Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and record keeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: December 18, 1998.

Jerry Clifford,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.

Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the 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 SS—Texas

2. Section 52.2270 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(112) to read as follows:

§ 52.2270 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(112) Revision to the Texas State Implementation Plan submitted by the Governor on January 10, 1996.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TNRCC) General Rules (30 TAC Chapter 101), Section 101.2(b), adopted by TNRCC on December 13, 1995, effective January 8, 1996.

(B) TNRCC Docket No. 95–0849–RUL issued December 13, 1995, for adoption of amendments to 30 TAC Chapter 101, Section 101.2(b), regarding Multiple Air Contaminant Sources or Properties and revision to the SIP.

(ii) Additional materials.

A letter from the Governor of Texas dated January 10, 1996, submitting revisions to 30 TAC Chapter 101, Section 101.2(b), for approval as a revision to the SIP.

[FR Doc. 99–1912 Filed 1–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[FRL–6222–7]

Approval of Section 112(l) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Perchloroethylene Air Emission Standards for Dry Cleaning Facilities; State of California; Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 112(l) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and through the California Air Resources Board, the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) requested approval to implement and enforce its ''Rule 9.7: Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning Operations'' (Rule 9.7) in place of the ''National Perchloroethylene Air Emission Standards for Dry Cleaning Facilities'' (dry cleaning NESHAP) for area sources under YSAQMD's jurisdiction. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed this request and has found that it satisfies all of the requirements necessary to qualify for approval. Thus, EPA is hereby granting YSAQMD the authority to implement and enforce Rule 9.7 in place of the dry cleaning NESHAP for area sources under YSAQMD's jurisdiction.

DATES: This rule is effective on March 29, 1999 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by March 1, 1999. If EPA receives such comment, then it will publish a timely withdrawal in the Federal Register informing the public that this rule will not take effect. The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of March 29, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments must be submitted to Andrew Steckel at the EPA Region IX office listed below. Copies of YSAQMD's request for approval are available for public inspection at the following locations:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), Air Division, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105–3901. Docket # A–96–25.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, 2020 ''L'' Street, P.O. Box 2815, Sacramento, California 95812–2815.

Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, 1947 Galileo Court, Suite 103, Davis, California 95616.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mae Wang, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105–3901, (415) 744–1200.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On September 22, 1993, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) promulgated the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for perchloroethylene dry cleaning facilities (*see* 58 FR 49354), which was codified in 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart M, ''National Perchloroethylene Air Emission Standards for Dry Cleaning Facilities'' (dry cleaning NESHAP). On May 21, 1996, EPA approved the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) request to implement and enforce section 93109 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations, ''Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Emissions of Perchloroethylene from Dry Cleaning Operations'' (dry cleaning ATCM), in place of the dry cleaning NESHAP for area sources (*see* 61 FR 25397). This approval became effective on June 20, 1996.

Thus, under Federal law, from September 22, 1993, to June 20, 1996, all dry cleaning facilities located within the jurisdiction of the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) that used perchloroethylene were subject to and required to comply with the dry cleaning NESHAP. Since June 20, 1996, all such dry cleaning facilities that also qualify as area sources are subject to the Federally-approved dry cleaning ATCM; major sources, as defined by the dry cleaning NESHAP, remain subject to the dry cleaning NESHAP and the Clean Air Act (CAA) Title V operating permit program.

On April 25, 1997, EPA received, through CARB, YSAQMD's request for approval to implement and enforce its ''Rule 9.7: Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning Operations'' (Rule 9.7), as the Federally-enforceable standard for area sources under YSAQMD's jurisdiction. YSAQMD's request, however, does not include the authority to determine equivalent emission control technology for dry cleaning facilities in place of 40 CFR 63.325. On November 14, 1997, YSAQMD withdrew its request to make revisions to Rule 9.7. YSAQMD subsequently revised Rule 9.7 on November 13, 1998, and resubmitted the rule on December 21, 1998, for EPA's approval.

II. EPA Action

A. YSAQMD's Dry Cleaning Rule

Under CAA section 112(l), EPA may approve state or local rules or programs to be implemented and enforced in place of certain otherwise applicable CAA section 112 Federal rules, emission standards, or requirements. The Federal regulations governing EPA's approval of state and local rules or programs under section 112(l) are located at 40 CFR part 63, Subpart E (*see* 58 FR 62262, dated November 26, 1993). Under these regulations, a local air pollution control agency has the option to request EPA's approval to substitute a local rule for the applicable Federal rule. Upon approval, the local agency is given the authority to implement and enforce its rule in

place of the otherwise applicable Federal rule. To receive EPA approval using this option, the requirements of 40 CFR 63.91 and 63.93 must be met.

After reviewing the request for approval of YSAQMD's Rule 9.7, EPA has determined that this request meets all the requirements necessary to qualify for approval under CAA section 112(l) and 40 CFR 63.91 and 63.93. Accordingly, with the exception of the dry cleaning NESHAP provisions discussed in sections II.A.1 and II.A.2 below, as of the effective date of this action, YSAQMD's Rule 9.7 is the Federally-enforceable standard for area sources under YSAQMD's jurisdiction. This rule will be enforceable by the EPA and citizens under the CAA. Although YSAQMD now has primary implementation and enforcement responsibility, EPA retains the right, pursuant to CAA section 112(l)(7), to enforce any applicable emission standard or requirement under CAA section 112.

1. Major Dry Cleaning Sources

Under the dry cleaning NESHAP, dry cleaning facilities are divided between major sources and area sources. YSAQMD's request for approval included only those provisions of the dry cleaning NESHAP that apply to area sources. Thus, dry cleaning facilities using perchloroethylene that qualify as major sources, as defined by the dry cleaning NESHAP, remain subject to the dry cleaning NESHAP and the CAA Title V operating permit program.

2. Authority To Determine Equivalent Emission Control Technology for Dry Cleaning Facilities

Under the dry cleaning NESHAP, any person may petition the EPA Administrator for a determination that the use of certain equipment or procedures is equivalent to the standards contained in the dry cleaning NESHAP (*see* 40 CFR 63.325). In its request, YSAQMD did not seek approval for the provisions in Rule 9.7 that would allow for the use of alternative emission control technology without previous approval from EPA (i.e., Rule 9.7 sections 216, 301.3.a(v), 301.3.b(ii)(c), and 502). A source seeking permission to use an alternative means of emission limitation under CAA section 112(h)(3) must receive approval, after notice and opportunity for comment, from EPA before using such alternative means of emission limitation for the purpose of complying with CAA section 112.

B. California's Authorities To Implement and Enforce CAA Section 112 Standards

1. Penalty Authorities

As part of its request for approval of the dry cleaning ATCM, CARB submitted a finding by California's Attorney General stating that ''State law provides civil and criminal enforcement authority consistent with [40 CFR] 63.91(b)(1)(i), 63.91(b)(6)(i), and 70.11, including authority to recover penalties and fines in a maximum amount of not less than $10,000 per day *per violation* * * *'' [emphasis added]. In accordance with this finding, EPA understands that the California Attorney General interprets section 39674 and the applicable sections of Division 26, Part 4, Chapter 4, Article 3 (''Penalties'') of the California Health and Safety Code as allowing the collection of penalties for multiple violations per day. In addition, EPA also understands that the California Attorney General interprets section 42400(c)(2) of the California Health and Safety Code as allowing for, among other things, criminal penalties for knowingly rendering inaccurate any monitoring *method* required by a toxic air contaminant rule, regulation, or permit.

As stated in section II.A above, EPA retains the right, pursuant to CAA section 112(l)(7), to enforce any applicable emission standard or requirement under CAA section 112, including the authority to seek civil and criminal penalties up to the maximum amounts specified in CAA section 113.

2. Variances

Division 26, Part 4, Chapter 4, Articles 2 and 2.5 of the California Health and Safety Code provide for the granting of variances under certain circumstances. EPA regards these provisions as wholly external to YSAQMD's request for approval to implement and enforce a CAA section 112 program or rule and, consequently, is proposing to take no action on these provisions of state or local law. EPA does not recognize the ability of a state or local agency who has received delegation of a CAA section 112 program or rule to grant relief from the duty to comply with such Federally-enforceable program or rule, except where such relief is granted in accordance with procedures allowed under CAA section 112. As stated above, EPA retains the right, pursuant to CAA section 112(l)(7), and citizens retain the right, pursuant to CAA section 304, to enforce any applicable emission standard or requirement under CAA section 112.

Similarly, section 39666(f) of the California Health and Safety Code allows local agencies to approve alternative methods from those required in the ATCMs, but only as long as such approvals are consistent with the CAA. As mentioned in section II.A.2 above, a source seeking permission to use an alternative means of emission limitation under CAA section 112 must also receive approval, after notice and opportunity for comment, from EPA before using such alternative means of emission limitation for the purpose of complying with CAA section 112.

III. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

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

B. Executive Order 12875

Under E.O. 12875, 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. If the mandate is unfunded, EPA must 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. 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 does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

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 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 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 final rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because approvals under 40 CFR 63.93 do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because this 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.

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 29, 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 63

Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Hazardous substances, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: This action is issued under the authority of section 112 of the Clean Air Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. section 7412.

Dated: January 11, 1999.

Felicia Marcus,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Title 40, chapter I, part 63 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 63—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 63 continues to read as follows:

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

2. Section 63.14 is amended by revising paragraph (d)(1) to read as follows:

§ 63.14 Incorporation by Reference

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(1) *California Regulatory Requirements Applicable to the Air Toxics Program*, January 5, 1999, IBR approved for § 63.99(a)(5)(ii) of subpart E of this part.

Subpart E—Approval of State Programs and Delegation of Federal Authorities

3. Section 63.99 is amended by revising paragraph (a)(5)(ii) introductory text, revising paragraph (a)(5)(ii)(A) introductory text, revising the first sentence of paragraph (a)(5)(ii)(A)(*1*)(*i*), revising the first sentence of paragraph (a)(5)(ii)(B)(*1*)(*i*s), and adding paragraph (a)(5)(ii)(D), to read as follows:

§ 63.99 Delegated Federal Authorities

(a) * * *

(5) * * *

(ii) Affected sources must comply with the *California Regulatory Requirements Applicable to the Air Toxics Program*, January 5, 1999 (incorporated by reference as specified in § 63.14) as described as follows:

(A) The material incorporated in Chapter 1 of the *California Regulatory*

Requirements Applicable to the Air Toxics Program (California Code of Regulations Title 17, section 93109) pertains to the perchloroethylene dry cleaning source category in the State of California, and has been approved under the procedures in § 63.93 to be implemented and enforced in place of subpart M—National Perchloroethylene Air Emission Standards for Dry Cleaning Facilities, as it applies to area sources only, as defined in § 63.320(h).

(*1*) * * *

(*i*) California is not delegated the Administrator's authority to implement and enforce California Code of Regulations Title 17, section 93109, in lieu of those provisions of subpart M which apply to major sources, as defined in § 63.320(g). * * *

(*ii*) * * *

(B) * * *

(*1*) * * *

(*i*) San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District is not delegated the Administrator's authority to implement and enforce Rule 432 in lieu of those provisions of subpart M which apply to major sources as defined in § 63.320(g). * * *

(*ii*) * * *

(C) * * *

(D) The material incorporated in Chapter 4 of the *California Regulatory Requirements Applicable to the Air Toxics Program* (Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District Rule 9.7) pertains to the perchloroethylene dry cleaning source category in the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, and has been approved under the procedures in § 63.93 to be implemented and enforced in place of subpart M—National Perchloroethylene Air Emission Standards for Dry Cleaning Facilities, as it applies to area sources only, as defined in § 63.320(h).

(*1*) Authorities not delegated.

(*i*) Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District is not delegated the Administrator's authority to implement and enforce Rule 9.7 in lieu of those provisions of subpart M which apply to major sources, as defined in § 63.320(g). Dry cleaning facilities which are major sources remain subject to subpart M.

(*ii*) Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District is not delegated the Administrator's authority of § 63.325 to determine equivalency of emissions control technologies. Any source seeking permission to use an alternative means of emission limitation, under sections 216, 301.3.a(v), 301.3.b(ii)(c), and 502 of Rule 9.7, must also receive approval from the Administrator before using such alternative means of emission limitation for the purpose of complying with section 112.

* * * *

[FR Doc. 99–1910 Filed 1–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[OPP–300778; FRL 6053–8]

RIN 2070–AB78

Diflufenzopyr; Pesticide Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes a tolerance for combined residues of diflufenzopyr, 2-(1-[([3,5-difluorophenylamino]carbonyl)-hydrazono]ethyl)-3-pyridinecarboxylic acid, and its metabolites convertible to M1 (8-methylpyrido[2,3-*d*]pyridazin-5(6*H*)-one) in or on field corn stover, forage and grain. BASF Corporation requested this tolerance under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), as amended by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–170).

DATES: This regulation is effective January 28, 1999. Objections and requests for hearings must be received by EPA on or before March 29, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written objections and hearing requests, identified by the docket control number, [OPP–300778], must be submitted to: Hearing Clerk (1900), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. M3708, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Fees accompanying objections and hearing requests shall be labeled ''Tolerance Petition Fees'' and forwarded to: EPA Headquarters Accounting Operations Branch, OPP (Tolerance Fees), P.O. Box 360277M, Pittsburgh, PA 15251. A copy of any objections and hearing requests filed with the Hearing Clerk identified by the docket control number, [OPP–300778], must also be submitted to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch, Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring a copy of objections and hearing requests to Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA.

A copy of objections and hearing requests filed with the Hearing Clerk may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Copies of objections and hearing requests must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Copies of objections and hearing requests will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1/6.1 or ASCII file format. All copies of objections and hearing requests in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number [OPP–300778]. No Confidential Business Information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail. Electronic copies of objections and hearing requests on this rule may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Joanne I. Miller, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location, telephone number, and e-mail address: Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA, (703) 305–6224; e-mail: miller.joanne@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the **Federal Register** of November 21, 1997, (62 FR 62304) (FRL 5755–4), EPA, issued a notice pursuant to section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(e) announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP) for tolerance by BASF Corporation, P.O. Box 13528, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709. This notice included a summary of the petition prepared by BASF Corporation, the registrant. There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

The petition requested that 40 CFR part 180 be amended by establishing tolerances for combined residues of the herbicide diflufenzopyr, 2-(1-[([3,5-difluorophenylamino]carbonyl)-hydrazono]ethyl)-3-pyridinecarboxylic acid, and its metabolites convertible to M1, (8-methylpyrido[2,3-*d*]pyridazin-5(6*H*)-one), in or on field corn fodder (stover), forage and grain at 0.05 part per million (ppm). Note that the scientific assessments relevant to establishing these tolerances for diflufenzopyr were conducted jointly between EPA and the Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) of Canada as a project under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Canadian United States Trade Agreement (CUSTA). Diflufenzopyr qualified as a candidate for such a program due to its classification as a reduced risk pesticide.