

(2) To determine whether the first fee waiver requirement is met, FOI Offices will consider the following factors:

(i) The subject of the request: Whether the subject of the requested records concerns "the operations or activities of the government." The subject of the requested records must concern identifiable operations or activities of the Federal government, with a connection that is direct and clear, not remote.

(ii) The informative value of the information to be disclosed: Whether the disclosure is "likely to contribute" to an understanding of government operations or activities. The disclosable portions of the requested records must be meaningfully informative about government operations or activities in order to be "likely to contribute" to an increased public understanding of those operations or activities. The disclosure of information that already is in the public domain, in either a duplicative or a substantially identical form, would not be as likely to contribute to such understanding when nothing new would be added to the public's understanding.

(iii) The contribution to an understanding of the subject by the public is likely to result from disclosure: Whether disclosure of the requested information will contribute to "public understanding." The disclosure must contribute to the understanding of a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in the subject, as opposed to the individual understanding of the requester. A requester's expertise in the subject area and ability and intention to effectively convey information to the public will be considered. It will be presumed that a representative of the news media will satisfy this consideration.

(iv) The significance of the contribution to public understanding: Whether the disclosure is likely to contribute "significantly" to public understanding of government operations or activities. The public's understanding of the subject in question, as compared to the level of public understanding existing prior to the disclosure, must be enhanced by the disclosure to a significant extent. FOI Offices will not make value judgments about whether information that would contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government is "important" enough to be made public.

(3) To determine whether the second fee waiver requirement is met, FOI Offices will consider the following factors:

(i) The existence and magnitude of a commercial interest: Whether the requester has a commercial interest that would be furthered by the requested disclosure. FOI Offices will consider any commercial interest of the requester (with reference to the definition of "commercial use request" in paragraph (b)(1) of this section), or of any person on whose behalf the requester may be acting, that would be furthered by the requested disclosure. Requesters will be given an opportunity in the administrative process to provide explanatory information regarding this consideration.

(ii) The primary interest in disclosure: Whether any identified commercial interest of the requester is sufficiently large, in comparison with the public interest in disclosure, that disclosure is "primarily in the commercial interest of the requester." A fee waiver or reduction is justified where the public interest standard is satisfied and that public interest is greater in magnitude than that of any identified commercial interest in disclosure. FOI Offices ordinarily will presume that when a news media requester has satisfied the public interest standard, the public interest will be the interest primarily served by disclosure to that requester. Disclosure to data brokers or others who merely compile and market government information for direct economic return will not be presumed to primarily serve the public interest.

(4) When only some of the requested records satisfy the requirements for a waiver of fees, a waiver will be granted for only those records.

(5) Requests for the waiver or reduction of fees must address the factors listed in paragraphs (k) (1)–(3) of this section, insofar as they apply to each request. FOI Offices will exercise their discretion to consider the cost-effectiveness of their investment of administrative resources in deciding whether to grant waivers or reductions of fees and will consult the appropriate EPA offices as needed. Requests for the waiver or reduction of fees must be submitted along with the request.

(6) When a fee waiver request is denied, EPA will do no further work on the request until it receives an assurance of payment or an appeal of the fee waiver adverse determination is made and a final appeal determination is made pursuant to § 2.104(j).

§ 2.108 Other rights and services.

Nothing in this subpart shall be construed to entitle any person, as a right, to any service or to the disclosure

of any record to which such person is not entitled under the FOIA.

[FR Doc. 02–28081 Filed 11–4–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA242–0373a; FRL–7395–8]

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

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District's (ICAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from Soil Decontamination Operations, Organic Solvent Degreasing Operations, and Organic Solvents. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on January 6, 2003 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by December 5, 2002. If we receive such comment, 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 94105–3901.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions and EPA's technical support documents (TSDs) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Room B–102, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., (Mail Code 6102T), Washington, DC 20460.
California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 "I" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, 150 South 9th Street, El Centro, California 92243–2850

A copy of the rules may also be available via the Internet at <http://>

www.arb.ca.gov/drdb/drdb1txt.htm. Please be advised that this is not an EPA website and may not contain the same version of the rule that was submitted to EPA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Terry McCall, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-3976.

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

Table of Contents

- I. The State’s Submittal
 - A. What Rules Did the State Submit?
 - B. Are There Other Versions of These Rules?
 - C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rules and Rule Revisions?
- II. EPA’s Evaluation and Action
 - A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rules?
 - B. Do the Rules Meet the Evaluation Criteria?
 - C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules

- D. Public Comment and Final Action
- III. Background Information
 - Why Were These Rules Submitted?
- IV. Administrative Requirements

I. The State’s Submittal

A. What Rules Did the State Submit?

Table 1 lists the rules we are approving with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
ICAPCD	412	Soil Decontamination Operations	01/16/01	10/30/01
ICAPCD	413	Organic Solvent Cleaning	01/16/01	10/30/01
ICAPCD	417	Organic Solvents	9/14/99	05/26/00

On January 18, 2002, for Rules 412 and 413, and on October 6, 2000 for Rule 417, these rule submittals were 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 These Rules?

There are no previous versions of Rules 412 and 413 SIP. The ICAPCD adopted earlier versions of Rule 417 and CARB submitted them to us on November 4, 1977 and October 15, 1979. We approved these versions of Rule 417 into the SIP on August 8, 1978 and January 1, 1981. The ICAPCD adopted revisions to the 1981 SIP-approved version of Rule 417 on September 14, 1999 and CARB submitted them to us on May 26, 2000. While we can act on only the most recently submitted version, we have reviewed materials provided with previous submittals.

C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rules and Rule Revisions?

Rule 412—Soil Decontamination Operations, establishes standards to reduce the emissions of VOC from soil that has been contaminated with organic materials, typically gasoline, jet fuel, or diesel fuel. The rule requires VOC emissions from contaminated soil (greater than 50 ppm VOC) to be controlled when the soil is being excavated.

Rule 413—Organic Solvent Degreasing Operations, applies to the operation of equipment using organic solvent in degreasing operations. The rule reduces emissions of reactive organic compounds (ROC) by establishing equipment standards and work practice procedures for cold cleaners and open top and conveyORIZED vapor degreasers.

Rule 417—Organic Solvents, applies to emissions of organic material from heated and unheated operations. Rule 417 reduces emissions of ozone precursor compounds from operations that are not currently regulated by other District rules. The TSDs have more information about Rules 412, 413 and 417.

II. EPA’s Evaluation and Action

A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rules?

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the Act), must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for major sources in nonattainment areas (see section 182(a)(2)(A)), and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). EPA has classified Imperial County a “transitional area” for attainment of the NAAQS for ozone (CAA section 185). Transitional areas are exempt from additional nonattainment requirements in CAA part D, subpart 2. The exemption will continue until EPA redesignates Imperial County as either attainment or nonattainment under CAA section 107(d)(4) (see 57 FR 113498, 13523–13527). The District is not exempt from the general nonattainment requirements in CAA part D, subpart 1.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to help evaluate specific enforceability and RACT requirements consistently include the following:

1. Portions of the proposed post-1987 ozone and carbon monoxide policy that concern RACT, 52 FR 45044, November 24, 1987.
2. “Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations,” EPA, May 25, 1988 (the Bluebook).
3. “Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule

Deficiencies,” EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001 (the Little Bluebook).

4. Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Solvent Metal Cleaning. EPA-450/2-77-022, November 1977.

5. Determination of Reasonably Available Control Technology and Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Organic Solvent Cleaning and Degreasing Operations. California Air Resources Board Guidance Document. July 18, 1991,

B. Do the Rules Meet the Evaluation Criteria?

We believe these rules are consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules

The TSD describes additional rule revisions that do not affect EPA’s current action but are recommended for the next time the local agency modifies the rules.

D. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving the submitted rules because we believe they fulfill all relevant requirements. We do not think anyone will object to this approval, so we are finalizing it without proposing it in advance. However, in the Proposed Rules section of this **Federal Register**, we are simultaneously proposing approval of the same submitted rules. If we receive adverse comments by December 5, 2002, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that the direct final approval will not take effect and we will address the comments in a subsequent final action

based on the proposal. If we do not receive timely adverse comments, the direct final approval will be effective without further notice on January 6, 2003. This will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP.

Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the

remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

III. Background Information

Why Were These Rules Submitted?

VOCs help produce ground-level ozone and smog, which harm human

health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control VOC emissions. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of these local agency VOC rules.

TABLE 2.—OZONE NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES

Date	Event
March 3, 1978	EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1977. 43 FR 8964; 40 CFR 81.305.
May 26, 1988	EPA notified Governors that parts of their SIPs were inadequate to attain and maintain the ozone standard and requested that they correct the deficiencies (EPA's SIP-Call). See section 110(a)(2)(H) of the pre-amended Act.
November 15, 1990	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted. Pub. L. 101-549, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.
May 15, 1991	Section 182(a)(2)(A) requires that ozone nonattainment areas correct deficient RACT rules by this date.

IV. 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. 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 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, "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, 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 SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP 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 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).

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 January 6, 2003. 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, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: September 30, 2002.

Keith Takata,

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 paragraphs (c)(279)(i)(A)(8) and (288)(i)(D) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *
(279) * * *
(i) * * *
(A) * * *

(8) Rule 417 adopted on September 14, 1999.

* * * * *

(288) * * *
(i) * * *

(D) Imperial County Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rules 412 and 413 adopted on January 16, 2001.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 02–28077 Filed 11–4–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[MS–200301(a); FRL–7404–2]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; State of Mississippi

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving the small Municipal Waste Combustion (MWC) units section 111(d) negative declaration submitted by the State of Mississippi. This negative declaration certifies that small MWC units subject to the requirements of section 111(d) and 129 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) do not exist in Mississippi.

DATE: This direct final rule will be effective January 6, 2003 unless EPA receives adverse comments by December 5, 2002. If adverse comments are received, EPA will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule in the **Federal Register** informing the public that the rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Joydeb Majumder, EPA Region 4, Air Toxics and Monitoring Branch, Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960.

Copies of documents relative to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the above-listed Region 4 location. The interested person wanting to examine this document should make an appointment with the office at least 24 hours in advance.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joydeb Majumder at (404) 562–9121 or Michele Notarianni at (404) 562–9031.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 111(d) of the CAA requires states to submit plans to control certain pollutants (designated pollutants) at existing facilities (designated facilities) whenever standards of performance have been established under section 111(d) for new sources of the same type, and EPA has established emissions guidelines for such existing sources. A designated pollutant is any pollutant for which no air quality criteria have been issued, and which is not included on a list published under section 108(a) or section 112(b)(1)(A) of the CAA, but emissions of which are subject to a standard of performance for new stationary sources.

The emissions guidelines for small MWC units were originally promulgated in December 1995 but were vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in March 1997. In response to the 1997 vacature, on August 30, 1999, EPA proposed to reestablish emission guidelines for small MWC units. On December 6, 2000 (65 FR 76378), EPA finalized the section 111(d) emission guidelines for existing small MWC units. The emission guidelines contained in this final rule are equivalent to the 1995 emission guidelines for small MWC units. The emission guidelines are codified at 40 CFR part 60, subpart BBBBB.

Subpart B of 40 CFR part 60 establishes procedures to be followed and requirements to be met in the development and submission of state plans for controlling designated pollutants. Part 62 of the CFR provides the procedural framework for the submission of these plans. When designated facilities are located in a state, a state must develop and submit a plan for the control of designated pollutant. However, 40 CFR 62.06 provides that if there are no existing sources of the designated pollutants in the state, the state may submit a letter of certification to that effect, or negative

declaration, in lieu of a plan. The negative declaration exempts the state from the requirements of subpart B for that designated pollutant. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

Final Action

The State of Mississippi has determined there is no existing source in the state of Mississippi subject to the small MWC units emission guidelines. Consequently, the state of Mississippi has submitted a letter of negative declaration certifying this fact. We are taking final action to approve this negative declaration.

The EPA is publishing this rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. However, in the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register** publication, EPA is publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve the SIP revision should adverse comments be filed. This rule will be effective January 6, 2003 without further notice unless the Agency receives adverse comments by December 5, 2002.

If the EPA receives such comments, then EPA will publish a document withdrawing the final rule and informing the public that the rule will not take effect. All public comments received will then be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period. Parties interested in commenting should do so at this time. If no such comments are received, the public is advised that this rule will be effective on January 6, 2003 and no further action will be taken on the proposed rule.

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. 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