

State's submittal becomes effective or until EPA takes action proposing or finally disapproving in whole or part the State submittal. If EPA's direct final action fully approving the State submittal becomes effective, at that time any sanctions clocks will be permanently stopped and any imposed sanctions will be permanently lifted.

Because EPA has preliminarily determined that the State has an approvable plan, relief from sanctions should be provided as quickly as possible. Therefore, EPA is invoking the good cause exception to the 30-day notice requirement of the Administrative Procedure Act because the purpose of this notice is to relieve a restriction. See 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1).

### III. 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 (Public Law 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 March 4, 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 regulations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 29, 2001.

**Laura Yoshii,**

*Deputy Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 01-32098 Filed 12-31-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[CA 252-312a; FRL-7118-1]

### Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern Oxides of Nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions from cement kilns. We are approving a local rule that regulates these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on March 4, 2002 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by February 1, 2002. If we receive such comment, 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 document (TSD) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), Air Division, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.  
California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule

Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95812.  
 Mojave Desert AQMD, 14306 Park Avenue, Victorville, CA 92392-2310.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
 Charnjit Bhullar, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 972-3960.

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

**Table of Contents**

- I. The State's Submittal
  - A. What rule did the State submit?
  - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
  - C. What Is the purpose of the submitted rule revisions?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action.
  - A. How is EPA evaluating this rule?
  - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. Public comment and final action.
- III. Background information.

Why was this rule submitted?  
 IV. Administrative Requirements

**I. The State's Submittal**

*A. What Rule Did the State Submit?*

Table 1 lists the rule we are approving with the dates that it was adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
MDAQMD .....	1161	Portland Cement Kilns .....	10/22/01	11/8/01

On November 21, 2001, this rule submittal was found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

*B. Are There Other Versions of This Rule?*

We approved a version of Rule 1161 into the SIP on May 11, 2000. The MDAQMD adopted revisions to the SIP-approved version on October 22, 2001 and CARB submitted them to us on November 8, 2001.

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

Rule 1161 applies to cement manufacturing operation within the Federal Ozone non-attainment area regulated by the MDAQMD. This rule controls emission of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) from Portland cement kilns.

On May 11, 2000, the EPA published a limited approval and limited disapproval of this rule, because some rule provisions conflicted with section 110 and part D of the Clean air Act. Those provisions included the following:

- 1. Alternative Compliance strategy in section (D).
- 2. Exemption during start-up and shutdown in section (G)(1)(a).
- 3. Referring to a rule not approved in the SIP in section (G)(1)(c).

The revisions are designed primarily to correct these deficiencies. The TSD has more information about this rule.

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

*A. How Is EPA Evaluating This Rule?*

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 sections 182(a)(2)(A) and 182(f)), and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). The

MDAQMD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so Rule 1161 must fulfill RACT.

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

- 1. "State Implementation Plans; Nitrogen Oxides Supplement to the General Preamble; Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 Implementation of Title I; Proposed Rule," (the NO<sub>x</sub> Supplement), 57 FR 55620, November 25, 1992.
- 2. "Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations; Clarification to Appendix D of November 24, 1987 **Federal Register** Notice," (Blue Book), notice of availability published in the May 25, 1988 **Federal Register**.
- 3. Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for the repowering of Utility Boilers, U.S. EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, March 9, 1994.

3. Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for the repowering of Utility Boilers, U.S. EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, March 9, 1994.

*B. Does This Rule Meet the Evaluation Criteria?*

We believe this rule corrects the deficiencies identified in our May 11, 2000 action and is consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

*C. Public Comment and Final Action*

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving the submitted rule because we believe it fulfills 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 rule. If we receive adverse comments by February 1, 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 March 4, 2002. This will incorporate this rule into the federally enforceable SIP.

**III. Background Information**

*Why Was This Rule Submitted?*

NO<sub>x</sub> helps produce ground-level ozone, smog and particulate matter, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of this local agency NO<sub>x</sub> rule.

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.

TABLE 2.—OZONE NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES—Continued

Date	Event
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 (Public Law 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 March 4, 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, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 29, 2001.

**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 paragraph (c)(286) and (c)(287) to read as follows:

#### § 52.220 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(286) [Reserved].

(287) New and amended regulations for the following APCD were submitted on November 8, 2001 by the Governor’s designee.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.

(1) Rule 1161 adopted on October 22, 2001.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 01–32099 Filed 12–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Railroad Administration

#### 49 CFR Part 219

[Docket No. 2001–11213, Notice No. 1]

RIN 2130–AA81

#### Alcohol and Drug Testing: Determination of Minimum Random Testing Rates for 2002

**AGENCY:** Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of determination.

**SUMMARY:** Using data from Management Information System annual reports, FRA has determined that the 2000 rail industry random testing positive rate was .20 percent for drugs and .79 percent for alcohol. Since the industry-wide random drug testing positive rate continues to be below 1.0 percent, the Federal Railroad Administrator (Administrator) has determined that the minimum annual random drug testing rate for the period January 1, 2002 through December 31, 2002 will remain at 25 percent of covered railroad employees. Since the random alcohol