

## Energy Effects

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under that Order because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

## Environment

We have considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that, under figure 2-1, paragraph 34(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. This rule fits paragraph 34(g) as it revises a Regulated Navigation Area. A "Categorical Exclusion Determination" is available in the docket for inspection or copying where indicated under ADDRESSES.

## List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

## PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191, 33 CFR 1.05-1(g), 6.04-1, 6.04-6, 160.5; 49 CFR 1.46.

2. From June 17, 2002 to March 30, 2003, amend § 165.165 to add paragraph (d)(10) to read as follows:

**§ 165.165 Regulated Navigation Area; Kill Van Kull Channel, Newark Bay Channel, South Elizabeth Channel, Elizabeth Channel, Port Newark Channel and New Jersey Pierhead Channel, New York and New Jersey**

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) \* \* \*

(10) *Bergen Point West Reach*. In addition to the requirements in paragraphs (d)(1) through (d)(9) of this section, the following provisions apply

to vessels transiting in or through Work Areas (4) and (5):

(i) *Tug requirements*. All vessels 350 feet in length, or greater, excluding tugs with tows, require one assist tug. All vessels 700 feet in length, or greater, excluding tugs with tows, require two assist tugs. All vessels 900 feet in length, or greater, excluding tugs with tows, require three assist tugs.

(ii) *Tidal current restrictions*. Vessels 700 feet in length, or greater, are restricted to movements within one hour before or after slack water, as measured from the Bergen Point current station.

(iii) *Astern tows*. Hawser tows are not permitted unless an assist tug accompanies the tow.

(iv) *Sustained winds from 20 to 34 knots*. In sustained winds from 20 to 34 knots:

(A) cargo ships and tankers in ballast may not transit Work Areas (4) and (5);

(B) tugs pushing or towing alongside tank barges 350 feet in length, or greater, in light condition, require an assist tug in Work Areas (4) and (5).

(v) *Sustained winds greater than 34 knots*. In sustained winds greater than 34 knots, vessels 300 gross tons or greater and all tugs with tows are prohibited from transiting Work Areas (4) and (5).

Dated: June 17, 2002.

**V.S. Crea,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, First Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 02-15967 Filed 6-24-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-15-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[CA261-0343a; FRL-7220-4]

### Revisions 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 revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from metal parts and products coating operations. We are

approving Rule 4603; a 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 August 26, 2002, without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by July 25, 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 document (TSD) 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; and,

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

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jerald S. Wamsley, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 947-4111.

### 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 is the purpose of the submitted or rule revisions?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?
  - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. EPA recommendations to further improve the rule.
  - D. 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 dates that it was adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULE

Local Agency	Rule #	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SJVUAPCD .....	4603	Surface Coating of Metal Parts and Products .....	12/20/01	02/20/02

On March 15, 2002, this rule 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?*

On October 22, 2001, EPA reviewed and gave a limited approval and limited disapproval to Rule 4603 (see 66 FR 53340) when incorporating the September 21, 2000 version of Rule 4603 within the SIP. CARB has made no intervening submittals of Rule 4603.

*C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted or Rule Revisions?*

SJVUAPCD's December 20, 2001 amendments to Rule 4603 served two purposes. The first purpose was to remedy the deficiencies noted in our October 2001 limited approval and limited disapproval. These remedies will be discussed in the following section II.B. The second purpose was to incorporate organic solvent use, disposal, and storage requirements within the rule. These changes are summarized below.

- The rule's applicability statement was amended to include organic solvent cleaning as well as the storage and disposal of organic solvents and waste solvent materials and twenty-nine new definitions were added to the rule.
- An exemption for stripping cured coating, adhesives, and inks was added.
- Evaporative loss minimization requirements will sunset on November 14, 2002 to be replaced with organic solvent cleaning, storage, and disposal requirements.
- High volume low pressure spray application requirements were defined.
- Solvent compliance statement requirements were added.
- Test methods for determining capture efficiency, coating viscosity, and destruction efficiency were updated and test methods were added for determining vapor pressure.

The TSD has more information about these amendments to Rule 4603.

**II. EPA's Evaluation and Action**

*A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rule?*

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). The SJVUAPCD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so Rule 4603 must fulfill RACT.

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; Clarification to Appendix D of November 24, 1987 **Federal Register** Document," (Blue Book), notice of availability published in the May 25, 1988 **Federal Register**.

3. "Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources Volume VI: Surface Coating of Miscellaneous Metal Parts and Products," USEPA, June 1978, EPA-450/2-78-015.

*B. Does the Rule Meet the Evaluation Criteria?*

We believe the rule is consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations.

Several portions of the September 21, 2000 version of Rule 4603 were inconsistent with EPA policy and guidance. On October 22, 2001, EPA reviewed and gave a limited approval and limited disapproval to Rule 4603 when incorporating the September 21, 2000 version of Rule 4603 within the SIP. CARB's February 20, 2002 submittal is in part to cure the deficiencies noted in our limited disapproval. SJVUAPCD has corrected these deficiencies in the manner described below.

—The deficiency at section 4.1 has been remedied by removing section 4.1 and adding section 4.2. Section 4.2 is consistent with EPA policy concerning noncompliant coating use.

—The viscosity limits are accompanied by an adequate test method for determining compliance with the rule.

—SJVUAPCD staff provided an analysis showing that the excess VOC emissions allowed by using an 880 gr/l versus a 420 gr/l emissions limit for the solid film lubricant specialty category represented a de minimis amount: less than 1% of the total metal parts and product source category. While SJVUAPCD's methodology did not strictly follow EPA's guidance on the subject, given the few sources using solid film lubricant and the small amount of related VOC emissions, the methodology was adequate for making the de minimis demonstration. Furthermore, the SJVUAPCD resolved to monitor VOC emissions from the solid film specialty category and take appropriate action to reduce these emissions should they exceed a de minimis amount.

In conclusion, SJVUAPCD corrected the three deficiencies that provoked our earlier limited disapproval. The TSD has more detailed information on our evaluation.

*C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rule*

We have no recommendations.

*D. Public Comment and Final Action*

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving the submitted rule because we believe it fulfills 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 rule. If we receive adverse comments by July 25, 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 August 26, 2002. This will incorporate this rule into the federally enforceable SIP.

**III. Background Information***Why Was the Rule 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 August 26, 2002. 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: May 9, 2002.

**Alexis Strauss,**

*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)(294)(i)(A)(2) to read as follows:

**§ 52.220 Identification of plan.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*  
 (294) \* \* \*  
 (i) \* \* \*  
 (A) \* \* \*

(2) Rule 4603 adopted on April 11, 1991, and amended on December 20, 2001.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 02-15871 Filed 6-24-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[WI104-02-7334; FRL-7226-8]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Excess Volatile Organic Compound Emissions Fee Rule

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is approving a rule that revises Wisconsin's State Implementation Plan (SIP) for ozone. The rule requires major stationary sources of volatile organic compounds (VOC) in the Milwaukee nonattainment area to pay a fee to the state if the area fails to attain the one-hour national ambient air quality standard for ozone by 2007. The fee must be paid beginning in 2008 and in each calendar year thereafter, until the area is redesignated to attainment of the one-hour ozone standard. Wisconsin submitted this rule on December 22, 2000, as part of the state's demonstration of attainment for the one-hour ozone standard. EPA proposed approval of this SIP revision on March 6, 2002.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This rule is effective on August 26, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the SIP revision and EPA's analysis are available for inspection at the following location: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. (Please telephone Kathleen D'Agostino at (312) 886-1767 before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kathleen D'Agostino, Regulation Development Section (AR-18J), Air Programs Branch, Air and Radiation Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-1767.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Table of Contents

- I. What Action Is EPA Taking?
- II. Did Anyone Comment on the Proposed Approval?
- III. What Administrative Requirements Did EPA Consider?

### I. What Action Is EPA Taking?

The EPA is approving a rule that revises Wisconsin's ozone SIP. The rule requires major stationary sources of VOC in the Milwaukee nonattainment area to pay a fee to the state if the area fails to attain the one-hour national ambient air quality standard for ozone by 2007. The fee must be paid beginning in 2008 and in each calendar year thereafter, until the area is redesignated to attainment of the one-hour ozone standard.

The EPA is approving this rule because it is consistent with the requirements of the Clean Air Act. This approval finalizes EPA's March 6, 2002 proposed approval.

### II. Did Anyone Comment on the Proposed Approval?

We received no comments on our March 6, 2002 proposal to approve Wisconsin's excess emissions fee rule.

### III. What Administrative Requirements Did EPA Consider?

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 an unfunded mandate, nor does it 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.

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTA), 15 U.S.C. 272 note, requires federal agencies to use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus to carry out policy objectives, so long as such standards are not inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impracticable. In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Absent a prior existing requirement for the state to use voluntary consensus standards, EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use such standards, and it would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Act. Therefore, the requirements of section 12(d) of the NTTA do not apply.

As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), in issuing Wisconsin's rule in today's notice, 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, and has determined that the rule's requirements do not constitute a taking. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the