

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), because it merely approves 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. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995, 15 U.S.C. 272 note, 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. The VCS are inapplicable to this action, because this action does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), 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. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications 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.*).

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 action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2). This rule will be effective November 9, 2001.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the 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, Nitrogen Oxides, Ozone, Volatile Organic Compounds.

Dated: September 26, 2001.

**Jerri Anne Garl,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

For the reasons stated in the preamble, 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 YY—Wisconsin

2. Section 52.2585 is amended by adding paragraph (o) to read as follows:

##### § 52.2585 Control Strategy: Ozone.

\* \* \* \* \*

(o) Approval—On December 11, 1997, Wisconsin submitted a post-1996 Rate Of Progress plan for the Milwaukee-Racine ozone nonattainment area as a requested revision to the Wisconsin State Implementation Plan. Supplements to the December 11, 1997 plan were submitted on August 5, 1999, January 31, 2000, March 3, 2000, and February 21, 2001 establishing the post-1996 ROP plan for the Milwaukee-Racine ozone nonattainment area. This plan reduces ozone precursor emissions by 9 percent from 1990 baseline emissions by November 15, 1999.

[FR Doc. 01-25259 Filed 10-9-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[CA 242-0292c; FRL-7067-2]

#### Interim Final Determination That the State of California Has Corrected Deficiencies and Stay of Sanctions, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

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

**ACTION:** Interim final determination.

**SUMMARY:** Elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**, EPA has published a direct final rulemaking fully approving the State of California's submittal of a revision to the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). We have also published a proposed rulemaking. If a person submits adverse comments on our direct final action, we will withdraw our direct final rule and will consider any comments received before taking final action on the State's submittal. Based on the full approval, we are making an interim final determination by this action that the State has corrected the deficiencies for which a sanctions clock began on February 14, 2000. This action will stay the imposition of the offset sanction and defer the imposition of the highway sanction. Although this action is effective upon publication, we will take comment. If no comments are received on our approval of the State's submittal and on our interim final determination, the direct final action published in today's **Federal Register** will also finalize our determination that the State has corrected the deficiencies that started the sanctions clock. If comments are received on our approval or on this interim final determination, we will publish a final rule taking into consideration any comments received.

**DATES:** This interim final determination is effective October 10, 2001. Although this action is effective upon publication, we will take comments which must be received by November 9, 2001. If comments are received on our approval or on this interim final determination, we will publish a final rule taking into consideration any comments received.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

You can inspect copies of the submitted rule revision and EPA's technical support document (TSD) at

our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted rule revision and TSD at the following locations:

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.

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Drive, Ventura, CA 93003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX; (415) 744-1135.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to EPA.

## I. Background

On October 13, 1995, the State of California submitted a revision to the VCAPCD portion of the SIP, which we disapproved in part on January 13, 2000. See 65 FR 2052. Our disapproval action started an 18-month clock beginning on February 14, 2000 for the imposition of one sanction (followed by a second sanction 6 months later) and a 24-month clock for promulgation of a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP). The State subsequently submitted revised SIP rules on December 11, 2000. We have taken direct final action on this submittal pursuant to our modified direct final policy set forth at 59 FR 24054 (May 10, 1994). In the Rules and Regulations section of today's **Federal Register**, we have issued a direct final full approval of the State of California's submittal of its SIP revision. In addition, in the Proposed Rules section of today's **Federal Register**, we have proposed full approval of the State's submittal. Based on the direct final full approval set forth in today's **Federal Register**, we believe that it is more likely than not that the State has corrected the original disapproval deficiencies. Therefore, we are taking this final rulemaking action, effective on publication, finding that the State has corrected the deficiencies. However, we are also providing the public with an opportunity to comment on this final action. If, based on any comments on this action and any comments on our direct final full approval of the State's submittal, we determine that the State's submittal is not fully approvable and this final action was inappropriate, we will either propose or take final action finding that the State has not corrected the original disapproval deficiencies. As

appropriate, we will also issue an interim final determination or a final determination that the deficiency has been corrected.

This action does not stop the sanctions clock that started for this area on February 14, 2000. However, this action will stay the imposition of the offsets sanction and will defer the imposition of the highway sanction. If our direct final action fully approving the State's submittal becomes effective, such action will permanently stop the sanction clock and will permanently lift any imposed, stayed or deferred sanction. If we must withdraw the direct final action based on adverse comments and we subsequently determine that the State, in fact, did not correct the disapproval deficiencies, we will also determine that the State did not correct the deficiencies and the sanctions consequences described in the sanctions rule will apply. See 59 FR 39832 (August 4, 1994), codified at 40 CFR 52.31.

## II. EPA Action

We are taking interim final action finding that the State has corrected the disapproval deficiencies that started the sanctions clock. Based on this action, imposition of the offset sanction will be stayed and imposition of the highway sanction will be deferred until our direct final action fully approving the State's submittal becomes effective or until we take action proposing or finally disapproving in whole or part the State submittal. If our direct final action fully approving the State submittal becomes effective, at that time any sanctions clocks will be permanently stopped and any imposed, stayed, or deferred sanctions will be permanently lifted.

Because we have preliminarily determined that the State has an approvable submittal, relief from sanctions should be provided as quickly as possible. Therefore, we are invoking the good cause exception to the 30-day notice requirement of the Administrative Procedure Act because the purpose of this notice is to relieve a restriction. See 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1).

## III. Administrative Requirements

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. This action merely stays and defers federal sanctions. 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

only stays an imposed sanction and defers the imposition of another, 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). For the same reason, 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), because it merely stays a sanction and defers another one, 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 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

This rule does not contain 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. As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), 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. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications 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.*).

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. However, section 808 provides that any rule for which the issuing agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefor in the rule) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or

contrary to the public interest, shall take effect at such time as the agency promulgating the rule determines. 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 October 10, 2001. 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 rule 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, Intergovernmental regulations, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping.

Dated: September 17, 2001.

**Jane Diamond,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 01-25254 Filed 10-9-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[CA 242-0292a; FRL-7067-3]

### Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking direct final action to approve a revision to the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions from boilers, steam generators, and process heaters. We are approving a local rule under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on December 10, 2001 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by November 9, 2001. If we receive such comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this rule will not take effect.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

You can inspect a copy of the submitted rule revision and EPA's technical support document (TSD) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see a copy of the submitted rule revision and TSD at the following locations:

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.

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
VCAPCD .....	74.15.1	Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters .....	6/16/00	12/11/00

On February 8, 2001, this submittal was found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

#### *B. Are There Other Versions of This Rule?*

We gave a limited approval and limited disapproval to a version of Rule 74.15.1 on January 13, 2000 (65 FR 2052).

#### *C. What Are the Purposes of the Submitted Rule Revisions?*

The purposes of the revisions contained in Rule 74.15.1 are to:

- Remedy the deficiency cited in the limited approval and limited

disapproval of January 13, 2000 (65 FR 2052).

- Delete obsolete dates for increments of progress and compliance.

## II. EPA's Evaluation and Actions

### *A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rule?*

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the CAA), must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for major sources of NO<sub>x</sub> in ozone nonattainment areas (see section 182(f) and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). The VCAPCD regulates a severe ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so Rule 74.15.1 must fulfill the requirements of RACT. Guidance and

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Drive, Ventura, CA 93003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX; (415) 744-1135.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to EPA.

#### **Table of Contents**

- I. The State's Submittal
  - A. What rule did the State submit?
  - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
  - C. What are the purposes of the submitted rule revisions?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Actions
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?
  - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. Public comment and final action.
- III. Background Information
  - Why was this rule submitted?
- IV. Administrative Requirements

### **I. The State's Submittal**

#### *A. What Rule Did the State Submit?*

Table 1 lists the rule we are approving with the date that it was adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

policy documents that we used to define specific enforceability and RACT requirements include the following:

- *Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations; Clarification to Appendix D of November 24, 1987 Federal Register Document*, (Blue Book), notice of availability published in the May 25, 1988 **Federal Register**.

- *Guidance Document for Correcting VOC Rule Deficiencies, U.S. EPA Region IX and California Air Resources Board* (April 1991).

- *State Implementation Plans; Nitrogen Oxides Supplement to the General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990* (the "NO<sub>x</sub> Supplement to the General Preamble"),