

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 51

[FRL-7522-6]

#### Revisions to the Regional Haze Rule To Correct Mobile Source Provisions in Optional Program for Nine Western States and Eligible Indian Tribes Within That Geographic Area

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is proposing to approve a correction to the mobile source provisions in the EPA's regional haze rule. This correction is consistent with recommendations of the Western Regional Air Partnership (WRAP). The amendments to the rule are intended to address an emissions projection scenario for mobile sources which was not addressed when EPA published the regional haze rule in 1999.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposal must be received by August 4, 2003.

In the "Final Rules" section of today's **Federal Register**, we are publishing a direct final rule that matches the substance of this proposed rule. If the Agency receives adverse comment or a request for public hearing by August 4, 2003, we will withdraw the direct final rule by publishing a timely withdrawal notice in the **Federal Register**. If the Agency receives no adverse comments to this proposed rule, the direct final rule is effective September 2, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** All comments should be submitted to Docket No. OAR-2002-0076. When mailing documents, comments, or requests to the EPA Docket Center through the U.S. Postal Service, please use the following address: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA West (Air Docket), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Room B108; Mail Code: 6102T, Washington, DC 20460. To mail comments or documents through a courier service, the mailing address is: EPA Docket Center (Air Docket), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room B108; Mail Code: 6102T, Washington, DC 20004. The normal business hours are 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding legal holidays. Comments can be submitted to the address above, by fax (202) 566-1741, or by e-mail to [A-and-R-Docket@epa.gov](mailto:A-and-R-Docket@epa.gov). The voice telephone number is (202) 566-1742.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you would like further information about this proposed rule or to request a

public hearing, contact Kathy Kaufman, Integrated Policies and Strategies Group, (919) 541-0102 or by e-mail [kaufman.kathy@epa.gov](mailto:kaufman.kathy@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Regulated Entities

Entities potentially regulated by this action are nine States in the Western United States (Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah and Wyoming) and Indian Tribes within that same geographic area. This proposed action, and an earlier action taken by EPA in 1999, provides these States and Tribes with an optional program to protect visibility in federally protected scenic areas. The portion of the program addressed by this proposed rule is a program for tracking of mobile source emissions under the 1999 rule.

**Docket.** The EPA has established an official public docket for this action under Docket No. OAR-2002-0076. The official public docket consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received, and other information related to this action. Although a part of the official docket, the public docket does not include confidential business information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. The official public docket is the collection of materials that is available for public viewing at the Air Docket in the EPA Docket Center, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the Air Docket is (202) 566-1742. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

**Electronic Access.** You may access this **Federal Register** document electronically through the EPA Internet under the "Federal Register" listings at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/>. An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, EPA Dockets. You may use EPA Dockets at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket/> to view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the docket facility identified above. Once in the system,

select "search," then key in the docket identification number OAR-2002-0076.

**Outline.** The contents of today's preamble are listed in the following outline.

- I. Background
  - A. What is the regional haze rule?
  - B. What are the special provisions for Western States and eligible Indian Tribes in 40 CFR 51.309 of the regional haze rule?
- II. Changes to the Mobile Source Provisions of Section 309
  - A. Why are we changing the mobile source provisions of 40 CFR 51.309?
  - B. What are the specific changes to the mobile source provisions of 40 CFR 51.309?
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
  - A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review
  - B. Paperwork Reduction Act
  - C. Regulatory Flexibility Act
  - D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
  - E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
  - F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
  - G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children from Environmental Health and Safety Risks
  - H. Executive Order 13211: Actions that Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use
  - I. National Technology Transfer Advancement Act
  - J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
- IV. Statutory Provisions and Legal Authority

#### I. Background

##### A. What Is the Regional Haze Rule?

Section 169(A) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) establishes a national goal for protecting visibility in federally-protected scenic areas. These "Class I" areas include national parks and wilderness areas. The national visibility goal is to remedy existing impairment and prevent future impairment in these Class I areas, consistent with the requirements of sections 169A and 169B of the CAA.

Regional haze is a type of visibility impairment caused by air pollutants emitted by numerous sources across a broad region. The EPA uses the term regional haze to distinguish this type of visibility problem from those which are more local in nature. In 1999, EPA issued a regional haze rule requiring States to develop implementation plans that will make "reasonable progress" toward the national visibility goal (64 FR 35714, July 1, 1999). The first State plans for regional haze are due between 2003 and 2008. The regional haze rule provisions appear at 40 CFR 51.308 and 40 CFR 51.309.

*B. What Are the Special Provisions for Western States and Eligible Indian Tribes in 40 CFR 51.309 of the Regional Haze Rule?*

The regional haze rule at 40 CFR 51.308 sets forth the requirements for State implementation plans (SIPs) under the regional haze program. The rule requires State plans to include visibility progress goals for each Class I area, as well as emissions reductions strategies and other measures needed to meet these goals. The rule also provides an optional approach, described in 40 CFR 51.309, that may be followed by the nine Western States (Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming) that comprise the transport region analyzed by the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission (GCVTC) during the 1990's. This optional approach is also available to eligible Indian Tribes within this geographic region. The regulatory provisions at 40 CFR 51.309 are based on the final report issued by the GCVTC in 1996,<sup>1</sup> which included a number of recommended emissions reductions strategies designed to improve visibility in the 16 Class I areas on the Colorado Plateau.

In developing the regional haze rule, EPA received a number of comments on the proposed rule encouraging the Agency to recognize explicitly the work of the GCVTC. In addition, in June 1998, Governor Leavitt of Utah provided comments to EPA on behalf of the Western Governors Association (WGA), further emphasizing the commitment of Western States to implementing the GCVTC recommendations. The WGA's comments also suggested the translation of the GCVTC's recommendations into specific regulatory language. The EPA issued a Notice of Availability during the fall of 1998 requesting further comment on the WGA's proposal and a draft set of regulatory language based upon the WGA's recommendations. Based on the comments received on this **Federal Register** action, EPA developed the provisions set forth in 40 CFR 51.309 that allow the nine Transport Region States and eligible Tribes within that geographic area to implement many of the GCVTC recommendations within the framework of the national regional haze rule.

The provisions in 40 CFR 51.309 comprise a comprehensive long-term strategy for addressing sources that contribute to visibility impairment within this geographic region. The strategy addresses the time period

between the year 2003, when the implementation plans are due,<sup>2</sup> and the year 2018. The provisions address emissions from stationary sources, mobile sources, and area sources such as emissions from fires and windblown dust.

## **II. Changes to the Mobile Source Provisions of Section 309**

### *A. Why Are We Changing the Mobile Source Provisions of 40 CFR 51.309?*

#### 1. What Is the Basis for the Old Provisions?

The GCVTC determined that mobile source emissions need to be an essential part of a strategy to reduce haze on the Colorado Plateau. Therefore, one element of the GCVTC's strategy, as reflected in 40 CFR 51.309(d)(5), was to address mobile source emissions. Section 309 also requires States to establish a mobile source emissions budget for each area that significantly contributes to visibility impairment in any of the 16 Class I areas covered by this section of the regulations. At the time the GCVTC made its recommendations (in 1996), mobile source emissions were projected to be lowest in 2005, and to subsequently rise over the course of the first regional haze planning period (*i.e.*, until 2018). Accordingly, section 309 required mobile source emissions budgets to be set using the lowest projected level as a planning objective and performance indicator for each area.

#### 2. What Is the Basis for the New Provisions?

Since the GCVTC made its recommendations, new developments have caused mobile source emissions projections to change significantly. Over the past few years, we have promulgated a series of new emissions standards for several different engine types, as well as new standards for diesel fuel content.<sup>3</sup> As a result of these new standards, the WRAP, using EPA's latest models,<sup>4</sup> now projects a significant decline in mobile source emissions throughout the region during the 2003–2018 time period covered by the section 309 plans, particularly from onroad mobile sources. Rather than emissions being

lowest in 2005, and subsequently rising, mobile source emissions for all pollutants except sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) are expected to decline continuously over the course of the first regional haze planning period.

The projected trends for mobile source emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> differ from those of other pollutants. Emission reductions from pollutants such as nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and particulate matter (PM) are dependent on technological changes to the onroad fleet and to nonroad engines which are implemented gradually. In contrast, SO<sub>2</sub> emissions reductions are immediately realized when the sulfur content of the fuel changes, because emissions from both new and existing engines immediately drop sharply. We have already published stringent fuel sulfur limits for onroad engines and have proposed stringent fuel sulfur limits for nonroad engines.<sup>5</sup> These Federal fuel sulfur regulations, fully implemented, would together result in a substantial reduction in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions over the 2003–2018 planning period.

### *B. What Are the Specific Changes to the Mobile Source Provisions of 40 CFR 51.309?*

These revisions would change § 51.309(d)(5)(i) to eliminate the requirement for setting mobile source emissions budgets using the lowest projected level as a planning objective and performance indicator for each area. Instead, the new § 51.309(d)(5)(i) would substitute, as the new planning objective and performance indicator, a requirement for statewide inventories to show a continuous decline in emissions of each pollutant of concern over the planning period. Should mobile source emissions not decline as expected, States would have to revise their SIPs to include any feasible additional strategies. This new requirement conforms to trends that are currently projected.

In addition, in light of the continuous decline in mobile source emissions expected over the entire region, these revisions also eliminate the unneeded requirement in § 51.309(5)(ii) and (iii) to determine whether mobile sources emissions constitute a significant contributor to haze in a given State. The revisions retain the requirements for statewide inventories and performance demonstrations.

Finally, the revisions contain a backstop provision, requested by the WRAP, to address any potential concerns regarding SO<sub>2</sub> from nonroad

<sup>5</sup> See <http://www.epa.gov/nonroad/> [placeholder for nonroad diesel proposal, signed 4/15/03].

<sup>2</sup> Indian Tribes are given the flexibility under EPA regulations to submit implementation plans and opt into the program after the 2003 deadline.

<sup>3</sup> See 62 FR 25355, (May 8, 1997); 63 FR 18978, (April 16, 1998); 63 FR 56968, (October 23, 1998); 64 FR 73300, (December 29, 1999); 65 FR 59895, (October 6, 2000); 66 FR 5001, (January 18, 2001); 67 FR 68241, (November 8, 2002); and 68 FR 9745, (February 28, 2003).

<sup>4</sup> MOBILE6 and MOBILE6.2 for on-highway vehicles and the NONROAD model for nonroad vehicles.

<sup>1</sup> *Recommendations for Improving Western Vistas*. GCVTC, June 10, 1996.

sources in the event that recently proposed Federal standards, referenced above, are not finalized. The backstop provision, contained in the new §51.309(d)(5)(i)(B), requires States to assess the need for any long-term strategies to address SO<sub>2</sub> from nonroad mobile sources by no later than December 31, 2008. In determining whether to revise their SIPs to address SO<sub>2</sub> from mobile sources, States may consider the emissions reductions achieved—or anticipated—by any Federal standards that are in place addressing fuel sulfur content for nonroad engines.

### III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), the Agency must determine whether the regulatory action is “significant” and therefore subject to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines “significant regulatory action” as one that is likely to result in a rule that may:

“(1) have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities;

(2) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;

(3) materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or

(4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.”

Pursuant to the terms of Executive Order 12866, we have determined that this proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action.

#### B. Paperwork Reduction Act

This action does not add any new requirements involving the collection of information as defined by the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* The OMB has approved the information collection requirements contained in the final Regional Haze regulations (64 FR 35714, July 1, 1999) and has assigned OMB control number 2060–0421 (EPA ICR No. 1813.04).

Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons

to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA’s regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR chapter 15.

#### C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, generally requires an agency to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute 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 organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

For purposes of assessing the impacts of today’s proposed rulemaking on small entities, small entity is defined as: (1) A small business that is a small industrial entity as defined in the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) size standards (as discussed on the SBA Web site at <http://www.sba.gov/size/indextableofsize.html>); (2) a small governmental jurisdiction that is a government of a city, county, town, school district or special district with a population of less than 50,000; and (3) a small organization that is any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field.

After considering the economic impacts of today’s direct final rule on small entities, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. In determining whether a rule has a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the impact of concern is any significant

adverse economic impact on small entities, since the primary purpose of the regulatory flexibility analyses is to identify and address regulatory alternatives “which minimize any significant economic impact of the proposed rule on small entities.” 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Thus, an agency may certify that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities if the rule relieves regulatory burden, or otherwise has a positive economic effect on all of the small entities subject to the rule.

This proposed rule would eliminate certain comprehensive requirements to address mobile source emissions that EPA now considers to be unnecessary. Specifically, as discussed above, this proposed rule would eliminate the requirements in § 51.309(5)(ii) and (iii) to determine whether mobile sources emissions constitute a significant contributor to haze in a given State, and for those States with areas that meet this significance criterion, to establish mobile source emissions budgets. This proposed rule would require emissions reductions consistent with the downward trend in mobile source emission inventories that is currently projected, based on regulations that have already been promulgated. We have therefore concluded that this proposed rule would relieve regulatory burden for all small entities.

#### D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4) (UMRA), establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local, and Tribal governments and the private sector. Under section 202 of the UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1532, EPA generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost-benefit analysis, for any proposed or final rule that “includes any Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100,000,000 or more \* \* \* in any one year.” A “Federal mandate” is defined under section 421(6), 2 U.S.C. 658(6), to include a “Federal intergovernmental mandate” and a “Federal private sector mandate.” A “Federal intergovernmental mandate,” in turn, is defined to include a regulation that “would impose an enforceable duty upon State, local, or tribal governments,” section 421(5)(A)(i), 2 U.S.C. 658(5)(A)(i), except for, among other things, a duty that is “a condition of Federal assistance,” section 421(5)(A)(i)(I). A “Federal private sector mandate”

includes a regulation that “would impose an enforceable duty upon the private sector,” with certain exceptions, section 421(7)(A), 2 U.S.C. 658(7)(A).

Before promulgating an EPA rule for which a written statement is needed under section 202 of the UMRA, section 205, 2 U.S.C. 1535, of the UMRA generally requires EPA to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and adopt the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule.

Because the entire program under 40 CFR 51.309, including today’s amendments, is an option that each of the States may choose to exercise, these revisions to section 309 do not establish any regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, including Tribal governments. The program is not required and, thus is clearly not a “mandate.” Moreover, as explained above, today’s rule eliminates certain requirements and will overall reduce any regulatory burdens. Accordingly, this rule will not result in expenditures to State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any given year. Thus EPA is not obligated, under section 203 of UMRA, to develop a small government agency plan.

We believe that this rulemaking is not subject to the requirements of UMRA. For regional haze SIPs overall, it is questionable whether a requirement to submit a SIP revision constitutes a Federal mandate, as discussed in the preamble to the regional haze rule (64 FR 35761, July 1, 1999). However, today’s direct final rule contains no Federal mandates (under the regulatory provisions of title II of the UMRA) for State, local or Tribal governments or the private sector. In addition, the program contained in 40 CFR 51.309, including today’s revisions, is an optional program.

#### *E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism*

Executive Order 13132, entitled “Federalism” (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), 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 section 6(b) of 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 a regulation. Under section 6(c) of Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law, unless EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the regulation.

This proposed rule does not have federalism implications. It would 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. As described above, this proposed rule contains minor revisions to section 309 of the regional haze rule which would reduce any regulatory burden on the States. In addition, section 309 is an optional program for States. The minor revisions to section 309, accordingly, would not directly impose significant new requirements on State and local governments. Moreover, even if today’s proposed revisions did have federalism implications, these proposed revisions would not impose substantial direct compliance costs on State or local governments, nor would they preempt State law. Thus, Executive Order 13132 does not apply to this proposed rule.

Consistent with EPA policy, we nonetheless did consult with representatives of State and local governments in developing this proposed rule. This rule directly implements specific recommendations from the WRAP, which includes representatives from all the affected States.

In the spirit of Executive Order 13132 and consistent with EPA policy to promote communications between EPA and State and local governments, EPA specifically solicits comment on today’s rule from State and local officials.

#### *F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments*

Executive Order 13175, entitled “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments” (65 FR 67249, November 6, 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.” “Policies that have tribal implications” is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have “substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal government and the Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Indian tribes.”

This proposed rule would eliminate certain requirements and will overall reduce any regulatory burden on the Tribes. Moreover, the section 309 program is an optional program for Tribes within the same geographic region as the WRAP states. Accordingly, this proposed rule would not have tribal implications. In addition, this proposed rule would directly implement specific recommendations from the WRAP, which includes representatives of Tribal governments. Thus, although this proposed rule would not have tribal implications, representatives of Tribal governments have had the opportunity to provide input into development of the recommendations forming its basis.

#### *G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children from Environmental Health and Safety Risks*

Executive Order 13045: “Protection of Children from Environmental Health 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.

The EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that are based on health or safety risks, such that the analysis required under section 5–501 of the Order has the potential to influence the regulation. This proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not establish an environmental standard intended to mitigate health or safety risks.

#### *H. Executive Order 13211: Actions that Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use*

This proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, “Actions 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 Advancement Act*

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 ("NTTAA"), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA directs EPA to provide Congress, through OMB, explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

This proposed rulemaking does not involve technical standards. Therefore, EPA is not considering the use of any voluntary consensus standards. We welcome comments on this aspect of the proposed rulemaking and, specifically, invite the public to identify potentially-applicable voluntary consensus standards and to explain why such standards should be used in this regulation.

#### *J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*

Executive Order 12898 requires that each Federal agency make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minorities and low-income populations. The requirements of Executive Order 12898 have been previously addressed to the extent practicable in the Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) for the regional haze rule (cited above), particularly in chapters 2 and 9 of the RIA. This proposed rule makes no changes that would have a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on minorities and low-income populations.

#### **IV. Statutory Provisions and Legal Authority**

Statutory authority for today's proposed rule comes from sections 169(a) and 169(b) of the CAA (42 U.S.C.

7545(c) and (k)). These sections require EPA to issue regulations that will require States to revise their SIPs to ensure that reasonable progress is made toward the national visibility goals specified in section 169(A).

#### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 51**

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Nitrogen dioxide, Particulate matter, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: June 27, 2003.

**Christine Todd Whitman,**  
*Administrator.*

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, part 51 of title 40, Chapter 1 of the Code of Federal Regulations is proposed to be amended as follows:

#### **PART 51—REQUIREMENTS FOR PREPARATION, ADOPTION, AND SUBMITTAL OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS**

1. The authority citation for part 51 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7410, 7414, 7421, 7470-7479, 7492, 7601, and 7602.

#### **Subpart P—Protection of Visibility**

2. Section 51.309 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(6) and (d)(5)(i), deleting paragraphs (d)(ii) and (d)(iii), and renumbering (d)(iv) to (d)(ii), to read as follows:

#### **§ 51.309 Requirements related to the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b)(6) *Continuous decline in total mobile source emissions* means that the projected level of emissions from mobile sources of each listed pollutant in 2008, 2013, and 2018, are less than the projected level of emissions from mobile sources of each listed pollutant for the previous period (i.e., 2008 less than 2003; 2013 less than 2008; and 2018 less than 2013).

\* \* \* \* \*

(d)(5)(i) Statewide inventories of onroad and nonroad mobile source emissions of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, elemental carbon, and organic carbon for the years 2003, 2008, 2013, and 2018.

(A) The inventories must demonstrate a continuous decline in total mobile source emissions (onroad plus nonroad; tailpipe and evaporative) of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, elemental carbon, and organic carbon, evaluated separately. If the inventories show a continuous decline in total mobile source emissions of each

of these pollutants over the period 2003–2018, no further action is required as part of this plan to address mobile source emissions of these pollutants. If the inventories do not show a continuous decline in mobile source emissions of one or more of these pollutants over the period 2003–2018, the plan submission must provide for an implementation plan revision by no later than December 31, 2008 containing any necessary long-term strategies to achieve a continuous decline in total mobile source emissions of the pollutant(s), to the extent practicable, considering economic and technological reasonableness and federal preemption of vehicle standards and fuel standards under title II of the CAA.

(B) The plan submission must also provide for an implementation plan revision by no later than December 31, 2008 containing any long-term strategies necessary to reduce emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> from nonroad mobile sources, consistent with the goal of reasonable progress. In assessing the need for such long-term strategies, the State may consider emissions reductions achieved or anticipated from any new Federal standards for sulfur in nonroad diesel fuel.

(ii) [text of (iv) retained same as before]

[FR Doc. 03-16923 Filed 7-2-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

#### **Fish and Wildlife Service**

#### **50 CFR Part 17**

**RIN 1018-A168**

#### **Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing of the Central California Distinct Population Segment of the California Tiger Salamander; Reclassification of the Sonoma County and Santa Barbara County Distinct Populations From Endangered to Threatened; Special Rule**

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; extension of comment period and notice of public hearings.

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, are extending the comment period on a proposed rule that would: (1) List the Central California distinct population segment (DPS) of the California Tiger Salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as