

**PART 422—ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES****Subpart B—[Amended]**

1. The authority citation for subpart B of part 422 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** Secs. 205, 232, 702(a)(5), 1131, and 1143 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405, 432, 902(a)(5), 1320b-1, and 1320b-13).

2. Revise § 422.104 to read as follows:

**§ 422.104 Who can be assigned a social security number.**

(a) *Persons eligible for SSN assignment.* We can assign you a social security number if you meet the evidence requirements in § 422.107 and you are:

(1) A United States citizen; or  
(2) An alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence or under other authority of law permitting you to work in the United States (§ 422.105 describes how we determine if a nonimmigrant alien is permitted to work in the United States); or

(3) An alien who cannot provide the evidence of alien status showing the alien has been lawfully admitted to the U.S., or an alien who has evidence of having been lawfully admitted but who does not have evidence of authority to work in the U.S., as required by § 422.107(e), if the evidence described in that paragraph does not exist, but only for a valid nonwork reason. We consider a valid nonwork reason to be:

(i) You need a social security number to satisfy a Federal statute or regulation that requires you to have a social security number in order to receive a Federally-funded benefit to which you have established entitlement and you reside either in or outside the U. S.; or  
(ii) You need a social security number to satisfy a state or local law that requires you to have a social security number in order to receive general public assistance benefits to which you have established entitlement, and you are legally in the United States.

(b) *Annotation for a nonwork purpose.* If we assign you a social security number as an alien for a nonwork purpose, we will indicate in our records that you are not authorized to work. We will also mark your social security card with a legend that reads "NOT VALID FOR EMPLOYMENT." If earnings are reported to us on your number, we will inform the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the reported earnings.

3. Amend § 422.107, to revise paragraphs (a) and (c), to read as follows:

**§ 422.107 Evidence requirements.**

(a) *General.* An applicant for an original social security number card must submit documentary evidence which the Commissioner of Social Security regards as convincing evidence of age, U.S. citizenship or alien status, and true identity. An applicant for a duplicate or corrected social security number card must submit convincing documentary evidence of identity and may also be required to submit convincing documentary evidence of age and U.S. citizenship or alien status. An applicant for an original, duplicate, or corrected social security number card is also required to submit evidence to assist us in determining the existence and identity of any previously assigned number(s). A social security number will not be assigned, or an original, duplicate, or corrected card issued, unless all the evidence requirements are met. An in-person interview is required of an applicant who is age 12 or older applying for an original social security number except for an alien who requests a social security number as part of the immigration process as described in § 422.103(b)(3). An in-person interview may also be required of other applicants. All documents submitted as evidence must be originals or copies of the original documents certified by the custodians of the original records and are subject to verification.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) *Evidence of identity.* An applicant for an original social security number or a duplicate or corrected social security number card is required to submit convincing documentary evidence of identity. Documentary evidence of identity may consist of a driver's license, identity card, school record, medical record, marriage record, passport, Immigration and Naturalization Service document, or other similar document serving to identify the individual. The document must contain sufficient information to identify the applicant, including the applicant's name and the applicant's age, date of birth, or parents' names; and/or a photograph or physical description of the individual. A birth record is not sufficient evidence to establish identity for these purposes.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 03-7188 Filed 3-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191-02-P

**DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS****38 CFR Part 3**

RIN 2900-AL55

**Disease Associated With Exposure to Certain Herbicide Agents: Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia**

**AGENCY:** Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is proposing to amend its adjudication regulations concerning presumptive service connection for certain diseases for which there is no record during service. This proposed amendment is necessary to implement a decision of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that there is a positive association between exposure to herbicides used in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era and the subsequent development of chronic lymphocytic leukemia. The intended effect of this proposed amendment is to establish presumptive service connection for that condition based on herbicide exposure.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before May 27, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail or hand-deliver written comments to: Director, Office of Regulations Management (02D), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Ave., NW., Room 1154, Washington, DC 20420; or fax comments to (202) 273-9289; or e-mail comments to "OGCRegulations@mail.va.gov". Comments should indicate that they are submitted in response to "RIN 2900-AL55." All comments received will be available for public inspection in the Office of Regulations Management, Room 1158, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday (except holidays).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Barrans, Staff Attorney (022), Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420, (202) 273-6332.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3 of the Agent Orange Act of 1991, Pub. L. 102-4, 105 Stat. 11, directed the Secretary to seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to review and summarize the scientific evidence concerning the association between exposure to herbicides used in support of military operations in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era and each disease suspected to be associated with such exposure. Congress mandated

that NAS determine, to the extent possible: (1) Whether there is a statistical association between the suspect diseases and herbicide exposure, taking into account the strength of the scientific evidence and the appropriateness of the methods used to detect the association; (2) the increased risk of disease among individuals exposed to herbicides during service in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era; and (3) whether there is a plausible biological mechanism or other evidence of a causal relationship between herbicide exposure and the suspect disease. Section 3 of Pub. L. 102-4 also required that NAS submit reports on its activities every 2 years (as measured from the date of the first report) for a 10-year period.

Section 1116(b) of title 38, United States Code, as enacted by the Agent Orange Act of 1991, Pub. L. 102-4, provides that whenever the Secretary determines, based on sound medical and scientific evidence, that a positive association (*i.e.*, the credible evidence for the association is equal to or outweighs the credible evidence against the association) exists between exposure of humans to an herbicide agent (*i.e.*, a chemical in an herbicide used in support of the United States and allied military operations in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era) and a disease, the Secretary will publish regulations establishing presumptive service connection for that disease. If the Secretary determines that a presumption of service connection is not warranted, he is to publish a notice of that determination, including an explanation of the scientific basis for that determination. The Secretary's determination must be based on consideration of the NAS reports and all other sound medical and scientific information and analysis available to the Secretary.

Although 38 U.S.C. 1116(b) does not define "credible," it does instruct the Secretary to "take into consideration whether the results [of any study] are statistically significant, are capable of replication, and withstand peer review." Simply comparing the number of studies which report a positive relative risk to the number of studies which report a negative relative risk for a particular condition is not a valid method for determining whether the weight of evidence overall supports a finding that there is or is not a positive association between herbicide exposure and the subsequent development of the particular condition. Because of differences in statistical significance, confidence levels, control for confounding factors, bias, and other

pertinent characteristics, some studies are clearly more credible than others, and the Secretary has given the more credible studies more weight in evaluating the overall weight of the evidence concerning specific diseases.

Section 2 of the Agent Orange Act of 1991, Public Law 102-4, provided that the Secretary's authority to establish presumptions of service connection under 38 U.S.C. 1116(b) would expire 10 years after the first day of the fiscal year in which the NAS transmitted its first report to VA. The first NAS report was transmitted to VA in July 1993, during the fiscal year that began on October 1, 1992. Accordingly, under the Agent Orange Act of 1991, Public Law 102-4, VA's authority to issue regulatory presumptions as specified in section 1116(b) expired on September 30, 2002. In December 2001, however, Congress enacted the Veterans Education and Benefits Expansion Act of 2001 (Benefits Expansion Act), Public Law 107-103. Section 201(d) of that Act extended VA's authority under section 1116(b) through September 30, 2015. Pursuant to the Benefits Expansion Act, Public Law 107-103, VA may issue new regulations between October 1, 2002, and September 30, 2015, establishing additional presumptions of service connection for diseases that are found to be associated with exposure to an herbicide agent.

### **I. History of Agent Orange Presumptions**

Pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 1116 and prior NAS reports received between July 1993 and April 2001, VA regulations contain presumptions of service connection for ten categories of disease based on exposure to an herbicide agent. Those diseases are listed in 38 CFR 3.309(e) as follows: Chloracne or other acneform disease consistent with chloracne, Type 2 diabetes (also known as Type II diabetes mellitus or adult-onset diabetes), Hodgkin's disease, Multiple myeloma, Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, Acute and subacute peripheral neuropathy, Porphyria cutanea tarda, Prostate cancer, Respiratory cancers (cancer of the lung, bronchus, larynx, or trachea), and Soft-tissue sarcoma (other than osteosarcoma, chondrosarcoma, Kaposi's sarcoma, or mesothelioma).

If a veteran who was exposed to an herbicide agent in service subsequently develops one of the presumptive diseases, VA will presume the disease was caused by the exposure to an herbicide agent in service for purposes of establishing entitlement to service-connected benefits. To qualify for this presumption, chloracne and porphyria cutanea tarda must become manifest to

a degree of disability of 10 percent or more within one year after the date of last exposure. The other conditions are presumed service connected if they are manifest to a degree of disability of ten percent or more at any time after exposure. 38 U.S.C. 1116(a)(2). VA presumes that any veteran who served in the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, was exposed to an herbicide agent during such service. 38 U.S.C. 1116(f).

### **II. Prior Actions Concerning Leukemia**

In each of its four previous biennial reports under the Agent Orange Act of 1991, the NAS concluded that there was "inadequate/insufficient" evidence to determine whether an association exists between exposure to an herbicide agent and the subsequent occurrence of leukemia in exposed persons. After reviewing each of those reports, the Secretary determined that the credible evidence against an association between exposure to an herbicide agent and the occurrence of leukemia in exposed persons outweighed the credible evidence for such an association, and that a positive association therefore did not exist. 67 FR 42600, 42604 (June 24, 2002); 64 FR 59232, 59238 (Nov. 2, 1999); 61 FR 41442, 41445 (Aug. 8, 1996); 59 FR 341, 344 (Jan. 4, 1994).

### **III. Latest NAS Review of Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia**

After receiving and reviewing the last prior NAS report in 2001, the Secretary asked that NAS' next report separately review the scientific evidence concerning the association between herbicide exposure and one particular form of leukemia, known as chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL). NAS issued its report, "Veterans and Agent Orange: Update 2002," on January 23, 2003. In that report, NAS concluded that "there is sufficient evidence of an association between exposure to at least one of the chemicals of interest (2,4-D, 2,4,5-T or its contaminant TCDD, picloram, or cacodylic acid) and CLL." The term "sufficient evidence of an association," as explained in the NAS report, means that a positive association has been observed between herbicides and the outcome in studies in which chance, bias, and confounding could be ruled out with reasonable confidence.

NAS discussed several studies that reported findings regarding the incidence of CLL as distinguished from other types of leukemia. One study of site-specific cancer incidence among 7,016 males and females in a rural farming community found a standard incidence ratio of 1.8, with a 95%

confidence interval (CI) of 0.8–3.2 for CLL. (Waterhouse D *et al.* 1996. Cancer incidence in the rural community of Tecumseh, Michigan: a pattern of increased lymphopoietic neoplasms. *Cancer* 77(4): 763–770). A population-based case-control study in an agricultural area of Italy noted an increased risk of CLL among farmers (Odds Ratio (OR) = 1.6, CI = 0.5–5.2) and animal breeders (OR = 3.1 CI = 1.1–8.3), although no information was provided on herbicide exposure in the study population. (Amadori D *et al.* 1995. Chronic lymphocytic leukaemias and non-Hodgkin's lymphomas by histological type in farming-animal breeding workers: a population case-control study based on job titles. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 52(6): 374–379). A study of cancer risk in Danish male gardeners reportedly exposed to pesticides and herbicides showed a significant increase in CLL (relative risk = 2.8, CI = 1.0–6.0), although no specific data on herbicide exposure were given. (Hansen ES *et al.* 1992. A cohort study on cancer incidence among Danish gardeners. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 21(5): 651–660). One study showed a significant increase in mortality due to CLL among farmers in Nebraska from 1957–1974 (OR = 1.7), although no data regarding herbicide exposure were given. (Blair A, White DW. 1985. Leukemia cell types and agricultural practices in Nebraska. *Archives of Environmental Health* 40(4): 211–214).

Two epidemiologic studies reported specifically on herbicide exposure and CLL. In a study of 1,675 white Iowa males who died of leukemia, CLL was significantly increased in farmers (OR = 1.9, CI=1.2–3.1). (Burmeister LF *et al.* 1982. Leukemia and farm practices in Iowa. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 115(5): 720–728). Further analysis showed a strong relationship of CLL deaths in counties with acres treated with herbicides. In a population-based case-control interview study of 578 white men with leukemia and 1,245 controls, CLL mortality was higher in farmers than nonfarmers. (Brown LM *et al.* Pesticide exposures and other agricultural risk factors for leukemia among men in Iowa and Minnesota. *Cancer Research* 50(20): 6585–6591). When risk was calculated for CLL subtype, odds ratios were significantly increased for use of any herbicide (OR = 1.4). The risk of CLL in farmers who ever handled 2,4-D was 1.3. The risk of CLL in men who first handled 2,4,5-T at least 20 years before interview was significantly increased (OR = 3.3, CI = 1.2–8.9).

NAS also noted that a recent follow-up study of residents of Seveso, Italy found no increased risk of lymphocytic leukemia. (Bertazzi PA *et al.* 2001. Health effects of dioxin exposure: a 20-year mortality study. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 153(11): 1031–1044).

NAS stated that the epidemiologic studies indicate that farming occupation is associated with significant risk of CLL, especially when there is exposure to the herbicides 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T. NAS further noted that CLL shares more traits with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (NHL) than with other types of leukemia and could have a common etiology, and that many studies support the hypothesis that herbicide exposure can contribute to the risk of NHL. NAS also concluded, as in its prior reports, that a connection between exposure to TCDD, a contaminant of 2,4,5-T, and human health effects is considered biologically plausible.

#### IV. The Secretary's Determination on Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia

After considering all of the evidence, the Secretary has determined that there is a positive association between the exposure of humans to an herbicide agent and the occurrence of CLL in humans. The studies cited by NAS consistently show an increased risk of CLL among agricultural workers and two of the studies show a significantly increased risk among farmers who were exposed to herbicides. Some of the findings noted by NAS are statistically significant, and the consistency of the findings overall supports the view that an association exists. Under these circumstances, the Secretary concludes that the credible evidence for an association between exposure to an herbicide agent and the occurrence of CLL in humans outweighs the credible evidence against such an association. Accordingly, the Secretary has determined that a presumption of service connection for CLL is warranted pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 1116(b).

This proposed rule does not reflect determinations concerning any disease other than CLL. The Secretary's determinations concerning other diseases discussed in the current NAS report will be addressed in future documents published in the **Federal Register**.

#### Unfunded Mandates

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act requires, at 2 U.S.C. 1532, that agencies prepare an assessment of anticipated costs and benefits before developing any rule that may result in an expenditure by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of

\$100 million or more in any given year. This rule would have no consequential effect on State, local or tribal governments.

#### Paperwork Reduction Act

This document contains no provisions constituting a collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501–3521).

#### Executive Order 12866

This document has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866.

#### Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Secretary hereby certifies that this regulatory amendment will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as they are defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601–612. The reason for this certification is that these amendments would not directly affect any small entities. Only VA beneficiaries could be directly affected. Therefore, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), these amendments are exempt from the initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis requirements of sections 603 and 604.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance program numbers are 64.109 and 64.110.

#### List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 3

Administrative practice and procedure, Claims, Disability benefits, Health care, Pensions, Veterans, Vietnam.

Approved: February 27, 2003.

**Anthony J. Principi,**

*Secretary of Veterans Affairs.*

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 38 CFR part 3 is proposed to be amended as follows:

### PART 3—ADJUDICATION

#### Subpart A—Pension, Compensation, and Dependency and Indemnity Compensation

1. The authority citation for part 3, subpart A continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 38 U.S.C. 501(a), unless otherwise noted.

2. In § 3.309, paragraph (e) the listing of diseases is amended by adding “Chronic lymphocytic leukemia” between “Hodgkin's disease” and “Multiple myeloma” to read as follows:

#### § 3.309 Diseases subject to presumptive service connection.

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) \* \* \*

Chronic lymphocytic leukemia

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 03-7221 Filed 3-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320-01-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[MO 177-1177; FRL-7471-7]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA proposes to approve a revision to the Missouri State Implementation Plan (SIP) which pertains to the control of emissions from surface coating operations in the Kansas City, Missouri, area. This revision clarifies an inconsistency between the SIP approved version of the rule and the state adopted version. Approval of this revision will ensure consistency between the state and federally-approved rules, and ensure Federal enforceability of the revised state rule. 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 April 25, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to Wayne Kaiser, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and

Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Wayne Kaiser at (913) 551-7603.

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

Dated: March 13, 2003.

Nat Scurry,

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 7.*

[FR Doc. 03-7054 Filed 3-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[KS 172-1172; FRL-7471-8]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Approval Under Sections 110 and 112(I); 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 applies to small businesses and creates a permit-by-rule that provides an alternative for certain small emission sources which otherwise would be required to apply for a full Class I or Class II operating permit. Small sources not operating at or above the major source thresholds are provided an option to operate under the conditions of this permit-by-rule in lieu of applying for the operating permit. Small sources which have emissions at 25 percent of the threshold levels are required to notify the state of their desire to operate under this regulation and to maintain the required records. Small sources which have emissions at 50 percent of the threshold levels are required to apply to the state, pay the appropriate fee and maintain the required records.

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 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 April 25, 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: March 13, 2003.

Nat Scurry,

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 7.*

[FR Doc. 03-7052 Filed 3-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 600

[I.D. 031803A]

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

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

**ACTION:** Notification of a proposal for EFPs to conduct experimental fishing; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Administrator, Northeast Region, NMFS (Regional Administrator) has made a preliminary determination that the subject EFP application contains all the required information and warrants further consideration. The Regional Administrator has also made a preliminary determination that the activities authorized under the EFP would be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP).