

### Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

### Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 251 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, 5 U.S.C. 804. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets.

### Executive Order 12866

This rule has been drafted and reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), section 1(b) (Principles of Regulation). The Department of Justice, United States Marshals Service, has determined that this rule is a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866, section 3(f), and, accordingly, this rule has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

### Executive Order 13132

This rule will not 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. Therefore, in accordance with section 6 of Executive Order 13132, the Department of Justice, United States Marshals Service, has determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement.

### Executive Order 12988 Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets the applicable standards set forth in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988.

### Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This rule does not contain collection of information requirements and would

not be subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, as amended (44 U.S.C. 3501-20).

### Plain Language Instructions

We try to write clearly. If you can suggest how to improve the clarity of these regulations, call or write Joe Lazar, Associate General Counsel, United States Marshals Service, 600 Army Navy Drive, CS-3, Arlington, Virginia 22202, telephone number (202) 307-9054.

### List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 0

Authority delegations (Government agencies), Government employees, Organization and functions (Government agencies), Whistleblowing.

Accordingly, Title 28, Part 0, Subpart U of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

### PART 0—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 0 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 301; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 515-519.

2. Section 0.114 is transferred from subpart U to the end of subpart T; paragraphs (b) through (d) are redesignated as paragraphs (f) through (h), respectively; paragraph (a) is revised; and new paragraphs (b) through (e) are added to read as follows:

#### § 0.114 Fees for services.

(a) The United States Marshals Service shall routinely collect fees according to the following schedule:

(1) For process forwarded for service from one U.S. Marshals Service Office or suboffice to another—\$8 per item forwarded;

(2) For process served by mail—\$8 per item mailed;

(3) For process served or executed personally—\$45 per hour (or portion thereof) for each item served by one U.S. Marshals Service employee, agent, or contractor, plus travel costs and any other out-of-pocket expenses. For each additional U.S. Marshals Service employee, agent, or contractor who is needed to serve process—\$45 per person per hour for each item served, plus travel costs and any other out-of-pocket expenses.

(4) For copies at the request of any party—\$.10 per page;

(5) For preparing notice of sale, bill of sale, or U.S. Marshal deed—\$20 per item;

(6) For keeping and advertisement of property attached—actual expenses incurred in seizing, maintaining, and disposing of property.

(b) Out-of-pocket expenses include, but are not limited to, advertising,

inventorying, storage, moving, insurance, guard hire, prisoner transportation and housing, and any other third-party expenditure incurred in executing process.

(c) Travel costs, including mileage, shall be calculated according to 5 U.S.C. chapter 57.

(d) "Item" is defined as all documents issued in one action which are served simultaneously on one person or organization.

(e) "Process" is defined to include, but is not limited to, a summons and complaint, subpoena, writ, orders, and the execution of court-ordered injunctions, and civil commitments on behalf of a requesting party. Process may also include the execution of ancillary court orders (other than subpoenas issued on behalf of indigent defendants and arrest warrants) in criminal cases.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: July 28, 2000.

**Janet Reno,**

*Attorney General.*

[FR Doc. 00-19809 Filed 8-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-04-M

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[CA 026-CORR; FRL-6733-5]

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of California

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Final rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This action corrects language to Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations that appeared in a direct final rule published in the **Federal Register** on April 19, 2000. It also corrects language that appeared in various other final **Federal Register** actions.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This action is effective August 4, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Julie A. Rose, Rulemaking Office, Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, Telephone: (415) 744-1184.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On April 19, 2000 at 65 FR 20913, EPA published a direct final rulemaking action approving a rule from the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District of the California State

Implementation Plan (SIP). The direct final rulemaking contained amendments to 40 CFR part 52, subpart F. The amendment which incorporated material by reference into § 52.220, Identification of plan, paragraph (c)(263)(i)(C)(2) is incorrect. The amendment is being corrected in this action. Paragraph (C) should have been identified as Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District and paragraph (1) should have listed Rule 464 instead of paragraph (2). The identification of these two paragraphs is being corrected in this action.

On May 7, 1996, at 61 FR 20454, EPA published a direct final rulemaking action approving Rule 359 for the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District. The direct final rulemaking contained amendments to 40 CFR part 52, subpart F. The material incorporated by reference into § 52.220, Identification of plan, paragraph (c)(198)(i)(K)(2) was identified in the **Federal Register**, however, the information was not transferred to the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Paragraph (2) should read: "Rule 359, adopted on June 28, 1994." This omission is being corrected in this action.

Additional omissions in 40 CFR 52.220 are being corrected in this action. Paragraph (c)(184)(i)(D) should be identified as San Diego County Air Pollution Control District. Paragraph (c)(220)(i)(B) should be identified as Placer County Air Pollution Control District. Paragraph (c)(225)(i)(C) should be identified as El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District. The identification of these paragraphs is being corrected in this action.

On March 1, 1996, at 61 FR 7994, the deletion of Kern County Air Pollution Control District Rule 425 was incorrectly added as paragraph (c)(194)(i)(D)(3). In today's action, the deletion of Rule 425 is being correctly added to paragraph (c)(132)(B) and paragraph (c)(194)(i)(D)(3) is being removed.

Section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), provides that, when an agency for good cause finds that notice and public procedures are impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest, the agency may issue a rule without providing notice and an opportunity for public comment. EPA has determined that there is good cause for making today's rule final without prior proposal and opportunity for comment because EPA is correcting omissions and amending the rules listed in the currently approved information. The affected regulations are codified at 40 CFR part 52, subpart F, § 52.220.

These rules were previously subject to notice and comment prior to EPA approval. Thus, notice and public procedure are unnecessary. EPA finds that this constitutes good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B).

#### Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and, is therefore not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. Because the agency has made a "good cause" finding that this action is not subject to notice-and-comment requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute, it is not subject to the regulatory flexibility provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), or to sections 202 and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Public Law 104-4). In addition, this action does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments or impose a significant intergovernmental mandate, as described in sections 203 and 204 of UMRA. This rule also does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of tribal governments, as specified by Executive Order 13084 (63 FR 27655, May 10, 1998). This rule will not 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, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

This technical correction action does not involve technical standards; 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. The rule also does not involve special consideration of environmental justice related issues as required by Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). In issuing this rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct, as required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996). EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implication of the rule in accordance with the "Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings" issued under the executive order. 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.*). EPA's compliance with these statutes and Executive Orders for the underlying rule is discussed in the June 8, 2000 **Federal Register** document.

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. Section 808 allows the issuing agency to make a rule effective sooner than otherwise provided by the CRA if the agency makes a good cause finding that notice and public procedure is impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest. This determination must be supported by a brief statement. 5 U.S.C. 808(2). As stated previously, EPA has made such a good cause finding, including the reasons therefor, and established an effective date of August 4, 2000. 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 action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(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.

Nora McGee,

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) (132)(i)(B), (184)(i)(D) introductory text, (198)(i)(K)(2), (220)(i)(B) introductory text, (225)(i)(C) introductory text, (263)(i)(C) introductory text, (263)(i)(C)(1) and by removing

(194)(i)(D)(3) and (263)(i)(C)(1) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

- (c) (132) (i) (B) Previously approved on May 3, 1984 and now deleted without replacement, Rule 425.
- (184) (i) (D) San Diego County Air Pollution Control District.
- (198) (i) (K) (2) Rule 359, adopted on June 28, 1994.
- (220) (i) (B) Placer County Air Pollution Control District.
- (225) (i) (C) El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District.
- (263) (i) (C) Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.
- (1) Rule 464, adopted on July 23, 1998.

[FR Doc. 00-18641 Filed 8-3-00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 132

[FRL-6846-3]

Identification of Approved and Disapproved Elements of the Great Lakes Guidance Submissions From the States of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and Final Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA published the final Water Quality Guidance for the Great Lakes System (the Guidance) on March 23, 1995. Section 118(c) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires the Great Lakes States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin to adopt within two years of publication of the final Guidance (i.e., March 23, 1997) minimum water quality standards, antidegradation policies and implementation procedures that are consistent with the Guidance, and to submit them to EPA for review and approval. Each of the Great Lakes States made those submissions.

Today, EPA is taking final action on the Guidance submissions of the States of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois. EPA's final action consists of approving those elements of the States' submissions that are consistent with the Guidance, disapproving those elements that are not consistent with the Guidance, and specifying in a final rule the elements of the Guidance that apply

in the portion of each State within the Great Lakes basin where a State either failed to adopt required elements or adopted elements that are inconsistent with the Guidance. EPA is separately taking final action on the Guidance submissions of the States of Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 5, 2000.

ADDRESSES: The public docket for EPA's final actions with respect to the Guidance submissions of the States of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois is available for inspection and copying at U.S. EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604 by appointment only. Appointments may be made by calling Mery Jackson-Willis (telephone 312-886-3717).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Morris (4301), U.S. EPA, Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460 (202-260-0312); or Mery Jackson-Willis, U.S. EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604 (312-353-3717).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

I. Discussion

A. Potentially Affected Entities

Entities potentially affected by today's action are those discharging pollutants to waters of the United States in the Great Lakes System in the States of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois. Potentially affected categories and entities include:

Category	Examples of potentially affected entities
Industry .....	Industries discharging to waters within the Great Lakes System as defined in 40 CFR 132.2 in the States identified above.
Municipalities ....	Publicly-owned treatment works discharging to waters within the Great Lakes System as defined in 40 CFR 132.2 in the States identified above.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected. This table lists the types of entities that EPA believes could be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be affected. To determine whether your facility may be affected by these final actions, you should examine the definition of "Great Lakes System" in 40 CFR 132.2 and examine 40 CFR 132.2 which describes the Part 132 regulations. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person

listed in the preceding FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section.

B. Background

On March 23, 1995, EPA published the Guidance. See 60 FR 15366 (The term "Guidance" as used below refers to the regulation promulgated by EPA on March 23, 1995 and codified at 40 CFR Part 132). The Guidance establishes minimum water quality standards, antidegradation policies, and implementation procedures for the waters of the Great Lakes System in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

Specifically, the Guidance specifies numeric criteria for selected pollutants to protect aquatic life, wildlife and human health within the Great Lakes System and provides methodologies to derive numeric criteria for additional pollutants discharged to these waters. The Guidance also contains minimum implementation procedures and an antidegradation policy.

Soon after being published, the Guidance was challenged in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. On June 6, 1997, the Court issued a decision upholding virtually all of the provisions contained in the 1995 Guidance. *American Iron*