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 August 25, 2003. 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, Carbon monoxide, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: May 13, 2003.

Robert E. Roberts,

Regional Administrator, Region 8.

■ 40 CFR part 52 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 TT—Utah

■ 2. Section 52.2320 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(56) to read as follows:

§ 52.2320 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(56) On June 27, 1994 and April 28, 2000, the Governor of Utah submitted revisions to the State Implementation Plan. On December 31, 2002, the State of Utah submitted Supplemental Administrative Documentation. The June 27, 1994 submittal revises the numbering and format of Utah's State Implementation Plan (SIP). The April 28, 2000 and December 31, 2002 submittals contain non-substantive changes to correct minor errors in the June 27, 1994 submittal. The provisions identified below are approved into the SIP and supersede and replace the corresponding prior codification of the provisions of the SIP.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Utah State Implementation Plan Section I; Section II; Section III (except III.C); Section IV; Section V; Section VI; Section VII (except VII.D); Section IX, Part IX.B (except the title, IX.B.3.a, IX.B.3.d, IX.B.3.e, and IX.B.4); Section IX, Parts C, E, F and G (except the titles); Section IX, Part D.1 (except for the title and IX.D.1.d (5)); Section XI (Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 only); Section XII; Section XIII; Section XIV (except Table IX.9); Section XV; Section XVI; Section XVII (except XVII.A, XVII.D and XVII.E); Section XVIII (except XVIII.B); and Section XIX, effective 11/12/93.

(B) Utah State Implementation Plan Section IX, Part IX.B.3.d; Section IX, titles of Parts B, C, D.1, E, F and G; Section XIV, Table XIV.9; Section XVII, Parts XVII.A, XVII.D and XVII.E; and Section XVIII, Part XVIII.B, effective 2/25/2000.

(C) Utah State Implementation Plan Section III, Part III.C; Section VII, Part VII.D; Section VIII; Section IX, Parts IX.B.3.a, IX.B.3.e, IX.B.4, IX.C.7.b(3), IX.C.7.h(3), IX.C.8.b(3), IX.C.8.f(1)(a), IX.C.8.h(3)(a), IX.C.8.h(3)(c), IX.D.1.d(5), IX.D.2.b, IX.D.2.d(1)(a), IX.D.2.e(1), IX.D.2.f(1)(a), IX.D.2.h, IX.D.2.i and IX.D.2.j; and Section XXII, effective January 1, 2003.

(ii) Additional Material.

(A) October 3, 2002 letter from Rick Sprott, Utah Department of Air Quality, to Richard Long, EPA Region VIII, to address typographical errors and missing pages in the January 27, 1994 submittal.

[FR Doc. 03–15900 Filed 6–24–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 086–SIP; FRL–7518–4]

Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for California State Implementation Plan Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing our February 13, 2003 proposed finding (68 FR 7327) that the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) is substantially inadequate for all nonattainment air pollution control districts in the State and for all

attainment area districts that have an approved Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program. We did not receive any comments on our proposal. EPA is finalizing this finding, pursuant to our authority in section 110(k)(5) of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act), because the State cannot provide ''necessary assurances'' that it or the districts have authority to carry out the applicable nonattainment New Source Review (NSR) or PSD portions of the SIP. This action requires California to amend its State law to eliminate the permitting exemption as it pertains to major agricultural sources of air pollution and submit the necessary assurances by November 23, 2003 to support an affirmative finding by EPA under section 110(a)(2)(E). If the State fails to submit the necessary assurances of authority or if EPA disapproves any such submittal in response to this final SIP call, the sanctions clock in section 179 of the Act will be triggered.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This rule is effective on July 25, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You can inspect copies of the administrative record for this action at EPA's Region IX office from 8:30 AM to 5 PM, Monday-Friday. Please call 24 hours in advance to accommodate building security procedures. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

Copies of the SIPs for the State of California are also available for inspection at the following location: California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 ''I'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please call Ed Pike, EPA Region IX, at (415) 972–3974 or send e-mail to *pike.ed@epa.gov*.

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

Table of Contents

I. Background

A. What Action Is EPA Finalizing?

CAA section 110(k)(5) provides that whenever EPA finds the applicable implementation plan ''is substantially inadequate to attain or maintain the relevant national ambient air quality standard, * * * or to otherwise comply with any requirement of this Act, the Administrator shall require the State to revise the plan as necessary to correct such inadequacies.'' EPA did not receive any comments on our February 13, 2003 proposed finding of inadequacy. Today we are finalizing our finding that the approved California SIP is substantially inadequate. The SIP cannot provide ''necessary assurances'' that the State or districts have the authority to issue permits under their PSD and nonattainment NSR SIPs to all major sources because Health & Safety Code section 42310(e) exempts major agricultural stationary sources from these permitting requirements.

Specifically, sections 110(a)(2)(C) and (I) and 172 of the Act require the applicable implementation plan to contain a program for issuing permits to major stationary sources of air pollution pursuant to parts C and D of title I of the Act. In addition, section 110(a)(2)(E) requires that each SIP provide necessary assurances that the State or districts have adequate authority to carry out the SIP and that no State law prohibits the State or districts from carrying out any portion of the SIP. The California SIP does not meet these requirements because California Health & Safety Code section 42310(e) exempts ''equipment used in agricultural operations in the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals'' from all permitting, including PSD and NSR permitting otherwise required by parts C and D of title I of the Act. As a result, the State and districts cannot issue permits to these agricultural sources, even if they are major stationary sources under the Act. The CAA NSR and PSD permitting requirements do not provide for this exemption.

B. How Can California Correct the SIP Inadequacy?

To correct the deficiency, EPA recommends that the State legislature amend Health & Safety Code section 42310(e) to remove the exemption as it applies to major agricultural sources. The State is already subject to a sanctions clock based on the Notice of Deficiency (NOD) that EPA issued on May 22, 2002, 67 FR 35990, with respect to the State's title V operating permits program. In that NOD, EPA explained that California Health & Safety Code section 42310(e) improperly exempted major agricultural sources from CAA title V permitting. The NOD stated: ''EPA has determined that significant action in this instance means the revision or removal of Health and Safety Code 42310(e) so that local air pollution control districts have the required authority to issue title V permits to stationary agricultural sources that are major sources of air pollution.'' A similar correction with respect to NSR and PSD permitting is necessary by November 23, 2003 to comply with this final action, *i.e.* remove the agricultural exemption for major sources. We are setting this deadline to be consistent with the deadline established in the May 22, 2002 NOD for making the revision for Title V purposes.

Our proposal listed several districts that have New Source Review exemptions that may pose problems for permitting major agricultural stationary sources, but did not call for specific revisions at this time. We believe it is reasonable to wait for the State legislature to correct Health and Safety Code section 42310(e) before we determine whether any such exemptions at the district level represent authority problems under section 110(a)(2)(E).[1] EPA, nonetheless, encourages districts to evaluate their SIP-approved rules to ensure that exemptions do not create potential authority problems. Once the State acts to address Health and Safety Code section 42310(e), EPA will work with the districts to determine if further rulemaking is necessary to address specific local deficiencies that remain after the State law change.

C. What Are the Consequences if California Does Not Correct the SIP Inadequacy?

As noted earlier, California must adopt and submit to EPA a revision to

[1] We note that certain local exemptions are tied to exemptions such as Health and Safety Code section 42310(e) provided under State law. Removal of the exemption at the State level could automatically resolve authority problems at the district level. In addition, if the State legislature were to not only revise the language of Health and Safety Code section 42310(e) but also to clarify that any such local exemptions were also void, no further action by the districts may be necessary. Depending on the action at the State level, EPA may be able to make the required finding under 110(a)(2)(E) that the authority to carry out the air permitting programs is not prohibited by any State or local law.

State law that will provide the necessary assurances that it (or the districts) can fully implement the required NSR and PSD programs for all major sources, including agricultural sources, within the State. If EPA determines that the State has failed to amend State law by November 23, 2003, or if EPA subsequently finds the correction does not adequately provide such assurances, EPA will make a finding under section 179 of the Act that will start a sanctions clock as specified under 40 CFR 52.31.[2] There are two types of sanctions: highway funding sanctions (section 179(b)(1)) and offset sanctions (section 179(b)(2)). Pursuant to our regulations at 40 CFR 52.31, offset sanctions will apply 18 months following a finding by EPA under section 179(a); highway funding sanctions would apply six months later. However, we expect that the State will make the necessary corrections to avoid sanctions.

II. 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

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.*)

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.

Today's SIP call does not establish requirements applicable to small entities. Instead, it requires the State of California to develop, adopt, and submit SIP revisions that would provide the necessary assurances that the applicable NSR and PSD programs do not exempt major agricultural sources.

This rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because the rule does not establish requirements applicable to small entities. Therefore, the Administrator certifies that this action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Under sections 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), 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 this final action 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 action will require the State of California to revise laws and regulations governing exemptions for agricultural sources. This requirement, even if considered a Federal mandate,[3] would not result in aggregate costs over $100 million to either the state or local districts. In addition, this final action will not significantly or uniquely impact small governments.

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.

This rule 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 does not impose a new enforceable duty on the State, 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.'' This final rule does 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.

[2] EPA is using its authority in section 110(k)(5) to set a deadline for a corrective submittal that is less than 18 months. We believe the November 23, 2003, deadline for beginning the 18 month sanctions clock is reasonable because action by this date is otherwise required to address the title V problems noted above.

[3] It is unclear whether a requirement to submit a SIP revision would constitute a federal mandate. The obligation for a state to revise its SIP that arises out of sections 110(a) and 110(k)(5) of the CAA is not legally enforceable by a court of law, and at most is a condition for continued receipt of highway funds. Therefore, it is possible to view an action requiring such a submittal as not creating any enforceable duty within the meaning of section 421(5)(9a)(I) of UMRA (2 U.S.C. 658 (a)(I)). Even if it did, the duty could be viewed as falling within the exception for a condition of Federal assistance under section 421(5)(a)(i)(I) of UMRA (2 U.S.C. 658(5)(a)(i)(I)).

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.

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

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

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, ''Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) because it is not a significant regulatory action 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 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). This rule will be effective July 25, 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 August 25, 2003. 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, New source review, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: July 16, 2003.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 03–16028 Filed 6–24–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[OPP–2003–0181; FRL–7313–9]

Flufenacet (N-(4-fluorophenyl)-N-(1-methylethyl)-2-[[5-(trifluoromethyl)-1,3,4-thiadiazol-2-yl]oxy]acetamide; Pesticide Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule. SUMMARY:

This regulation establishes a tolerance for combined residues of flufenacet (*N*-(4-fluorophenyl)-*N*-(1-methylethyl)-2-[[5-(trifluoromethyl)-1,3,4-thiadiazol-2-yl]oxy]acetamide and its metabolites containing the 4-fluoro-*N*-methylethyl benzenamine moiety in or on corn, field, forage; corn, field, grain; corn, field, stover; and soybean, seed; and for indirect or inadvertent residues for flufenacet and its metabolites in or on alfalfa, forage; alfalfa, hay; alfalfa, seed; clover, forage; clover, hay; grain, cereal, group 15, except rice; grain, cereal, forage, fodder and straw, group 16, except rice; and grass, forage, fodder, and hay, group 17. BayerCropScience requested this tolerance under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), as amended by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA).

DATES: This regulation is effective June 25, 2003. Objections and requests for hearings, identified by docket ID number OPP–2003–0181, must be received on or before August 25, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Written objections and hearing requests may be submitted electronically, by mail, or through hand delivery/courier. Follow the detailed instructions as provided in Unit VII. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James A. Tompkins, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW.,Washington, DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (703) 305–5697; e-mail address: *tompkins.jim@epa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected entities may include, but are not limited to:

- Crop production (NAICS 111)
- Animal production (NAICS 112)
- Food manufacturing (NAICS 311)
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS 32532)

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in this unit could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether this action might apply to certain entities. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

B. How Can I Get Copies of this Document and Other Related Information?

1. *Docket*. EPA has established an official public docket for this action under docket identification (ID) number OPP–2003–0181. The official public