

applicable statutory requirements and for consistency with EPA guidance. Massachusetts' Plan Approval and EPA's evaluation are detailed in a memorandum dated December 21, 1994, entitled "Technical Support Document—Massachusetts—Brittany Dyeing and Printing Corporation." Copies of that document are available, upon request, from the EPA Regional Office listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document. A summary of EPA's analysis is provided below.

Brittany has four 310 CMR 7.18(17) RACT applicable VOC emitting processes at its textile processing facility: Fabric printing, fabric finishing, fabric dyeing, and process cleaning. Brittany's total 1990 VOC emissions were 172.1 tons.

Brittany has significantly reduced its VOC emissions by reformulating its printing pastes and finish formulations. Fabric printing and fabric finishing are the main source of VOC emissions at Brittany. Together these processes account for 93.6 percent of the facility's total 1990 VOC emissions. Although there is no CTG document for the fabric printing and finishing operations at Brittany, a CTG does exist for graphic arts printing (Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources—Volume VIII: Graphic Arts—Rotogravure and Flexography; EPA-450/2-78-033) which covers a printing process that is similar to the fabric printing and finishing operations at Brittany. This CTG recommends a 65 percent overall reduction in VOC emissions from packaging rotogravure and a 75 percent overall reduction for publication rotogravure when using add-on controls. Furthermore, EPA has determined that a 0.5 pounds of VOC per pound of solids emission limit constitutes RACT for flexographic and packaging rotogravure printing.

The DEP has determined that an emission limit of 0.5 pounds of VOC per pound of solids represents RACT for both the fabric printing and the fabric finishing processes at Brittany. These emissions limits, which are consistent with those imposed on facilities covered by the Graphic Arts printing CTG, are reasonable limits. The 0.5 pounds of VOC per pound of solids limits are also consistent with a previously approved RACT Plan for Duro Textile Printers of Fall River, Massachusetts (54 FR 46896).

DEP has also determined that an emissions limit of 0.5 pounds of VOC per pound of solids represents RACT for the fabric dyeing process at Brittany. One exception to this limit is allowed for Polyester Carrier. Once again, the 0.5 pounds of VOC per pound of solids limit appears reasonable. The exception

for Polyester Carrier is also considered acceptable in light of the following: (1) Fabric dyeing is responsible for only 0.7 percent of the facility's total 1990 emissions; and (2) DEP is also imposing a 0.4 tons of VOC per year cap on emissions from this product.

Finally, cleaning activities account for 5 percent of Brittany's total 1990 VOC emissions. EPA has recently published guidance on emissions from process cleaning (Alternate Control Techniques Document—Industrial Cleaning Solvents; EPA-453/R-94-015). This document indicates that the establishment of a solvents accounting or tracking system whereby actual solvent usage is tracked (rather than tracking only the total quantity purchased) leads to a reduction in emissions from cleaning activities. DEP is requiring that Brittany keep a separate daily VOC emissions log for cleaning activities and is also imposing annual caps on VOC emissions from specific cleaning products.

Brittany's compliance with the RACT requirements outlined above will be determined by the VOC content of its print pastes, finish formulations and dyes, and by the amount of solvent used per day. Brittany is required to keep daily records documenting the use of all VOC containing material.

EPA's review of Massachusetts' SIP revision indicates that the requirements contained in Massachusetts Plan Approval No. 4P92012 represent RACT for Brittany. EPA is, therefore, approving the March 31, 1994 Massachusetts SIP revision.

EPA is publishing this action without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. However, in a separate document in this **Federal Register** publication, EPA is proposing to approve the SIP revision should adverse or critical comments be filed. This action will be effective May 5, 1995 unless, by April 5, 1995, adverse or critical comments are received.

If the EPA receives such comments, this action will be withdrawn before the effective date by simultaneously publishing a subsequent document that will withdraw the final action. All public comments received will then be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this action serving as a proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If no such comments are received, the public is advised that this action will be effective on May 5, 1995.

Final Action

EPA is approving Massachusetts' Plan Approval for Brittany Dyeing Printing Corporation which was submitted as a SIP revision on March 31, 1994. This Plan Approval imposes RACT on Brittany in order to reduce VOC emissions from this facility.

This action has been classified as a Table 3 action by the Regional Administrator under the procedures published in the **Federal Register** on January 19, 1989 (54 FR 2214-2225), as revised by an October 4, 1993 memorandum from Michael H. Shapiro, Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation. A future document will inform the general public of these tables. On January 6, 1989, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) waived Table 2 and Table 3 SIP revisions from the requirement of section 3 of Executive Order 12291 for a period of two years. The EPA has submitted a request for a permanent waiver for Table 2 and Table 3 SIP revisions. The OMB has agreed to continue the waiver until such time as it rules on U.S. EPA's request. This request continues in effect under Executive Order 12866 which superseded Executive Order 12291 on September 30, 1993.

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 et seq., EPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Alternatively, EPA may certify that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000.

SIP approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the CAA do not create any new requirements, but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the federal SIP-approval does not impose any new requirements, I certify that it does not have a significant impact on any small entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the federal-state relationship under the CAA, preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis would constitute federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The CAA forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co. v. U.S. E.P.A.*, 427 U.S. 246, 256-66 (S.Ct. 1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410 (a)(2).

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting or allowing or establishing a precedent for any future