Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4701 *et seq.*

Subpart F—California

2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraphs (c) (175)(i)(B)(*2*) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(175) * * *

(i) * * *

(B) * * *

(*2*) Rule 4.22, adopted on August 4, 1987.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 01–25263 Filed 10–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 241–0300; FRL–7075–7]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This action was proposed in the **Federal Register** on August 2, 2001 and concerns volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from storage of organic liquids and leaking equipment at petroleum refineries, chemical plants, bulk and bulk terminals. Under authority of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act), this action simultaneously approves local rules that regulate these emission sources and directs the BAAQMD to correct rule deficiencies.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This rule is effective on November 9, 2001.

ADDRESSES: You can inspect copies of the administrative record for this action at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 ''I'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine Vineyard, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 744–1197.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, ''we,'' ''us'' and ''our'' refer to EPA.

I. Proposed Action

On August 2, 2001 (66 FR 40168), EPA proposed a limited approval and limited disapproval of the following rules that were submitted for incorporation into the California SIP.

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
BAAQMD	8–5	Storage of Organic Liquids	12/15/99	03/28/00
BAAQMD	8–18	Equipment Leaks	01/07/98	03/28/00

We proposed a limited approval because we determined that these rules improve the SIP and are largely consistent with the relevant CAA requirements. We simultaneously proposed a limited disapproval because some rule provisions conflict with section 110 and part D of the Act. These provisions include the following:

1. Rule 8–5 exempts sources from control requirements during certain startup, shutdown, and maintenance conditions in violation of EPA's 1999 guidance on excess emission during malfunctions, startup, and shutdown.

2. Rule 8–18 contains director's discretion in the allowance of compliance options and the use of new leak detection and repair technology without EPA approval.

Our proposed action contains more information on the basis for this rulemaking and on our evaluation of the submittal.

II. Public Comments and EPA Responses

EPA's proposed action provided a 30-day public comment period. During this period, we received no comments.

III. EPA Action

No comments were submitted. Therefore, as authorized in sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the Act, EPA is finalizing a limited approval of the submitted rules. This action incorporates the submitted rules into the California SIP, including those provisions identified as deficient. As authorized under section 110(k)(3), EPA is simultaneously finalizing a limited disapproval of the rules. As a result, sanctions will be imposed unless EPA approves subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rule deficiencies within 18 months of the effective date of this action. These sanctions will be imposed under section 179 of the Act according to 40 CFR 52.31. In addition, EPA must promulgate a federal implementation plan (FIP) under section 110(c) unless we approve subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rule deficiencies within 24 months. Note that the submitted rules have been adopted by the BAAQMD, and EPA's final limited disapproval does not prevent the local agency from enforcing them.

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866, entitled ''Regulatory Planning and Review.''

B. Executive Order 13211

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, ''Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 Fed. Reg. 28355 (May 22, 2001)) because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

C. Executive Order 13045

Executive Order 13045, entitled Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), applies to any rule that: (1) Is determined to be ''economically significant'' as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria,

the Agency 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 the Agency.

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

D. Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132, entitled Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Orders 12612, Federalism and 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership. Executive Order 13132 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 Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes 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 the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

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, because it merely acts on 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. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this rule.

E. Executive Order 13175

Executive Order 13175, entitled ''Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments'' (65 FR 67249, November 6, 2000), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure ''meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications.'' ''Policies that have tribal implications'' is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have ''substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal government and the Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Indian tribes.''

This final rule does not have tribal implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on tribal governments, 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 in Executive Order 13175. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule.

F. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This final rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply act on requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

EPA's disapproval of the state request under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act does not affect any existing requirements applicable to small entities. Any pre-existing federal requirements remain in place after this disapproval. Federal disapproval of the state submittal does not affect state enforceability. Moreover, EPA's disapproval of the submittal does not impose any new Federal requirements. Therefore, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co.* v. *U.S. EPA,* 427 U.S. 246, 255–66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

G. Unfunded Mandates

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (''Unfunded Mandates Act''), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to private sector, of $100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of $100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action acts on pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

H. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing a new regulation. To comply with NTTAA, EPA must consider and use ''voluntary consensus standards'' (VCS) if available and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to today's action because it does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

I. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

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 rule is not a ''major'' rule as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

J. Petitions for Judicial Review

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 December 10, 2001. 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, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: September 21, 2001.

Jane Diamond,

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 paragraph (c)(277)(i)(C) (*7*) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(277) * * *

(i) * * *

(C) * * *

(*7*) Rule 8–5 adopted on December 15, 1999 and Rule 8–18 adopted on January 7, 1998.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 01–25261 Filed 10–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[OH118–2; FRL–7062–5]

Conditional Approval Implementation Plans; Ohio

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is conditionally approving the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's (OEPA) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) provisions for attainment areas based on the State's December 5, 2000, letter of commitment to submit the needed changes to its program within one year of the final conditional approval.

Ohio submitted a request for a SIP-approved PSD program on March 1, 1996. The request was supplemented on April 16, 1997, September 5, 1997, December 4, 1997, and April 21, 1998. Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) sections 3745–31–11 to 3745–31–20 contain the permitting provisions for areas attaining the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The general provisions applying to both attainment and nonattainment areas are found in OAC sections 3745–31–01 to 3745–31–10.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rule is effective October 10, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Materials relevant to this rulemaking are available for inspection at the following address: Permits and Grants Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Please contact Genevieve Damico at (312) 353–4761 before visiting the Region 5 office.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Genevieve Damico, Environmental Engineer, Permits and Grants Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353–4761.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This supplemental information section is organized as follows:

A. What Is the Purpose of This Document?

We are conditionally approving Ohio's PSD program into the SIP. The public comment period for the June 29, 2001, notice of proposed rulemaking closed on July 30, 2001. One comment was received in favor of the conditional approval action. If Ohio fails to timely submit the materials discussed above within one year of EPA's final conditional approval, the final conditional approval will automatically convert to a disapproval.

B. Who Is Affected by This Action?

Because the fully approved PSD program will be similar to the PSD program that OEPA already operates under delegated authority, air pollution sources will generally not be affected by this action. However, persons wishing to appeal PSD permits will have to file their appeals with OEPA under the SIP-approved program, rather than with EPA's Environmental Appeals Board as they have been doing under the delegated PSD program.

C. What Is the History of Ohio's PSD Program?

OEPA submitted its first permitting SIP to EPA on January 31, 1972, and submitted replacement regulations on June 6, 1973. These regulations provided requirements, such as best available technology, that were meant to be uniformly applied throughout the state.

The Clean Air Act (CAA) Amendments of 1977 required states to go further than uniformly applied regulations. The Amendments provided for the designation of areas within a state as ''attainment'' or ''nonattainment.'' An ''attainment'' area meets the NAAQS. A ''nonattainment'' area does not meet the NAAQS.