

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule, and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: July 21, 2008.

**Walter W Kovalick Jr.,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*  
[FR Doc. E8-17704 Filed 8-1-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0004; FRL-8700-4]

### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is proposing to correct its June 12, 2006, approval of a revision to the Indiana State Implementation Plan (SIP) for ozone in which it approved Indiana's exclusion of ethylene glycol monobutyl ether (EGBE), a hazardous air pollutant (HAP), as a revision to the SIP. As discussed further below, this proposed action is based upon the fact that HAPs are regulated under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (Act). State programs related to HAPs are governed by Section 112(l) of the Act and should not be included in the SIP under Section 110, which addresses national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for criteria

pollutants. Therefore, pursuant to section 110(k)(6) of the Act, which allows EPA to correct SIP actions made in error, EPA is proposing to rescind its exclusion of EGBE from Indiana's ozone SIP. It should be noted that EPA delisted EGBE as a HAP on November 29, 2004.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before September 3, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0004, by one of the following methods:

1. *http://www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

2. *E-mail*: [mooney.john@epa.gov](mailto:mooney.john@epa.gov).

3. *Fax*: (312) 886-5824.

4. *Mail*: John M. Mooney, Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

5. *Hand Delivery*: John M. Mooney, Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The Regional Office official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. excluding Federal holidays.

*Instructions:* Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0004. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. The <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through <http://www.regulations.gov> your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your

name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses. For additional instructions on submitting comments, go to section I of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

*Docket:* All documents in the docket are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. This Facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. We recommend that you telephone Steven Rosenthal, Environmental Engineer, at (312) 886-6052 before visiting the Region 5 office.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steven Rosenthal, Environmental Engineer, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6052, [rosenthal.steven@epa.gov](mailto:rosenthal.steven@epa.gov).

### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Throughout this document whenever "we," "us," or "our" is used, we mean EPA. This supplementary information section is arranged as follows:

- I. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?
- II. What action is EPA taking today and what is the basis for this action?
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### **I. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?**

When submitting comments, remember to:

1. Identify the rulemaking by docket number and other identifying information (subject heading, **Federal Register** date and page number).
2. Follow directions—The EPA may ask you to respond to specific questions or organize comments by referencing a Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part or section number.

3. Explain why you agree or disagree; suggest alternatives and substitute language for your requested changes.

4. Describe any assumptions and provide any technical information and/or data that you used.

5. If you estimate potential costs or burdens, explain how you arrived at your estimate in sufficient detail to allow for it to be reproduced.

6. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns, and suggest alternatives.

7. Explain your views as clearly as possible, avoiding the use of profanity or personal threats.

8. Make sure to submit your comments by the comment period deadline identified.

## II. What action is EPA taking today and what is the basis for this action?

Section 110 of the Act is the authority under which Congress has directed EPA to act on SIPs and SIP revisions. Section 110(a) establishes the applicable procedures for SIP development and submission. The trigger for these activities is the promulgation of NAAQS; and the focus of the State's efforts is to develop "a plan which provides for implementation, maintenance, and enforcement" of the NAAQS. Section 110(a)(1). EPA must then determine whether the submission contains the air quality-related components prescribed in section 110(a)(2).

Other than for lead, which is both a HAP and criteria pollutant, Section 110 does not provide parameters to determine the approvability of a HAP provision. Instead, in the 1990 Amendments to the Act, Congress envisioned that HAPs (including the then-listed EGBE) would be regulated under section 112. State programs for hazardous pollutants, including delegations, are governed by section 112(l) of the Act. They should not be included in the SIP under section 110. EPA is, therefore, proposing to correct its June 12, 2006, approval of Indiana's requested revision to delete EGBE from the definition of "hazardous air pollutant" in 326 IAC 1-2-33.5.

Section 110(k)(6) of the Act provides that whenever EPA determines that its action approving, disapproving, or promulgating any plan or plan revision (or part thereof), \* \* \* was in error, EPA may revise such action as appropriate without requiring any further submission from the State. Therefore, under section 110(k)(6), EPA is rescinding its exclusion of EGBE from Indiana's definition of HAP, as well as Indiana's definition of HAP in 326 IAC 1-2-33.5, from Indiana's ozone SIP.

## III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this proposed action is not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this proposed action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This action merely proposes to correct an error and to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this proposed 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.*). Because this rule proposes to correct an error and approve preexisting requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4).

This proposed rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This proposed action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely proposes to correct an error and approve a state rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This proposed rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of

the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This proposed rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

## List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

Dated: July 22, 2008.

**Bharat Mathur,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. E8-17809 Filed 8-1-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0386; FRL-8700-1]

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; El Paso County Carbon Monoxide Redesignation to Attainment, and Approval of Maintenance Plan

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** On February 13, 2008, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) submitted a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision to request redesignation of the El Paso carbon monoxide (CO) nonattainment area to attainment for the CO National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). This submittal also included a CO maintenance plan for the El Paso area and associated Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets (MVEBs). The maintenance plan was developed to ensure continued attainment of the CO NAAQS for a period of 10 years from the effective date of EPA approval of redesignation to attainment. In this action, EPA is proposing to approve the