

State of California
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

Final Statement of Reasons for Rulemaking,
Including Summary of Comments and Agency Response

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDING THE TEST METHOD DESIGNATED FOR
DETERMINING THE OXYGEN CONTENT OF GASOLINE

Public Hearing Date: June 29, 1995
Agenda Item No.: 95-6-4

I. GENERAL

This rulemaking was initiated by the issuance of a hearing notice and a Staff Report: Initial Statement of Reasons for Rulemaking (the Staff Report), which was available for inspection on May 12, 1995. The Staff Report, which is incorporated herein by reference, included the text of the proposed amendments, and the rationale for the proposal. The proposed amendments update the test method designated for determining the oxygen content of gasoline.

On June 29, 1995, the Air Resources Board (ARB) conducted a public hearing at which it received written and oral comments on the proposed amendments. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Board adopted Resolution 94-68, in which the amendments to section 2258(c), 2251.5(c), and 2263(b) were adopted as proposed.

During the 45-day comment period, written comments were submitted by the American Automobile Manufacturers Association and 76 Products Company. Oral comments were presented at the hearing by Donald Bea on behalf of the Western States Petroleum Association. All of the commenters supported adoption of the proposed amendments. None of the commenters presented any objections or recommendations specifically directed at the proposed amendments or the procedures followed by the ARB in proposing the amendments.

The Board has determined that this regulatory action will not result in a mandate to any local agency or school district, the costs of which are reimbursable pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with section 17500), Division 4, Title 2 of the Government Code.

The Board has determined that no alternative considered by the agency would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulatory action was proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the action taken by the Board.