

Evaluation Section, 1001 "I" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814;

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, 24580 Silver Cloud Court, Monterey, CA 93940; and, 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:

Jerald S. Wamsley, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-4111.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposal addresses the following local rules: MBUAPCD 417-Storage of Organic Liquids and SJVUAPCD 4311-Flares. In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, we are approving these local rules in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe these SIP revisions are not controversial. If we receive adverse comments, however, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in subsequent action based on this proposed rule. Please note that if we receive adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, we may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is

planned. For further information, please see the direct final action.

Dated: December 6, 2002.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 03-4382 Filed 2-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 264-0388; FRL-7455-1]

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

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) emissions from stationary gas turbines. We are proposing to approve a local rule to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by March 28, 2003.

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: California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 "I" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814. Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Drive, Ventura, California 93003.

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 Web site and may not contain the same version of the rule that was submitted to EPA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Charnjit Bhullar, EPA Region IX, (415)972-3960.

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 rule revisions?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is EPA evaluating this rule?
 - B. Does this rule meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. Public comment and final action.
- III. Background Information
 - Why was this rule submitted?
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. The State's Submittal

A. What Rule Did the State Submit?

Table 1 lists the rule addressed by this proposal with the date that it was adopted by local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local Agency	Rule #	Rule Title	Adopted	Submitted
VCAPCD	74.23	Stationary Gas Turbines	01/08/02	03/15/02

On May 7, 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?

VCAPCD adopted an earlier version of this rule on October 10, 1995, and CARB submitted it to us on March 26, 1996. We published approval of this previous version of rule 74.23 into the SIP on January 22, 1997 (14 FR 3220). VCAPCD

adopted revisions to the SIP-approved version on June 12, 2001 and CARB submitted to us on October 30, 2001. While we can only act on the most recently submitted version, we have reviewed material associated with previous submittals.

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

Rule 74.23 applies to all stationary gas turbines with a rating equal to or greater than 0.3 megawatts (MW) output and operated on gaseous and/or liquid fuel.

Stationary gas turbines in Ventura County are used as cogeneration units to generate electricity and supply heat for industrial processes, or as electric generators, and/or as primemovers of equipment used in the oil production industry. The primary purpose of the rule revisions is to slightly modify two emission limits.

The TSD has more information about this rule.

II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

A. How Is EPA Evaluating This 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), 182(f) and 189(a)), and must not relax existing requirements (*see* sections 110(l) and 193). The VCAPCD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (*see* 40 CFR part 81), so Rule 74.23 must fulfill RACT.

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

1. Issue Relating to VOC Regulation, Cut points, Deficiencies, and Deviations (the Blue Book), U.S. EPA, May 25, 1988.

2. "Guidance Document for Correcting VOC Rule Deficiencies", U.S. EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001 (the little bluebook).

3. State Implementation Plans: Nitrogen Oxides Supplement to the General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendment of 1990 (the "NO_x Supplement to the General Preamble"), U.S. EPA, 57 FR 55620, November 25, 1992.

4. Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans, U.S. EPA, 40 CFR part 51.

5. State Implementation Plans for National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards, Section 110 of the Clean Air Act, and Plan Requirements for Nonattainment Areas, Title I Part D of the Clean Air Act.

6. Determination of Reasonably Available Control Technology and Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for the Control of Oxides of Nitrogen From Stationary Gas Turbines, State of California Air Resources Board, May 18, 1992.

7. Alternative Control Techniques (ACT) Document, NO_x Emissions from Stationary Gas Turbines, U.S. EPA, January 1993, EPA-453/R-93-007.

8. Cost Effective Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x) Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT), U.S. EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, March 16, 1994.

B. Does This Rule Meet the Evaluation Criteria?

The substantive revisions to the rule were relaxation of the NO_x emission limit in section B.5 from 20 ppmv to 24 ppmv for LM-2500 turbines, and the strengthening of the limit in section B.6 from 9 ppmv to 6.8 ppmv for LM-5000

turbines. We believe these changes result in a net decrease and that this rule is consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. Public Comment and Final Action

Because EPA believes the submitted rule fulfill all relevant requirements, we are proposing to fully approve it as described in section 110(k)(3) of the Act. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal for the next 30 days. Unless we receive convincing new information during the comment period, we intend to publish a final approval action that will incorporate this rule into the federally enforceable SIP.

III. Background Information

Why Was This Rule Submitted?

NO_x 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_x emissions. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of this local agency NO_x rule.

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. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this proposed 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 proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this proposed 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 proposes to approve 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 proposed 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 proposes to approve 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 proposed 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 proposed 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.*).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: February 7, 2003.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.
[FR Doc. 03-4514 Filed 2-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA273-0381b; FRL-7452-4]

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

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a revision to the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns particulate matter (PM) emissions livestock feed yard operations. We are proposing to approve this local rule regulating these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: Any comments on this proposal must arrive by March 28, 2003.

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 revision 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:

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 "I" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814; and, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, 150 South 9th Street, El Centro, CA 92243.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposal addresses ICAPCD Rule 420—Livestock Feedyards. In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, we are approving this local rule in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe this SIP revision is not controversial. However, if we receive adverse comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in subsequent action based on this proposed rule. We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, please see the direct final action.

Dated: February 3, 2003.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.
[FR Doc. 03-4377 Filed 2-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[KS 173-1173; FRL-7456-1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the state of Kansas. This revision is a new regulation entitled "Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality" and will replace the existing regulation which comprised the prior body of Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality. This revision adopts by reference 40 CFR 52.21, as in effect on July 1, 2000.

In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no relevant adverse comments to this action. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this action. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed action. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on part of this rule and if that part can be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those parts of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by March 28, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Heather Hamilton, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Heather Hamilton at (913) 551-7039.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: February 20, 2003.

James B. Gulliford,

Regional Administrator, Region 7.

[FR Doc. 03-4627 Filed 2-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 600

[I.D 020303A]

Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; General Provisions for Domestic Fisheries; Application for Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs)

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.