responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely approves a state rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by November 22, 2004. 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, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: August 26, 2004.

Wayne Nastri,

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)(156)(vii)(B), (189)(i)(A)(*8*), and (215)(i)(A)(*7*) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(156) * * *

(vii) * * *

(B) Previously approved on January 15, 1987 in paragraph (c)(156)(vii)(A) of this section and now deleted without replacement for implementation in the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District Rule 1141.2.

* * * * *

(189) * * *

(i) * * *

(A) * * *

(*8*) Previously approved on December 20,1993 in paragraph (c)(189)(i)(A)(*3*) of this section and now deleted without replacement for implementation in the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District Rule 1141.

* * * * *

(215) * * *

(i) * * *

(A) * * *

(*7*) Previously approved on June 13, 1995 in paragraph (c)(215)(i)(A)(*1*) of this section and now deleted without replacement for implementation in the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District Rules 1125 and 1126.

* * * * *

■ 3. Section 52.222 is amended by adding paragraphs (a)(6)(v) and (a)(6)(vi) to read as follows:

§ 52.222 Negative declarations.

(a) * * *

(6) * * *

(v) Metal Container, Closure and Coil Coating Operations and Magnet Wire Coating Operations submitted on June 3, 2004 and adopted on February 17, 2004.

(vi) Control of Volatile Compound Emissions from Resin Manufacturing and Surfactant Manufacturing submitted on July 19, 2004 and adopted on March 16, 2004.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 04–21179 Filed 9–20–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 261

[SW–FRL–7816–9]

Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is granting a petition submitted by American Chrome & Chemicals L.P. (ACC) to exclude (or delist) a certain solid waste generated by its Corpus Christi, Texas facility from the lists of hazardous wastes. This final rule responds to the petition submitted by ACC to delist K006 dewatered sludge generated from the production of chrome oxide green pigments.

After careful analysis and use of the Delisting Risk Assessment Software (DRAS), EPA has concluded the petitioned waste is not hazardous waste. This exclusion applies to 1,450 cubic yards per year of the dewatered sludge. Accordingly, this final rule excludes the petitioned waste from the requirements of hazardous waste regulations under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) when disposed of in a Subtitle D landfill.

DATES: *Effective Date:* September 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: The public docket for this final rule is located at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202, and is available for viewing in EPA Freedom of Information Act review room on the 7th floor from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. Call (214) 665–6444 for appointments. The reference number for this docket is [F–03-TXDEL–ACC]. The public may copy

material from any regulatory docket at no cost for the first 100 pages and at a cost of $0.15 per page for additional copies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ben Banipal, Section Chief of the Corrective Action and Waste Minimization Section, Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, (6PD-C), Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202.

For technical information concerning this notice, contact Michelle Peace, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas .

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The information in this section is organized as follows:

I. Overview Information

A. What Action Is EPA Finalizing?

After evaluating the petition, EPA proposed, on November 17, 2003 to exclude the ACC waste from the lists of hazardous waste under §§ 261.31 and 261.32 (see 68 FR 64836). EPA is finalizing the decision to grant ACC's delisting petition to have its dewatered sludge (chromic oxide) excluded, or delisted, generated from its process of manufacturing chromic oxide subject to certain continued verification and monitoring conditions.

B. Why Is EPA Approving This Delisting?

ACC's petition requests a delisting from the K006 waste listings under 40 CFR 260.20 and 260.22. ACC does not believe that the petitioned waste meets the criteria for which EPA listed it. ACC also believes no additional constituents or factors could cause the waste to be hazardous. EPA's review of this petition included consideration of the original listing criteria, and the additional factors required by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA). See section 3001(f) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6921(f), and 40 CFR 260.22 (d)(1)–(4)(hereinafter all sectional references are to 40 CFR unless otherwise indicated). In making the final delisting determination, EPA evaluated the petitioned waste against the listing criteria and factors cited in § 261.11(a)(2) and (a)(3). Based on this review, EPA agrees with the petitioner that the waste is nonhazardous with respect to the original listing criteria. (If EPA had found, based on this review, that the waste remained hazardous based on the factors for which the waste was originally listed, EPA would have proposed to deny the petition.) EPA evaluated the waste with respect to other factors or criteria to assess whether there is a reasonable basis to believe that such additional factors could cause the waste to be hazardous. EPA considered whether the waste is acutely toxic, the concentration of the constituents in the waste, their tendency to migrate and to bioaccumulate, their persistence in the environment once released from the waste, plausible and specific types of management of the petitioned waste, the quantities of waste generated, and waste variability. EPA believes that the petitioned waste does not meet the listing criteria and thus should not be a listed waste. EPA's final decision to delist waste from ACC's facility is based on the information submitted in support of this rule, including descriptions of the wastes and analytical data from the Corpus Christi, Texas facility.

C. What Are the Limits of This Exclusion?

This exclusion applies to the waste described in the April 2002 petition only if the requirements described in 40 CFR part 261, appendix IX, Table 2 and the conditions contained herein are satisfied.

D. How Will ACC Manage the Waste If It Is Delisted?

The delisted waste stream will be disposed of in a non-hazardous waste landfill.

E. When Is the Final Delisting Exclusion Effective?

This rule is effective September 21, 2004. The Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 amended section 3010 of RCRA, 42 USCA 6930(b)(1), allow rules to become effective in less than six months after the rule is published when the regulated community does not need the six-month period to come into compliance. That is the case here because this rule reduces, rather than increases, the existing requirements for persons generating hazardous waste. This reduction in existing requirements also provides a basis for making this rule effective immediately, upon final publication, under the Administrative Procedure Act, pursuant to 5 USCA 553(d).

F. How Does This Final Rule Affect States?

Because EPA is issuing this exclusion under the Federal RCRA delisting program, only states subject to Federal RCRA delisting provisions would be affected. This would exclude states which have received authorization from EPA to make their own delisting decisions.

The EPA allows states to impose its own non-RCRA regulatory requirements that are more stringent than the EPA's, under section 3009 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C.6929. These more stringent requirements may include a provision that prohibits a Federally issued exclusion from taking effect in the state. Because a dual system (that is, both Federal (RCRA) and State (non-RCRA) programs) may regulate a petitioner's waste, the EPA urges petitioners to contact the State regulatory authority to establish the status of their wastes under the state law.

The EPA has also authorized some States (for example, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Georgia, Illinois) to administer a RCRA delisting program in place of the Federal program, that is, to make State delisting decisions. Therefore, this exclusion does not apply in those authorized States unless that State makes the rule part of its authorized program. If ACC transports the petitioned waste to or manages the waste in any state with delisting authorization, ACC must obtain delisting authorization from that state before it can manage the waste as nonhazardous in the State.

II. Background

A. What Is a Delisting Petition?

A delisting petition is a request from a generator to EPA or another agency with jurisdiction to exclude or delist, from the RCRA list of hazardous waste, waste the generator believes should not be considered hazardous under RCRA.

B. What Regulations Allow Facilities To Delist a Waste?

Under 40 CFR 260.20 and 260.22, facilities may petition EPA to remove their wastes from hazardous waste regulation by excluding them from the lists of hazardous wastes contained in §§ 261.31 and 261.32. Specifically, § 260.20 allows any person to petition the Administrator to modify or revoke any provision of parts 260 through 265 and 268 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Section 260.22 provides generators the opportunity to petition the Administrator to exclude a waste from a particular generating facility from the hazardous waste lists.

C. What Information Must the Generator Supply?

Petitioners must provide sufficient information to EPA to allow EPA to determine that the waste to be excluded does not meet any of the criteria under which the waste was listed as a hazardous waste. In addition, the Administrator must determine, where he/she has a reasonable basis to believe that factors (including additional constituents) other than those for which the waste was listed could cause the waste to be a hazardous waste and that such factors do not warrant retaining the waste as a hazardous waste.

III. EPA's Evaluation of the Waste Information and Data

A. What Waste Did ACC Petition EPA To Delist?

On April 17, 2002, ACC petitioned EPA to exclude from the lists of hazardous waste contained in § 261.32, dewatered sludge generated from its facility located in Corpus Christi, Texas. The waste falls under the classification of listed waste under § 261.30.

B. How Much Waste Did ACC Propose To Delist?

Specifically, in its petition, ACC requested that EPA grant an exclusion for 1,450 cubic yards per year of the dewatered sludge.

C. What Information Did ACC Present To Support Its Petition To Delist the Waste?

To support its petition, ACC submitted:

(1) Historical information on past waste generation and management practices;

(2) Results from four waste samples of the total constituent list for 40 CFR part 264, appendix IX volatiles, semivolatiles, metals, pesticides, herbicides, and PCBs;

(3) Results of the constituent list for Appendix IX on Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) extract;

(4) Results from total oil and grease analyses; and

(5) Multiple pH testing of the petitioned waste.

IV. Public Comments Received on the Proposed Exclusion

A. Who Submitted Comments on the Proposed Rule

Two comments were received from the general public expressing opposition to the proposed rule.

B. Summary of the Comments and EPA Responses

The first comment opposed EPA's decision to delist this material because it places a ''green'' name on dangerous sewage sludges.

It is EPA's position that the waste information presented does not indicate that the waste will pose a threat to human health or the environment. The disposal of this material is regulated, just under Subtitle D regulations. The regulations allow a specific facility to demonstrate that the waste should not be regulated as a hazardous waste and ACC has done so.

The second comment opposes EPA's decision because (1) additional constituents warrant the waste remaining hazardous; (2) accurate ground water risks have not been made; (3) the test period should cover four years and not be hurried; and (4) a true environmental organization should be check and test that the information is true.

It is EPA's position that there are no additional constituents present in the sludge that warrant retaining the sludge as hazardous waste. A totals analysis for all the constituents in 40 CFR part 264, appendix IX was presented as part of the sampling and analysis event and none of the constituents present pose a threat to human health and the environment. The ground water risks were modeled and these conservative results fell within the acceptable range of protection of human health and the environment. ACC will be required to continuously evaluate the sludge prior to disposal as long as this exclusion is in place. The companies typically evaluate years of historical data before approaching EPA with a petition to delist. Finally, any interested outside organization can review and check the data of any petition. That information is available to the public.

V. Regulatory Impact

Under Executive Order 12866, EPA must conduct an ''assessment of the potential costs and benefits'' for all ''significant'' regulatory actions.

The proposal to grant an exclusion is not significant, since its effect, if promulgated, would be to reduce the overall costs and economic impact of EPA's hazardous waste management regulations. This reduction would be achieved by excluding waste generated at a specific facility from EPA's lists of hazardous wastes, thus enabling a facility to manage its waste as nonhazardous.

Because there is no additional impact from this proposed rule, this proposal would not be a significant regulation, and no cost/benefit assessment is required. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has also exempted this rule from the requirement for OMB review under section (6) of Executive Order 12866.

VI. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, whenever an agency is required to publish a general notice of rulemaking for any proposed or final rule, it must prepare and make available for public comment a regulatory flexibility analysis which describes the impact of the rule on small entities (that is, small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions). No regulatory flexibility analysis is required, however, if the Administrator or delegated representative certifies that the rule will not have any impact on small entities.

This rule, if promulgated, will not have an adverse economic impact on small entities since its effect would be to reduce the overall costs of EPA's hazardous waste regulations and would be limited to one facility. Accordingly, EPA hereby certifies that this proposed regulation, if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This regulation, therefore, does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

VII. Paperwork Reduction Act

Information collection and recordkeeping requirements associated with this proposed rule have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96–511, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2050–0053.

VIII. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), Public Law 104–4, which was signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA generally must prepare a written

statement for rules with Federal mandates that may result in estimated costs to State, local, and tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector, of $100 million or more in any one year.

When such a statement is required for EPA rules, under section 205 of the UMRA EPA must identify and consider alternatives, including the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. EPA must select that alternative, unless the Administrator explains in the final rule why it was not selected or it is inconsistent with law.

Before EPA establishes regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, including tribal governments, it must develop under section 203 of the UMRA a small government agency plan. The plan must provide for notifying potentially affected small governments, giving them meaningful and timely input in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising them on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

The UMRA generally defines a Federal mandate for regulatory purposes as one that imposes an enforceable duty upon state, local, or tribal governments or the private sector.

EPA finds that this delisting decision is deregulatory in nature and does not impose any enforceable duty on any State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector. In addition, the proposed delisting decision does not establish any regulatory requirements for small governments and so does not require a small government agency plan under UMRA section 203.

IX. Executive Order 13045

The Executive Order 13045 is entitled ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). This order applies to any rule that 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, EPA 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 EPA. This proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because this is not an economically significant regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866.

X. Executive Order 13084

Because this action does not involve any requirements that affect Indian Tribes, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply.

Under Executive Order 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 the mandate is unfunded, EPA must provide to the Office 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 have ''meaningful and timely input'' in the development of regulatory policies on matters that significantly or uniquely affect their 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 Executive Order 13084 do not apply to this rule.

XI. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Under Section 12(d) if the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act, EPA is directed to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (*e.g.*, materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, business practices, etc.) developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standard bodies. Where available and potentially applicable voluntary consensus standards are not used by EPA, the Act requires that EPA to provide Congress, through the OMB, an explanation of the reasons for not using such standards.

This rule does not establish any new technical standards and thus, EPA has no need to consider the use of voluntary consensus standards in developing this final rule.

XII. Executive Order 13132, Federalism

Executive Order 13132, entitled ''Federalism'' (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure ''meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications.'' ''Policies that have federalism implications'' is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have ''substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.''

Under section 6 of Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that impose substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law unless EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This action does not have federalism implications. It 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 13132, because it affects only one facility.

Lists of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 261

Environmental protection, Hazardous waste, Recycling, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: Sec. 3001(f) RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6921(f).

Dated: September 9, 2004.

Carl E. Edlund,

Director, Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, Region 6.

■ For the reasons set out in the preamble, 40 CFR part 261 is to be amended as follows:

PART 261—IDENTIFICATION AND LISTING OF HAZARDOUS WASTE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 261 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 6905, 6912(a), 6921, 6922, and 6938.

■ 2. In Table 2 of Appendix IX of Part 261 add the following waste stream in alphabetical order by facility to read as follows:

Appendix IX to Part 261—Waste Excluded Under §§ 260.20 and 260.22

TABLE 2.—WASTE EXCLUDED FROM SPECIFIC SOURCES

Facility	Address	Waste description
*	*	* * * * *
American Chrome & Chemical	Corpus Christi, Texas	Dewatered sludge (the EPA Hazardous Waste No. K006) generated at a maximum generation of 1450 cubic yards per calendar year after September 21, 2004 and disposed in a Subtitle D landfill. ACC must implement a verification program that meets the following Paragraphs: (1) Delisting Levels: All leachable constituent concentrations must not exceed the following levels (mg/l). The petitioner must use the method specified in 40 CFR 261.24 to measure constituents in the waste leachate. Dewatered wastewater sludge: Arsenic-0.0377; Barium-100.0; Chromium-5.0; Thallium-0.355; Zinc-1130.0. (2) Waste Holding and Handling: (A) ACC is a 90 day facility and does not have a RCRA permit, therefore, ACC must store the dewatered sludge following the requirements specified in 40 CFR 262.34, or continue to dispose of as hazardous all dewatered sludge generated, until they have completed verification testing described in Paragraph (3), as appropriate, and valid analyses show that paragraph (1) is satisfied. (B) Levels of constituents measured in the samples of the dewatered sludge that do not exceed the levels set forth in Paragraph (1) are non-hazardous. ACC can manage and dispose the non-hazardous dewatered sludge according to all applicable solid waste regulations. (C) If constituent levels in a sample exceed any of the delisting levels set in Paragraph (1), ACC must retreat the batches of waste used to generate the representative sample until it meets the levels. ACC must repeat the analyses of the treated waste. (D) If the facility does not treat the waste or retreat it until it meets the delisting levels in Paragraph (1), ACC must manage and dispose the waste generated under Subtitle C of RCRA. (E) The dewatered sludge must pass paint filter test as described in SW 846, Method 9095 or another appropriate method found in a reliable source before it is allowed to leave the facility. ACC must maintain a record of the actual volume of the dewatered sludge to be disposed of-site according to the requirements in Paragraph (5). (3) Verification Testing Requirements: ACC must perform sample collection and analyses, including quality control procedures, according to appropriate methods such as those found in SW–846 or other reliable sources (with the exception of analyses requiring the use of SW–846 methods incorporated by reference in 40 CFR 260.11, which must be used without substitution. ACC must conduct verification testing each time it decides to evacuate the tank contents. Four (4) representative composite samples shall be collected from the dewatered sludge. ACC shall analyze the verification samples according to the constituent list specified in Paragraph (1) and submit the analytical results to EPA within 10 days of receiving the analytical results. If the EPA determines that the data collected under this Paragraph do not support the data provided for the petition, the exclusion will not cover the generated wastes. The EPA will notify ACC the decision in writing within two weeks of receiving this information. (4) Changes in Operating Conditions: If ACC significantly changes the process described in its petition or starts any processes that may or could affect the composition or type of waste generated as established under Paragraph (1) (by illustration, but not limitation, changes in equipment or operating conditions of the treatment process), they must notify the EPA in writing; they may no longer handle the wastes generated from the new process as nonhazardous until the test results of the wastes meet the delisting levels set in Paragraph (1) and they have received written approval to do so from the EPA. (5) Data Submittals: ACC must submit the information described below. If ACC fails to submit the required data within the specified time or maintain the required records on-site for the specified time, the EPA, at its discretion, will consider this sufficient basis to reopen the exclusion as described in Paragraph 6. ACC must:

TABLE 2.—WASTE EXCLUDED FROM SPECIFIC SOURCES—Continued

Facility	Address	Waste description
		(A) Submit the data obtained through Paragraph 3 to the Section Chief, Corrective Action and Waste Minimization Section, Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, Mail Code, (6PD–C) within the time specified. (B) Compile records of operating conditions and analytical data from Paragraph (3), summarized, and maintained on-site for a minimum of five years. (C) Furnish these records and data when the EPA or the State of Texas request them for inspection. (D) Send along with all data a signed copy of the following certification statement, to attest to the truth and accuracy of the data submitted: Under civil and criminal penalty of law for the making or submission of false or fraudulent statements or representations (pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Federal Code, which include, but may not be limited to, 18 U.S.C. 1001 and 42 U.S.C. 6928), I certify that the information contained in or accompanying this document is true, accurate and complete. As to the (those) identified section(s) of this document for which I cannot personally verify its (their) truth and accuracy, I certify as the company official having supervisory responsibility for the persons who, acting under my direct instructions, made the verification that this information is true, accurate and complete. If any of this information is determined by the EPA in its sole discretion to be false, inaccurate or incomplete, and upon conveyance of this fact to the company, I recognize and agree that this exclusion of waste will be void as if it never had effect or to the extent directed by the EPA and that the company will be liable for any actions taken in contravention of the company's RCRA and CERCLA obligations premised upon the company's reliance on the void exclusion. (6) Reopener: (A) If, anytime after disposal of the delisted waste, ACC possesses or is otherwise made aware of any environmental data (including but not limited to leachate data or ground water monitoring data) or any other data relevant to the delisted waste indicating that any constituent identified for the delisting verification testing is at level higher than the delisting level allowed by the Division Director in granting the petition, then the facility must report the data, in writing, to the Division Director within 10 days of first possessing or being made aware of that data. (B) If the verification testing of the waste does not meet the delisting requirements in Paragraph 1, ACC must report the data, in writing, to the Division Director within 10 days of first possessing or being made aware of that data. (C) If ACC fails to submit the information described in paragraphs (5),(6)(A) or (6)(B) or if any other information is received from any source, the Division Director will make a preliminary determination as to whether the reported information requires Agency action to protect human health or the environment. Further action may include suspending, or revoking the exclusion, or other appropriate response necessary to protect human health and the environment. (D) If the Division Director determines that the reported information does require Agency action, the Division Director will notify the facility in writing of the actions the Division Director believes are necessary to protect human health and the environment. The notice shall include a statement of the proposed action and a statement providing the facility with an opportunity to present information as to why the proposed Agency action is not necessary. The facility shall have 10 days from the date of the Division Director's notice to present such information. (E) Following the receipt of information from the facility described in paragraph (6)(D) or (if no information is presented under paragraph (6)(D)) the initial receipt of information described in paragraphs (5), (6)(A) or (6)(B), the Division Director will issue a final written determination describing the Agency actions that are necessary to protect human health or the environment. Any required action described in the Division Director's determination shall become effective immediately, unless the Division Director provides otherwise.

TABLE 2.—WASTE EXCLUDED FROM SPECIFIC SOURCES—Continued

Facility	Address	Waste description
		(7) Notification Requirements: ACC must do the following before transporting the delisted waste: Failure to provide this notification will result in a violation of the delisting petition and a possible revocation of the decision. (A) Provide a one-time written notification to any State Regulatory Agency to which or through which they will transport the delisted waste described above for disposal, 60 days before beginning such activities. If ACC transports the excluded waste to or manages the waste in any state with delisting authorization, ACC must obtain delisting authorization from that state before it can manage the waste as nonhazardous in the state. (B) Update the one-time written notification if they ship the delisted waste to a different disposal facility. (C) Failure to provide the notification will result in a violation of the delisting variance and a possible revocation of the exclusion.
* * *	* * *	* * *

[FR Doc. 04–21185 Filed 9–20–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 281

[FRL–7816–1]

Missouri: Final Approval of Missouri Underground Storage Tank Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule; final determination on application of State of Missouri for final approval.

SUMMARY: Missouri has applied to EPA for final approval of its Underground Storage Tank (UST) program under Subtitle I of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). EPA has reviewed the Missouri application and has made a final determination that Missouri's UST program satisfies all of the requirements necessary to qualify for final approval. Thus, EPA is granting final approval to the State of Missouri to operate its program.

DATES: Final approval for Missouri shall be effective October 21, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Garwood, EPA Region 7, ARTD/STOP, 901 N. 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101, (913) 551–7268, or by e-mail at *garwood.linda@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Subtitle I of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended, requires that EPA develop standards for Underground Storage Tanks (UST) systems as may be necessary to protect human health and the environment, and procedures for approving state programs in lieu of the Federal program. EPA promulgated state program approval procedures at 40 CFR part 281. Program approval may be granted by EPA pursuant to RCRA section 9004(b), if the Agency finds that the state program is ''no less stringent'' than the Federal program for the seven elements set forth at RCRA section 9004(a)(1) through (7); includes the notification requirements of RCRA section 9004(a)(8); and provides for adequate enforcement of compliance with UST standards of RCRA section 9004(a). Note that RCRA sections 9005 (information-gathering) and 9006 (Federal enforcement) by their terms apply even in states with programs approved by EPA under RCRA section 9004. Thus, the Agency retains its authority under RCRA sections 9005 and 9006, 42 U.S.C. 6991d and 6991e, and other applicable statutory and regulatory provisions to undertake inspections and enforcement actions in approved states. With respect to such an enforcement action, the Agency will rely on Federal sanctions, Federal inspection authorities, and Federal procedures rather than the state authorized analogues to these provisions.

II. Missouri UST Program

The Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) is the lead implementing agency for the UST program in Missouri. MDNR has broad statutory authority to regulate UST releases under Sections 260.500 through 260.550 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri (RSMo.) and more specific authority to regulate the installation, operation, maintenance, and closure of USTs under sections 319.100 through 319.139, RSMo., the Missouri UST Law. Additional authorities, in particular the appeals process through the Missouri Clean Water Commission, are found at Chapter 644, RSMo., the Missouri Clean Water Law.

The State of Missouri submitted a state program approval application to EPA by letter dated July 28, 2003. EPA evaluated the information provided and determined the application package met all requirements for a complete program application. On December 11, 2003, EPA notified Missouri that the application package was complete.

Included in the state's Application is an Attorney General's statement. The Attorney General's statement provides an outline of the state's statutory and regulatory authority and details concerning areas where the state program is broader in scope or more stringent than the Federal program. Also included was a transmittal letter from the Governor of Missouri requesting program approval, a description of the Missouri UST program, a demonstration of Missouri's procedures to ensure adequate enforcement, a Memorandum of Agreement outlining the roles and responsibilities of EPA and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, and copies of all applicable state statutes and regulations.

Specifically, the Missouri UST program has requirements that are no less stringent than the Federal requirements at 40 CFR 281.30 New UST system design, construction, installation, and notification; 40 CFR 281.31 Upgrading existing UST systems; 40 CFR 281.32 General operating requirements; 40 CFR 281.33 Release detection; 40 CFR 281.34 Release reporting, investigation, and confirmation; 40 CFR 281.35 Release response and corrective action; 40 CFR 281.36 Out-of-service UST systems and closure; 40 CFR 281.37 Financial responsibility for UST systems