Cumberland, Dauphin, Erie, Fayette, Lackawanna, Lancaster, Lebanon, Lehigh, Luzerne, Mercer, Monroe, Somerset, Northhampton, Perry, Washington, Westmoreland, Wyoming and York. On December 1, 1994, EPA received a petition from Governor Casey to remove these twenty-eight counties from the list of covered areas defined by § 80.70 of the reformulated gasoline rule. As with New York's request, the Administrator responded to the State's request in a letter to Governor Casey dated December 12, 1994, stating EPA's intention to grant Pennsylvania's request, and conduct rulemaking to implement this. Effective January 1, 1995, and until formal rulemaking to remove the twenty-eight counties from the list of covered areas is completed, EPA would not enforce the reformulated gasoline requirements in these twentyeight counties for reformulated gasoline violations arising after January 1, 1995. This was based on the particular circumstances in Pennsylvania. EPA has reserved its authority to enforce the reformulated gasoline program for violations that may have occurred prior to January 1, 1995.

Hancock and Waldo Counties in Maine were included as covered areas in EPA's reformulated gasoline regulation based on Governor John R. McKernan's request of June 26, 1991, that these counties be included under the Act's opt-in provision for ozone nonattainment areas. (56 FR 46119, September 10, 1991) See 40 CFR 80.70(j)(5) (viii) and (ix). On December 27, EPA received a petition from the Acting Commissioner of Maine's Department of Environmental Protection, Ms. Deborah Garrett, to remove Hancock and Waldo Counties in Maine from the list of areas covered by the requirements of the reformulated gasoline program. EPA understands that Commissioner Garrett is acting for Governor McKernan in this matter. EPA Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, Mary Nichols, responded to the state's request in a letter to Commissioner Garrett, dated December 28, 1994, stating EPA's intention to grant Maine's request, and conduct rulemaking to implement this. The December 28 letter also stated EPA's intent to stay the reformulated gasoline regulations from January 1, 1995 until July 1, 1995, in the specified counties while the Agency completes rulemaking to appropriately change the regulations. However, EPA has reserved its authority to enforce the reformulated gasoline program for violations that may have occurred prior to January 1, 1995.

III. EPA's Proposal To Grant New York's, Pennsylvania's and Maine's Requests To Remove Selected Opt-In Areas From the Requirements of the Reformulated Gasoline Program and Extension of the Stay of Application of the Reformulated Gasoline Regulations

EPA believes that it is reasonable to construe section 211(k) as authorizing the Agency to establish procedures and requirements for states to opt out of the reformulated gasoline program. This would only apply to areas that have previously opted in under section 211(k)(6); the mandatory covered areas would not be allowed to opt out of the program.

In section 211(k)(6), Congress expressed its clear intention regarding state opt-in to this program. That paragraph establishes that "upon the application of the Governor of a State, the Administrator shall apply the prohibition set forth in paragraph (5) in any (ozone nonattainment) area in the State * * * The Administrator shall establish an effective date for such prohibition * * *." 2 However, with respect to opting out, "the statute is silent or ambiguous with respect to the specific issue" and the question is whether EPA's interpretation "is based on a permissible construction of the statute." Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 467 U.S. 837, 843 (1984). In addition, "[i]f Congress has explicitly left a gap for the Agency to fill, there is an express delegation of authority to the Agency to elucidate a specific provision of the statute by regulation." Id. at 843-44. If the delegation is implicit, the Agency may adopt a reasonable interpretation of the statute. Id. at 844.

Section 211(k)(1) provides that EPA is to promulgate "regulations establishing requirements for reformulated gasoline." This provision therefore delegates to EPA the authority to define the requirements for reformulated gasoline. Clean Air Act section 301(a)(1) also delegates to EPA the general authority to promulgate "such regulations as are necessary" for EPA to carry out its function under the Act. Given these delegations of legislative rulemaking authority, EPA's interpretation of section 211(k) with respect to opting out should be upheld unless manifestly contrary to the Act. Chevron, 467 U.S. at 843-44.

EPA believes that it is appropriate to interpret section 211(k) as authorizing states to opt-out of this program, provided that a process is established

for a reasonable transition out of the program.3 There are really two aspects to this, the first being whether states should be allowed to opt out at all, the second being what conditions, if any, should be placed on opting out. With respect to the former, the ability to opt out is consistent with the Act's recognition that states have the primary responsibility to develop a mix of appropriate control strategies needed to reach attainment with the NAAQS. While various mandatory control strategies were established under the Clean Air Act, the Act still evidences a clear commitment to allowing states the flexibility to determine the appropriate mix of other measures needed to meet their air pollution goals. Section 211(k)'s opt-in provision reflects this deference to state choice, providing that opt-in will occur upon application by the governor. The only discretion EPA retains regarding opt-in is in setting or extending the effective date. Allowing states the ability to opt-out is a logical extension of these considerations of deference to state decision making.

Given such deference, it follows that opting out should be accomplished through application of the governor. It also follows that the conditions on opting out should be geared towards achieving a reasonable transition out of the reformulated gasoline program, as compared to requiring a state to justify its decision. EPA has identified two principal areas of concern in this regard. The first involves coordination of air quality planning. For example, reformulated gasoline in opt-in areas has been relied upon by several states in their State Implementation Plan submissions or in their redesignation requests. The second involves appropriate lead time for industry to transition out of the program.

With respect to air quality planning, EPA believes there is no reason to delay the removal of the 39 affected counties, or portions of counties, in New York, Pennsylvania and Maine. The 39 counties have not had an ozone exceedance over a consecutive three-year period. Certain of these thirty-nine

² Paragraph 5 of section 211(k) prohibits the sale of conventional, or non-reformulated gasoline, in covered areas.

³ The preamble to the December 15, 1993, final regulations failed to provide a clear discussion of EPA's views on this issue. While EPA noted that it "may pursue a separate action in the future that would allow states to opt out of the RFG program, provided sufficient notice is given," the preamble also indicated there were concerns over whether EPA had authority to allow states to opt-out. 59 FR 7808 (February 16, 1994). The context for these statements, however, makes it clear that EPA's concerns were based on issues surrounding questions of opting-in for only Phase I of the reformulated gasoline program. See 59 FR 7809. As noted above, EPA believes that it does have authority to establish requirements that allow states to opt-out of this program.