

would have been larger. Applying the Federal cost-share rate according to the criteria specified in the proposed rule would have saved about \$64 million in FY 2001, lowering the overall Federal share from 78 percent (the actual cost share percentage in that year) to 58 percent.

The adoption of the proposed rule is anticipated to yield savings to the Federal Government in future years

largely due to the limits placed on Federal financial contributions to long-term emergency programs, especially those involving commodities with commercial interests. As an emergency situation dissipates, a greater share of the funding of these extended programs should appropriately be assumed by the affected States and other cooperators who, with time, would be in a better position to obtain the necessary

resources to address a long-term pest or disease situation.

Additionally, the increased program effectiveness that is expected to result from more reliable State participation and funding certainty would yield economic and environmental benefits over the long run. These gains are expected to balance the costs to State cooperators from redistribution.

TABLE 2.—DISTRIBUTION OF THE FEDERAL SHARE IN EMERGENCY PROGRAMS, ACTUAL AND UNDER PROPOSED RULE  
(\$ millions)<sup>1</sup>

Program	Actual federal share			Actual non-Federal share	Total program cost	Proposed Federal percentage share	Federal share under proposed rule	Savings under proposed rule
	Operations	Compensation	Total					
FY 1999								
ALB <sup>2, 3</sup> .....	9,010	0	9,010	2,572	11,582	75	8,687	324
Citrus canker .....	25,000	0	25,000	22,441	47,441	57	27,041	– 2,041
Medfly .....	11,935	0	11,935	12,353	24,288	47	11,415	520
Total .....	45,945	0	45,945	37,366	83,311	.....	47,143	– 1,198
% of total .....	.....	.....	55%	.....	.....	.....	57%	.....
FY 2000								
ALB <sup>2, 3</sup> .....	16,180	0	16,180	1,555	17,735	60	10,641	5,539
Belgian sheep .....	1,400	700	2,100	0	2,100	77	1,617	483
Citrus canker .....	81,821	9,000	90,821	53,981	144,739	57	82,501	8,320
Pierce's disease .....	22,289	0	22,289	32,423	54,712	62	33,921	– 11,632
Plum pox virus .....	3,653	13,200	16,853	6,800	23,653	62	14,665	2,188
Scrapie <sup>3</sup> .....	11,791	1,200	12,991	0	12,991	47	6,106	6,885
Total .....	137,134	24,100	161,234	94,696	255,930	.....	149,451	11,783
% of total .....	.....	.....	63%	.....	.....	.....	58%	.....
FY 2001								
ALB <sup>2, 3</sup> .....	51,698	0	51,698	2,654	54,352	60	32,611	19,087
Belgian sheep .....	1,578	0	1,578	0	1,578	62	978	600
Bovine TB <sup>4</sup> .....	14,524	45,600	60,124	10,400	70,524	47	33,146	26,978
Citrus canker .....	59,574	57,872	117,446	41,235	158,681	62	98,382	19,064
Chronic wasting disease .....	701	1,950	2,651	2,200	4,851	72	3,493	– 842
Karnal bunt .....	1,223	6,100	7,323	2,000	9,323	47	4,382	2,941
Plum pox virus .....	2,112	0	2,112	2,500	4,612	62	2,859	– 747
Rabies .....	4,200	0	4,200	8,886	13,086	52	6,805	– 2,605
Total .....	135,610	111,522	247,132	69,875	317,007	.....	182,657	64,475
% of total .....	.....	.....	78%	.....	.....	.....	58%	.....

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, Federal expenditures for emergency programs are based on transfer funds from the CCC. These figures represent funds available for use in a fiscal year.

<sup>2</sup> ALB = Asian longhorned beetle.

<sup>3</sup> The actual Federal share included funds from CCC transfers and agency-level appropriated funds available for emergency activities.

<sup>4</sup> TB = Tuberculosis.

### *Economic Effects on Small Entities*

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires that agencies specifically consider the economic effect of their rules on small entities. The Small Business Administration (SBA) has established guidelines for determining when establishments are to be considered small under the Act. This proposed rule is not expected to directly

affect commercial entities as defined by the SBA.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action would not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

### **Executive Order 12372**

This program/activity is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

under No. 10.025 and is subject to Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. (See 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V.)

### **Executive Order 12988**

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. If this proposed rule is adopted: (1) All State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with