filed. This action will be effective on September 26, 1995 in the **Federal Register** unless, by August 28, 1995, adverse or critical comments are received. If EPA receives such comments, this action will be withdrawn before the effective date by publishing a subsequent document that will withdraw the final action. All public comments received will then be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this action serving as a proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If no such comments are received, the public is advised that this action will be effective on September 26, 1995.

EPA has reviewed this request for revision of the federally-approved SIP for conformance with the provisions of the 1990 Amendments enacted on November 15, 1990. EPA has determined that this action conforms with those requirements.

Under Section 307(b)(1) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7607(b)(1), petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by September 26, 1995. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for 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) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7607(b)(2).)

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this action from review under Executive Order 12866.

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.

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 et seq., EPA 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, EPA 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.

SIP Action

SIP approvals under 110 and subchapter I, Part D of the CAA do not create any new requirements, but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the federal SIP-approval does not impose any new requirements, I certify that it does not have a significant impact on any small entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the federal-state relationship under the CAA, preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis would constitute federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The CAA forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co.* v. *U.S. E.P.A.*, 427 U.S. 246, 256–66 (S.Ct. 1976); 42 U.S.C. Section 7410(a)(2).

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (''Unfunded Mandates Act''), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector, of $100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the proposed interim approval action promulgated today does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of $100 million or more to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new Federal requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon Monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by Reference, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and Recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides.

Dated: June 23, 1995.

William A. Waldrop,

Regional Administrator.

Part 52 of chapter I, title 40, 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 II—North Carolina

2. Section 52.1770 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(70) to read as follows:

§ 52.1770 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(70) The minor source operating permit program for Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, submitted by the Mecklenburg County Department of Environmental Protection on November 24, 1993, and as part of the Mecklenburg County portion of the North Carolina SIP.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

MCAPCO Regulations 1.5211 through 1.5214, 1.5216, 1.5219, 1.5221, 1.5222, 1.5232, 1.5234, and 1.5306 of the Mecklenburg County portion of the North Carolina SIP adopted June 6, 1994.

(ii) Other material. None.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 95–18527 Filed 7–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

40 CFR Part 52

[IN22–4–6825; FRL–5265–2]

Approval and Promulgation of an Implementation Plan for Vehicle Miles Traveled; Indiana

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: On November 2, 1994, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) proposed to approve a November 17, 1993, request for a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision, addressing the Lake and Porter County ozone nonattainment area, submitted by the State of Indiana for the purpose of offsetting growth in emissions from growth in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) or number of vehicle trips, and to attain reduction in motor vehicle emissions, in combination with other emission

reduction requirements, as necessary to comply with Reasonable Further Progress (RFP) milestones and attainment requirements of the Clean Air Act (Act). Public comments were solicited on the proposed SIP revision, and on USEPA's proposed rulemaking action. The public comment period ended on December 2, 1994, and one public comment letter was received. This rulemaking action approves, in final, the VMT Offset SIP revision request for Lake and Porter Counties, Indiana as requested by Indiana.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rulemaking becomes effective on August 28, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for inspection during normal business hours at the following location: Regulation Development Section, Regulation Development Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604.

Please contact Patricia Morris at (312) 353–8656 before visiting the Region 5 office.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia Morris, Regulation Development Section, Regulation Development Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353–8656.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Section 182(d)(1)(A) of the Act, as amended in 1990 (Act), requires States containing ozone nonattainment areas classified as ''severe'' pursuant to section 181(a) of the Act to adopt transportation control measures (TCMs) and transportation control strategies to offset any growth in emissions from growth in VMT or number of vehicle trips, and to attain reductions in motor vehicle emissions (in combination with other emission reduction requirements) as necessary to comply with the Act's RFP milestones and attainment requirements. The requirements for establishing a VMT Offset program are discussed in the April 16, 1992, General Preamble to Title I of the Act (57 FR 13498), in addition to section 182(d)(1)(A) of the Act.

The VMT Offset provision requires that States submit by November 15, 1992, specific enforceable TCMs and strategies to offset any growth in emissions from growth in VMT or number of vehicle trips sufficient to allow total area emissions to comply with the RFP and attainment requirements of the Act.

As described in the November 2, 1994, proposed rule (see 59 FR 54866, 54867), the USEPA has observed that these three elements (i.e., offsetting growth in mobile source emissions, attainment of the RFP reduction, and attainment of the ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)) can be divided into three separate submissions that could be submitted on different dates.

Under this approach, the first element, the emissions offset element, was due on November 15, 1992. The USEPA believes this element is not necessarily dependent on the development of the other elements. The State could submit the emissions growth offset element independent of an analysis of that element's consistency with the periodic reduction and attainment requirements of the Act. Emissions trends from other sources need not be considered to show compliance with this offset requirement. As submitting this element in isolation does not implicate the timing problem of advancing deadlines for RFP and attainment demonstrations, USEPA does not believe it is necessary to extend the statutory deadline for submittal of the emissions growth offset element.

The second element, which requires the VMT Offset SIP to comply with the 15 percent RFP requirement of the Act, was due on November 15, 1993, which is the same date on which the 15 percent RFP SIP itself was due under section 182(b)(1) of the Act. The USEPA believes it is reasonable to extend the deadline for this element to the date on which the entire 15 percent SIP was due, as this allows States to develop the comprehensive strategy to address the 15 percent reduction requirement and assure that the TCM elements required under section 182(d)(1)(A) are consistent with the remainder of the 15 percent demonstration. Indeed, USEPA believes that only upon submittal of the broader 15 percent plan can a State have had the necessary opportunity to coordinate its VMT strategy with its 15 percent plan.

The third element, which requires the VMT Offset SIP to comply with the post-1996 RFP and attainment requirements of the Act, was due on November 15, 1994, the statutory deadline for those broader submissions. The USEPA believes it is reasonable to extend the deadline for this element to the date on which the post-1996 RFP and attainment SIPs are due for the same reasons it is reasonable to extend the deadline for the second element. First, it is arguably impossible for a State to make the showing required by Section 182(d)(1)(A) for the third element until the broader demonstrations have been developed by the State. Moreover, allowing States to develop the comprehensive strategy to address post-1996 RFP and attainment by providing a fuller opportunity to assure that the TCM elements comply with the broader RFP and attainment demonstrations, will result in a better program for reducing emissions in the long term.

On November 17, 1993, Indiana submitted to USEPA documentation to fulfill the first and second elements of the VMT-Offset SIP. A public hearing was held on December 14, 1993, and documentation on the public hearing was submitted to complete the SIP revision request. Indiana does not at this time anticipate the need for additional TCMs to meet the attainment demonstration requirement but will submit any necessary TCMs with the attainment demonstration SIP.

II. Evaluation of the State Submittal

Section 182(d)(1)(A) of the Act requires the State to offset any growth in emissions from growth in VMT. As discussed in the General Preamble, the purpose is to prevent a growth in motor vehicle emissions from canceling out the emission reduction benefits of the federally mandated programs in the Act. The USEPA interprets this provision to require that sufficient measures be adopted so that projected motor vehicle volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions will never be higher during the ozone season in one year than during the ozone season in the year before. When growth in VMT and vehicle trips would otherwise cause a motor vehicle emissions upturn, this upturn must be prevented. The emissions level at the point of upturn becomes a ceiling on motor vehicle emissions. This requirement applies to projected emissions in the years between the submission of the SIP revision and the attainment deadline, and is above and beyond the separate requirements for the RFP and the attainment demonstrations. The ceiling level is defined, therefore, up to the point of upturn, as motor vehicle emissions that would occur in the ozone season of that year, with VMT growth, if all measures for that area in that year were implemented as required by the Act. When this curve begins to turn up due to growth in VMT or vehicle trips, the ceiling becomes a fixed value. The ceiling line would include the effects of Federal measures such as new motor vehicle standards, phase II RVP controls, and reformulated gasoline, as well as the Act-mandated SIP requirements.

The State of Indiana has demonstrated in its submittal of November 17, 1993, that the predicted growth in VMT in Lake and Porter Counties, Indiana, is not expected to result in a growth in motor vehicle emissions that will negate the effects of the reductions mandated by the Act. Further, Indiana has projected motor vehicle emissions to the year 2007 and, using the most current socioeconomic data, has not predicted an upturn in motor vehicle emissions. In the event that the projected socioeconomic data and associated VMT grow more rapidly than currently predicted, Indiana is required by Section 182(c)(5) to track actual VMT starting with 1996 and every three years thereafter to demonstrate that the actual VMT is equal to or less than the projected VMT. TCMs will be required to offset VMT that is above the projected levels (section 182(c)(5)).

The VMT offset submittal from Indiana dated November 17, 1993, contains the final report ''TCMs to Offset Emissions from VMT Growth in Northwestern Indiana.'' The report used the most current socioeconomic data and the travel network model in conjunction with the MOBILE5a to estimate mobile source emissions to the attainment year of 2007.

This report also documents the progress Indiana has made in evaluating TCMs to reduce growth in VMT and thus reduce emissions. Indiana may choose to take credit for TCM emission reductions as part of the post-1996 RFP requirement or to meet the attainment requirement. Not only has Indiana evaluated the effectiveness and predicted impact of a number of TCMs, but actual implementation of selected TCMs has been ongoing. Several examples are cited in the proposed rule.

These specific TCMs, however, are not a part of the current SIP revision request and are not a required portion of this SIP revision. Thus, Indiana is not currently taking credit for the emission reductions from these TCM measures and the State is not bound to implement or continue to implement any specific TCMs. These measures, however, illustrate Indiana's work in evaluating and implementing TCMs to meet the goals of the Act. Also, the TCMs may be used in subsequent SIP submittals as necessary to meet the post 1996 RFP requirement or the attainment requirement.

Indiana submitted a 15 percent RFP SIP for northwest Indiana to the USEPA in November 1993, but the submittal was found incomplete in a letter dated January 25, 1994. The RFP SIP lacked enforceable regulations and a public hearing. The public hearing was held on March 29, 1994.

On June 26, 1995, Indiana submitted an updated 15 percent SIP which contained all enforceable regulations. Indiana's submitted 15 percent SIP was found complete by the USEPA in a letter dated July 7, 1995. The submittal details the adopted enforceable regulations that have been submitted to support the 15 percent RFP demonstration. The SIP submission contains a menu of adopted emissions reductions measures that the State believes will achieve the 15 percent reduction requirement by November 15, 1996. Also, Indiana is moving forward with implementation of the 15 percent measures including the enhanced inspection and maintenance program. In the submission, Indiana does not rely upon TCMs in order to satisfy the 15 percent reduction requirement. Rather, the majority of the reduction would be obtained from stationary source shutdowns and the enhanced inspection and maintenance program. Indiana believes that TCMs will not be necessary to attain the 15 percent reduction requirement.

The attainment demonstration and post-1996 RFP plans, were submitted on December 5, 1994, and became complete by operation of law under 110(k)(1)(B) on June 5, 1995. Indiana is planning to use the Phase I and II approach to submission of the attainment demonstration and post-1996 RFP as described in the March 2, 1995, memorandum from Mary Nichols. The USEPA is reserving action on the third element of the VMT Offset SIP until such time as the phase I and II attainment submittals are complete.

Indiana has met the first and second elements of the VMT offset SIP requirements of section 182(d)(1)(A). Regarding the first element, Indiana has identified and evaluated TCMs to reduce VMT, and has shown that VMT growth will not result in a growth of motor vehicle emissions that will negate the effects of the reductions required under the Act and that there will not be an upturn of motor vehicle emissions. Regarding the second element, Indiana has submitted a complete 15 percent SIP that does not rely upon TCMs to make its proffered showing that the 15 percent reduction will be achieved. Consequently, USEPA does not believe it is necessary to delay taking action on this second element of the VMT SIP, and that the Agency can at this point rely upon Indiana's submitted 15 percent SIP to make a judgment that TCM's will not be necessary to satisfy the second VMT SIP element. However, if in evaluating the 15 percent SIP for approval it is determined that Indiana would in fact have to implement TCMs to meet the 15 percent RFP requirement, and a subsequent submission of a revised 15 percent SIP is required, EPA would have to reevaluate its approval of the second element of the VMT SIP.

The third requirement is for Indiana to use TCMs as necessary to attain the standard. This third requirement will be submitted with the attainment demonstration SIP and will be addressed in a future **Federal Register** notice.

III. Public Comments

On November 2, 1994, the USEPA proposed to approve the first and second elements of the Indiana VMT Offset SIP and requested public comment. The public comment period closed on December 2, 1994, and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) submitted comments on December 2, 1994. The following summarizes NRDC's comments and USEPA's response to these comments:

Comment 1: The Act requires TCMs to offset emissions resulting from all growth in VMT above 1990 levels, and USEPA is required by the Act to ensure emission reductions despite an increase in VMT. The legislative history states that ''[t]he baseline for determining whether there has been a growth in emissions due to increased VMT is the level of vehicle emissions that would occur if VMT held constant in the area.'' See H.Rep. No. 101–490, Part I, 101st Cong., 2nd Sess. at 242, and S.Rep. No. 101–228, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. at 44.

Response: As discussed in the General Preamble, USEPA believes that section 182(d)(1)(A) of the Act requires the State to ''offset any growth in emissions'' from growth in VMT but not, as suggested by the comment, all emissions resulting from VMT growth (see 57 FR 13498, 13522–13523, April 16, 1992). The purpose is to prevent a growth in motor vehicle emissions from canceling out the emission reduction benefits of the federally mandated programs in the Act. The baseline for emissions is the 1990 level of vehicle emissions and the subsequent reductions in emission levels required to reach attainment. Thus, the anticipated benefits from the mandated measures such as the Federal motor vehicle pollution control program, lower reid vapor pressure, enhanced inspection and maintenance and all other motor vehicle emission control programs are included in the ceiling line calculation used by Indiana in the VMT Offset SIP. Table 13 in the Indiana SIP submittal demonstrates how motor vehicle emissions will decline substantially from 136.63 tons per day (tpd) in 1990 to 25.04 tpd in 2007 and

will not begin to turn up. Emission reductions are expected every year through the year 2007.

The ceiling line approach does not ''tolerate increases in traffic of a magnitude that would wipe out the air quality gains'' as suggested by the comment. In fact, the ceiling line level decreases from year to year as the State implements various control measures and the decreasing ceiling line prevents an upturn in mobile source emissions. Dramatic increases in VMT that could wipe out the benefits of motor vehicle emission reduction measures will not be allowed and will trigger the implementation of TCMs. This prevents mere preservation of the status quo, and ensures emissions reductions despite an increase in VMT such that the rate of emissions decline is not slowed by increases in VMT or number of trips. To prevent future growth changes from adversely impacting emissions from motor vehicles, Indiana is required by section 182(c)(5) to track actual VMT starting with 1996 and every three years thereafter to demonstrate that the actual VMT is equal to or less than the projected VMT. TCMs will be required to offset VMT that is above the projected levels (section 182(c)(5)).

Under the commenter's approach to section 182(d)(1)(A), Indiana would have to offset VMT growth even while vehicle emissions are declining. Although the statutory language could be read to require offsetting any VMT growth, EPA believes that the language can also be read so that only actual emissions increases resulting from VMT growth need to be offset. The statute by its own terms requires offsetting of ''any growth in emissions from growth in VMT.'' It is reasonable to interpret this language as requiring that VMT growth must be offset only where such growth results in emissions increases from the motor vehicle fleet in the area.

While it is true that the language of the legislative history appears to support the commenter's interpretation of the statutory language, such an interpretation would have drastic implications for Indiana if the State were forced to ignore the beneficial impacts of all vehicle tailpipe and alternative fuel controls. Although the original authors of the provision and the legislative history may in fact have intended this result, EPA does not believe that the Congress as a whole, or even the full House of Representatives, believed at the time it voted to pass the 1990 Amendments to the Act that the words of this provision would impose such severe restrictions.

Given the susceptibility of the statutory language to these two alterative interpretations, EPA believes it is the Agency's role in administering the statute to take the interpretation most reasonable in light of the practical implications of such interpretation and the purposes and intent of the statutory scheme as a whole. In the context of the intricate planning requirements Congress established in title I to bring areas towards attainment of the ozone NAAQS, and in light of the absence of any discussion of this aspect of the VMT offset provision by the Congress as a whole (either in floor debate or in the Conference Report), EPA concludes that the appropriate interpretation of section 182(d)(1)(A) requires offsetting VMT growth only when such growth would result in actual emissions increases.

Comment 2: Section 182(d)(1)(A) of the Act requires that emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) as well as VOCs resulting from VMT growth must be offset.

Response: USEPA disagrees with the commenter's interpretation that section 182(d)(1)(A) requires NO_x emissions from VMT growth to be offset. While that section provides that ''any growth in emissions'' from growth in VMT must be offset, USEPA believes that Congress clearly intended that the offset requirement be limited to VOC emissions. First, section 182(d)(1)(A)'s requirement that a State's VMT TCMs comply with the ''periodic emissions reduction requirements'' of sections 182(b) and (c) the Act indicates that the VMT offset SIP requirement is VOC-specific. Section 182(c)(2)(B), which requires reasonable further progress demonstrations for serious ozone nonattainment areas, provides that such demonstrations will result in VOC emissions reductions; thus, the only ''periodic emissions reduction requirement'' of section 182(c)(2)(B) is VOC-specific. In fact, it is only in section 182(c)(2)(C)—a provision not referenced in section 182(d)(1)(A)—that Congress provided States the authority to submit demonstrations providing for reductions of emissions of VOCs and NO_X in lieu of the SIP otherwise required by section 182(c)(2)(B).

Moreover, the 15 percent periodic reduction requirement of section 182(b)(1)(A)(i) applies only to VOC emissions, while only the separate ''annual'' reduction requirement applies to both VOC and NO_X emissions. USEPA believes that Congress did not intend the terms ''periodic emissions reductions'' and ''annual emissions reductions'' to be synonymous, and that the former does not include the latter. In section 176(c)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act, Congress required that conformity SIPs ''contribute to annual emissions reductions'' consistent with section 182(b)(1) (and thus achieve NO_X emissions reductions), but does not refer to the 15 percent periodic reduction requirement. Conversely, section 182(d)(1)(A) refers to the periodic emissions reduction requirements of the Act, but does not refer to annual emissions reduction requirements that require NO_X reductions. Consequently, USEPA interprets the requirement that VMT SIPs comply with periodic emissions reduction requirements of the Act to mean that only VOC emissions are subject to section 182(d)(1)(A) in severe ozone nonattainment areas.

Finally, USEPA notes that where Congress intended section 182 ozone SIP requirements to apply to NO_X as well as VOC emissions, it specifically extended applicability to NO_X. Thus, references to ozone or emissions in general in section 182 do not on their own implicate NO_X. For example, in section 182(a)(2)(C), the Act requires States to require preconstruction permits for new or modified stationary sources ''with respect to ozone''; Congress clearly did not believe this reference to ozone alone was sufficient to subject NO_X emissions to the permitting requirement, since it was necessary to enact section 182(f)(1) of the Act, which specifically extends the permitting requirement to major stationary sources of NO_X. Since section 182(d)(1)(A) does not specifically identify NO_X emissions requirements in addition to the VOC emissions requirements identified in the provision, USEPA does not believe States are required to offset NO_X emissions from VMT growth in their section 182(d)(1)(A) SIPs.

IV. Final Rulemaking Action

Based on the State's submittal request and in consideration of the public comments received in response to the proposed rule, USEPA is approving the SIP revision submitted by the State of Indiana as satisfying the first two of the three VMT offset plan requirements.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866 review.

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

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.

SIP approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Act do not create any new requirements, but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP-approval does not impose any new requirements, I certify that it does not have a significant impact on small entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-state relationship under the Act, preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Act forbids USEPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. See *Union Electric Co. v. U.S. E.P.A.* , 427 U.S. 246, 256–66 (S. Ct. 1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

Under Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (''Unfunded Mandates Act''), signed into law on March 22, 1995, the USEPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of $100 million or more. Under Section 205, the USEPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires the USEPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

The USEPA has determined that the approval action promulgated today does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of $100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector.

This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new Federal requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or the private sector, result from this action.

Under Section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by September 26, 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, Ozone.

Dated: July 14, 1995.

Valdas V. Adamkus,

Regional Administrator.

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. 7401–7671q.

Subpart P—Indiana

2. Section 52.777 is amended by adding paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 52.777 Control Strategy: Photochemical oxidents (hydrocarbons).

* * * * *

(h) On November 17, 1993, Indiana submitted two of three elements required by section 182(d)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Amendments of 1990 to be incorporated as part of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) State Implementation Plan intended to offset any growth in emissions from a growth in vehicle miles traveled. These elements are the offsetting of growth in emissions attributable to growth in VMT which was due November 15, 1992, and, any transportation control measures (TCMs) required as part of Indiana's 15 percent reasonable further progress (RFP) plan which was due November 15, 1993. Indiana satisfied the first requirement by projecting emissions from mobile sources and demonstrating that no increase in emissions would take place. Indiana satisfied the second requirement by determining that no TCMs were required as part of Indiana's 15 percent RFP plan.

[FR Doc. 95–18521 Filed 7–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 52

[WI49–01–6738a; FRL–5254–4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) approves revisions to Wisconsin's State Implementation Plan (SIP) for ozone which were submitted to the USEPA on April 17, 1990, and June 30, 1994, and supplemented on July 15, 1994. Included in these revisions is a volatile organic compound (VOC) regulation which establishes reasonably available control technology (RACT) for screen printing facilities. Additionally, the State has submitted current negative declarations for pre-1990 Control Technology Guideline (CTG) categories for which Wisconsin does not have rules as well as a list of major sources affected by the 13 CTG categories that USEPA is required to issue pursuant to sections 183(a), 183(b)(3) and 183(b)(4) of the Clean Air Act (Act). These revisions were submitted to address, in part, the requirement of section 182(b)(2)(B) of the Act that States adopt RACT regulations for sources covered by pre-1990 CTG documents, and the requirement of section 182(b)(2)(C) of the Act that States revise their SIPs to establish RACT regulations for major sources of VOCs for which the USEPA has not issued a CTG document. In the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register**, the USEPA is proposing approval of and soliciting public comment on this requested SIP revision. If adverse comments are received on this action, the USEPA will withdraw this final rule and address the comments received in response to this action in a final rule on the related proposed rule, which is being published in the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register**. A second public comment period will not be held. Parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: This action will be effective September 26, 1995 unless an adverse comment is received by August 28, 1995. If the effective date of this action is delayed due to adverse comments, timely notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Toxics and Radiation Branch (AT–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,