

standards of subsections (a) and (b) of that section. However, these standards are not applicable to the actual language of State regulatory programs and program amendments since each such program is drafted and promulgated by a specific State, not by OSM. Under sections 503 and 505 of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1253 and 1255) and 30 CFR 730.11, 732.15, and 732.17(h)(10), decisions on proposed State regulatory programs and program amendments submitted by the State must be based solely on a determination of whether the submittal is consistent with SMCRA and its implementing Federal regulations and whether the other requirements of 30 CFR Parts 730, 731, and 732 have been met.

#### *National Environmental Policy Act*

No environmental impact statement is required for this rule since section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that agency decisions on proposed State regulatory program provisions do not constitute major Federal actions within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

#### *Paperwork Reduction Act*

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

#### *Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Department of the Interior has determined 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.*). The State submittal which is the subject of this rule is based upon corresponding Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously promulgated by OSM will be implemented by the State. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the corresponding Federal regulations.

#### List of Subjects in 30 CFR 914

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: October 13, 1995.

Brent Wahlquist,

*Regional Director, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center.*

For the reasons set out in the preamble, Title 30, Chapter VII, Subchapter T of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as set forth below:

#### **PART 914—INDIANA**

1. The authority citation for Part 914 continues to read as follows:

**AUTHORITY:** 30 U.S.C. 1201 *et seq.*

2. Section 914.15 is amended by adding paragraph (nnn) to read as follows:

#### **§ 914.15 Approval of regulatory program amendments.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(nnn) Revisions to the following regulations (Program Amendment Number 95-3), as submitted to OSM on May 3, 1995, are approved effective October 25, 1995:

310 IAC 12-3-130—Small operator assistance; definitions for program administrator and qualified laboratory.

310 IAC 12-3-131—Introductory paragraph, (1), (2), (2)(B), and (2)(C)—Small operator assistance; eligibility for assistance.

310 IAC 12-3-132.5—Small operator assistance; application approval and notice.

310 IAC 12-3-133—Small operator assistance; program services and data requirements.

310 IAC 12-3-134—Small operator assistance; qualified laboratories.

310 IAC 12-3-135—Small operator assistance; applicant liability.

[FR Doc. 95-26401 Filed 10-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-M

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

#### **40 CFR Part 52**

[CA 14-12-7054a FRL-5286-6]

#### **Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking direct final action on revision to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revision concerns the rule from Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). This approval action will incorporate this rule into the federally

approved SIP. The intended effect of approving this rule is to regulate emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). The rule controls VOC emissions from leather processing operations. Thus, EPA is finalizing the approval of this revision into the California SIP under provisions of the CAA regarding EPA action on SIP submittals, SIPs for national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards and plan requirements for nonattainment areas.

**DATES:** This action is effective on December 26, 1995, unless adverse or critical comments are received by November 24, 1995. If the effective date is delayed, a timely notice will be published in the Federal Register.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the rule and EPA's evaluation report is available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule is available for inspection at the following locations:

Rulemaking Section (A-5-3), Air and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), 401 "M" Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, 24580 Silver Cloud Court, Monterey, CA 93940.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Daniel A. Meer, Rulemaking Section (A-5-3), Air and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, Telephone: (415) 744-1185.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Applicability**

The rule being approved into the California SIP includes Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD), Rule 430, Leather Processing Operations. This rule was submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to EPA on July 13, 1994.

##### **Background**

On March 3, 1978, EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the provisions of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1977 (1977 Act or pre-amended Act), that included Monterey Bay. 43 FR 8964, 40 CFR 81.305. Because this area was unable to meet the statutory attainment date of December 31, 1982, California requested

under section 172(a)(2), and EPA approved, an extension of the attainment date to December 31, 1987. (40 CFR 52.222). On May 26, 1988, EPA notified the Governor of California, pursuant to section 110(a)(2)(H) of the 1977 Act, that the above district's portion of the California SIP was inadequate to attain and maintain the ozone standard and requested that deficiencies in the existing SIP be corrected (EPA's SIP-Call). On November 15, 1990, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted. Public Law 101-549, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q. In amended section 182(a)(2)(A) of the CAA, Congress statutorily adopted the requirement that nonattainment areas fix their deficient reasonably available control technology (RACT) rules for ozone and established a deadline of May 15, 1991 for states to submit corrections of those deficiencies.

Section 182(a)(2)(A) applies to areas designated as nonattainment prior to enactment of the amendments and classified as marginal or above as of the date of enactment. It requires such areas to adopt and correct RACT rules pursuant to pre-amended section 172(b) as interpreted in pre-amendment guidance.<sup>1</sup> EPA's SIP-Call used that guidance to indicate the necessary corrections for specific nonattainment areas. Monterey Bay is classified as moderate;<sup>2</sup> therefore, this area was subject to the RACT fix-up requirement and the May 15, 1991 deadline.

The State of California submitted many revised RACT rules for incorporation into its SIP on July 13, 1994, including the rule being acted on in this notice. This notice addresses EPA's direct-final action for MBUAPCD Rule 430, Leather Processing Operations. MBUAPCD adopted Rule 430 on May 25, 1994. This submitted rule was found to be complete on September 12, 1994 pursuant to EPA's completeness criteria that are set forth in 40 CFR part 51 Appendix V<sup>3</sup> and are being finalized for approval into the SIP.

<sup>1</sup> Among other things, the pre-amendment guidance consists of those portions of the proposed Post-1987 ozone and carbon monoxide policy that concern RACT, 52 FR 45044 (November 24, 1987); "Issues Relating of VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations, Clarification to Appendix D of November 24, 1987 Federal Register Notice" (Blue Book) (notice of availability was published in the Federal Register on May 25, 1988); and the existing control technique guidelines (CTG's).

<sup>2</sup> Monterey Bay area retained its designation of nonattainment and was classified by operation of law pursuant to sections 107(d) and 181(a) upon the date of enactment of the CAA. See 55 FR 56694 (November 6, 1991).

<sup>3</sup> EPA adopted the completeness criteria on February 16, 1990 (55 FR 5830) and, pursuant to

Rule 430 controls the emissions of VOC from tanning and finishing in leather processing operations. VOCs contribute to the production of ground level ozone and smog. This rule was originally adopted as part of MBUAPCD'S effort to achieve the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone and in response to EPA's SIP-Call and the section 182(a)(2)(A) CAA requirement. The following is EPA's evaluation and final action for this rule.

#### EPA Evaluation and Action

In determining the approvability of a VOC rule, EPA must evaluate the rule for consistency with the requirements of the CAA and EPA regulations, as found in section 110 and part D of the CAA and 40 CFR part 51 (Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans). The EPA interpretation of these requirements, which forms the basis for today's action, appears in the various EPA policy guidance documents listed in footnote 1. Among those provisions is the requirement that a VOC rule must, at a minimum, provide for the implementation of RACT for stationary sources of VOC emissions. This requirement was carried forth from the pre-amended Act.

For the purpose of assisting state and local agencies in developing RACT rules, EPA prepared a series of Control Technique Guideline (CTG) documents. The CTGs are based on the underlying requirements of the Act and specify the presumptive norms for what is RACT for specific source categories. Under the CAA, Congress ratified EPA's use of these documents, as well as other Agency policy, for requiring States to "fix-up" their RACT rules. See section 182(a)(2)(A). The CTG applicable to Rule 430 is entitled, "Air Emissions and Control Technology for Leather Tanning and Finishing Operations (EPA-453/R-93-025)." Further interpretations of EPA policy are found in the Blue Book, referred to in footnote 1. In general, these guidance documents have been set forth to ensure that VOC rules are fully enforceable and strengthen or maintain the SIP.

MBUAPCD's submitted Rule 430, Leather Processing Operations, is a new rule that will control VOC emissions from tanning and finishing operations in the leather processing industry. The significant provisions of this rule are:

1. Exemption of leather processing facilities with VOC emissions less than

100 tons per year which are subject to Rules 416 & 429.

2. Reduction in the allowable VOC content of leather treatment materials.

3. Emission restriction from the use of any specialty treatment materials, which cannot be reformulated.

4. Requirement to use of transfer efficiency application methods.

5. Prohibitions of the use of toxic air contaminants or ozone depleting compounds as substitutes for VOCs in reformulated coatings or as clean-up solvents.

6. Daily & monthly recordkeeping requirements.

7. Specification of test methods to verify VOC content and calculate combined efficiency of control equipment.

EPA has evaluated the submitted rule and has determined that it is consistent with the CAA, EPA regulations, and EPA policy. Therefore, MBUAPCD's Rule 430, Leather Processing Operations is being approved under section 110(k)(3) of the CAA as meeting the requirements of section 110(a) and part D.

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting or allowing or establishing a precedent for any future 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.

EPA is publishing this notice without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. However, in a separate document in this Federal Register publication, the EPA is proposing to approve the SIP revision should adverse or critical comments be filed. This action will be effective December 26, 1995, unless, by November 24, 1995, adverse or critical comments are received.

If the EPA receives such comments, this action will be withdrawn before the effective date by publishing a subsequent notice 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. The 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 December 26, 1995.

section 110(K)(1)(A) of the CAA, revised the criteria on August 26, 1991 (56 FR 42216).

**Regulatory Process**

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 population of less than 50,000.

SIP approvals under sections 110 and 301(a) 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. 7410 (a)(2).

**Unfunded Mandates**

Under sections 202, 203, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must undertake various actions in association with proposed or final rules that include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to the private sector, or to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate.

Through submission of this state implementation plan or plan revision, the State and any affected local or tribal governments have elected to adopt the program provided for under Part D of the Clean Air Act. These rules may bind State, local and tribal governments to perform certain actions and also require the private sector to perform certain duties. To the extent that the rules being approved by this action will impose no new requirements; such sources are already subject to these regulations under State law. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action. EPA has also determined that this final action does not include a 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 action has been classified as a Table 3 action for signature by the Regional Administrator under the procedures published in the Federal Register on January 19, 1989 (54 FR 2214-2225), as revised by a July 10, 1995 memorandum from Mary Nichols, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866 review.

**List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52**

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Note: Incorporation by reference of the State Implementation Plan for the State of California was approved by the Director of the Federal Register on July 1, 1982.

Dated: August 18, 1995.

David P. Howekamp,  
*Acting 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 F—California**

2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraph (c) (198)(i)(F) to read as follows:

**§ 52.220 Identification of Plan.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(198) \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(F) Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

(I) Rule 430, adopted on May 25, 1994.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 95-26456 Filed 10-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**40 CFR Part 52**

[IA-18-1-6984a; FRL-5303-9]

**Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa**

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** By this action the EPA gives full approval to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the state of Iowa for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements set forth in the EPA's General Conformity rule. The SIP was submitted by the state to satisfy the Federal requirements in 40 CFR 51.852 and 93.151.

**DATES:** This action will be effective December 26, 1995 unless by November 24, 1995 adverse or critical comments are received. If the effective date is delayed, timely notice will be published in the Federal Register.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the: Environmental Protection Agency, Air Branch, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101; and EPA Air & Radiation Docket and Information Center, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lisa V. Haugen at (913) 551-7877.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (the Act), requires the EPA to promulgate criteria and procedures for demonstrating and ensuring conformity of Federal actions to an applicable implementation plan developed pursuant to section 110 and part D of the Act. Conformity to an SIP is defined in the Act as meaning conformity to an SIP's purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and achieving expeditious attainment of such standards. The Federal agency responsible for the action is required to determine if its actions conform to the applicable SIP. On November 30, 1993, the EPA promulgated the final rule (hereafter referred to as the General Conformity rule), which establishes the criteria and procedures governing the determination of conformity for all Federal actions, except Federal highway and transit actions.

The General Conformity rule also establishes the criteria for EPA approval of SIPs. See 40 CFR 51.852 and 93.151. These criteria provide that the state provisions must be at least as stringent as the requirements specified in EPA's General Conformity rule, and that they can be more stringent only if they apply equally to Federal and nonfederal entities (Section 51.851(b)).

On March 10, 1994, the EPA promulgated a nonattainment designation for part of Muscatine County, Iowa, in response to violations of the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. Section 51.851 and section 93.151 of the General