

(1) *Notifying the Director.* If the Warden suspends operation of the rules, the Warden must, within eight hours of the suspension, notify the Director by providing written documentation which:

- (i) Describes the institutional emergency that threatens human life or safety; and
- (ii) Sets forth reasons why suspension of the rules is necessary to handle the institutional emergency.

(2) *Submitting certification to Director of continuing emergency.* 30 days after the Warden suspends operation of the rules, and every 30 days thereafter, the Warden must submit to the Director written certification that an institutional emergency threatening human life or safety and warranting suspension of the rules continues to exist. If the Warden does not submit this certification to the Director, or if the Director so orders at any time, the suspension of the rules will cease.

[FR Doc. 03-9310 Filed 4-15-03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-05-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 241-0392; FRL-7471-4]

Revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan and California State Implementation Plan, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department and Bay Area Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department portion of the Arizona State Implementation Plan (SIP) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District portion of the California SIP. This action was proposed in the **Federal Register** on June 5, 2002, and concerns volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from solvent cleaning operations. Under authority of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act), this action simultaneously approves a local rule that regulates these emission sources and directs Arizona and California to correct rule deficiencies.
EFFECTIVE DATE: This rule is effective on May 16, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You can inspect copies of the administrative record for this action at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

- Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.
- 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.
- Maricopa County environmental Services Department, Air Quality Division, 1001 North Central Avenue, Suite 201, Phoenix, AZ 85004.
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al Petersen, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 947-4118.

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

I. Proposed Action

On June 5, 2002 (67 FR 38630), EPA proposed a limited approval and limited disapproval of the following rules that were submitted for incorporation into the Arizona and California SIPs.

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule #	Rule title	Revised	Submitted
MCESD	331	Solvent Cleaning	04/07/99	08/04/99
BAAQMD	8-16	Solvent Cleaning Operations	09/15/98	03/28/00

We proposed a limited approval because we determined that these rules improve the SIP and are largely consistent with the relevant CAA requirements. We simultaneously proposed a limited disapproval because some rule provisions conflict with section 110 and part D of the Act. The provisions in MCESD rule 331 include the following:

- The provisions of this rule exempt sources that are not necessarily covered by another federally approved rule.
- Subsections of this rule provide methods of determining capture efficiency, but do not refer to EPA's January 9, 1995, guidance document, *Guidelines for Determining Capture Efficiency*, describing calculation procedures.
- Sections II and III of the appendix to this rule do not clarify which and

how standards are adjusted for boiling point.

- Section I-6 of the appendix to this rule raise the threshold limit from 10.75 sq ft to 13 sq ft for additional control without adequately justifying this relaxation.

The provisions in BAAQMD rule 8-16 include the following:

- Section 8-16-501.2 allows facility-wide make-up solvent recording on an annual basis, which is not sufficient to ensure that the rule is enforceable pursuant to CAA section 110(a)(2)(A).
- Rule 8-16 contains a number of incorrect section references that may result in enforcement ambiguity.

Our proposed action contains more information on the basis for this rulemaking and on our evaluation of the submittal.

II. Public Comments and EPA Responses

EPA's proposed action provided a 30-day public comment period. During this period, we did not receive any comments.

III. EPA Action

No comments were submitted that change our assessment of the rules as described in our proposed action. Therefore, as authorized in sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the CAA, EPA is finalizing a limited approval of the submitted rules. This action incorporates the submitted rules into the Arizona and California SIPs, respectively, including those provisions identified as deficient. As authorized under section 110(k)(3), EPA is simultaneously finalizing a limited disapproval of the rules. As a result,

sanctions will be imposed unless EPA approves subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rule deficiencies within 18 months of the effective date of this action. These sanctions will be imposed under section 179 of the CAA according to 40 CFR 52.31. In addition, EPA must promulgate a federal implementation plan (FIP) under section 110(c) unless we approve subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rule deficiencies within 24 months. Note that the submitted rules have been adopted by the MCESD and BAAQMD, and EPA's final limited disapproval does not prevent the local agencies from enforcing them.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

A. Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866, entitled "Regulatory Planning and Review."

B. Paperwork Reduction Act

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.*)

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co., v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255-66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Under sections 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

E. Executive Order 13132, Federalism

Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Orders 12612 (Federalism) and 12875 (Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership). Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that 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." Under Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism

implications and that preempts State law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

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, 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. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this rule.

F. Executive Order 13175, Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

Executive Order 13175, entitled "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments" (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications." This final rule does not have tribal implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175. It will not have substantial direct effects on tribal governments, 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. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule.

G. Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), applies to any rule that: (1) is determined to be "economically significant" as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency.

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

H. Executive Order 13211, Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

This rule 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 under Executive Order 12866.

I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 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 EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to this action. Today's action does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

J. Congressional Review Act

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. section 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. section 804(2). This rule will be effective May 16, 2003.

K. Petitions for Judicial Review

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 June 16, 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, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: March 5, 2003.

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 D—Arizona

■ 2. Section 52.120 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(94)(i)(G) to read as follows:

§ 52.120 Identification of plan.

* * * * *
 (c) * * *
 (94) * * *
 (i) * * *
 (G) Rule 331, revised on April 7, 1999.
 * * * * *

Subpart F—California

■ 3. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(277)(i)(C)(3) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *
 (c) * * *
 (277) * * *
 (i) * * *
 (C) * * *
 (3) Rule 8–16, adopted on March 7, 1979 and amended on September 15, 1998.
 * * * * *

[FR Doc. 03–9041 Filed 4–15–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 70

[DC–T5–2003–01a; FRL–7483–6]

Clean Air Act Approval of Operating Permits Program Revision; District of Columbia

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve a revision to the District of Columbia's Clean Air Act title V operating permit program, pertaining to requirements for public notification of permit actions. In a notice of deficiency (NOD) published in the **Federal Register** on December 21, 2001, EPA notified the District of Columbia of EPA's finding that the District's provisions for providing public notification of permitting actions did not fully comply with the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and its implementing regulations. Direct final approval of this program revision resolves the deficiency identified in the NOD and the District of Columbia maintains final full approval of the Clean Air Act title V operating permits program.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This rule is effective on June 2, 2003 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse written comment by May 16, 2003. If EPA receives such comments, it 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: Written comments may be mailed to Kristeen Gaffney, Acting Chief, Permits and Technical Assessment Branch, Mailcode 3AP11, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 and District of Columbia Department of Health, Air Quality Division, 51 N Street, NE., Washington, DC 20002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paresh R. Pandya, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III (3AP11), 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103 at (215) 814–2167, or by e-mail at pandya.perry@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The EPA granted final interim approval of the District of Columbia's operating permit program on August 7, 1995 (60 FR 40101). The District amended its operating permit program to address deficiencies identified in the interim approval action. The EPA proposed full approval of the District of Columbia's operating permit program in the **Federal Register** on October 16,