

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, E.O. 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 conditional and limited approvals of SIP submittals under sections 110 and 301, and subchapter I, part D of the 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 impose any new requirements, EPA certifies 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).

If the conditional approval is converted to a disapproval under section 110(k), based on the State's failure to meet the commitment, it will not affect any existing state requirements applicable to small entities. Federal disapproval of the state submittal does not affect its state-enforceability. Moreover, EPA's disapproval of the submittal does not impose a new Federal requirement. Therefore, EPA certifies that this

proposed disapproval action does not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because it does not remove existing requirements nor does it substitute a new federal requirement.

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 proposed approval action of Maryland's NO_x RACT rule 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, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and record keeping requirements.

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

Dated: February 9, 1999.

W. Michael McCabe,

Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 99-3996 Filed 2-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 82

[FRL-6301-7]

RIN 2060-AG12

Protection of Stratospheric Ozone

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This action proposes to list as acceptable with restrictions two substitutes for ozone depleting substances (ODSs) under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) program. SNAP implements section 612 of the amended Clean Air Act of 1990, which requires EPA to evaluate substitutes for the ODSs to reduce overall risk to human health and the environment. Through these evaluations, SNAP generates lists of acceptable and unacceptable substitutes for each of the major industrial use sectors. The intended effect of the SNAP program is to expedite movement away from ozone depleting compounds while avoiding a shift into substitutes posing other environmental problems.

On March 18, 1994, EPA promulgated a final rulemaking setting forth its plan for administering the SNAP program (59 FR 13044), and issued decisions on the acceptability and unacceptability of a number of substitutes. In this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), EPA is issuing its preliminary decisions on the acceptability of halon substitutes in the fire suppression and explosion protection sector which have not previously been reviewed by the Agency. To arrive at determinations on the acceptability of substitutes, the Agency completed a cross-media evaluation of risks to human health and the environment by sector end-use.

DATES: Written comments or data provided in response to this document must be submitted by April 19, 1999. A public hearing will be held if requested in writing. If a public hearing is requested, EPA will provide notice of the date, time and location of the hearing in a subsequent **Federal Register** notice. For further information, please contact the SNAP Coordinator at the address listed below under For Further Information.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and data should be sent to Docket A-91-42, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, OAR Docket and Information Center, Room M-1500, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. The docket may be inspected between 8 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. on weekdays. Telephone (202) 260-7548; fax (202) 260-4400. As provided in 40 CFR, Part 2, a reasonable fee may be charged for photocopying. To expedite review, a second copy of the comments should be sent to Kelly Davis at the address listed below under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**. Information designated as Confidential Business Information (CBI) under 40 CFR, Part 2, Subpart B, must be sent directly to the contact person for this notice. However,

the Agency is requesting that all respondents submit a non-confidential version of their comments to the docket as well.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kelly Davis at (202) 564-2303 or fax (202) 565-2096, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 6205-J, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. Overnight or courier deliveries should be sent to our 501-3rd Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20001 location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Overview of This Action

This action is divided into four sections:

- I. Section 612 Program
 - A. Statutory Requirements
 - B. Regulatory History
- II. Proposed Listing of Substitutes
- III. Administrative Requirements
 - A. Executive Order 12866
 - B. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
 - C. Regulatory Flexibility Act
 - D. Paperwork Reduction Act
 - E. Applicability of Executive Order 13045: Children's Health Protection
 - F. Executive Order 12875: Enhancing Intergovernmental Partnerships
 - G. The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
 - H. Executive Order 13084: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
- IV. Additional Information

I. Section 612 Program

A. Statutory Requirements

Section 612 of the Clean Air Act authorizes EPA to develop a program for evaluating alternatives to ozone-depleting substances. EPA is referring to this program as the Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) program. The major provisions of section 612 are:

Rulemaking—Section 612(c) requires EPA to promulgate rules making it unlawful to replace any class I (chlorofluorocarbon, halon, carbon tetrachloride, methyl chloroform, methyl bromide, and hydrobromofluorocarbon) or class II (hydrochlorofluorocarbon) substance with any substitute that the Administrator determines may present adverse effects to human health or the environment where the Administrator has identified an alternative that (1) reduces the overall risk to human health and the environment, and (2) is currently or potentially available.

Listing of Unacceptable/Acceptable Substitutes—Section 612(c) also requires EPA to publish a list of the substitutes unacceptable for specific uses. EPA must publish a corresponding list of acceptable alternatives for specific uses.

Petition Process—Section 612(d) grants the right to any person to petition EPA to add a substitute to or delete a substitute from the lists published in accordance with section 612(c). The Agency has 90 days to grant or deny a petition. Where the Agency grants the petition, EPA must publish the revised lists within an additional six months.

90-day Notification—Section 612(e) requires EPA to require any person who produces a chemical substitute for a class I substance to notify the Agency not less than 90 days before new or existing chemicals are introduced into interstate commerce for significant new uses as substitutes for a class I substance. The producer must also provide the Agency with the producer's unpublished health and safety studies on such substitutes.

Outreach—Section 612(b)(1) states that the Administrator shall seek to maximize the use of federal research facilities and resources to assist users of class I and II substances in identifying and developing alternatives to the use of such substances in key commercial applications.

Clearinghouse—Section 612(b)(4) requires the Agency to set up a public clearinghouse of alternative chemicals, product substitutes, and alternative manufacturing processes that are available for products and manufacturing processes which use class I and II substances.

B. Regulatory History

On March 18, 1994, EPA published the Final Rulemaking (FRM) (59 FR 13044) which described the process for administering the SNAP program and issued EPA's first acceptability lists for substitutes in the major industrial use sectors. These sectors include: refrigeration and air conditioning; foam blowing; solvent cleaning; fire suppression and explosion protection; sterilants; aerosols; adhesives, coatings and inks; and tobacco expansion. These sectors comprise the principal industrial sectors that historically consume large volumes of ozone-depleting compounds.

The Agency defines a "substitute" as any chemical, product substitute, or alternative manufacturing process, whether existing or new, that could replace a class I or class II substance. Anyone who produces a substitute must provide the Agency with health and safety studies on the substitute at least 90 days before introducing it into interstate commerce for significant new use as an alternative. This requirement applies to chemical manufacturers, but may include importers, formulators or end-users when they are responsible for introducing a substitute into commerce.

II. Proposed Listing of Substitutes

To develop the lists of unacceptable and acceptable substitutes, EPA conducts screens of health and environmental risks posed by various substitutes for ozone-depleting compounds in each use sector. The outcome of these risk screens can be found in the public docket, as described above in the Addresses portion of this notice.

Under section 612, the Agency has considerable discretion in the risk management decisions it can make in SNAP. The Agency has identified five possible decision categories: acceptable; acceptable subject to use conditions; acceptable subject to narrowed use limits; unacceptable; and pending. Fully acceptable substitutes (i.e., no restrictions) can be used for all applications within the relevant sector end-use. Conversely, it is illegal to replace an ODS with a substitute listed by SNAP as unacceptable. A pending listing represents substitutes for which the Agency has not received complete data or has not completed its review of the data.

After reviewing a substitute, the Agency may make a determination that a substitute is acceptable only if certain conditions of use are met to minimize risks to human health and the environment. Use of such substitutes in ways that are inconsistent with such use conditions renders these substitutes unacceptable.

Even though the Agency can restrict the use of a substitute based on the potential for adverse effects, it may be necessary to permit a narrowed range of use within a sector end-use because of the lack of alternatives for specialized applications. Users intending to adopt a substitute acceptable within narrowed use limits must ascertain that other acceptable alternatives are not technically feasible. Companies must document the results of their evaluation, and retain the results on file for the purpose of demonstrating compliance. This documentation shall include descriptions of substitutes examined and rejected, processes or products in which the substitute is needed, reason for rejection of other alternatives, e.g., performance, technical or safety standards, and the anticipated date other substitutes will be available and projected time for switching to other available substitutes. Use of such substitutes in applications and end-uses which are not specified as acceptable in the narrowed use limit renders these substitutes unacceptable.

In this NPRM, EPA is issuing its preliminary decision on the

acceptability of certain substitutes not previously reviewed by the Agency. As described in the March 1994 rulemaking for the SNAP program (59 FR 13044), EPA believes that, as a general matter, notice-and-comment rulemaking is required to place any alternative on the list of prohibited substitutes, to list a substitute as acceptable only under certain use conditions or narrowed use limits, or to remove an alternative from either the list of prohibited or acceptable substitutes.

EPA does not believe that notice and comment rulemaking procedures are required to list alternatives as acceptable with no limitations. Such listings do not impose any sanction, nor do they remove any prior license to use a substitute. Consequently, EPA adds substitutes to the list of acceptable alternatives without first requesting comment on new listings. Updates to the acceptable and pending lists are published as separate Notices of Acceptability in the **Federal Register**.

The sections below present a detailed discussion of the proposed substitute listing determinations by major use sector. Tables summarizing listing decisions in this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking are in Appendix G. The comments contained in Appendix G provide additional information on a substitute. These comments are not part of the regulatory decision, and therefore they are not mandatory for use of a substitute. Nor should the comments listed in Appendix G be considered comprehensive with respect to other legal obligations pertaining to the use of the substitute. However, EPA encourages users to apply all comments listed in the application of these substitutes. In many instances, the comments simply allude to sound operating practices that have already been identified in existing industry and/or building-code standards. Thus, many of the comments, if adopted, would not require significant changes, if any, in existing operating practices for the affected industry.

A. Fire Suppression and Explosion Protection

EPA is proposing to list IG-100 and HCFC Blend E as acceptable halon substitutes subject to certain use conditions. In implementing its application of conditions to limit the use of alternatives under the SNAP program, EPA has sought to avoid overlap with other existing regulatory authorities. EPA believes that section 612 clearly authorizes imposition of use conditions to ensure safe use of replacing agents. EPA's mandate is to list agents that "reduce overall risk to

human health and the environment" for "specific uses." In light of this authorization, EPA only intends to set conditions for the safe use of halon substitutes in the workplace until OSHA incorporates specific language addressing gaseous agents in OSHA regulation. Under Public Law 91-596, section 4(b)(1), OSHA is precluded from regulating working conditions currently being regulated by another federal agency. EPA is specifically deferring to OSHA and has no intention to assume the responsibility for regulating workplace safety, especially with respect to fire protection. EPA's workplace use conditions will not bar OSHA from regulating under its P.L. 91-596 authority.

Additionally, EPA understands that, under the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995, Section 12(d), Pub. L. 104-113, federal agencies are required to use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies, using such technical standards as a means to carry out policy objectives or activities. EPA will consider adopting such technical standards as they become available.

1. Proposed Acceptable Subject to Use Conditions

Total Flooding Agents. IG-100 is proposed acceptable as a Halon 1301 substitute for total flooding applications. IG-100, which is composed of 100% nitrogen, is designed to lower the oxygen level in a protected area to a level that does not support combustion. The toxicological issues of concern with inert gas systems differ from those of halocarbon agent systems, since the endpoint for hypoxic (low oxygen) atmospheres associated with inert gas systems is asphyxiation, while the endpoint for halocarbon agents is cardiotoxicity leading to cardiac arrhythmia. Peer reviews by medical specialists considering specific questions regarding exposure of a typical working population to inert gas fire suppression systems have provided sufficient information to support use conditions previously listed for IG-541, IG-55, and IG-01; EPA has determined these use conditions are appropriate for IG-100 as well.

Specifically, because the terms No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) and Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) are not appropriate when considering the continuum of health effects associated with hypoxic atmospheres, EPA proposes a "no effect level" for inert gas systems at 12% oxygen, and a "lowest effect level" at 10% oxygen. Thus, consistent with the

OSHA conditions used by EPA for all total flooding agents, EPA proposes that an IG-100 system could be designed to an oxygen level of 10% if employees can egress the area within one minute, but may be designed only to the 12% level if it takes longer than one minute to egress the area. If the possibility exists for the oxygen to drop below 10%, employees must be evacuated prior to such oxygen depletion. A design concentration of less than 10% oxygen may only be used in normally unoccupied areas, provided that any employee who could possibly be exposed can egress within 30 seconds.

EPA does not encourage any employee to intentionally remain in an area following discharge of IG-100 (or any other total flooding agent), even in the event of accidental discharge. In addition, the system must include alarms and warning mechanisms as specified by OSHA.

EPA intends that all personnel be evacuated from an area prior to, or quickly after, discharge. An inert gas system may not be designed with the intention of personnel remaining in the area unless appropriate protection is provided, such as self-contained breathing apparatuses.

2. Proposed Acceptable Subject to Narrowed Use Limits

Streaming Agents. HCFC Blend E is proposed acceptable as a Halon 1211 substitute for streaming agent uses in nonresidential applications. This agent is a blend of an HCFC, an HFC, and an additive. The primary constituent, an HCFC, is currently listed as acceptable for use in non-residential streaming applications. The secondary constituent, an HFC, is listed acceptable as a flooding agent subject to use conditions. Upon combustion, the synergistic effect of these two compounds can result in the formulation of hydrochloric and other acids at levels potentially harmful to human health. The formulation of such byproducts of combustion is similar for many halocarbon fire extinguishing agents. The manufacturer claims the presence of the additive might help mitigate these potential effects.

This potential risk of human health effects, although it does not outweigh the risks associated with fire, necessitate limiting the use of this blend to non-residential applications only. EPA recommends that the potential risks associated with the use of this blend, as well as handling procedures to reduce such risk, be clearly labeled on each extinguisher containing this blend. Additionally, section 610(d) of the Clean Air Act and its implementing

regulations prohibit the sale and distribution of HCFCs in fire extinguishers for residential applications. (See 61 FR 69671, December 4, 1996, and 58 FR 69637, December 30, 1993.)

EPA has reviewed the environmental impacts of this blend and has concluded that, by comparison to Halon 1211, it reduces overall risk to the environment. The ozone-depletion potential of the HCFC is 0.02; no other constituent in the blend has ozone-depleting characteristics. EPA's review of environmental and human health impacts of this blend is contained in the public docket for this rulemaking.

III. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

Under Executive Order 12866, (58 FR 51735; October 4, 1993) the Agency must determine whether the regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to OMB review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines "significant regulatory action" as one that is likely to result in a rule that may: (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlement, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

Pursuant to the terms of Executive Order 12866, OMB notified EPA that it considers this a "significant regulatory action" within the meaning of the Executive Order and EPA submitted this action to OMB for review. Changes made in response to OMB suggestions or recommendations have been documented in the public record.

B. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 requires EPA to prepare a budgetary impact statement before promulgating a rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in expenditure of \$100 million or more in any one year by state, local, and tribal governments, in aggregate, or by the private sector. Section 203 requires the Agency to

establish a plan for obtaining input from and informing any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely affected by the rule. Section 205 requires that regulatory alternatives be considered before promulgating a rule for which a budgetary impact statement is prepared. The Agency must select the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the rule's objectives, unless there is an explanation why this alternative is not selected or this alternative is inconsistent with law.

Because this proposed rule is estimated to result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments or the private sector of less than \$100 million in any one year, the Agency has not prepared a budgetary impact statement or specifically addressed the selection of the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative. Because small governments will not be significantly or uniquely affected by this rule, the Agency is not required to develop a plan with regard to small governments. However, this proposed rule has the net effect of reducing burden from part 82, Stratospheric Protection regulations, on regulated entities.

C. 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 would not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because costs of the SNAP requirements as a whole are expected to be minor. In fact, this proposed rule offers regulatory relief to small businesses by providing acceptable alternatives to phased-out ozone-depleting substances. The actions proposed herein may well provide benefits for small businesses anxious to examine potential substitutes to any ozone-depleting class I and class II substances they may be using, by requiring manufacturers to make information on such substitutes available. Therefore, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

D. Paperwork Reduction Act

EPA has determined that this proposed rule contains no information

requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, that are not already approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). OMB has reviewed and approved an Information Collection Request by EPA described in the March 18, 1994 rulemaking (59 FR 13044, at 13121, 13146-13147); its OMB Control Number is 2060-0226.

E. Applicability of Executive Order 13045: Children's Health Protection

This rule is not subject to E.O. 13045, entitled Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it does not involve decisions on environmental health risks or safety risks that may disproportionately affect children.

F. Executive Order 12875: Enhancing Intergovernmental Partnerships

Under Executive Order 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, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA consults with those governments, Executive Order 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 any written communications from the governments, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 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 Executive Order 12875 do not apply to this rule.

G. The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995

(NTTAA), Section 12(d), Pub. L. 104-113, requires federal agencies and departments to use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies, using such technical standards as a means to carry out policy objectives or activities determined by the agencies and departments. If use of such technical standards is inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical, a federal agency or department may elect to use technical standards that are not developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies if the head of the agency or department transmits to the Office of Management and Budget an explanation of the reasons for using such standards.

Although this proposed rule includes technical standards for exposure limits, there are no applicable voluntary consensus standards on this subject. EPA will consider adopting such technical standards as they become available.

H. Executive Order 13084: Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments

Under Executive Order 13084, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute, that significantly 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, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting Executive Order 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, because this regulation applies directly to facilities that use

these substances and not to governmental entities. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to this rule.

IV. Additional Information

For copies of the comprehensive SNAP lists or additional information on SNAP, contact the Stratospheric Protection Hotline at 1-800-296-1996, Monday-Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. (EST).

For more information on the Agency's process for administering the SNAP program or criteria for evaluation of substitutes, refer to the SNAP final rulemaking published in the **Federal Register** on March 18, 1994 (59 FR 13044). Notices and rulemakings under the SNAP program, as well as EPA publications on protection of stratospheric ozone, are available from EPA's Ozone World Wide Web site at (<http://www.epa.gov/ozone/title6>) and from the Stratospheric Protection Hotline, whose number is listed above.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 82

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: February 10, 1999.

Carol M. Browner,
Administrator.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 40 CFR part 82 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 82—PROTECTION OF STRATOSPHERIC OZONE

1. The authority citation for Part 82 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. Sec. 7414, 7601, 7671-7671q.

2. Subpart G is amended by adding the following Appendix G to read as follows:

Subpart G—Significant New Alternatives Policy Program

* * * * *

Appendix G to Subpart G—Substitutes Subject to Use Restrictions and Unacceptable Substitutes Listed in the [FR publication date] final rule, effective [30 days after FR publication date].

Summary of Proposed Decisions

FIRE SUPPRESSION AND EXPLOSION PROTECTION TOTAL FLOODING AGENTS
 [Substitutes Acceptable Subject to Use Conditions]

| End Use | Substitute | Decision | Conditions | Comments |
|------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|---|---|
| Halon 1301, Total Flooding Agents. | IG-100 | Acceptable | Until OSHA establishes applicable workplace requirements: IG-100 systems may be designed to an oxygen level of 10% if employees can egress the area within one minute, but may be designed only to the 12% oxygen level if it takes longer than one minute to egress the area. If the possibility exists for the oxygen level to drop below 10%, employees must be evacuated prior to such oxygen depletion. A design concentration of less than 10% may only be used in normally occupied areas, as long as an employee who could possibly be exposed can egress within 30 seconds. | EPA does not contemplate personnel remaining in the space after system discharge during a fire without Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) as required by OSHA. EPA does not encourage any employee to intentionally remain in the area after system discharge, even in the event of accidental discharge. In addition, the system must include alarms and warning mechanisms as specified by OSHA. See additional comments 1, 2. |

Additional Comments

1. Must conform with OSHA 29 CFR 1910, Subpart L, Section 1910.160.

2. Per OSHA requirements, protective gear (SCBA) must be available in the event personnel must re-enter the area.

FIRE SUPPRESSION AND EXPLOSION PROTECTION STREAMING AGENTS
 [Substitutes Acceptable Subject to Narrowed Use Limits]

| End use | Substitute | Decision | Limitations | Comments |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| Halon 1211, Streaming Agents. | HCFC Blend E | Acceptable | Nonresidential uses only. | |

[FR Doc. 99-3992 Filed 2-17-99; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 82

[FRL-6301-8]

RIN 2060-AG12

Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; Listing of Substitutes for Ozone-Depleting Substances

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Request for data and advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This action requests comments and information on n-propyl bromide (nPB) under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) program. SNAP implements section 612 of the amended Clean Air Act of 1990 (CAAA), which requires EPA to evaluate substitutes for

ozone depleting substances (ODSs) to reduce overall risk to human health and the environment. Through these evaluations, SNAP generates lists of acceptable and unacceptable substitutes for each of the major industrial use sectors. The intended effect of the SNAP program is to expedite movement away from ozone depleting compounds while avoiding a shift into substitutes posing other environmental or health problems.

Through this Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR), the Agency hopes to receive information as part of the development of effective regulatory options on the listing of nPB as acceptable or unacceptable for the various submitted end-uses under SNAP. This action notifies the public of the availability of information regarding nPB and the Agency hopes that this action will provide the public an opportunity to provide input at an early stage in the decision-making process.

This notice does not constitute a final, or even preliminary, decision by the Agency. Based on information collected as part of this ANPR, EPA intends to propose a future determination

regarding the acceptability or unacceptability of nPB as a substitute for class I and class II ozone depleting substances and, if acceptable, an occupational exposure limit (OEL) for nPB. This limit would be designed to protect worker safety until the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) sets its own standards under Public Law 91-596. However, until a final determination is made, users of nPB should exercise caution in the manufacture, handling, and disposal of this chemical.

EPA has received petitions under CAAA Section 612(d) to add nPB to the list of acceptable alternatives for class I and class II ozone depleting substances in the solvent sector for general metals, precision, and electronics cleaning, as well as in aerosol and adhesive applications.

DATES: Written comments on data provided in response to this notice must be submitted by April 19, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on and materials supporting this advanced notice are collected in Air Docket # A-92-13, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401