

revision submitted by the State does not satisfy the minimum criteria established under section 110(k) of the amended Act, or disapproves a SIP submission in whole or in part, unless the deficiency has been corrected within 18 months after the finding, one of the sanctions referred to in section 179(b) of the amended Act shall apply until the Administrator determines that the State has come into compliance. (Pursuant to 40 CFR 52.31, the first sanction shall be a sanction requiring 2 to 1 offsets, in the absence of a case-specific selection otherwise.) If the deficiency has not been corrected within 6 months of the selection of the first sanction, the second sanction under section 179(b) shall also apply. In addition, section 110(c) of the Act requires promulgation of a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) within 2 years after the finding or disapproval, as discussed above, unless the State corrects the deficiency and the SIP is approved before the FIP is promulgated.

On December 17, 1991, a letter was sent to the Governor of Illinois notifying him that the EPA was making a finding that the State of Illinois had failed to submit PM SIPs for the Lake Calumet, McCook, and Granite City nonattainment areas. This letter triggered both the sanctions and FIP processes as explained above. Illinois submitted a PM SIP revision for the three nonattainment areas on May 15, 1992, and in an April 30, 1993, letter to the State the EPA informed the State that the SIP was determined to be complete. Therefore, the deficiency which started the sanctions and FIP processes was corrected, and the sanctions process ended. The FIP process, however, was not stopped by the correction of the deficiency and EPA was to promulgate a FIP within 2 years of the failure-to-submit letter (or December 17, 1993), unless a PM SIP for the three nonattainment areas was finally approved before then.

On November 18, 1994, the EPA conditionally approved the SIP. The final conditional approval allowed the State until November 20, 1995, to correct the five stated deficiencies. Conditional approval does not start a new sanctions process, unless the state fails to make a submittal to address the deficiencies, makes an incomplete submittal, or the submittal is ultimately disapproved. Illinois made a submittal to meet the commitments related to the conditional approval on November 14, 1995. Supplemental information was submitted on May 9, 1996, June 14, 1996, and February 3, 1997. This submittal became complete by operation of law on May 14, 1996.

### III. EPA's Proposed Rulemaking Action

Illinois has corrected all of the deficiencies listed in the November 18, 1994, conditional approval as they relate to the Granite City PM nonattainment area except for one deficiency. The State failed to provide an acceptable opacity limit on coke oven combustion stacks. Because Illinois has not met all of the commitments of the conditional approval, the EPA is proposing limited approval/limited disapproval of the plan. By this action, EPA is proposing to approve those regulations that have a strengthening effect on the SIP, while at the same time proposing to disapprove the overall SIP for failure to satisfy the requirement under the Clean Air Act for a fully enforceable plan that assures attainment. See sections 172(c)(1), 172(c)(6), and 189(a)(1)(B) of the Act. The EPA may grant such a limited approval under section 110(k)(3) of the Act in light of the general authority delegated to EPA under section 301(a) of the Act, which allows EPA to take actions necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act.

Upon limited approval/limited disapproval of the Granite City PM SIP, a new 18-month sanctions clock will begin. See section 179 (a) and (b) of the Act. To correct the deficiency and avoid implementation of sanctions, Illinois must submit a complete plan to the EPA, and that plan must be fully approved within 18 months from the final limited approval/limited disapproval.

The EPA is also proposing disapproval of Illinois' March 19, 1996, and October 15, 1996, request to redesignate the Granite City area to attainment for PM because the SIP for the area has not been fully approved by the EPA.

EPA is requesting written comments on all aspects of this proposed rule. As indicated at the outset of this document, EPA will consider any written comments received by August 21, 1997.

### IV. Administrative Requirements

#### A. Executive Order 12866

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

#### B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. section 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. sections 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 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 Act, preparation of a flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of the State action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co. v. EPA.*, 427 U.S. 246, 256-66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

#### C. Unfunded Mandates

Under Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must undertake various actions in association with 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. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under state or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to state, local, or tribal governments, or the private sector, result from this action.

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

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Particulate matter.

Dated: July 1, 1997.

**David A. Ullrich,**

*Acting Regional Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 97-19212 Filed 7-21-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[MN44-01-7269b; FRL-5861-7]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Minnesota

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** In this action, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to conditionally approve a revision to the Minnesota State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the Saint Paul particulate matter (PM) nonattainment area, located in Ramsey County Minnesota. The SIP was submitted by the State for the purpose of bringing about the attainment of the PM National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is conditionally approving the SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal, because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment 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 proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. 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. 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.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposed action must be received by August 21, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christos Panos, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-8328

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information, see the Direct Final notice which is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**. Copies of the request and the EPA's analysis are available for inspection at the above address. (Please telephone Christos Panos at (312) 353-8328 before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671(q)

Dated: July 8, 1997.

**Michelle D. Jordan,**  
Acting Regional Administrator  
[FR Doc. 97-19217 Filed 7-21-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

### 44 CFR Part 67

[Docket No. FEMA-7222]

### Proposed Flood Elevation Determinations

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** Technical information or comments are requested on the proposed base (1% annual chance) flood elevations and proposed base flood elevation modifications for the communities listed below. The base flood elevations and modified base flood elevations are the basis for the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of being already in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

**DATES:** The comment period is ninety (90) days following the second publication of this proposed rule in a newspaper of local circulation in each community.

**ADDRESSES:** The proposed base flood elevations for each community are available for inspection at the office of the Chief Executive Officer of each community. The respective addresses are listed in the following table.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Frederick H. Sharrocks, Jr., Chief, Hazard Identification Branch, Mitigation Directorate, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-2796.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Federal Emergency Management Agency proposes to make determinations of base flood elevations and modified base flood elevations for each community listed below, in accordance with Section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and 44 CFR 67.4(a).

These proposed base flood and modified base flood elevations, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own, or pursuant to policies established by other

Federal, State, or regional entities. These proposed elevations are used to meet the floodplain management requirements of the NFIP and are also used to calculate the appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings built after these elevations are made final, and for the contents in these buildings.

*National Environmental Policy Act.* This proposed rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR Part 10, Environmental Consideration. No environmental impact assessment has been prepared.

*Regulatory Flexibility Act.* The Associate Director for Mitigation certifies that this proposed rule is exempt from the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act because proposed or modified base flood elevations are required by the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and are required to establish and maintain community eligibility in the NFIP. No regulatory flexibility analysis has been prepared.

*Regulatory Classification.* This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under the criteria of Section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review, 58 FR 51735.

*Executive Order 12612, Federalism.* This proposed rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under Executive Order 12612, Federalism, dated October 26, 1987.

*Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform.* This proposed rule meets the applicable standards of Section 2(b)(2) of Executive Order 12778.

### List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 67

Administrative practice and procedure, Flood insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, 44 CFR Part 67 is proposed to be amended as follows:

### PART 67—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 67 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 329; E.O. 12127, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp., p. 376.

### § 67.4 [Amended]

2. The tables published under the authority of § 67.4 are proposed to be amended as follows: