

J1979 may be obtained from the Society of Automotive Engineers, Inc., 400 Commonwealth Drive, Warrendale, PA 15096-0001. Copies may be inspected at the EPA Docket No. A-94-21 at EPA's Air Docket (LE-131), Room 1500 M, 1st Floor, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC, or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC. Beginning January 1, 2001, if the readiness evaluation indicates that any on-board tests are not complete the customer shall be instructed to return after the vehicle has been run under conditions that allow completion of all applicable on-board tests. If the readiness evaluation again indicates that any on-board test is not complete the vehicle shall be failed.

* * * * *

9. Section 85.2231 is amended by revising paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 85.2231 On-board diagnostic test equipment requirements.

* * * * *

(b) The test system shall be capable of communicating with the standard data link connector of vehicles with certified OBD systems.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 98-11751 Filed 5-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[AZ059-0005; FRL-6004-5]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking final action to approve a revision to the Arizona State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revision concerns Maricopa County's Ordinance P-7, Maricopa County Trip Reduction Ordinance. This approval action will incorporate this ordinance into the federally-approved SIP. The intended effect of approving this ordinance is to reduce emissions of volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter by reducing the number of single-occupant-vehicle commute trips in the Phoenix, Arizona, metropolitan area. EPA is finalizing the approval of this revision into the Arizona 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.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 3, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the SIP revision and supporting information are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule revisions are available for inspection at the following location: Office of Air Planning (AIR-2), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frances Wicker, Office of Air Planning, AIR-2, Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, Telephone: (415) 744-1248.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On December 9, 1997 at 62 FR 64794, EPA proposed to approve Maricopa County's Ordinance P-7, Maricopa County Trip Reduction Ordinance which was revised by the Maricopa County, Arizona, Board of Supervisors on May 26, 1994 and submitted as a SIP revision to EPA by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 31, 1995. A discussion of the ordinance and EPA's proposed approval action can be found in the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) cited above.

EPA has evaluated this ordinance for consistency with the requirements of the CAA and EPA regulations and EPA's interpretation of these requirements as expressed in the various Agency policy guidance documents referenced in the NPRM. EPA has found that the ordinance meets the applicable EPA requirements.

II. Public Comments

No comments were received on the proposed approval during the 30-day public comment period that was provided in 62 FR 64794.

III. EPA Action

EPA is approving the above submitted ordinance for inclusion into the federally-approved Arizona SIP. EPA is approving the submittal under section 110(k)(3) as meeting the requirements of section 110(a) and Part D of the CAA.

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

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from E.O. 12866 review.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

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 approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air 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, the Administrator certifies 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 flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co. v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255-66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

C. Unfunded Mandates

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 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 approval action promulgated 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 to the private sector, result from this action.

D. Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major" rule as defined by 5 U.S.C. § 804(2).

E. Petitions for Judicial Review

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 July 6, 1998. 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, *Hydrocarbons, Carbon monoxide, Particulate matter*, 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 Arizona was approved by the Director of the Federal Register on July 1, 1982.

Dated: March 20, 1998.

Felicia Marcus,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

40 CFR part 52 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 *et seq.*

Subpart D—Arizona

2. Section 52.120 by adding paragraph (c)(82)(i)(E) to read as follows:

§ 52.120 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(82) * * *

(i) * * *

(E) Maricopa County.

(1) Ordinance P-7, Maricopa County Trip Reduction Ordinance, adopted May 26, 1994.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 98-11759 Filed 5-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[FRL-5980-9]

Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule; correction of effective date under CRA.

SUMMARY: On July 22, 1997 (62 FR 39120), the Environmental Protection Agency published in the **Federal Register** a direct final rule approving a revision to the Minnesota State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the Saint Paul particulate matter (PM) nonattainment area located in Ramsey County, Minnesota, which established an effective date of September 22, 1997. This document corrects the effective date of the rule to May 4, 1998 to be consistent with sections 801 and 808 of the Congressional Review Act (CRA), enacted as part of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 and 808.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This rule is effective on May 4, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Eagles, Office of Air at (202) 260-5585.

Supplementary Information:

I. Background

Section 801 of the CRA precludes a rule from taking effect until the agency promulgating the rule submits a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office (GAO). EPA recently discovered that it had inadvertently failed to submit the above rule as required; thus, although the rule was promulgated on the date stated in the July 22, 1997, **Federal Register** document, by operation of law, the rule did not take effect on September 22, 1997, as stated therein. Now that EPA has discovered its error, the rule has been submitted to both Houses of Congress and the GAO. This document amends the effective date of the rule consistent with the provisions of the CRA.

Section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), provides that, when an agency for good cause finds that notice and public procedure are impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest, an agency may issue a rule without providing notice and an opportunity for public comment. EPA has determined that there is good cause for making today's rule final without prior proposal and opportunity for comment because EPA merely is correcting the effective date of the promulgated rule to be consistent with the congressional review requirements of the Congressional Review Act as a matter of law and has no discretion in this matter. Thus, notice and public procedure are unnecessary. The Agency finds that this constitutes good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B). Moreover, since today's action does not create any new regulatory requirements and affected parties have known of the underlying rule since July 22, 1997, EPA finds that good cause exists to provide for an immediate effective date pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3) and 808(2).

II. Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and is therefore not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4), or require prior consultation with State officials as specified by Executive Order 12875 (58 FR 58093, October 28, 1993), or involve special consideration of environmental