

necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity). Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review) emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, reducing costs, harmonizing rules, and promoting flexibility. Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review) defines a “significant regulatory action,” which requires review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), as “any regulatory action that is likely to result in a rule that may: (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.”

The economic, interagency, budgetary, legal, and policy implications of this proposed regulatory action have been examined and it has been determined not to be a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

Unfunded Mandates

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 requires, at 2 U.S.C. 1532, that agencies prepare an assessment of anticipated costs and benefits before issuing any rule that may result in expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more (adjusted annually for inflation) in any given year. This proposed rule would have no such effect on State, local, and tribal governments, or on the private sector.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance numbers and titles are 64.005, Grants to States for Construction of State Home Facilities; 64.009, Veterans Medical Care Benefits; 64.010, Veterans Nursing Home Care; 64.015, Veterans State Nursing Home Care; 64.018, Sharing Specialized Medical

Resources; 64.019, Veterans Rehabilitation Alcohol and Drug Dependence.

Signing Authority

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, or designee, approved this document and authorized the undersigned to sign and submit the document to the Office of the Federal Register for publication electronically as an official document of the Department of Veterans Affairs. John R. Gingrich, Chief of Staff, Department of Veterans Affairs, approved this document on September 10, 2012, for publication.

List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 51

Administrative practice and procedure, Claims, Grant programs-health, Grant programs-veterans, Health care, Health facilities, Health professions, Health records, Mental health programs, Nursing homes, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Travel and transportation expenses, Veterans.

Dated: September 24, 2012.

Robert C. McFetridge,

Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Department of Veterans Affairs proposes to amend 38 CFR part 51 as follows:

PART 51—PER DIEM FOR NURSING HOME CARE OF VETERANS IN STATE HOMES

1. The authority citation for part 51 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 38 U.S.C. 101, 501, 1710, 1741–1743, 1745.

2. Amend § 51.43(c) by removing “the veteran has resided in the facility for 30 consecutive days (including overnight stays) and”, and by adding a sentence at the end of the paragraph to read as follows:

§ 51.43 Per diem and drugs and medicines—principles.

* * * * *

(c) * * * Occupancy rate is calculated by dividing the total number of patients in the nursing home or domiciliary by the total recognized nursing home or domiciliary beds in that facility.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2012–23777 Filed 9–26–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0013(b); FRL–9732–6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina: Approval of Rocky Mount Supplemental Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget Update

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a revision to the North Carolina State Implementation Plan (SIP), submitted to EPA on February 7, 2011, by the State of North Carolina, through the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Air Quality. North Carolina’s February 7, 2011, submission supplements the original redesignation request and maintenance plan for Rocky Mount 1997 8-hour ozone area submitted on June 19, 2006, and approved by EPA on November 6, 2006. The Rocky Mount 1997 8-hour ozone area is comprised of Edgecombe and Nash Counties in North Carolina. The February 7, 2011, revision proposes to increase the safety margin allocated to motor vehicle emissions budgets to account for changes in the emissions model and vehicle miles traveled projection model. EPA is proposing approval of this SIP revision pursuant to section 110 of the Clean Air Act. North Carolina’s SIP revision meets all the statutory and regulatory requirements, and is consistent with EPA’s guidance.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before October 29, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0013 by one of the following methods:

1. *www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
2. *Email:* R4-RDS@epa.gov.
3. *Fax:* (404) 562–9019.
4. *Mail:* “EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0013,” Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960.
5. *Hand Delivery or Courier:* Lynorae Benjamin, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street

SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office's normal hours of operation. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding federal holidays.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zuri Farnigalo, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Zuri Farnigalo may be reached by phone at (404) 562–9152 or by electronic mail address farnigalo.zuri@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 12, 2008, EPA issued a revised ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). See 73 FR 16436. The current action, however, is being taken to address requirements under the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Requirements for the Rocky Mount Area under the 2008 NAAQS will be addressed in the future.

For additional information regarding today's action see the direct final rule which is published in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**. Through that direct final rule, EPA is approving the State's implementation plan revision 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 on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

Dated: September 11, 2012.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2012–23717 Filed 9–26–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

[Docket No. FWS–R8–ES–2010–0077; 4500030113]

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 12-Month Finding on a Petition To List Spring Mountains Acastus Checkerspot Butterfly as an Endangered or Threatened Species

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of 12-month petition finding.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce a 12-month finding on a petition to list the Spring Mountains acastus checkerspot butterfly (*Chlosyne acastus robusta*) as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). After review of the best available scientific and commercial information, we find that listing the Spring Mountains acastus checkerspot butterfly is not warranted at this time. However, we ask the public to submit to us any new information that becomes available concerning the threats to the Spring Mountains acastus checkerspot butterfly or its habitat at any time.

DATES: The finding announced in this document was made on September 27, 2012.

ADDRESSES: This finding is available on the internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> at Docket Number FWS–R8–ES–2010–0077. Supporting documentation we used in preparing this finding is available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Nevada Fish and Wildlife Office, 4701 North Torrey Pines Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89130. Please submit any new information, materials, comments, or questions concerning this finding to the above street address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward D. Koch, Field Supervisor, Nevada Fish and Wildlife Office (see **ADDRESSES**); by telephone at 775–861–6300; or by facsimile at 775–861–6301. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), please call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) requires that, for any petition to revise the Federal Lists

of Threatened and Endangered Wildlife and Plants that contains substantial scientific or commercial information that listing a species may be warranted, we make a finding within 12 months of the date of receipt of the petition. In this finding we will determine that the petitioned action is: (1) Not warranted; (2) warranted; or (3) warranted, but the immediate proposal of a regulation implementing the petitioned action is precluded by other pending proposals to determine whether species are an endangered or threatened species, and expeditious progress is being made to add or remove qualified species from the Federal Lists of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants. Section 4(b)(3)(C) of the Act requires that we treat a petition for which the requested action is found to be warranted but precluded as though resubmitted on the date of such finding, that is, requiring a subsequent finding to be made within 12 months. We must publish these 12-month findings in the **Federal Register**.

Previous Federal Actions

On September 18, 2009, we received a petition dated September 16, 2009, from Bruce M. Boyd requesting that the Spring Mountains acastus checkerspot butterfly (*Chlosyne acastus robusta*) be listed as an endangered species under the Act. Included in the petition was information regarding the species' taxonomy, historical and current distribution, present status, and potential causes of decline. We acknowledged the receipt of the petition in a letter to Bruce M. Boyd, dated November 24, 2009. In that letter, we responded that we had reviewed the information presented in the petition and determined that issuing an emergency regulation temporarily listing the butterfly under section 4(b)(7) of the Act was not warranted (Service 2009, p. 1). We also stated that funding was secured and that we anticipated making an initial finding in fiscal year 2010 as to whether the petition contained substantial information indicating that the action may be warranted. On April 13, 2011, we published a 90-day petition finding (76 FR 20613) in which we concluded that the petition and information in our files provided substantial information indicating that listing the Spring Mountains acastus checkerspot butterfly may be warranted, and we initiated a status review. This notice constitutes the 12-month finding on the September 16, 2009, petition to list the Spring Mountains acastus checkerspot butterfly.