

the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, E.O. 12875 requires EPA to provide to the Office of Management and Budget 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 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

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 the EPA determines (1) is "economically significant," as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) the environmental health or safety risk addressed by the rule has 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 proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it is not an economically significant regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866, and it does not address an environmental health or safety risk that would have a disproportionate effect on children.

#### D. Executive Order 13084

Under E.O. 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 EPA complies by consulting, E.O. 13084 requires EPA to

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. This action does not involve or impose any requirements that affect Indian Tribes. 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 proposed rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals under sections 110 and 301, and subchapter I, part D of the CAA do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not impose any new requirements, I certify that it does not have a significant impact on any small entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of a 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 this proposed approval action, proposing limited approval of Pennsylvania's July 31, 1998 Post-96 ROP plan for its portion of the Philadelphia severe ozone nonattainment area, 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.

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

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone.

Dated: August 12, 1999.

**W. Michael McCabe,**

*Regional Administrator, Region III.*

[FR Doc. 99-22047 Filed 8-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[CO-001-0032b; FRL-6410-8]

### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Colorado Springs Carbon Monoxide Redesignation to Attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes, and Approval of a Related Revision

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing approval of the Colorado Springs carbon monoxide redesignation request, maintenance plan, and revisions to Colorado's Regulation No. 13 "Oxygenated Fuels Program". The redesignation request and maintenance plan were submitted by the Governor on August 19, 1998. The revisions to Regulation No. 13 were submitted by the Governor on October

1, 1998. In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's redesignation request and State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions, involving the maintenance plan and the changes to Regulation No. 13, as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views the redesignation and SIP revisions as noncontroversial and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Comments must be received in writing by September 24, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments may be mailed to: Richard R. Long, Director, Air and Radiation Program, Mailcode 8P-AR, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466.

Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday at the following office: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, Air Program, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tim Russ, Air and Radiation Program, Mailcode 8P-AR, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466. Telephone number (303) 312-6479.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title which is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: July 21, 1999.

**Jack W. McGraw,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.*  
[FR Doc. 99-21934 Filed 8-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-6427-1]

#### North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA proposes to grant final authorization for the hazardous waste program revisions submitted by North Carolina. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is authorizing the State's program revisions as an immediate final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this action as noncontroversial and anticipates no adverse comments. The Agency has explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the immediate final rule. If EPA does not receive adverse written comments, the immediate final rule will become effective and the Agency will not take further action on this proposal. If EPA receives adverse written comments, EPA will withdraw the immediate final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will then address public comments in a later final rule based on this proposal. EPA may not provide further opportunity for comment. Any parties interested in commenting on this action must do so at this time.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before September 24, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail written comments to Narindar Kumar, Chief, RCRA Programs Branch, Waste Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, The Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, GA 30303-3104; (404) 562-8440. You can examine copies of the materials submitted by North Carolina during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA Region 4, Library, The Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, GA 30303-3104; (404) 562-8190, and North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, P.O. Box 27687, Raleigh, North Carolina 29201, (919) 733-2178.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Narindar Kumar, Chief RCRA Programs Branch, Waste Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, The Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, GA 30303-3104; (404) 562-8440.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information, please see the immediate final rule published in the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 13, 1999.

**A. Stanley Meiburg,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

[FR Doc. 99-21826 Filed 8-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-6428-5]

#### Hazardous Waste Management Program: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions for State of Louisiana

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule and request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA (also, "the Agency" in this preamble) is proposing to grant final authorization to the State of Louisiana for its hazardous waste program revisions, specifically, revisions needed to meet Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Land Disposal Restrictions, which contains Federal rules promulgated between November 7, 1986 to June 30, 1996. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register** (FR), EPA is authorizing the State's program revisions as an immediate final rule without prior proposal because the EPA views this action as noncontroversial and anticipates no adverse comments. The Agency has explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the immediate final rule. If the EPA does not receive adverse written comments, the immediate final rule will become effective and the Agency will not take further action on this proposal. If the EPA receives adverse written comments, a second **Federal Register** document will be published before the time the immediate final rule takes effect. The second document may withdraw the immediate final rule or identify the issues raised, respond to the comments and affirm that the immediate final rule will take effect as scheduled. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before September 24, 1999.