

122° 02'35" W; thence to latitude 38° 03'50" N and longitude 122° 01'15" W; thence to latitude 38° 03'43" N and longitude 122° 00'28" W; thence to latitude 38° 03'41" N and longitude 122° 00'03" W; thence to latitude 38° 03'18" N and longitude 121° 59'31" W, and along the shoreline back to the beginning point.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, entering, transiting through or anchoring in this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, San Francisco Bay, or his designated representative.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Patrol Commander on scene on VHF-FM channel 13 or 16 or the Captain of the Port at telephone number 415-399-3547 to seek permission to transit the area. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or his or her designated representative.

(c) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231 and 50 U.S.C. 191, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

(d) *Enforcement.* The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the security zone by local law enforcement and the MOTCO police as necessary.

(e) *Effective Dates.* This section becomes effective at 7 a.m. PDT on October 1, 2003, and terminates at 11:59 p.m. PST on October 31, 2003.

Dated: September 25, 2003.

**Gerald M. Swanson,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, San Francisco Bay, California.*

[FR Doc. 03-25893 Filed 10-10-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-15-P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

[CA 253-0405a; FRL-7567-2]

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District and Santa Barbara 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 El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) and Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions from biomass boilers and from large water heaters and small boilers. 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 December 15, 2003 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by November 13, 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:** Mail or e-mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105; [steckel.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:steckel.andrew@epa.gov).

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:

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.

El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District, 2850 Fairlane Court, Building C, Placerville, CA 95667.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, 26 Castilian Drive, Suite B-23, Goleta, CA 93117.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX; (415) 947-4118.

**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 Are the Purposes of the Submitted Rule 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. Public Comment and Final Action
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. The State's Submittal**

*A. What Rules Did the State Submit?*

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

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule number	Rule title	Adopted or amended	Submitted
EDCAPCD .....	232	Biomass Boilers .....	Amended 09/25/01	11/09/01
SBCAPCD .....	360	Emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen from Large Water Heaters and Small Boilers.	Adopted 10/17/02	01/21/03

On January 15, 2002 and February 7, 2003, respectively, these 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?*

EPA proposed a limited approval and limited disapproval on May 5, 1999 (64 FR 24117) of Rule 232, Biomass Boilers (adopted on October 18, 1994, submitted on October 20, 1994). The proposed action was not finalized, but the deficiency cited concerning the lack of a compliance schedule is addressed

in this current direct final action. The EDCAPCD also amended the October 18, 1994 version on January 23, 2001 and CARB submitted it to us on May 23, 2001. No action was taken on this submittal. While we can act on only the most recent submittal, we reviewed the information in this previous submittal.

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

NO<sub>x</sub> helps produce ground-level ozone, smog and particulate matter, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control NO<sub>x</sub> emissions.

The purpose of the revisions to EDCAPCD Rule 232 is to remedy a deficiency in the October 18, 1994 version of the rule.

The purpose of submitted SBCAPCD Rule 360 is to regulate NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from large water heaters and small boilers.

## 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 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 EDCAPCD regulates a severe ozone nonattainment area. *See* 40 CFR part 81. Rule 232 must fulfill the requirements of RACT. The SBCAPCD regulates an ozone maintenance attainment area. Rule 360 must fulfill the requirements of RACT.

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

- *Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans*, U.S. EPA, 40 CFR part 51.
- *Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations*, EPA (May 25, 1988) (the Bluebook).
- *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"), U.S. EPA, 57 FR 55620 (November 25, 1992).
- *Cost-Effective Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT)*, U.S. EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (March 16, 1994).
- *Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule Deficiencies*, U.S. EPA Region IX (August 21, 2001) (the Little Bluebook).
- *Determination of Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) and Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT) for Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters,*

California Air Resources Board (CARB) (July 18, 1991).

- *Alternative Control Techniques Document—NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions from Utility Boilers*, EPA-453/R-94-023 (March 1994).

### 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. We also believe that Rule 232 corrects the previously identified deficiency regarding the lack of a compliance schedule in the rule. The TSDs have more information on our evaluation.

### C. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the CAA, EPA is fully approving the submitted rules because we believe they fulfill all relevant requirements. We do not think anyone will object to this, so we are finalizing the approval 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 November 13, 2003, 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 December 15, 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. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

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 (Pub. L. 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 December 15, 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, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: September 3, 2003.

**Wayne Nastri,**

*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)(296)(i)(A)(2) and (312)(i)(B) to read as follows:

#### § 52.220 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(296) \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(A) \* \* \*

(2) Rule 232, adopted on October 18, 1994 and amended on September 25, 2001.

\* \* \* \* \*

(312) \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(B) Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 360, adopted on October 17, 2002.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 03-25800 Filed 10-10-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-U**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[KY 135—200337(a); FRL-7572-9]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Kentucky: Source-Specific Revision for Marathon Ashland Petroleum Marine Repair Terminal

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is approving a source-specific revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. This revision requires the Marathon Ashland Petroleum Marine Repair Terminal (MAPMRT) to implement volatile organic compound (VOC) reasonably available control technology (RACT) for its barge cleaning operation as part of a contingency measure implemented for the Huntington-Ashland 1-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area.

**DATES:** This direct final rule is effective December 15, 2003 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comment by November 13, 2003. If adverse comment is received, EPA will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule in the **Federal Register** and inform the public that the rule will not take effect.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted by mail to: Michele Notarianni, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Comments may also be submitted electronically, or through hand delivery/courier. Please follow the detailed instructions described in **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** (sections VI. B.1. through 3.).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michele Notarianni, Air Planning

Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Phone: (404) 562-9031. E-mail: [notarianni.michele@epa.gov](mailto:notarianni.michele@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Table of Contents

- I. What is Today's Action?
- II. Why Must Kentucky Adopt an Ozone Contingency Measure for the Huntington-Ashland Maintenance Area?
- III. What Contingency Measure was Adopted for the Area?
- IV. What VOC Control System is MAPMRT Using?
- V. What is EPA's Final Action?
- VI. General Information
- VII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. What Is Today's Action?

EPA is approving a source-specific SIP revision to the Kentucky SIP, submitted by the Commonwealth of Kentucky on October 7, 2001, which requires MAPMRT to implement vapor collection and control equipment with an overall efficiency of at least 90 percent for its barge cleaning operation. This revision satisfies a requirement for Kentucky to implement a contingency measure for the Huntington-Ashland 1-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area and meets EPA's VOC RACT requirements for major VOC sources. The Huntington-Ashland 1-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area consists of: Boyd County and a portion of Greenup County, Kentucky; and Cabell County and Wayne County, West Virginia. MAPMRT is located in Boyd County, Kentucky, within the maintenance area. MAPMRT is a major VOC point source because the source's barge cleaning operation has the potential to emit more than 100 tons per year of VOC.

#### II. Why Must Kentucky Adopt an Ozone Contingency Measure for the Huntington-Ashland Maintenance Area?

During calendar year 1998, a Huntington, West Virginia ozone monitor recorded five exceedances of the 1-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) during a period when the 1-hour NAAQS was revoked by EPA. The 1-hour ozone maintenance plan for the Kentucky portion of the Huntington-Ashland maintenance area requires Kentucky to adopt one or more contingency measures within six months of a monitored violation. This six-month time period is not applicable in this case, since the initial violation occurred in 1998, during a time period in which EPA had revoked the 1-hour ozone