

areas have attained the ozone standard, the requirements of section 182(b)(1) concerning the submission of the 15 percent plan and ozone attainment demonstration and the requirements of section 172(c)(9) concerning contingency measures are not applicable to the area so long as the area does not violate the ozone standard.

USEPA emphasizes that these determinations are contingent upon the continued monitoring and continued attainment and maintenance of the ozone NAAQS in the affected areas. If a violation of the ozone NAAQS is monitored in the Grand Rapids and Muskegon areas (consistent with the requirements contained in 40 CFR part 58 and recorded in AIRS), USEPA will provide notice to the public in the **Federal Register**. Such a violation would mean that the area would thereafter have to address the requirements of section 182(b)(1) and section 172(c)(9) since the basis for the determination that they do not apply would no longer exist.

As a consequence of the determinations that the areas have attained and that the reasonable further progress and attainment demonstration requirements of section 182(b)(1) and contingency measure requirements of section 172(c)(9) do not presently apply, the sanctions clocks started by USEPA as a result of the findings made on January 21, 1994 regarding incompleteness of the section 181(b)(1) 15 percent plans and 172(c)(9) contingency plans are hereby stopped as the deficiency for which the clocks were started no longer exists.

Nothing in this action shall be construed as permitting or allowing or establishing a precedent for any future request for a revision to any state implementation plan. Each request for revision to the State implementation plan shall be considered separately in light of specific technical, economic, and environmental factors and in relation to relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

This action will become effective on July 17, 1995. However, if the USEPA receives adverse comments by July 3, 1995, then the USEPA will publish a notice that withdraws the action, and will address these comments in a subsequent final rule on the related proposed rule which is being published in the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 et seq., USEPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities (5 U.S.C. 603 and 604). Alternatively, USEPA may

certify that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000. This action's determination does not create any new requirements, but allows suspension of the indicated requirements. Therefore, because the approval does not impose any new requirements, I certify that it does not have a significant impact on any small entities affected.

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act") (signed into law on March 22, 1995) requires that the Agency prepare a budgetary impact statement before promulgating a rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any one year. Section 203 requires the Agency to establish a plan for obtaining input from and informing, educating, and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely affected by the rule.

Under section 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Act, the Agency must identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives before promulgating a rule for which a budgetary impact statement must be prepared. The Agency must select from those alternatives the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule, unless the Agency explains why this alternative is not selected or the selection of this alternative is inconsistent with law.

Because this final rule is estimated to result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments or the private sector of less than \$100 million in any one year, the Agency has not prepared a budgetary impact statement or specifically addressed the selection of the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative. Because small governments will not be significantly or uniquely affected by this rule, the Agency is not required to develop a plan with regard to small governments.

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 1, 1995. 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, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Volatile organic compounds, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and record keeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4201-7601q.

Dated: May 18, 1995.

Valdas V. Adamkus,

Regional Administrator.

Part 52, chapter 1, 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. 7401-7671q.

Subpart X—Michigan

2. Section 52.1174 is amended by adding new paragraph (k) to read as follows:

* * * * *

§ 52.1174 Control strategy: Ozone.

(k) Determination—EPA is determining that, as of July 17, 1995, the Grand Rapids and Muskegon ozone nonattainment area has attained the ozone standard and that the reasonable further progress and attainment demonstration requirements of section 182(b)(1) and related requirements of section 172(c)(9) of the Clean Air Act do not apply to the area for so long as the area does not monitor any violations of the ozone standard. If a violation of the ozone NAAQS is monitored in the Grand Rapids and Muskegon ozone nonattainment area, these determinations shall no longer apply.

[FR Doc. 95-13461 Filed 6-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

43 Public Land Order 7146

[NM-1430-01; NMMN 89978]

Withdrawal of National Forest System Land for the Coyote Ranger District; New Mexico

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Public land order.

SUMMARY: This order withdraws 232.50 acres of National Forest System land from mining for 20 years to protect the newly constructed Coyote Ranger District administrative facilities. The land has been and will remain open to mineral leasing.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 2, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hal Knox, BLM Taos Resource Area, 224 Cruz Alta Road, Taos, New Mexico, 87571, (505) 758-8851.

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by Section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. 1714 (1988), it is ordered as follows:

1. Subject to valid existing rights, the following described National Forest System land is hereby withdrawn from location and entry under the United States mining laws (30 U.S.C. Ch. 2 (1988)), but not from leasing under the mineral leasing laws, to protect the Coyote Ranger District administrative facilities:

New Mexico Principal Meridian

T. 23 N., R. 2 E.,

Sec. 26, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$;

Sec. 35, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, and SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$.

The area described contains 232.50 acres in Rio Arriba County.

2. The withdrawal made by this order does not alter the applicability of those land laws governing the use of the National Forest System lands under lease, license or permit, or governing the disposal of their mineral or vegetative resources other than under the mining laws.

3. This withdrawal will expire 20 years from the effective date of this order unless, as a result of a review conducted before the expiration date pursuant to section 204(f) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. 1714(f) (1988), the Secretary determines that the withdrawal shall be extended.

Dated: May 19, 1995.

Bob Armstrong,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

[FR Doc. 95-13481 Filed 6-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-FB-P

**FEDERAL EMERGENCY
MANAGEMENT AGENCY**

44 CFR Part 64

[Docket No. FEMA-7618]

Suspension of Community Eligibility

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule identifies communities, where the sale of flood insurance has been authorized under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), that are suspended on the effective dates listed within this rule because of noncompliance with the floodplain management requirements of the program. If the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) receives documentation that the community has adopted the required floodplain management measures prior to the effective suspension date given in this rule, the suspension will be withdrawn by publication in the **Federal Register**.

EFFECTIVE DATES: The effective date of each community's suspension is the third date ("Susp.") listed in the third column of the following tables.

ADDRESSES: If you wish to determine whether a particular community was suspended on the suspension date, contact the appropriate FEMA Regional Office or the NFIP servicing contractor.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert F. Shea Jr., Division Director, Program Implementation Division, Mitigation Directorate, 500 C Street, SW., Room 417, Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-3619.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NFIP enables property owners to purchase flood insurance which is generally not otherwise available. In return, communities agree to adopt and administer local floodplain management aimed at protecting lives and new construction from future flooding. Section 1315 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 4022, prohibits flood insurance coverage as authorized under the National Flood Insurance Program, 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*, unless an appropriate public body adopts adequate floodplain management measures with effective enforcement measures. The communities listed in this document no longer meet that statutory requirement for compliance with program regulations, 44 CFR part 59 *et seq.* Accordingly, the communities will be suspended on the effective date in the third column. As of that date, flood insurance will no longer be

available in the community. However, some of these communities may adopt and submit the required documentation of legally enforceable floodplain management measures after this rule is published but prior to the actual suspension date. These communities will not be suspended and will continue their eligibility for the sale of insurance. A notice withdrawing the suspension of the communities will be published in the **Federal Register**.

In addition, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has identified the special flood hazard areas in these communities by publishing a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). The date of the FIRM if one has been published, is indicated in the fourth column of the table. No direct Federal financial assistance (except assistance pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act not in connection with a flood) may legally be provided for construction or acquisition of buildings in the identified special flood hazard area of communities not participating in the NFIP and identified for more than a year, on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's initial flood insurance map of the community as having flood-prone areas (section 202(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4106(a), as amended). This prohibition against certain types of Federal assistance becomes effective for the communities listed on the date shown in the last column.

The Deputy Associate Director finds that notice and public comment under 5 U.S.C. 553(b) are impracticable and unnecessary because communities listed in this final rule have been adequately notified.

Each community receives a 6-month, 90-day, and 30-day notification addressed to the Chief Executive Officer that the community will be suspended unless the required floodplain management measures are met prior to the effective suspension date. Since these notifications have been made, this final rule may take effect within less than 30 days.

National Environmental Policy Act

This rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR Part 10, Environmental Considerations. No environmental impact assessment has been prepared.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Deputy Associate Director has determined that this rule is exempt from the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act because the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as