conspicuously placing or causing to be engraved, cast, stamped (impressed) or placed on the frame or receiver thereof an individual serial number. The serial number must be placed in a manner not susceptible of being readily obliterated, altered, or removed, and must not duplicate any serial number placed by you on any other firearm. For firearms manufactured on and after [insert effective date of final rule], the engraving, casting, or stamping (impressing) of the serial number must be to a minimum depth of .005 inch and in a print size no smaller than 3/32 inch; and

(2) By engraving, casting, stamping (impressing), or otherwise conspicuously placing or causing to be engraved, cast, stamped (impressed), or placed on the frame, receiver, or barrel thereof certain additional information. This information must be placed in a manner not susceptible of being readily obliterated, altered or removed. For firearms manufactured on and after [Insert effective date of final rule], the engraving , casting, or stamping (impressing) of this information must be to a minimum depth of .005 inch. The additional information includes:

(i) The model, if such designation has been made;

(ii) The caliber or gauge;

(iii) Your name (or recognized abbreviation) and also, when applicable, the name of the foreign manufacturer or maker;

(iv) In the case of a domestically made firearm, the city and State (or recognized abbreviation thereof) where you as the manufacturer maintain your place of business, or where you, as the maker, made the firearm; and

(v) In the case of an imported firearm, the name of the country in which it was manufactured and the city and State (or recognized abbreviation thereof) where you as the importer maintain your place of business.

(b) The Director may authorize other means of identification upon receipt of a letter application from you, submitted in duplicate, showing that such other identification is reasonable and will not hinder the effective administration of this part.

(c) In the case of a destructive device, the Director may authorize other means of identifying that weapon upon receipt of a letter application you, submitted in duplicate, showing that engraving, casting, or stamping (impressing) such a weapon would be dangerous or impracticable.

(d) A firearm frame or receiver that is not a component part of a complete weapon at the time it is sold, shipped, or otherwise disposed of by you must be identified as required by this section.

(e)(1) Any part defined as a machine gun, muffler, or silencer for the purposes of this part that is not a component part of a complete firearm at the time it is sold, shipped, or otherwise disposed of by you must be identified as required by this section.

(2) The Director may authorize other means of identification of parts defined as machine guns other than frames or receivers and parts defined as mufflers or silencers upon receipt of a letter application from you, submitted in duplicate, showing that such other identification is reasonable and will not hinder the effective administration of this part.

Signed: April 12, 1999.

John W. Magaw,

Director.

Approved: June 4, 1999.

Dennis M. O'Connell,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, (Regulatory, Tariff and Trade Enforcement).

[FR Doc. 99–15943 Filed 6–22–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–31–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[Docket No. A–99–03; FRL–6364–8]

Hazardous Air Pollutants List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of receipt of a complete petition to delist methyl ethyl ketone from the list of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs).

SUMMARY: This notice announces the receipt of a complete petition from the Chemical Manufacturers Association's (CMA'S) Ketone Panel requesting EPA to remove the chemical methyl ethyl ketone (MEK, 2-Butanone) (CAS No. 78–93–3) from the list of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) contained in section 112(b)(1) of the 1990 Clean Air Act (Act). We have determined that the Chemical Manufacturers Association's original petition dated November 27, 1996 and the supplemental materials provided by CMA through August 31, 1998 will support an assessment of the human health impacts associated with people living in the vicinity of facilities emitting methyl ethyl ketone. In addition, the data submitted by CMA will support an assessment of the environmental impacts associated with emissions of methyl ethyl ketone to the ambient air and deposited onto soil or water. Consequently, we have concluded that CMA's petition is complete as of August 31, 1998, the date of the last supplement, and is ready for public comment and the technical review phase of our delisting procedure.

This notice invites the public to comment on the petition and to provide additional data, beyond that filed in the petition, on sources, emissions, exposure, health effects and environmental impacts associated with methyl ethyl ketone that may be relevant to our technical review.

DATES: Written comments on this proposal must be received by July 23, 1999.

ADDRESSES: *Documents.* A copy of the complete petition is contained in a docket available at the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Office, 401 M Street S.W., Room M–1500 (Mail Code 6102), Waterside Mall, Washington DC 20460. The docket number for this action is A–99–03. The docket is an organized file of all the information received and considered in making the decision on the completeness of CMA's petition. The main purpose of the docket is to allow you to readily identify and locate documents that record the process we followed in making our decision. You may inspect the petition and copy it for offsite review between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. E.S.T., Monday through Friday. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying. In addition, CMA will make copies of the petition available upon request. You may call Mr. Andrew Jakes at CMA's help line at (703) 741–5627 between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. EST, Monday through Friday, for information on how to obtain a copy of the petition. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

Data Submissions. Comments and additional data should be submitted (in duplicate if possible) to: The Docket Clerk, Air and Radiation Docket and Information Office, 401 M Street S.W., Room M–1500 (Mail Code 6102), Waterside Mall, Washington DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James B. White, Emission Standards Division (MD–13), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone (919) 541–0842, electronic mail address: White.James@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Plain Language.* In compliance with President Clinton's June 1, 1998 Executive Memorandum on Plain Language in Government Writing, this package is written using plain language. Therefore,

the use of ''we'' in this package refers to the EPA. The use of ''you'' refers to the reader and may include State, local or tribal government agencies, industry, environmental groups, or other interested individuals.

I. Introduction

A. What Is the List of Hazardous Air Pollutants?

Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) include a wide variety of organic and inorganic substances released from large and small industrial operations, fossil fuel combustion, gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles, and many other sources. The HAPs have been associated with a wide variety of adverse health effects, including cancer, neurological effects, reproductive effects, and developmental effects. The health effects associated with the various HAPs may differ depending upon the toxicity of the individual HAP and the particular circumstances of exposure, such as the amount of chemical present, the length of time a person is exposed, and the stage in life of the person when the exposure occurs. The list of HAPs, which includes methyl ethyl ketone, can be found in section 112(b)(1) of the Act. The HAPs list provides the basis for research, regulation, and other related EPA activities under the Act.

B. What Is a Delisting Petition?

A delisting petition is a formal request to the EPA from an individual or group to remove a specific HAP from the HAPs list. The removal of a HAP from the list eliminates it from consideration in EPA's program to promulgate national, technology-based emissions control standards. This technology-based standards program is commonly referred to as the MACT (Maximum Achievable Control Technology) program.

Petitions to add or delete chemicals from the HAPs list are allowed under section 112(b)(3)(A) of the Act. The Act specifies that any person may petition the Administrator to modify, by addition or deletion, the list of HAPs. The EPA Administrator is required under section 112(b)(3)(A) of the Act to either grant or deny a petition to delist a specific HAP within 18 months of the receipt of a complete petition.

To delete a substance from the HAPs list, section 112(b)(3)(C) requires that the petitioner must provide adequate data on the health and environmental effects of the substance to determine that emissions, ambient concentrations, bio-accumulation or deposition of the substance may not reasonably be anticipated to cause any adverse effects to human health or adverse environmental effects.

C. How Does EPA Review a Petition To Delist a HAP?

The petition review process proceeds in two phases: a completeness determination and a technical review. During the completeness determination, we conduct a broad review of the petition to determine whether or not all the necessary subject areas are addressed. In addition, we determine if adequate data, analyses, and evaluation are included for each subject area. Once the petition is determined to be complete, we place a ''Notice of Receipt of a Complete Petition'' in the **Federal Register**. That **Federal Register** notice announces a public comment period on the petition and starts the technical review phase of our decision making process. The technical review determines whether the petition has satisfied the necessary requirements and can support a decision to delist the HAP. All comments and data submitted during the public comment period are considered during the technical review.

D. How Is the Decision to Delist a HAP Made?

The decision to either grant or deny a petition is made after a comprehensive technical review of both the petition and the information received from the public to determine whether the petition satisfies the requirements of section 112(b)(3)(C) of the Act. If the Administrator decides to grant a petition, a ''Notice of Proposed Rule Making'' is published in the **Federal Register**. That notice proposes a modification of the HAPs list and presents the reasoning for doing so. However, if the Administrator decides to deny a petition, a notice setting forth an explanation of the reasons for denial will be published instead. A notice of denial constitutes final Agency action of nationwide scope and applicability, and is subject to judicial review as provided in section 307(b) of the Act.

II. Completeness Determination and Request for Public Comment

On November 27, 1996, we received a petition from the CMA's Ketone Panel to remove methyl ethyl ketone (MEK, 2-Butanone)(CAS No. 78–93–3) from the HAPs list. The petition was presented on behalf of the producers and consumers of methyl ethyl ketone in the United States. After reviewing the petition, we found that all of the necessary subject areas for a human health and environmental risk assessment had been addressed. However, we determined that there were certain information gaps in the emission modeling and the ecological risk assessment that required supplemental information before being considered complete. To address the modeling issue, we requested specific modeling data for several of the major emitting sources identified in the petition. The CMA returned to the largest emitters and obtained their permission to release the data that had previously been provided to CMA as a part of a private study. To address the issues in the ecological risk assessment, we requested additional modeling to relate emissions of methyl ethyl ketone to ecological effects. The CMA responded with a report on the output from a fugacity model which predicted methyl ethyl ketone tendency to either remain airborne or to collect in soil or water. Fugacity is a thermodynamic quantity that describes the ''escaping tendency'' of a chemical from an environmental compartment such as air, soil, water, or biota. It is used in certain environmental models to describe a chemical's movement between the different compartments.

After reviewing all of the supplemental information, we have determined that the essential subject areas have been addressed. Therefore, the petition is complete and ready for technical review. The CMA's last supplement which occurred August 31, 1998 marked the start of the 18-month technical review and decision period. Today's notice initiates our comprehensive technical review of the petition and invites public comment on the substance of the petition as described above.

III. Description of Petition

The original petition and the supplemental materials provided by CMA contain the following information:

(A) Identification and location of facilities producing or using methyl ethyl ketone.

(B) Background data on methyl ethyl ketone, including chemical and physical properties data and production and use data.

(C) Toxicological data on human heath and environmental effects of methyl ethyl ketone. These data include CMA's proposed recalculation of the air inhalation reference concentration (RfC) currently contained in the EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). The RfC is a quantitative estimate of an inhalation exposure to humans that is likely to be without appreciable risk of adverse impacts over a lifetime. The IRIS is an electronic data base prepared and maintained by EPA that contains information on human health

effects that may result from exposure to various chemicals in the environment.

(D) Estimated emissions of methyl ethyl ketone derived from the most recent version of the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI). The TRI is an emissions inventory database developed under section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) of 1986.

(E) Tiered air dispersion modeling that provides estimates of the ambient concentration of methyl ethyl ketone adjacent to those facilities that use it. Tiered modeling involves the use of successive modeling techniques to move from conservative ''worst case'' estimates of the ambient concentrations of a substance emitted from a source toward more realistic site-specific estimates of the ambient concentrations.

(F) Characterization of the exposures and risks from methyl ethyl ketone to human health and the environment.

(G) Documentation of a literature search on methyl ethyl ketone conducted immediately prior to the filing of the petition. This includes an identification of the data bases searched, the search strategy, and printed results.

(H) Printed copies of all human, animal, in vitro, or other toxicity studies cited in the literature search.

(I) Environmental effects data characterizing the fate of methyl ethyl ketone emitted to the atmosphere. This includes atmospheric residence time, solubility, phase distribution, vapor pressure, octanol/water partition coefficients, particle size, adsorption coefficients, information on atmospheric transformations, potential degradation or transformation products, and bio-accumulation potential.

(J) Other relevant considerations, such as CMA's petition to delist methyl ethyl ketone under EPCRA section 313.

(K) List of all support documents in the petition.

At the time of the petition, only three companies: Exxon Chemical Company, Hoechst Celanese, and Shell Chemical, produced methyl ethyl ketone. The estimated total domestic capacity in 1995 was approximately 595 million pounds. The 1994 Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) shows that over 2,300 facilities reported emissions associated with the use of methyl ethyl ketone and that 85 percent of these facilities reported emissions of less than 25 tons per year.

The petition describes methyl ethyl ketone as being both a solvent and chemical intermediate. When used as a solvent, it is highly efficient for dissolving a wide variety of resins. Therefore, it is widely used in surface coatings, adhesives, inks, and traffic marking paints. Methyl ethyl ketone is also used as a solvent in cleaning fluids and dewaxing agents, and in the extraction of fats, oils, waxes, and resins. It is especially valuable in the formulation of high-solids coatings which are being used to reduce emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from many types of coatings. Methyl ethyl ketone is reported to occur naturally as an emission from plants such as European firs, junipers, cedars, cypress trees, and ferns. It has also been identified as a natural component of several foods.

Based on an analysis of the TRI, the petition states that inhalation is the only significant route of human exposure to methyl ethyl ketone emissions. Using the most recent TRI data as input in a tiered air dispersion modeling approach, the petition develops estimates of the maximum annual and 24-hour concentrations anticipated to occur at the boundaries of facilities known to emit methyl ethyl ketone. The petition compares the output from the air models and available IRIS health data to conclude that, given the low concentrations anticipated to occur at the facility boundaries, methyl ethyl ketone cannot reasonably be anticipated to cause either acute or chronic adverse health effects to people living nearby these facilities.

This conclusion is based on methyl ethyl ketone's relatively low toxicity, the estimated low ambient concentrations, and a proposed revision of the IRIS RfC for methyl ethyl ketone. The proposed revision increases methyl ethyl ketone's RfC from 1.0 mg/m^3 to 3.3 mg/m^3. The proposal is based on guidelines published by EPA in 1994 (EPA Office of Research and Development, ''Methods for the Derivation of Inhalation Reference Concentrations and Application of Inhalation Dosimetry,'' EPA No. 600/8–90/066F (October 1994)). This proposed RfC and the assumptions underlying its derivation will be evaluated during our technical review.

The petition also uses a fugacity model to demonstrate that methyl ethyl ketone tends to remain in the air rather than to accumulate in water or on soil. Data is provided to support the position that in the concentrations expected to occur in the environment, methyl ethyl ketone is non-toxic to plants and animals. It is readily degradable through natural process and does not tend to accumulate in living organism. Based on the lack of toxicity and the limited persistence in the environment, the petition concludes that methyl ethyl ketone does not pose a significant adverse effect to the environment.

Dated: June 14, 1999.

Robert D. Brenner,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 99–15981 Filed 6–22–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P