shall be charged to requester in the same amount as incurred by NMB.

(e) *Aggregating requests.* When the NMB reasonably believes that a requester or group of requesters is attempting to break a request down into a series of requests for the purpose of evading the assessment of fees, the NMB will aggregate any such requests and charge accordingly.

(f) *Charging interest.* Interest at the rate prescribed in 31 U.S.C. 3717 may be charged those requesters who fail to pay fees charged, beginning on the thirtieth day following the billing date. Receipt of a fee by the NMB, whether processed or not, will stay the accrual of interest. If a debt is not paid, the agency may use the provisions of the Debt Collection Act of 1982, (Pub. L. 97–365, 96 Stat. 1749) including disclosure to consumer reporting agencies, for the purpose of obtaining payment.

(g) *Advance payments.* The NMB will not require a requester to make an advance payment, i.e., payment before work is commenced or continued on a request, unless:

(1) The NMB estimates or determines that allowable charges that a requester may be required to pay are likely to exceed $250. Then the NMB will notify the requester of the likely cost and obtain satisfactory assurances of full payment where the requester has a history of prompt payment of FOIA fees, or require an advance payment of an amount up to the full estimated charges in the case of requesters with no history of payment; or

(2) A requester has previously failed to pay a fee charge in a timely fashion (i.e, within thirty days of the date of the billing), in which case the NMB requires the requester to pay the full amount owed plus any applicable interest as provided above or demonstrate that he has, in fact, paid the fee, and to make an advance payment of the full amount of the estimated fee before the agency begins to process a new request or a pending request from that requester. When the NMB acts under paragraph (g)(1) or (2) of this section, the administrative time limits prescribed in subsection (a)(6) of the FOIA (i.e., twenty working days from receipt of initial requests and twenty working days from receipt of appeals from initial denial, plus permissible extension of these time limits) will begin only after the NMB has received fee payments described in this paragraph (g).

(h) *Payment.* Payment of fees shall be made by check or money order payable to the United States Treasury.

Dated: August 11, 1998.

Stephen E. Crable,

Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. 98–21978 Filed 8–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7550–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 009–0090a FRL–6142–3]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action on revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revisions concern rules from the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD). This action will remove these rules from the Federally approved SIP. The intended effect of this action is to remove rules from the SIP that are no longer in effect in VCAPCD, in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). Thus, EPA is finalizing the removal of these rules from the California SIP under provisions of the CAA regarding EPA action on SIP submittals, SIPs for national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards and plan requirements for nonattainment areas.

DATES: This rule is effective on October 19, 1998, without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by September 18, 1998. 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.

ADDRESSES: Comments must be submitted to Andrew Steckel at the Region IX office listed below. Copies of these rules, along with EPA's evaluation report for each rule, are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted requests for rescission are also available for inspection at the following locations:

Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), 401 ''M'' Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 ''L'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93003

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Applicability

The VCAPCD rules being removed from the California SIP include: Rule 61, Effluent Oil Water Separators, adopted July 5, 1983; Rule 65, Gasoline Specifications, adopted May 23, 1972; and Rule 66, Organic Solvents, adopted on June 24, 1975. These rules were repealed by VCAPCD on October 4, 1988, October 22, 1985, and July 9, 1996, respectively, and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to EPA on March 26, 1990, June 4, 1986, and October 18, 1996, respectively, for removal from the SIP.

II. Background

On March 3, 1978, EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the provisions of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1977 (1977 Act or pre-amended Act), that included the Ventura County Area. 43 FR 8964, 40 CFR 81.305. The rules being addressed in this action were originally adopted by the VCAPCD as part of VCAPCD's efforts to achieve the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone. These rules were originally adopted to control volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from oil water separators, motor vehicle fuels, and organic solvents. Since the adoption of these rules, the VCAPCD has adopted other rules that regulate the same sources covered by Rule 61 and Rule 66. The requirements in Rule 65 are covered by statewide regulations. VCAPCD subsequently repealed these three rules because they had been replaced by the provisions contained in other rules. These other rules have all been approved into the Federally enforceable SIP. As a result, VCAPCD submitted requests to EPA, through CARB, for the removal of Rule 61, Rule 65, and Rule 66 from the California SIP.

III. EPA Action

The VCAPCD rules that are being rescinded by today's action are listed below. EPA previously approved all these rules into the California SIP:

—Rule 61, Effluent Oil Water Separators, adopted July 5, 1983, submitted October 16, 1985, approved April 17, 1987 (52 FR 12522).
—Rule 65, Gasoline Specifications, adopted May 23, 1972, submitted November 3, 1975, approved August 15, 1977 (42 FR 41121).
—Rule 66, Organic Solvents, adopted on June 24, 1975, submitted November 3, 1975, approved August 15, 1977 (42 FR 41121).

EPA is publishing this notice 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** publication, EPA is publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve this SIP revision should adverse comments be filed. This rule will be effective October 19, 1998, without further notice unless the Agency receives adverse comments by September 18, 1998.

If EPA receives such comments, then EPA will publish a document withdrawing this final rule and informing the public that the rule will not take effect. All public comments received will then be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this rule. Any parties interested in commenting on this rule should do so at this time. If no such comments are received, the public is advised that this rule will be effective on October 19, 1998 and no further action will be taken on the proposed rule.

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Orders 12866 and 13045

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this regulatory action from review under Executive Order (E.O.) 12866.

This final rule is not subject to E.O. 13045, entitled ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks,'' because it is not an ''economically significant'' action under E.O. 12866.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 *et seq.*, EPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Alternatively, EPA may certify 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 government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000.

The SIP revisions in this rule do not create any new requirements, but simply remove previously-approved SIP requirements that are no longer in effect in the VCAPCD. Therefore, because this SIP revision does not impose any new requirements, the Administrator 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 CAA, preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The CAA forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co.* v. *U.S. E.P.A.*, 427 U.S. 246, 256–66 (S. Ct. 1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410 (a)(2).

C. 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 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 mandate that may result in estimated costs of $100 million or more to state, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action removes from the SIP outdated requirements under state or local law, and imposes no new Federal requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to state, local, or tribal governments, or to private sector, result from this action.

D. Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office

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).

E. 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 October 19, 1998. 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 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Note: Incorporation by reference of the State Implementation Plan for the State of California was approved by the Director of the Federal Register on July 1, 1982.

Dated: August 3, 1998.

David P. Howekamp,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

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 F—California

2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraphs (c)(29)(vi)(B) and (c)(164)(i)(C)(*3*) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of Plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(29) * * *

(vi) * * *

(B) Previously approved on August 15, 1977 and now deleted without replacement Rules 65 and 66.

* * * * *

(164) * * *

(i) * * *

(C) * * *

(*3*) Previously approved on April 17, 1987 and now deleted without replacement Rule 61.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 98–22319 Filed 8–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[OH117–1; FRL–6147–9]

Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is finalizing a June 18, 1998, proposal to approve an Ohio State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision to remove the air quality triggers from the Dayton-Springfield (Montgomery, Clark, Greene, and Miami Counties), Ohio maintenance area contingency plan.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action will be effective on August 19, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for inspection during normal business hours at the following location: Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604.

Please contact William Jones at (312) 886–6058 before visiting the Region 5 office.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Jones, Environmental Scientist, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–6058.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Since the initial Clean Air Act (CAA) attainment status designations were made, the Dayton-Springfield area has attained the one hour ozone standard and has been redesignated to attainment status for ozone. As a requirement of being redesignated to attainment status, the area developed a maintenance plan. The purpose of the maintenance plan is to assure maintenance of the one hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for at least ten years.

The area's maintenance plan included contingency provisions. The contingency provisions are intended to identify and correct violations of the one hour ozone NAAQS in a timely fashion. Triggers are included in the contingency provisions to identify the need to implement measures and correct air quality problems until such time as a revised maintenance or attainment plan could be developed to address the level of the air quality problem. Triggering events in the contingency plans could be linked to ozone air quality and/or an emission level of ozone precursors.

USEPA approved the Dayton-Springfield ozone maintenance plan in the **Federal Register** on May 5, 1995 (60 FR 22289).

II. One Hour Ozone Standard Revocation

On July 18, 1997, USEPA approved a revision to the NAAQS for ozone which changed the standard from 0.12 parts per million (ppm) averaged over one hour, to 0.08 ppm, averaged over eight hours. The USEPA is revoking the one hour standard in separate rulemakings based on an area's attainment of the one hour ozone standard. The first round of revocations was for areas attaining the one hour standard based on quality assured air monitoring data for the years 1994–1996. The second round of one hour ozone standard revocations was for areas attaining the one hour standard based on quality assured air monitoring data for the years 1995–1997. USEPA intends to publish rulemakings on an annual basis revoking the one hour ozone standard for additional areas that come into attainment of the one hour standard.

On July 22, 1998, USEPA published a final rule (63 FR 39432) in the **Federal Register** revoking the one hour ozone standard in areas attaining the one hour standard based on quality assured air monitoring data for the years 1995–1997. In that action, USEPA revoked the one hour ozone standard in the Dayton-Springfield, Ohio ozone maintenance area, effective July 22, 1998.

On July 16, 1997, President Clinton issued a directive to Administrator Browner on implementation of the new ozone standard, as well as the current one hour ozone standard (62 FR 38421). In that directive the President laid out a plan on how the new ozone and particulate matter standards, as well as the current one hour standard, are to be implemented. A December 29, 1997 memorandum entitled ''Guidance for Implementing the 1-Hour and Pre-Existing PM10 NAAQS,'' signed by Richard D. Wilson, USEPA's Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, reflected that directive. The purpose of the guidance set forth in the memorandum is to ensure that the momentum gained by States to attain the one hour ozone NAAQS was not lost when moving toward implementing the eight hour ozone NAAQS.

The guidance document explains that maintenance plans will remain in effect for areas where the one hour standard is revoked; however, those maintenance plans may be revised to withdraw certain contingency measure provisions that have not been triggered or implemented prior to USEPA's determination of attainment and revocation. Where the contingency measure is linked to the one hour ozone standard or air quality ozone concentrations, the measures may be removed from the maintenance plan. Measures linked to non-air quality elements, such as emissions increases or vehicle miles traveled, may be removed if the State demonstrates that removing the measure will not affect an area's ability to attain the eight hour ozone standard.

In other words, after the one hour standard is revoked for an area, USEPA believes it is permissible to withdraw contingency measures designed to correct violations of that standard. Since such measures were designed to address future violations of a standard that no longer exists, it is no longer necessary to retain them. Furthermore, USEPA believes that future attainment and maintenance planning efforts should be directed toward attaining the eight hour ozone NAAQS. As part of the implementation of the eight hour ozone standard, the State's ozone air quality will be evaluated and eight hour attainment and nonattainment designations will be made.

III. Review of the State Submittal

In a letter from Donald R. Schregardus, Director, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) received by USEPA on April 27, 1998, OEPA officially requested that all air quality triggers be deleted from the maintenance plans for the areas in Ohio now attaining the one hour ozone standard and where USEPA proposed to revoke the one hour standard. In a letter from Robert Hodanbosi, Chief of the Division of Air Pollution Control, dated June 11, 1998, OEPA transmitted the results of its public hearing held on June 1, 1998. No public comments were made at the hearing and no written comments were received.

The USEPA believes that Ohio's request is consistent with the December 29, 1997 guidance document and the