

limited disapproval action, 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. 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.

EPA believes 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 (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 13, 2005. 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 November 14, 2005. 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, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: August 19, 2005.

**Laura Yoshii,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.*  
[FR Doc. 05-18020 Filed 9-12-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[CA-319-0488a; FRL-7966-4]

### 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 facilities storing and processing organic liquids such as crude oil and petroleum by-products. We are approving SJVUAPCD Rule 4623, a rule regulating these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on November 14, 2005 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by October 13, 2005. If we receive such comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this direct final 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 94105-3901, or e-mail to [steckel.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:steckel.andrew@epa.gov), or submit comments at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions, EPA's technical support document (TSD), and public comments at our Region IX office during normal business hours by appointment. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions by appointment at the following locations:

Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Room B-102, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., (Mail Code 6102T), 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.

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, at either (415) 947-4111, or [wamsley.jerry@epa.gov](mailto:wamsley.jerry@epa.gov).

**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 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. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews.

**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 RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SJVUAPCD .....	4623	Storage of Organic Liquids .....	05/19/05	07/15/05

On August 18, 2005, EPA found this rule submittal met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR Part 51 Appendix V. These criteria must be met before formal EPA review may begin.

*B. Are There Other Versions of This Rule?*

On January 22, 2004, EPA gave a limited approval and limited disapproval and incorporated into the SIP a prior version of Rule 4623 (see 69 **Federal Register** (FR) 3012.) This version of Rule 4623 was adopted by the SJVUAPCD Governing Board on December 20, 2001. CARB has made no intervening submittals of Rule 4623 to EPA.

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

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. SJVUAPCD Rule 4623—Storage of Organic Liquids is designed to reduce VOC emissions at industrial sites engaged in storing any organic liquids with a vapor pressure greater than 0.5 pounds per square inch atmospheric. VOCs are emitted from containment vessels such as tanks and transfer lines due to the vapor pressure of the processed crude oil and organic liquids. Tanks and systems of tanks must have a vapor recovery system that recovers at least 95% of VOC vapors by

weight or combusts excess vapors. Also, Rule 4623 sets specific requirements for vapor loss control devices, closure devices, external floating roofs, internal floating roofs, tank degassing and cleaning, and tank inspections. Our Technical Support Document (TSD) has more information about this rule.

**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 4623 must fulfill RACT.

We used the following guidance and policy documents to evaluate consistently specific enforceability and RACT requirements:

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," EPA, May 25, 1988 (the Bluebook);
3. "Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule Deficiencies," EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001 (the Little Bluebook);

4. "Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Petroleum Liquid Storage in External Floating Roof Tanks," EPA-450/2-78-047, USEPA, December 1978; and

5. "Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Storage of Petroleum Liquids in Fixed-Roof Tanks," EPA-450/2-77-036, USEPA, December 1977.

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

We believe SJVUAPCD Rule 4623 is consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. In our January 22, 2004 action, EPA identified two deficiencies as providing the basis for our limited disapproval of the Rule 4623. The first deficiency identified two problems within Section 5.6.1. The second deficiency concerned Section 7.1 having a missing compliance date and conflicting dates in its last sentence. SJVUAPCD has remedied these deficiencies. Section 5.6.1 has been amended to clarify the requirements for vapor recovery systems and where test methods in Section 6.4.6 apply. The deficiency within Section 7.1 is remedied by removal of the section and its expired compliance dates. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

*C. EPA Recommendations to Further Improve the Rule*

The TSD describes an additional rule revision that does not affect EPA's current action but is recommended for

the next time the local agency modifies the rule.

#### D. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving SJVUAPCD Rule 4623 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 October 13, 2005, 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 November 14, 2005. This approval action will incorporate this rule into the federally enforceable SIP. Also, our final approval of Rule 4623 will remove any federal sanctions associated with our January 22, 2004 limited disapproval action.

#### 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 November 14, 2005. 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: August 19, 2005.

**Laura Yoshii,**

*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 paragraph (c)(337) to read as follows:

##### § 52.220 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(337) New and amended regulations for the following APCDs were submitted on July 15, 2005, by the Governor's designee.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 4623, adopted on April 11, 1991 and amended on May 19, 2005.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 05-18019 Filed 9-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P