

under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) for this emergency closure are impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest. Lack of appropriate and immediate conservation measures could seriously affect the continued viability of fish populations, adversely impact future subsistence opportunities for rural Alaskans, and would generally fail to serve the overall public interest. Therefore, the Board finds good cause pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B) to waive additional public notice and comment procedures prior to implementation of this action and pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d) to make this effective as indicated in the **DATES** section.

Conformance With Statutory and Regulatory Authorities

National Environmental Policy Act Compliance

A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was published on February 28, 1992, and a Record of Decision on Subsistence Management for Federal Public Lands in Alaska (ROD) signed April 6, 1992. The final rule for Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subparts A, B, and C (57 FR 22940–22964, published May 29, 1992) implemented the Federal Subsistence Management Program and included a framework for an annual cycle for subsistence hunting and fishing regulations. A final rule that redefined the jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Management Program to include waters subject to the subsistence priority was published on January 8, 1999, (64 FR 1276.)

Compliance With Section 810 of ANILCA

The intent of all Federal subsistence regulations is to accord subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on public lands a priority over the taking of fish and wildlife on such lands for other purposes, unless restriction is necessary to conserve healthy fish and wildlife populations. A Section 810 analysis was completed as part of the FEIS process. The final Section 810 analysis determination appeared in the April 6, 1992, ROD which concluded that the Federal Subsistence Management Program, under Alternative IV with an annual process for setting hunting and fishing regulations, may have some local impacts on subsistence uses, but the program is not likely to significantly restrict subsistence uses.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The emergency closure does not contain information collection requirements subject to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

Other Requirements

The emergency closure has been exempted from OMB review under Executive Order 12866.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) requires preparation of flexibility analyses for rules that will have a significant effect on a substantial number of small entities, which include small business, organizations, or governmental jurisdictions. The exact number of businesses and the amount of trade that will result from this Federal land-related activity is unknown. The aggregate effect is an insignificant economic effect (both positive and negative) on a small number of small entities supporting subsistence activities, such as boat, fishing tackle, and gasoline dealers. The number of small entities affected is unknown; but, the effects will be seasonally and geographically-limited in nature and will likely not be significant. The Departments certify that the emergency closure will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Title VIII of ANILCA requires the Secretaries to administer a subsistence preference on public lands. The scope of this program is limited by definition to certain public lands. Likewise, the emergency closure has no potential takings of private property implications as defined by Executive Order 12630.

The Servicer has determined and certifies pursuant to the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, 2 U.S.C. 1502 *et seq.* that the emergency closure will not impose a cost of \$100 million or more in any given year on local or State governments or private entities. The implementation is by Federal agencies, and no cost is involved to any State or local entities or Tribal governments.

The Service has determined that the emergency closure meets the applicable standards provided in Sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, regarding civil justice reform.

In accordance with Executive Order 13132, the emergency closure does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of Federalism Assessment. Title VIII of ANILCA precludes the State from exercising management authority over fish and

wildlife resources on Federal lands. Cooperative salmon run assessment effects with ADF&G will continue.

In accordance with the President's memorandum of April 29, 1994, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments" (59 FR 22951), Executive Order 13175, and 512 DM 2, we have evaluated possible effects on Federally recognized Indian tribes and have determined that there are no effects. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is a participating agency in this rulemaking.

On May 18, 2001, the President issued Executive Order 13211 on regulations that significantly affect energy supply, distribution, or use. This Executive Order requires agencies to prepare Statements of Energy when undertaking certain actions. As this action is not expected to significantly affect energy supply, distribution, or use, it is not a significant energy action and no Statement of Energy Effects is required.

Drafting Information

William Knauer drafted this document under the guidance of Thomas H. Boyd, of the Office of Subsistence Management, Alaska Regional Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska. Taylor Brelsford, Alaska State Office, Bureau of Land Management; Rod Simons, Alaska Regional Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Bob Gerhard, Alaska Regional Office, National Park Service; Ida Hildebrand, Alaska Regional Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Ken Thompson, USDA—Forest Service, provided additional guidance.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 3, 472, 551 668dd, 3103–3126; 18 U.S.C. 3551–3586; 43 U.S.C. 1733.

Dated: November 16, 2001.

Thomas H. Boyd,

Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board.

Dated: November 16, 2001.

Kenneth E. Thompson,

Subsistence Program Leader, USDA—Forest Service.

[FR Doc. 02–4538 Filed 2–26–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M and 4310–55–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 52**

[CA 250-0317c; FRL-7146-1]

Interim Final Determination That the State of California Has Corrected Deficiencies and Stay of Sanctions, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Interim final determination.

SUMMARY: Elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**, EPA has published a direct final rulemaking fully approving the State of California's submittal of a revision to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). We have also published a proposed rulemaking to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on EPA's action. If a person submits adverse comments on our direct final action, we will withdraw our direct final rule and will consider any comments received before taking final action on the State's submittal. Based on the proposed full approval, we are making an interim final determination by this action that the State has corrected the deficiencies for which a sanctions clock began on August 25, 2000 (65 FR 45912). This action will stay the imposition of the offset sanction and defer the imposition of the highway sanction. Although this action is effective upon publication, we will take comment. If no comments are received on our approval of the State's submittal and on our interim final determination, the direct final action published in today's **Federal Register** will also finalize our determination that the State has corrected the deficiencies that started the sanctions clock. If comments are received on our approval or on this interim final determination, we will publish a final rule taking into consideration any comments received.

DATES: This document is effective February 27, 2002. Comments must be received by March 29, 2002.

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.

You can inspect copies of the submitted rule 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 rule revisions and TSD at the following locations:

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

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

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

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1990 East Gettysburg Street, Fresno, CA 93726.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX; (415) 947-4118.

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

I. Background

On April 5, 1991, the State of California submitted a revision to Rule 4103 in the SJVUAPCD portion of the SIP, which we disapproved in part on July 25, 2000 (65 FR 45912). Our disapproval action started an 18-month clock beginning on August 25, 2000 for the imposition of one sanction (followed by a second sanction 6 months later) and a 24-month clock for promulgation of a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP). The State subsequently submitted revised Rule 4103 and new Rule 4106 on October 30, 2001. We have taken direct final action on this submittal pursuant to our modified direct final policy set forth at 59 FR 24054 (May 10, 1994). In the Rules and Regulations section of today's **Federal Register**, we have issued a direct final full approval of the State of California's submittal of its SIP revision. In addition, in the Proposed Rules section of today's **Federal Register**, we have proposed full approval of the State's submittal. Based on the proposed full approval set forth in today's **Federal Register**, we believe that it is more likely than not that the State has corrected the original disapproval deficiencies. Therefore, we are taking this final rulemaking action, effective on publication, finding that the State has corrected the deficiencies. However, we are also providing the public with an opportunity to comment on this final action. If, based on any comments on this action and any comments on our proposed full approval of the State's submittal, we determine that the State's submittal is not fully approvable and this final action was inappropriate, we will either propose or take final action finding that

the State has not corrected the original disapproval deficiencies. As appropriate, we will also issue an interim final determination or a final determination that the deficiency has been corrected.

This action does not stop the sanctions clock that started for this area on August 25, 2000. However, this action will stay the imposition of the offsets sanction and will defer the imposition of the highway sanction. If our direct final action fully approving the State's submittal becomes effective, such action will permanently stop the sanctions clock and will permanently lift any imposed, stayed or deferred sanctions. If we must withdraw the direct final action based on adverse comments and we subsequently determine that the State, in fact, did not correct the disapproval deficiencies, we will also determine that the State did not correct the deficiencies and the sanctions consequences described in the sanctions rule will apply. See 59 FR 39832 (August 4, 1994), codified at 40 CFR 52.31.

II. EPA Action

We are taking interim final action finding that the State has corrected the disapproval deficiencies that started the sanctions clock. Based on this action, imposition of the offset sanction will be stayed and imposition of the highway sanction will be deferred until our direct final action fully approving the State's submittal becomes effective or until we take action proposing or finally disapproving in whole or part the State submittal. If our direct final action fully approving the State submittal becomes effective, at that time any sanctions clocks will be permanently stopped and any imposed, stayed, or deferred sanctions will be permanently lifted.

Because we have preliminarily determined that the State has an approvable submittal, relief from sanctions should be provided as quickly as possible. Therefore, we are 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. This action merely stays and defers federal sanctions. 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 only stays an imposed sanction and defers the imposition of another, 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). For the same reason, this rule also does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of tribal governments, as specified by Executive Order 13084 (63 FR 27655, May 10, 1998). 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 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it merely stays a sanction and defers another one, 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 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

This rule does not contain technical standards, 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. As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), in issuing this rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the "Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings" issued under the executive order.

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. However, section 808 provides that any rule for which the issuing agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefor in the rule) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, shall take effect at such time as the agency promulgating the rule determines. 5 U.S.C. 808(2). As stated previously, EPA has made such a good cause finding, including the reasons therefor, and established an effective date of February 27, 2002. 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**. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental regulations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: January 31, 2002.

Wayne Nastri,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 02-4525 Filed 2-26-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 250-0317a; FRL-7145-8]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve a revision to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns the emission of particulate matter (PM-10) from open burning, prescribed burning, and hazard reduction burning. We are

approving local rules that regulate this emission source under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on April 29, 2002 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by March 29, 2002. If we receive such 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.

You can inspect copies of the submitted rule 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 rule revisions and TSD at the following locations:

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

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

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1990 East Gettysburg Street, Fresno, CA 93726.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX; (415) 947-4118.

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 submitted rule revisions?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
 - B. Do the rules 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 Rules Did the State Submit?

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