PART 52—[AMENDED]

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

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

Subpart BB—Montana

■ 2. Section 52.1370 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(52) to read as follows:

§52.1370 Identification of plan

(c) * * * * * *

- (52) The Governor of Montana submitted sulfur dioxide (SO₂) SIP revisions for Billings/Laurel on July 29, 1998 and May 4, 2000. EPA is approving some of the provisions of the July 29, 1998 submittal that it did not approve before. The May 4, 2000 submittal revises some previously approved provisions of the Billings/Laurel SO₂ SIP and adds new provisions.
 - (i) Incorporation by reference.
- (A) Sections 3(B)(2) and 4(D) (excluding "or the flare" and "or the flare" in both sections), 3(A)(1)(d) and 4(B) of Cenex Harvest States Cooperatives' exhibit A to the stipulation between the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and Cenex Harvest States Cooperatives, adopted June 12, 1998 by Board Order issued by the Montana Board of Environmental Review.
- (B) Board Order issued March 17, 2000 by the Montana Board of Environmental Review adopting and incorporating the February 14, 2000 stipulation between the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and Cenex Harvest States Cooperatives. This stipulation revises attachment #2 to Cenex Harvest States Cooperatives' exhibit A to require the use of method #6A-1.
- (C) Sections 3(E)(4) and 4(E) (excluding "or in the flare" and "or the flare" in both sections), 3(A)(2), 3(B)(2), 3(B)(3), 4(B) and 6(B)(3) of Exxon's exhibit A to the stipulation between the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and Exxon, adopted June 12, 1998 by Board Order issued by the Montana Board of Environmental Review
- (D) Board Order issued March 17, 2000, by the Montana Board of Environmental Review adopting and incorporating the February 14, 2000 stipulation between the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and Exxon Mobil Corporation. The stipulation adds the following to Exxon Mobil Corporation's exhibit A: method #6A-1 of attachment #2 and sections 2(A)(11)(d), 4(C), 7(B)(1)(j) and

7(C)(1)(l). The stipulation revises the following sections of Exxon Mobil Corporation's exhibit A: 3 (introductory text only), 3(A) (introductory text only), 3(A)(1), 3(B) (introductory text only), 3(B)(1), 3(E)(3), 6(B)(7), 7(B)(1)(d), 7(C)(1)(b), 7(C)(1)(d), and 7(C)(1)(f).

(É) Board Order issued on March 17, 2000, by the Montana Board of Environmental Review adopting and incorporating the February 14, 2000 stipulation between the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and Yellowstone Energy Limited Partnership (YELP). The stipulation revises the following sections of YELP's exhibit A: sections 3(A)(1) through (3) and 7(C)(1)(b).

 \blacksquare 3. In § 52.1384, add paragraph (e) to read as follows:

§ 52.1384 Emission control regulations.

(e) In 40 CFR 52.1370(c)(52), we approved portions of the Billings/Laurel Sulfur Dioxide SIP for the limited purpose of strengthening the SIP. Those provisions that we limitedly approved are hereby limitedly disapproved. This limited disapproval does not prevent EPA, citizens, or the State from enforcing the provisions. This paragraph identifies those provisions of the Billings/Laurel SO₂ SIP identified in 40 CFR 52.1370(c)(52) that have been limitedly disapproved.

(1) Sections 3(B)(2) and 4(D) (excluding "or in the flare" and "or the flare" in both sections, which was previously disapproved in paragraphs (d)(1)(i)(B) and (C) above), 3(A)(1)(d) and 4(B) of Cenex Harvest State Cooperatives' exhibit A to the stipulation between the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and Cenex Harvest State Cooperatives, adopted June 12, 1998 by Board Order issued by the Montana Board of Environmental Review.

(2) Method #6A-1 of attachment #2 of Cenex Harvest State Cooperatives' exhibit A, as revised pursuant to the stipulation between the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and Cenex Harvest State Cooperatives, adopted by Board Order issued on March 17, 2000, by the Montana Board of Environmental Review.

(3) Sections 3(B)(2), 4(B), and 6(B)(3) of Exxon's exhibit A to the stipulation between the Montana Department of Environmental Quality and Exxon, adopted on June 12, 1998 by Board Order issued by the Montana Board of Environmental Review.

(4) Sections 2(A)(11)(d), 3(A)(1), 3(B)(1) and 4(C) of Exxon Mobil Corporation's exhibit A, as revised pursuant to the stipulation between the

Montana Department of Environmental Quality and Exxon Mobil Corporation, adopted by Board Order issued on March 17, 2000, by the Montana Board of Environmental Review.

[FR Doc. 03–12616 Filed 5–21–03; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[VT-1226a; FRL-7502-1]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Vermont; Negative Declaration

AGENCY: Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving the sections 111(d) negative declaration submitted by the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) on August 20, 1996. This negative declaration adequately certifies that there are no existing municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills located in the state of Vermont that have accepted waste since November 8, 1987 and that must install collection and control systems according to EPA's emissions guidelines for existing MSW landfills. EPA publishes regulations under sections 111(d) and 129 of the Clean Air Act requiring states to submit control plans to EPA. These state control plans show how states intend to control the emissions of designated pollutants from designated facilities (e.g., landfills). The state of Vermont submitted this negative declaration in lieu of a state control plan.

DATES: This direct final rule is effective on July 21, 2003 without further notice unless EPA receives significant adverse comment by June 23, 2003. If EPA receives adverse comment, we 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: You should address your written comments to: Mr. Steven Rapp, Chief, Air Permits, Toxics & Indoor Programs Unit, Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. EPA, One Congress Street, Suite 1100 (CAP), Boston, MA 02114–2023.

Copies of the documents relevant to this action 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John J. Courcier, (617) 918–1659.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. What action is EPA taking today?II. What is the origin of the requirements?III. When did the requirements first become known?

- IV. When did Vermont submit its negative declaration?
- V. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

I. What Action Is EPA Taking Today?

EPA is approving the negative declaration submitted by the state of Vermont on August 20, 1996.

EPA is publishing this negative declaration 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**, EPA is publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve this negative declaration should relevant adverse comments be filed. If EPA receives no significant adverse comment by June 23, 2003, this action will be effective July 21, 2003.

If EPA receives significant adverse comments by the above date, we will withdraw this action before the effective date by publishing a subsequent document in the **Federal Register**. EPA will address all public comments received in a subsequent final rule based on the parallel proposed rule published in today's **Federal Register**. 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. If EPA receives no comments, this action will be effective July 21, 2003.

II. What Is the Origin of the Requirements?

Under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, EPA published regulations at 40 CFR part 60, subpart B which require states to submit plans to control emissions of designated pollutants from designated facilities. In the event that a state does not have a particular designated facility located within its boundaries, EPA requires that a negative declaration be submitted in lieu of a control plan.

III. When Did the Requirements First Become Known?

On May 30, 1991 (56 FR 24468), EPA proposed emission guidelines for existing MSW landfills. This action enabled EPA to list existing MSW landfills as designated facilities. EPA specified non-methane organic compounds (NMOC) as a designated pollutant by proposing the emission guidelines for existing MSW landfills. These guidelines were published in final form on March 12, 1996 (61 FR 9905).

IV. When Did Vermont Submit Its Negative Declaration?

On August 20, 1996, the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) submitted a letter certifying that there are no existing MSW landfills subject to 40 CFR part 60, subpart B. Section 111(d) and 40 CFR 62.06 provide that when no such designated facilities exist within a state's boundaries, the affected state may submit a letter of "negative declaration" instead of a control plan. EPA is publishing this negative declaration at 40 CFR 62.11485.

V. Regulatory Assessment 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. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). 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 (Pub. L. 104-4).

This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does 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 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing sections 111(d)/129 State Plans, 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 state plan for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a state plan, to use VCS in place of a 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. 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.)

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**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the Federal Register. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

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 July 21, 2003. Interested parties should comment in response to the proposed rule rather than petition for judicial review, unless the objection arises after the comment

period allowed for in the proposal. 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 62

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waste treatment and disposal.

Dated: May 8, 2003.

Robert W. Varney,

Regional Administrator, EPA New England.

■ 40 CFR part 62 is amended as follows:

PART 62—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 62 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Subpart UU—Vermont

■ 2. Subpart UU is amended by adding a new § 62.11485 and a new undesignated center heading to read as follows:

Emission From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills

§ 62.11485 Identification of Plan—negative declaration.

On August 20, 1996, the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation submitted a letter certifying that there are no existing municipal solid waste landfills in the state subject to the emission guidelines under part 60, subpart B of this chapter.

[FR Doc. 03–12863 Filed 5–21–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[OAR-2002-0086, FRL-7461-3]

RIN 2060-AG93

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Semiconductor Manufacturing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action promulgates national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) for new and existing semiconductor manufacturing operations located at major sources of emissions of hazardous air pollutants (HAP). The final standards implement section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), which requires the Administrator to regulate emissions of HAP listed in section 112(b) of the CAA. The intent of the standards is to protect public health and the environment by requiring new and existing major sources to control emissions to the level attainable by implementing the maximum achievable control technology (MACT). The primary HAP that will be controlled with this action include hydrochloric acid (HCl), hydrogen flouride (HF), methanol, glycol ethers, and xylene. Exposure to these substances has been demonstrated to cause adverse health effects such as irritation of the lung, eye, and mucous membranes; effects on the central nervous system; liver and kidney damage; and, possibly cancer. We do not have the type of current detailed data on each of the facilities and the people living around the facilities covered by today's final rule for this source category that would be necessary to conduct an analysis to determine the actual population exposures to the HAP emitted from these facilities and the potential for resultant health effects. Therefore, we do not know the extent to which the adverse health effects described above occur in the populations surrounding these facilities. However, to the extent the adverse effects do occur, and today's final rule reduces emissions, subsequent exposures will be reduced.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 22, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Docket No. A–97–15 and E-Docket No. OAR–2002–0086 contain supporting information used in developing the standards for the semiconductor manufacturing source category. The docket is located at EPA Docket Center (Air Docket), U.S. EPA, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room B108, Mail Code: 6102T, Washington,

DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John Schaefer, U.S. EPA, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Emission Standards Division (C504–05), Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, telephone number (919) 541–0296, electronic mail (e-mail) address: schaefer.john@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Docket.* The docket is an organized and complete file of all the information considered by the EPA in the

development of the rule. The docket is a dynamic file because material is added throughout the rule development process. The docketing system is intended to allow members of the public and industries involved to readily identify and locate documents so that they can effectively participate in the rule development process. Along with the proposed and promulgated standards and their preambles, the contents of the docket will serve as the record in the case of judicial review. (See section 307(d)(7)(A) of the CAA.) The regulatory text and other materials related to the final rule are available for review in the docket or copies may be mailed on request from the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center by calling (202) 566-1742. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying docket materials.

Electronic Docket Access. You may access the final rule electronically through the EPA Internet under the "Federal Register" listings at http:// www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/. An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, EPA Dockets. You may use EPA Dockets at http:// www.epa.gov/edocket/ to view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the docket facility in the above paragraph entitled "Docket." Once in the system, select "search," then key in the appropriate docket

World Wide Web (WWW). In addition to being available in the docket, an electronic copy of the final rule will also be available on the WWW through the EPA's Technology Transfer Network (TTN). Following signature by the EPA Administrator, a copy of the final rule will be posted on the TTN's policy and guidance page for newly proposed or promulgated rules at http:// www.epa.gov/ttn/oarpg. The TTN provides information and technology exchange in various areas of air pollution control. If more information regarding the TTN is needed, call the TTN HELP line at (919) 541–5384.

identification number.

Regulated Entities. Categories and entities potentially regulated by this action include those listed on the following table. This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but is just a guide to entities likely to be regulated by these standards. It lists the types of entities that may be regulated, but you