

3RD QUARTER 1999 DISTRICT QUARTERLY REPORT—Continued

District docket	Location	Type	Effective date
13-99-025	Columbia River, St. Helens, OR	Safety Zone	7/4/99
13-99-026	Columbia River, St. Helens, OR	Safety Zone	7/3/99
13-99-027	Willamette River, Portland, OR	Safety Zone	7/4/99
13-99-028	Columbia River, Kennewick, WA	Safety Zone	7/4/99
13-99-030	Chehalis River, Aberdeen, WA	Safety Zone	7/4/99
13-99-031	Commencement Bay, WA	Safety Zone	7/4/99
13-99-032	Seattle, WA	Security	7/9/99
13-99-034	Willamette River, Portland, OR	Safety Zone	8/13/99
13-99-035	Lake Washington, Washington State	Safety Zone	8/5/99
13-99-036	Elliott Bay, Washington State	Safety Zone	8/4/99
13-99-037	Columbia River, Astoria, OR	Safety Zone	8/14/99
13-99-038	Willamette River, Portland, OR	Safety Zone	8/21/99
13-99-039	Willamette River, Portland, OR	Safety Zone	9/2/99
13-99-041	Puget Sound, Washington State	Safety Zone	9/12/99
13-99-042	Commencement Bay, Tacoma, WA	Safety Zone	9/19/99
13-99-043	Willamette River, Portland, OR	Safety Zone	9/17/99

[FR Doc. 99-33805 Filed 12-28-99; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 4910-15-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[LA-26-1-6965a; FRL-6514-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan for Louisiana: Transportation Conformity Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is approving a revision to the Louisiana State Implementation Plan (SIP) that contains the transportation conformity rule. The conformity rules assure that in air quality nonattainment or maintenance areas, projected emissions from transportation plans and projects stay within the motor vehicle emissions ceiling in the SIP. The transportation conformity SIP revision enables the State to implement and enforce the Federal transportation conformity requirements at the State level. The EPA's approval action streamlines the conformity process and allows direct consultation among agencies at the local levels. The final approval action is limited to Transportation Conformity. The EPA approved the SIP revision sent under conformity of general Federal actions on September 13, 1996 (61 FR 48409).

The EPA approves this SIP revision under sections 110(k) and 176 of the Clean Air Act (Act). We have given our rationale for approving this SIP revision in this action.

DATES: This rule is effective on February 28, 2000 without further notice, unless

EPA receives adverse comment by January 28, 2000. If we receive adverse comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public that this rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: You should send your written comments to Mr. Thomas H. Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PDL) at the address given below. You may inspect copies of the State's SIP revision and other relevant information during normal business hours at the following locations. If you wish to examine these documents, you should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the visiting day.

Air Planning Section (6PDL), Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202, Telephone: (214) 665-7214.

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality, 7290 Bluebonnet Boulevard, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70810, Telephone: (225) 765-0178.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. J. Behnam, P. E.; Air Planning Section (6PDL), Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202, Telephone (214) 665-7247.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

We have outlined the contents of this document below for your reading convenience:

- I. Background
 - A. What is a SIP?
 - B. What is the Federal approval process for a SIP?
 - C. What is transportation conformity?
 - D. Why must the State send a transportation conformity SIP?

- E. How does transportation conformity work?
- II. Approval of the State Transportation Conformity Rule
 - A. What did the State send?
 - B. What is EPA approving today and why?
 - C. How did the State satisfy the interagency consultation process (40 CFR 93.105)?
 - D. Why did the State exclude the grace period for new nonattainment areas (40 CFR 93.102(d))?
 - E. What parts of the rule are excluded?
- III. Opportunity for Public Comments
- IV. Administrative Requirements

I. Background

A. What Is a SIP?

The states under section 110 of the Act must develop air pollution regulations and control strategies to ensure that state air quality meets the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) established by the EPA. The Act under section 109 established these ambient standards which currently includes six criteria pollutants. These pollutants are: carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, lead, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide.

Each state must send these regulations and control strategies to us, the EPA, for approval and incorporation into the Federally enforceable SIP.

Currently, each state has a federally approved SIP which protects air quality and has emission control plans for nonattainment areas. These SIPs can be extensive, containing state regulations or other enforceable documents and supporting information such as emission inventories, monitoring networks, and modeling demonstrations.

B. What Is the Federal Approval Process for a SIP?

The states must formally adopt the regulations and control strategies

consistent with state and Federal laws for incorporating the state regulations into the Federally enforceable SIP. This process generally includes a public notice, public hearing, public comment period, and a formal adoption by a state-authorized rulemaking body.

Once a state rule, regulation, or control strategy is adopted, the state will send these provisions to us for inclusion in the federally enforceable SIP. We must then decide on an appropriate Federal action, provide public notice, and request additional public comment on the action. If anyone sends adverse comments, we must consider the comments before a final action.

We incorporate all state regulations and supporting information (sent under section 110 of the Act) into the Federally approved SIP after our approval action. We maintain records of such SIP actions in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at Title 40, Part 52, entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans." The Government does not reproduce the text of the Federally approved state regulations in the CFR. They are "incorporated by reference," which means that the specific state regulation is cited in the CFR and is considered a part of the CFR the same as if the text were fully printed in the CFR.

C. What Is Transportation Conformity?

Conformity first appeared in the Act's 1977 amendments (Public Law 95-95). Although the Act did not define conformity, it stated that no Federal department could engage in, support in any way or provide financial assistance for, license or permit, or approve any activity which did not conform to a SIP which has been approved or promulgated.

The Act's 1990 Amendments expanded the scope and content of the conformity concept by defining conformity to an implementation plan. Section 176(c) of the Act defines conformity as conformity to the SIP's purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the NAAQS and achieving expeditious attainment of such standards. Also, the Act states that no Federal activity will: (1) Cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area, (2) increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area, or (3) delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area.

D. Why Must the State Send a Transportation Conformity SIP?

We were required to issue criteria and procedures for determining conformity of transportation plans, programs, and projects to a SIP by section 176(c) of the Act. The Act also required the procedure to include a requirement that each State submit a revision to its SIP including conformity criteria and procedures. We published the first transportation conformity rule in the November 24, 1993, **Federal Register** (FR), and it was codified at 40 CFR part 51, subpart T and 40 CFR part 93, subpart A. We required the States and local agencies to adopt and submit a transportation conformity SIP revision to us by November 25, 1994. The State of Louisiana sent a transportation conformity SIP on November 23, 1994, but we could not approve this SIP revision. We revised the transportation conformity rule on August 7, 1995 (60 FR 40098), November 14, 1995 (60 FR 57179), August 15, 1997 (62 FR 43780), and it was codified under 40 CFR part 51, subpart T and 40 CFR part 93, subpart A—Conformity to State or Federal Implementation Plans of Transportation Plans, Programs, and Projects Developed, Funded or Approved Under Title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws (62 FR 43780). Our action of August 15, 1997, required the States to change their rules and send a SIP revision by August 15, 1998.

E. How Does Transportation Conformity Work?

The Federal or State transportation conformity rule applies to all nonattainment and maintenance areas in the State. The Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO), the State Departments of Transportation (in absence of a MPO), and U.S. Department of Transportation make conformity determinations. These agencies make conformity determinations on transportation plans, programs, and projects. The MPOs calculate the projected emissions for the transportation plans and programs and compare those calculated emissions to the motor vehicle emissions ceiling established in the SIP. The calculated emissions must be smaller than the motor vehicle emissions ceiling for showing a positive conformity with the SIP.

II. Approval of the State Transportation Conformity Rule

A. What Did the State Send?

On October 21, 1998, the Governor of Louisiana sent a SIP revision that includes the State's transportation

conformity and consultation rule. At the same time, the Governor withdrew his November 23, 1994, submission. Also, the State submitted additional information on November 19, 1998, and June 29, 1999. The Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) published its final transportation conformity rule on September 20, 1998, in Louisiana Register after appropriate public participation and interagency consultation.

B. What is EPA Approving Today and Why?

We are approving the Louisiana transportation conformity rule that the Governor of Louisiana sent us on October 21, 1998, information submitted on November 19, 1998, and June 29, 1999, except for the incorporation by reference of sections 93.102(c), 93.104(d), 93.109(c)-(f), 93.118(e), 93.120(a)(2), 93.121(a)(1), and 93.124(b) of 40 CFR into Louisiana Administrative Code (LAC) 33:III.1432. The rationale for exclusion of these sections is discussed in section II.E of this action. The LDEQ has adopted the Federal rules by "incorporation by reference" except for the interagency consultation section (40 CFR 93.105) and the grace period for new nonattainment areas (40 CFR 93.102(d)). We will discuss the reasons for exclusion of these two sections later in this notice.

"Incorporation by Reference" (IBR) means that the State adopted the Federal rules without rewriting the text of the Federal rules but by referring to them for inclusion as if they were printed in the state regulation. The Federal Transportation Conformity Rule required the states to adopt a majority of the Federal rules in verbatim form with a few exceptions. The States can not make their rules more stringent than the Federal rules unless the State's rules apply equally to nonfederal entities as well as Federal entities. The LDEQ Transportation Conformity Rule is the same as the Federal rule and the State has made no additional changes or modifications, with the exception of those sections mentioned above.

We have evaluated this SIP revision and have determined that the State has fully adopted the Federal transportation conformity rules as described in 40 CFR part 51, subpart T and part 93, subpart A. Also, the LDEQ has completed and satisfied the public participation and comprehensive interagency consultations during development and adoption of these rules at the local level. Therefore, we are approving this SIP revision.

Our approval action does not include general conformity (40 CFR part 51, subpart W). We approved the Louisiana general conformity SIP on September 13, 1996 (61 FR 48409).

C. How Did the State Satisfy the Interagency Consultation Process?

Our rule requires the States to develop their own processes and procedures for interagency consultation among the Federal, State, and local agencies and resolution of conflicts meeting the criteria in 40 CFR 93.105. The SIP revisions must include processes and procedures to be followed by the MPO, State Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U. S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) in consulting with the State and local air quality agencies and EPA before making conformity determinations. Also, the transportation conformity SIP revision must have processes and procedures for the State and local air quality agencies and EPA in coordinating development of applicable SIPs with MPOs, State DOT, and USDOT.

The State developed its own consultation rule based on the elements in 40 CFR 93.105, and excluded this section from IBR. As a first step, the State established an ad hoc multiagency committee that included representatives from the State air quality agency, State DOT, USDOT, MPOs, EPA, the local air quality agency, local transportation agencies, and local transit operators. The State air quality agency served as the lead agency in coordinating the multiagency efforts for developing the consultation rule. The committee met periodically and drafted consultation rules by considering the elements in 40 CFR 93.105 and 23 CFR part 450, and by integrating the local procedures and processes into the final consultation rule. The consultation rule developed through this process is unique to the State of Louisiana and is codified under section LAC 33:III.1434 of the State rule. We have determined that the State adequately included all elements of 40 CFR 93.105 and meets the EPA SIP requirements.

D. Why Did the State Exclude the Grace Period for New Nonattainment Areas (40 CFR 93.102(d))?

The State excluded 40 CFR 93.102(d) from its IBR. Section 93.102(d) of 40 CFR allows up to 12 months for newly designated nonattainment areas to complete their conformity determination. The Sierra Club challenged this section of the rule arguing that allowing a 12-month grace period was unlawful under the Act. On

November 4, 1997, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held in *Sierra Club v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 129 F.3d 137 (D.C.Cir.1997), that EPA's grace period violates the plain terms of the Act and, therefore, is unlawful. Based on this court action, the State has excluded this section from its rule. We agree with the State's action, and exclusion of 40 CFR 93.102(d) will not prevent us from approving the State transportation conformity SIP.

E. What Parts of the Rule Are Excluded?

We promulgated the transportation conformity rule on August 15, 1997. On March 2, 1999, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit issued its opinion in *Environmental Defense Fund v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 167 F.3d 641 (D.C.Cir.1999). The Court granted the environmental group's petition for review and ruled that 40 CFR 93.102(c)(1), 93.121(a)(1), and 93.124(b) are unlawful and remanded 40 CFR 93.118(e) and 93.120(a)(2) to EPA for revision to harmonize these provisions with the requirements of the Act for an affirmative determination that the Federal actions will not cause or increase violations or delay attainment. The sections that were included in this decision were:

(a) 40 CFR 93.102(c)(1) which allowed certain projects for which the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process has been completed by the DOT to proceed toward implementation without further conformity determinations during a conformity lapse;

(b) 40 CFR 93.118(e) which allowed use of motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEB) in the submitted SIPs after 45 days if EPA had not declared them inadequate;

(c) 40 CFR 93.120(a)(2) which allowed use of the MVEB in a disapproved SIP for 120 days after disapproval;

(d) 40 CFR 93.121(a)(1) which allowed the nonfederally funded projects to be approved if included in the first three years of the most recently conforming transportation plan and transportation improvement programs, even if conformity status is currently lapsed; and

(e) 40 CFR 93.124(b) which allowed areas to use a submitted SIP that allocated portions of a safety margin to transportation activities for conformity purposes before EPA approval.

Since the States were required to submit transportation conformity SIPs not later than August 15, 1998, and include those provisions in verbatim form, the State's SIP revision includes

all those sections which the Court ruled unlawful or remanded for consistency with the Act. The EPA can not approve these sections.

We believe that the LDEQ has complied with the SIP requirements and has adopted the Federal rules which were in effect at the time that the transportation conformity SIP was due to the EPA. If the court had issued its ruling before adoption and SIP submittal by the LDEQ, we believe the LDEQ would have removed these sections from its IBR. The LDEQ has expended its resources and time in preparing this SIP and meeting the Act's statutory deadline, and EPA acknowledges the agency's good faith effort in submitting the transportation conformity SIP on time.

The LDEQ will be required to submit a SIP revision in the future when EPA revises its rule to comply with the court decision. Because the court decision has invalidated these provisions, we believe that it would be reasonable to exclude the corresponding sections of the state rules from this SIP approval action. As a result, we are not taking any action on the IBR of sections 93.102(c), 93.104(d), 93.109(c)-(f), 93.118(e), 93.120(a)(2), 93.121(a)(1), and 93.124(b) of 40 CFR at LAC 33:III.1432 under the State conformity rule. The conformity determinations affected by these sections should comply with the relevant requirements of the statutory provisions of the Act underlying the court's decision on these issues. The EPA has already issued guidance on how to implement these provisions in the interim prior to EPA amendment of the Federal transportation conformity rules. Once these Federal rules have been revised, conformity determinations in Louisiana should comply with the requirements of the revised Federal rule until corresponding provisions of the Louisiana conformity SIP have been approved by EPA.

III. Opportunity for Public Comments

The EPA is publishing this rule without prior proposal because we view this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipate no adverse comment. However, in the "Proposed Rules" section of today's **Federal Register** publication, we are publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve this SIP revision if adverse comments are filed. This rule will be effective on February 28, 2000 without further notice unless we receive adverse comment by January 28, 2000. If EPA receives adverse comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public that the rule will not take effect. We will

address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. We will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time.

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

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

B. Executive Orders on Federalism

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 complies by consulting, Executive Order 12875 requires EPA to provide to the OMB 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.

On August 4, 1999, President Clinton issued a new Executive Order on federalism, Executive Order 13132, (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), which will take effect on November 2, 1999. In the interim, the current Executive Order 12612 (52 FR 41685, October 30, 1987), on federalism still applies. This rule will not have a substantial direct effect on 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 12612. The rule affects only one State, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power

and responsibilities established in the Act.

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: (1) is determined to be "economically significant" as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency.

The EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that are based on health or safety risks, such that the analysis required under section 5-501 of the Order has the potential to influence the regulation. This final rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it approves a State program.

D. Executive Order 13084

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 OMB, 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 officials and other representatives of Indian tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory policies on matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities."

Today's rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of

Executive Order 13084 do not apply to this rule.

E. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 *et seq.*, generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions. This final rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals under section 110 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 create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Act, preparation of a flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. See *Union Electric Co., v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255-66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

F. Unfunded Mandates

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, 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.

The EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves preexisting requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no

additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

G. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. The EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major" rule as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

H. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by February 28, 2000. 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, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Transportation conformity, Transportation-air quality planning, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: November 22, 1999.

Gregg A. Cooke,
Regional Administrator, Region 6.

Part 52, Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended to read 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 T—LOUISIANA

2. § 52.970 is amended in paragraph (c), under Chapter 14—Conformity, by adding Subchapter B, Sections 1431, 1432, and 1434, after Subchapter A, Section 1415, to read as follows:

§ 52.970 Identification of plan.

* * * * *
(c) * * *

EPA APPROVED LOUISIANA REGULATIONS IN THE LOUISIANA SIP

State citation	Title/subject	State approval date	EPA approval date	Explanation
* * * * *				
CHAPTER 14— Conformity				
* * * * *				
Subchapter B	Conformity to State or Federal Implementation Plans of Transportation Plans, Programs, and Projects Developed, Funded, or Approved under Title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Act			
Section 1431	Purpose	September 1998, LR24:1684	[December 29, 1999 FR volume and page number].	
Section 1432	Incorporation by Reference.	July 1998, LR24:1280	[December 29, 1999 FR volume and page number].	No action is taken on the portions of LAC 33:III.1432 that contain 40 CFR 93.102(c), 93.104(d), 93.109(c)–(f), 93.118(e), 93.120(a)(2), 93.121(a)(1), and 93.124(b).
Section 1434	Consultation	November 1994, LR20:1278; July 1998, LR24:1280; September 1998, LR24:1684; October 1998, LR24:1925.	[December 29, 1999 FR volume and page number].	
* * * * *				