

notice will be published to inform the public and affected sources of the delegation, indicating where source notifications and reports should be sent, and to amend the relevant portions of the Code of Federal Regulations showing which NSPS and NESHAP standards have been delegated to NMED.

#### **XIV. What Is the Relationship Between RCRA and the Hazardous Waste Combustor MACT?**

As part of today's rule, we are delegating, under the CAA, implementation and enforcement authority for the Hazardous Waste Combustor (HWC) MACT (subpart EEE) to NMED. Many of the sources subject to the HWC MACT are also subject to the RCRA permitting requirements. We expect air emissions and related operating requirements found in the HWC MACT will be included in part 70 permits issued by NMED. However, RCRA permits will still be required for all other aspects of the combustion unit and the facility that are governed by RCRA (e.g., corrective action, general facility standards, other combustor-specific concerns such as materials handling, risk-based emissions limits and operating requirements, as appropriate and other hazardous waste management units).<sup>2</sup> See the HWC MACT rule preamble discussion (64 FR 52828, 52839–52843 (September 30, 1999)), and the RCRA Site-Specific Risk Assessment Policy for HWC Facilities dated June 2000 for more information on the interrelationship of the MACT rule with the RCRA Omnibus provision and site specific risk assessments.

<sup>2</sup> EPA promulgated the HWC MACT (40 CFR part 63, subpart EEE) under the joint authority of the CAA and RCRA. Before this rule went into effect, the air emissions from these sources were primarily regulated under the authority of RCRA. See 40 CFR parts 264, 265, 266, and 270. With the release of HWC MACT, the air emissions are now regulated under both CAA and RCRA. Even though both statutes give EPA the authority to regulate air emissions, we determined that having the emissions standards and permitting requirements in both sets of implementing regulations would be duplicative. For this reason, using the authority provided by section 1006(b) of RCRA, EPA deferred the RCRA requirements for the HWC emission controls to the CAA requirements of 40 CFR part 63, Subpart EEE. After a facility has demonstrated compliance with the HWC MACT, the RCRA standards for air emissions from these units will no longer apply, with the exception of section 3005(c)(3) of RCRA, which requires that each RCRA permit contain the terms and conditions necessary to protect human health and the environment. Under this provision of RCRA, if a regulatory authority determines that more stringent conditions than the HWC MACT are necessary to protect human health and the environment for a particular facility, then that regulatory authority may impose those conditions in the facility's RCRA permit.

#### **XV. Final Action**

The public was provided the opportunity to comment on the proposed approval of the program and mechanism for delegation of section 112 standards, as applied to part 70 sources, on May 19, 1994. The proposal was part of EPA's proposed approval of New Mexico's Operating Permits Program. 59 FR at 26160. The EPA did not receive any public comments on the proposed delegation of section 112 standards. 59 FR 59656 (November 18, 1994). In this action, the public is given the opportunity to comment on the approval of NMED request for delegation of authority to implement and enforce certain section 112 standards for all sources (both part 70 and non-part 70 sources) which have been adopted by reference into New Mexico's state regulations. However, the Agency views the approval of these requests as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. Therefore, EPA is publishing this rule without prior proposal. However, in the "Proposed Rules" section of today's **Federal Register** publication, EPA is publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve the program and delegation of authority described in this action if adverse comments are received. This action will be effective February 9, 2004 without further notice unless the Agency receives relevant adverse comments by January 12, 2004.

If EPA receives adverse comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public the rule will not take effect. We will address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. Please note that if we receive adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, we may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

#### **XVI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May

22, 2001). This action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule approves pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-4).

This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does 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 action merely approves a state request to receive delegation of certain Federal standards, 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 delegation submissions, EPA's role is to approve submissions 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 delegation submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA to use VCS in place of a delegation 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