

(4) Such other factors as may be relevant to and consistent with the public health and safety.

(d) If the Administrator certifies to the head of a Federal department or agency that there is no reasonable cause to believe that the sale of a specific chemical to a prospective bidder and end-user will result in the illegal manufacture of a controlled substance, that certification will be effective for one year from the date of issuance with respect to further sales of the same chemical to the same prospective bidder and end-user, unless the Administrator notifies the head of the Federal department or agency in writing that the certification is withdrawn. If the certification is withdrawn, DEA will also provide written notice to the bidder and end-user, which will contain a statement of the legal and factual basis for this determination.

(e) If the Administrator determines there is reasonable cause to believe the sale of the specific chemical to a specific bidder and end-user would result in the illegal manufacture of a controlled substance, DEA will provide written notice to the head of a Federal department or agency refusing to certify the proposed sale under the authority of 21 U.S.C. 890. DEA also will provide, within fifteen calendar days of receiving a request for certification from a Federal department or agency, the same written notice to the prospective bidder and end-user, and this notice also will contain a statement of the legal and factual basis for the refusal of certification. The prospective bidder and end-user may, within thirty calendar days of receipt of notification of the refusal, submit written comments or written objections to the Administrator's refusal. At the same time, the prospective bidder and end-user also may provide supporting documentation to contest the Administrator's refusal. If such written comments or written objections raise issues regarding any finding of fact or conclusion of law upon which the refusal is based, the Administrator will reconsider the refusal of the proposed sale in light of the written comments or written objections filed. Thereafter, within a reasonable time, the Administrator will withdraw or affirm the original refusal of certification as he determines appropriate. The Administrator will provide written reasons for any affirmation of the original refusal. Such affirmation of the original refusal will constitute a final decision for purposes of judicial review under 21 U.S.C. 877.

(f) If the Administrator determines there is reasonable cause to believe that

an existing certification should be withdrawn, DEA will provide written notice to the head of a Federal department or agency of such withdrawal under the authority of 21 U.S.C. 890. DEA also will provide, within fifteen calendar days of withdrawal of an existing certification, the same written notice to the bidder and end-user, and this notice also will contain a statement of the legal and factual basis for the withdrawal. The bidder and end-user may, within thirty calendar days of receipt of notification of the withdrawal of the existing certification, submit written comments or written objections to the Administrator's withdrawal. At the same time, the bidder and end-user also may provide supporting documentation to contest the Administrator's withdrawal. If such written comments or written objections raise issues regarding any finding of fact or conclusion of law upon which the withdrawal of the existing certification is based, the Administrator will reconsider the withdrawal of the existing certification in light of the written comments or written objections filed. Thereafter, within a reasonable time, the Administrator will withdraw or affirm the original withdrawal of the existing certification as he determines appropriate. The Administrator will provide written reasons for any affirmation of the original withdrawal of the existing certification. Such affirmation of the original withdrawal of the existing certification will constitute a final decision for purposes of judicial review under 21 U.S.C. 877.

Dated: October 28, 2003.

Michele M. Leonhart,
Acting Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 03-27889 Filed 11-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 140-0415; FRL-7583-5]

Disapproval of State Implementation Plan Revisions, Antelope Valley, Butte County, Mojave Desert, and Shasta County Air Quality Management Districts and Kern County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing disapproval of a revision to the Antelope Valley Air

Quality Management District (AVAQMD), Butte County Air Quality Management District (BCAQMD), Kern County Air Pollution Control District (KCAPCD), Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD), and Shasta County Air Quality Management District (SHCAQMD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This action was proposed in the **Federal Register** on June 6, 2003 (68 FR 33899) and concerns excess emissions and breakdown provisions. Under authority of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act), this action directs California to correct rule deficiencies in AVAQMD Rule 430, BCAQMD Rule 275, KCAPCD Rule 111, MDAQMD Rule 430, and SHCAQMD Rule 3:10.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This rule is effective on December 8, 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 revision at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX,
75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA
94105-3901.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary
Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section,
1001 "I" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Antelope Valley Air Quality Management
District, 43301 Division St., Ste. 206,
Lancaster, CA 93535-4649

Butte County Air Quality Management
District, 2525 Dominic Drive, Suite J,
Chico, CA 95928-7184

Kern County Air Pollution Control District,
2700 "M" Street, Suite 302, Bakersfield,
CA 93301-2370

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management
District, 14306 Park Avenue, Victorville,
CA 92392-2310

Shasta County Air Quality Management
District, 1855 Placer Street, Ste. 101,
Redding, CA 96001-1759

Copies of the rules 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:
Thomas C. Canaday, EPA Region IX,
(415) 947-4121.

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

I. Proposed Action

On June 6, 2003 (68 FR 33899), EPA proposed to disapprove the following rules that were submitted for incorporation into the California SIP.

Local agency	Rule	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
AVAQMD	430	Breakdown Provisions	03/17/98	02/16/99
BCAQMD	275	Reporting Procedures for Excess Emissions	02/15/96	05/10/96
KCAPCD	111	Equipment Breakdown	05/02/96	07/23/96
MDAQMD	430	Breakdown Provisions	12/21/94	01/24/95
SHCAQMD	3:10	Excess Emissions	12/05/95	05/10/96

We proposed to disapprove these rules because some rule provisions conflict with section 110 and part D of the Act. In particular, we are disapproving AVAQMD Rule 430, KCAPCD Rule 111, and MDAQMD Rule 430 because the rules describe how the districts intend to apply their enforcement discretion in instances where facilities exceed emissions limits due to breakdown. We are disapproving BCAQMD Rule 275 and SHCAQMD Rule 3:10 because they fail to make clear that the excess emissions are violations of the applicable emissions limitations and that a determination by the APCO not to take an enforcement action (or finding by the APCD that an emergency exists) would not bar EPA or citizen action.

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 received no comments.

III. EPA Action

Therefore, as authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is finalizing a disapproval of the submitted rules. These are not required SIP submittals, so this disapproval has no sanction or FIP implications under CAA sections 179 or 110(c). Note that the submitted rules have been adopted by the AVAQMD, BCAQMD, KCAPCD, MDAQMD, and SHCAQMD, and EPA's final disapproval does not prevent the local agency 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

These rules do 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.

These rules will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because this SIP disapproval under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act does not create any new requirements but simply disapproves requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP disapproval 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 disapproval 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 disapproves 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.

These rules 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 disapproves 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." These final rules do 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.

These rules are not subject to Executive Order 13045 because they do not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

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

These rules are 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. 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 these rules 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 December 8, 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 January 5, 2004. 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, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: August 25, 2003.

Wayne Nastri,

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 52.271 is amended by adding paragraphs (b)(5) and (b)(6) and (d) to read as follows:

§ 52.271 Malfunction, startup, and shutdown regulations.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(5) Butte County AQMD.

(i) Rule 275, Reporting Procedures for Excess Emissions, submitted on May 10, 1996.

(6) Shasta County AQMD.

(i) Rule 3:10, Excess Emissions, submitted on May 10, 1996.

* * * * *

(d) The following regulations are disapproved because they merely describe how state agencies intend to apply their enforcement discretion and thus, if approved, the regulations would have no effect on the State Implementation Plan.

(1) Antelope Valley AQMD.

(i) Rule 430, Breakdown Provisions, submitted on February 16, 1999.

(2) Kern County APCD.

(i) Rule 111, Equipment Breakdown, submitted on July 23, 1996.

(3) Mojave Desert AQMD.

(i) Rule 430, Breakdown Provisions, submitted on January 24, 1995.

[FR Doc. 03-27848 Filed 11-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 131

[FRL-7584-1]

Water Quality Standards; Withdrawal of Federal Nutrient Standards for the State of Arizona

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking final action to amend the Federal regulations to withdraw water quality criteria applicable to Arizona. In 1976, EPA