal closed on May 8, 2000. The comment period is again reopened and we will accept