

credit the account of the claimant or appellant with the amount of the reduction and refund any excess payment on account to the claimant or appellant not later than the expiration of the time within which the ruling may be appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.

(j) In addition to whatever other penalties may be prescribed by law or regulation, failure to comply with the requirements of this section may result in proceedings under § 14.633 of this chapter to terminate the attorney's or agent's right to practice before the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

\* \* \* \* \*

4. In subpart G, § 20.610, paragraph (d) is revised, and paragraph (e) is added to read as follows:

**§ 20.610 Rule 610. Payment of representative's expenses in proceedings before Department of Veterans Affairs field personnel and before the Board of Veterans' Appeals.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) *Expense charges permitted; motion for review of expenses.*

Reimbursement for the expenses of a representative may be obtained only if the expenses are reasonable. The Board of Veterans' Appeals may review expenses charged by a representative upon the motion of the claimant or appellant and may order a reduction in the expenses charged if it finds that they are excessive or unreasonable. Such motions must be in writing and must include the name of the veteran, the name of the claimant or appellant if other than the veteran, and the applicable Department of Veterans Affairs file number. Such motions must specifically identify which expenses charged are unreasonable; must set forth the reason, or reasons, why such expenses are excessive or unreasonable; must be accompanied by all evidence the claimant or appellant desires to submit; and must include a signed statement certifying that a copy of the motion and any evidence was sent by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the representative. Such motions must be filed at the following address: Office of the Senior Deputy Vice Chairman (012), Board of Veterans' Appeals, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20420. The representative may file a response to the motion, with any accompanying evidence, with the Board at the same address not later than 30 days following the date of receipt of the

copy of the motion and must include a signed statement certifying that a copy of the response and any evidence was sent by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the claimant or appellant, setting forth the address to which the copy was mailed. Factors considered in determining whether expenses are excessive or unreasonable include the complexity of the case, the potential extent of benefits recoverable, whether travel expenses are in keeping with expenses normally incurred by other representatives, etc. Once there has been a ruling on the motion, an order shall issue which will constitute the final decision of the Board with respect to the motion.

(e) In addition to whatever other penalties may be prescribed by law or regulation, failure to comply with the requirements of this section may result in proceedings under § 14.633 of this chapter to terminate the attorney's or agent's right to practice before the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 02-12866 Filed 5-22-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320-01-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

[CA247-0325a; FRL-7201-6]

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and Ventura County 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 South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from solvent usage and graphic arts operations. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on July 22, 2002 without further notice, unless EPA

receives adverse comments by June 24, 2002. If we receive adverse comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this rule will not take effect.

**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 documents (TSDs) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington D.C. 20460;

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

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 21865 East Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4182; and,

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Drive, Ventura, CA 93003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

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

**Table of Contents**

- I. The State's Submittal
  - A. What rules did the State submit?
  - B. Are there other versions of these rules?
  - C. What is the purpose of the rule revisions?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
  - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. EPA recommendations to further improve the rules.
  - D. Public comment and final action.
- III. Background Information
  - Why were these rules submitted?
- IV. Administrative Requirements

**I. The State's Submittal**

*A. What Rules Did the State Submit?*

Table 1 lists the rules we are approving with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule #	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SCAQMD .....	442	Usage of Solvents .....	12/15/00	05/08/01
VCAPCD .....	74.19	Graphic Arts .....	4/10/01	10/30/01

EPA found these rule submittals met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V on the following dates: on July 20, 2001 for SCAQMD Rule 442; and on January 18, 2002 for VCAPCD Rule 74.19. These completeness criteria must be met before formal EPA review may begin.

#### *B. Are there Other Versions of These Rules?*

We approved a version of SCAQMD Rule 442 into the SIP on November 16, 1983. We approved a version of VCAPCD Rule 74.19 into the SIP on April 19, 2001. Between these dates and today's action, California has not made an intervening submittal of these rules.

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

SCAQMD Rule 442 specifies emission limits for organic materials used in operations not governed by SCAQMD Regulation 11 rules. These emission limits take the form of daily and monthly facility wide emission caps. A facility may meet these caps by installing emission control equipment, changing product formulation, or modifying manufacturing operations.

SCAQMD's December 15, 2000 amendments to Rule 442 revised the 1983 version within the SIP. Now, Rule 442 is formatted similar to other SCAQMD prohibitory rules. Consequently, the rule now incorporates the following sections: purpose, applicability, definitions, requirements, control equipment, test methods, recordkeeping, storage and disposal of VOC containing materials, and exemptions. Most of the 1983 rule language has been incorporated within this new format. The most significant addition to Rule 442 is the emission requirements that apply upon January 1, 2003. Here, daily VOC emission caps are replaced by a monthly emission cap of 833 pounds per facility.

VCAPCD Rule 74.19 is a rule designed to reduce volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions at industrial sites engaged in graphics arts operations such as flexographic printing, gravure printing, and lithographic printing. VOCs are emitted during the surface preparation, cleaning, printing, and drying phases of these processes.

VCAPCD's September 10, 1996 version of Rule 74.19 was amended as follows:

- The required ROC (reactive organic compound) content of adhesives used for printing operations was lowered;
  - The required ROC content of flexographic inks on porous substrates was lowered;
  - The required ROC content of fountain solutions used by lithographic printing operations was lowered;
  - The required ROC content or vapor pressure of cleaning solvents used for printing operations was reduced; and
  - The exemption limit of the rule was lowered from 175 pounds of ROC emissions per month to 200 pounds of ROC emissions per year.
- Each rule's TSD has more information on these changes.

## **II. EPA's Evaluation and Action**

### *A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rules?*

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). Both the SCAQMD and VCAPCD regulate an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so both Rule 442 and Rule 74.19 must fulfill RACT.

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

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; Clarification to Appendix D of November 24, 1987 **Federal Register** Document," (Blue Book), notice of availability published in the May 25, 1988 **Federal Register**.

3. "Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources Volume VIII: Graphic Arts—Rotogravure and Flexography," USEPA, December 1978, EPA-450/2-78-033. A second draft CTG was published along with a companion Alternative Control Technique (ACT) document:

4. "Guideline Series, Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Offset Lithographic Printing," Draft, USEPA, OAQPS, September 1993; and,

5. "Alternative Control Techniques Document: Offset Lithographic Printing," USEPA, OAQPS, June 1994, EPA 453/R-94-054.

### *B. Do the Rules Meet the Evaluation Criteria?*

We believe these rules are consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations.

Within SCAQMD Rule 442, daily VOC emission caps are replaced by a monthly emission cap of 833 pounds per facility. This monthly emissions cap of 833 pounds per month is approximately equivalent to the daily cap for photochemically reactive solvents assuming 22 working days a month. Furthermore, the 833 pound monthly limit is more stringent than the 600 pound daily emissions cap for non-photochemically reactive organic solvents that will be removed. As a result, the submitted Rule 442 does not interfere with reasonable further progress or attainment.

VCAPCD Rule 74.19's coating limits and exemption limit have been made more stringent. VCAPCD staff estimate that the April 10, 2001 changes to Rule 74.19 will reduce ROC emissions from graphics arts operations by 20 tons per year. In sum, the SIP is not weakened by the April 2001 changes to Rule 74.19.

The TSD for each rule has more information on our evaluation.

### *C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules*

The TSD for VCAPCD Rule 74.19 describes additional rule revisions that do not affect EPA's current action but are 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 the submitted rules because we believe they fulfill 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 rules. If we receive adverse comments by June 24, 2002, 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 July 22, 2002. This will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP.

Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

### III. Background Information

#### *Why Were These Rules Submitted?*

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. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of these local agency VOC rules.

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. Administrative 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. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 32111, "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 July 22, 2002. 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: March 29, 2002.

**Laura Yoshii,**

*Deputy 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 paragraphs (c)(284)(i)(B)(3) and (c)(288)(i)(C) to read as follows:

**§ 52.220 Identification of plan.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(284) \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(B) \* \* \*

(3) Rule 442 adopted on May 7, 1976 and amended on December 15, 2000.

\* \* \* \* \*

(288) \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(C) Ventura County Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 74.19 adopted on August 11, 1992 and amended on April 10, 2001.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 02-12839 Filed 5-22-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 52**

[PA183-4192a; FRL-7211-8]

**Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> RACT Determinations for Bethlehem Steel Corporation**

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking direct final action to approve a revision to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revision was submitted by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) to establish and require reasonably available control technology (RACT) for Bethlehem Steel Corporation. Bethlehem Steel Corporation is a major source of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) located in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. EPA is approving this revision to establish RACT requirements in the SIP in accordance with the Clean Air Act (CAA).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on July 22, 2002 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse written comment by June 24, 2002. 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 should be mailed to David L. Arnold, Branch

Chief, Air Quality Planning & Information Services Branch, Air Protection Division, Mailcode 3AP21, 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; the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460; and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Air Quality Control, P.O. Box 8468, 400 Market Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rose Quinto at (215) 814-2182 or Betty Harris at (215) 814-2168 or via e-mail at [quinto.rose@epa.gov](mailto:quinto.rose@epa.gov) or [harris.betty@epa.gov](mailto:harris.betty@epa.gov). Please note that while questions may be posed via e-mail, formal comments must be submitted in writing, as indicated in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Background**

Pursuant to sections 182(b)(2) and 182(f) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (the Commonwealth or Pennsylvania) is required to establish and implement RACT for all major VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> sources. The major source size is determined by its location, the classification of that area and whether it is located in the ozone transport region (OTR). Under section 184 of the CAA, RACT as specified in sections 182(b)(2) and 182(f) applies throughout the OTR. The entire Commonwealth is located within the OTR. Therefore, RACT is applicable statewide in Pennsylvania.

**II. Summary of the SIP Revision**

On December 21, 2001, PADEP submitted formal revisions to its SIP to establish and impose RACT for several major sources of VOC and NO<sub>x</sub>. This rulemaking pertains to one of those sources. The other sources are the subject of separate rulemaking actions. The RACT determinations and requirements are included in plan approvals or operating permits issued by PADEP.

Bethlehem Steel Corporation (BSC) manufactures steel materials. This facility is located in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania and is considered a major VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emitting facility. In this

instance, RACT has been established and imposed by PADEP in an operating permit. On December 21, 2001, PADEP submitted operating permit No. OP 22-02012 to EPA as a SIP revision. This permit requires BSC sources and any associated air cleaning devices to be operated and maintained in a manner consistent with good operating and management practices. This permit also contains a facility-wide NO<sub>x</sub> emission limit of 1,206 tons per year based on a 12-month rolling total, and includes NO<sub>x</sub> emissions generated by BSC's steel production sources, combustion units of rated capacity greater than 50 million British Thermal Units per hour (mmbtu/hr), and combustion sources of rated capacity between 20-50 mmbtu/hr. Additionally, VOC emissions from this facility shall not exceed 210 tons per year based on a 12-month rolling total. The annual capacities of BSC's Boilers 2 and 5; 20-inch Mill Reheat Furnace; 35-inch Mill Reheat Furnaces 3 and 4; and Soaking Pit Batteries 1 through 6, shall not exceed the aforementioned facility-wide VOC emission limit. This permit also requires BSC to perform stack testing in accordance with 25 Pa Code Chapter 139 and approved by PADEP. BSC must comply with the recordkeeping requirements of 25 Pa Code, section 129.95, and shall consist of records pertaining to fuel usage, steel production throughput, and operating hours for NO<sub>x</sub> sources. For the VOC sources, BSC shall maintain records pertaining to operating hours and usage of coatings, isopropylene, quench oil, and safety klean. These records shall be retained for two years, and made available to PADEP upon request.

**III. EPA's Evaluation of the SIP Revisions**

EPA is approving this SIP submittal because the Commonwealth established and imposed requirements in accordance with the criteria set forth in SIP-approved regulations for imposing RACT or for limiting a source's potential to emit. The Commonwealth has also imposed record-keeping, monitoring, and testing requirements on these sources sufficient to determine compliance with these requirements.

**IV. Final Action**

EPA is approving a revision to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's SIP which establishes and requires RACT for Bethlehem Steel Corporation located in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. EPA is publishing this rule without prior proposal because we view this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipate no adverse comment. However, in the "Proposed Rules"