

EPA APPROVED REGULATIONS IN THE TEXAS SIP—Continued

State citation	Title/Subject	State approval/Submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
*	*	*	*	*
Subchapter B—New Source Review Permits				
Division 1—Permit Application				
*	*	*	*	*
Section 116.112	Distance Limitations	12/18/02	September 30, 2003	
*	*	*	*	*

[FR Doc. 03–24553 Filed 9–29–03; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 290–0419c; FRL–7565–4]

Interim Final Determination That State Has Corrected a Deficiency in the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Interim final determination.

SUMMARY: EPA is making an interim final determination to stay and/or defer imposition of sanctions based on a proposed approval of revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) published elsewhere in today’s **Federal Register**. The revisions concern SJVUAPCD Rule 4901.

DATES: This interim final determination is effective on September 30, 2003. However, comments will be accepted until October 30, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, or e-mail to steckel.andrew@epa.gov, or submit comments at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

You can inspect a copy of the submitted rule revisions 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 revisions 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.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1990 East Gettysburg Street, Fresno, CA 93726.

A copy of the rule may also be available via the Internet at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/drdb/drdbtxt.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: Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 947–4118 or petersen.alfred@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On February 7, 2002 (67 FR 5725), we published a limited approval and limited disapproval of SJVUAPCD Rule 4901 as adopted locally on July 15, 1993 and submitted by the State on December 10, 1993. We based our limited disapproval action on deficiencies in the submittal. This disapproval action started a sanctions clock for imposition of offset sanctions 18 months after March 11, 2002 and highway sanctions 6 months later, pursuant to section 179 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and our regulations at 40 CFR 52.31.

On July 17, 2003, SJVUAPCD adopted revisions to Rule 4901 that were intended to correct the deficiencies identified in our limited disapproval action. On August 19, 2003, the State submitted these revisions to EPA. In the Proposed Rules section of today’s **Federal Register**, we have proposed approval of this submittal because we

believe it corrects the deficiencies identified in our February 7, 2002 disapproval action. Based on today’s proposed approval, we are taking this final rulemaking action, effective on publication, to stay and/or defer imposition of sanctions that were triggered by our February 7, 2002 limited disapproval.

EPA is providing the public with an opportunity to comment on this stay/deferral of sanctions. If comments are submitted that change our assessment described in this final determination and the proposed full approval of revised SJVUAPCD Rule 4901, we intend to take subsequent final action to reimpose sanctions pursuant to 40 CFR 51.31(d). If no comments are submitted that change our assessment, then all sanctions and sanction clocks will be permanently terminated on the effective date of a final rule approval.

II. EPA Action

EPA is making an interim final determination 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 EPA’s direct final action fully approving the State’s submittal becomes effective or until EPA takes action proposing or finally disapproving in whole or part the State submittal. If EPA’s 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 EPA has preliminarily determined that the State has corrected the deficiencies identified in EPA’s limited disapproval action on the previous version of this rule, relief from sanctions should be provided as quickly

as possible. Therefore, EPA is invoking the good cause exception under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) in not providing an opportunity for comment before this action takes effect (5 U.S.C. section 553(b)(3)). However, by this action EPA is providing the public with a chance to comment on EPA's determination after the effective date, and EPA will consider any comments received in determining whether to reverse such action.

We believe that notice-and-comment rulemaking before the effective date of this action is impracticable and contrary to the public interest. EPA has reviewed the State's submittal and, through its proposed action, is indicating that it is more likely than not that the State has corrected the deficiencies that started the sanctions clocks. Therefore, it is not in the public interest to initially impose sanctions or to keep applied sanctions in place when the State has most likely done all it can to correct the deficiencies that triggered the sanctions clocks. Moreover, it would be impracticable to go through notice-and-comment rulemaking on a finding that the State has corrected the deficiencies prior to the rulemaking approving the State's submittal. Therefore, EPA believes that it is necessary to use the interim final rulemaking process to stay and/or defer sanctions while EPA completes its rulemaking process on the approvability of the State's submittal. Moreover, with respect to the effective date of this action, EPA is invoking the good cause exception to the 30-day notice requirement of the APA, because the purpose of this notice is to relieve a restriction. See 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1).

III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action stays and/or defers federal sanctions and imposes no additional 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 is not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) because it is not a significant regulatory action.

The administrator certifies that this action 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.*).

This rule does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as

described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4).

This rule 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 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 rule 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.

The requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272) do not apply to this rule because it imposes no standards.

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 to Congress and the Comptroller General. However, section 808 provides that any rule for which the issuing agency for good cause finds 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). EPA has made such a good cause finding, including the reasons therefor, and established an effective date of September 30, 2003. 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).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States

Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by December 1, 2003. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purpose of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which 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, Intergovernmental regulations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: September 18, 2003.

Deborah Jordan,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 03-24771 Filed 9-29-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 290-0419a; FRL-7563-6]

Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified 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 San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revision concerns the emission of particulate matter (PM-10) from wood burning fireplaces and wood burning heaters. We are approving a local rule that regulates these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on December 1, 2003 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by October 30, 2003. 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: Send comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, or e-mail to steckel.andrew@epa.gov, or