

### 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 proposed action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies 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.*). Because this rule proposes to approve pre-existing 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 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 proposed action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. As a result, it does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the CAA. 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 CAA. 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 CAA. 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, Carbon monoxide, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: January 3, 2007.

#### A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. E7-531 Filed 1-16-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE** 6560-50-P

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0892; FRL-8269-3]

#### Redesignation of Washington County, OH To Attainment for the 8-Hour Ozone Standard

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA) submitted a request on September 22, 2006, and supplemented it on November 17, 2006, for redesignation of Washington County, Ohio (the Ohio portion of the Parkersburg-Marietta 8-hour ozone nonattainment area) to attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. EPA is proposing to approve the several elements of this request. First, EPA is making a determination that complete, quality-assured ambient air quality data indicate that the Parkersburg-Marietta area has attained the 8-hour ozone standard. Furthermore, preliminary monitoring data for the 2006 ozone season show that the

Parkersburg-Marietta area continues to attain the NAAQS. Second, EPA is proposing to approve, as revisions to the Ohio State Implementation Plan (SIP), the State's plans for maintaining the 8-hour ozone NAAQS through 2018. Third, EPA is proposing to redesignate Washington County to attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard, based on a finding that the requirements for this redesignation have been satisfied. Fourth, EPA finds adequate and is proposing to approve the State's 2018 Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets (MVEBs) for Washington County. Region 3 will address the West Virginia portion of the Parkersburg-Marietta area (Wood County) in a separate rulemaking action.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before February 16, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0892, by one of the following methods:

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

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

- Fax: (312) 886-5824.

- 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.

- Hand delivery: John M. Mooney, Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, 18th floor, 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-2006-0892. 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 [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or e-mail. The [www.regulations.gov](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 [www.regulations.gov](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 [www.regulations.gov](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 <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 Steve Marquardt, Environmental Engineer, at (312) 353-3214 before visiting the Region 5 office.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steve Marquardt, Environmental Engineer, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-3214, [marquardt.steve@epa.gov](mailto:marquardt.steve@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:

## Table of Contents

- I. What Should I Consider as I Prepare My Comments for EPA?
- II. What Actions Is EPA Proposing To Take?
- III. What Is the Background for These Actions?
- IV. What Are the Criteria for Redesignation?
- V. Why Is EPA Proposing To Take These Actions?

- VI. What Is the Effect of These Actions?
- VII. What Is EPA’s Analysis of the Requests?
  - A. Attainment Determination and Redesignation
  - B. Adequacy of Ohio’s Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (MVEBs)
- VIII. What Actions Is EPA Taking?
- IX. 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 Actions Is EPA Proposing To Take?

EPA is proposing to take several related actions. EPA is proposing to determine that the Parkersburg-Marietta nonattainment area has attained the 8-hour ozone standard. EPA is also proposing to approve Ohio’s maintenance plan SIP revision for Washington County. The maintenance plan is designed to keep the Parkersburg-Marietta nonattainment area in attainment of the ozone NAAQS through 2018. EPA is proposing the Ohio portion of this area (Washington County) has met the requirements for redesignation under Section 107(d)(3)(E) of the Clean Air Act (CAA). EPA is thus proposing to approve Ohio’s request to change the legal determination of Washington County from nonattainment to attainment for the 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). Finally, EPA is announcing its action on the Adequacy Process for the newly established 2018 MVEBs for the area. The adequacy comment period for the 2018 MVEBs began on November

20, 2006, with EPA’s posting of the availability of these submittals on EPA’s Adequacy Web site (at <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/adequacy.htm>). The adequacy comment period for these MVEBs ended on December 20, 2006. EPA did not receive any requests for these submittals or adverse comments on these submittals during the adequacy comment period. Therefore, we find adequate and are proposing to approve the State’s 2018 MVEBs for transportation conformity purposes.

## III. What Is the Background for These Actions?

On September 22, 2006, and with supplemental information on November 17, 2006, Ohio requested that EPA redesignate Washington County to attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. The redesignation request included three years of complete, quality-assured data for the periods of 2002 through 2004 and 2003 through 2005, indicating that the 8-hour NAAQS for ozone had been attained for the Parkersburg-Marietta area. Furthermore, preliminary monitoring data for the 2006 ozone season show that the area continues to attain the NAAQS. Under the CAA, nonattainment areas may be redesignated to attainment if sufficient complete, quality-assured data are available for the Administrator to determine that the area has attained the standard, and the area meets the other CAA redesignation requirements in section 107(d)(3)(E).

## IV. What Are the Criteria for Redesignation?

Section 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA allows for redesignation from nonattainment to attainment provided that: (1) The Administrator determines that the area has attained the applicable NAAQS; (2) the Administrator has fully approved the applicable implementation plan for the area under section 110(k); (3) the Administrator determines that the improvement in air quality is due to permanent and enforceable reductions in emissions resulting from implementation of the applicable SIP and applicable federal air pollutant control regulations and other permanent and enforceable reductions; (4) the Administrator has fully approved a maintenance plan for the area as meeting the requirements of section 175A; and, (5) the state containing such area has met all requirements applicable to the area under section 110 and part D.

EPA provided guidance on redesignation in the General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the

CAA Amendments of 1990, on April 16, 1992 (57 FR 13498), and supplemented this guidance on April 28, 1992 (57 FR 18070). EPA has provided further guidance on processing redesignation requests in several guidance documents. A listing of pertinent documents is provided in other redesignation actions including a September 9, 2005 notice; 70 FR 53606.

**V. Why Is EPA Proposing To Take These Actions?**

On September 22, 2006, and with supplemental information provided on November 17, 2006, Ohio requested redesignation of Washington County to attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. EPA believes that the area has attained the standard and has met the requirements for redesignation set forth in section 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA.

**VI. What Is the Effect of These Actions?**

Approval of the redesignation requests would change the official designation of Washington County for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS found at 40 CFR part 81. It would also incorporate into the Ohio SIP a plan for maintaining the 8-hour ozone NAAQS through 2018. The maintenance plans include contingency measures to remedy future violations of the 8-hour NAAQS. They also establish MVEBs for the year 2018 of 1.67 tons per day (tpd) volatile organic compounds (VOC) and 1.76 tpd oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) for Washington County.

These proposed actions pertain to the designation of Washington County for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS and to the emission controls in the County related to the attainment and maintenance of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. If you own or operate a VOC or NO<sub>x</sub> emissions source in this County or live in this County, this proposed rule may impact or apply to you. It may also impact you if you are involved in transportation planning or implementation of emission controls in this area.

**VII. What Is EPA's Analysis of the Requests?**

*A. Attainment Determination and Redesignation*

EPA is proposing to make a determination that the Parkersburg-Marietta area has attained the 8-hour ozone standard and that Washington County has met all other applicable section 107(d)(3)(E) redesignation criteria. The basis for EPA's determinations is as follows:

**1. The Area Has Attained the 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS (Section 107(d)(3)(E)(i))**

EPA is proposing to make the determination that the Parkersburg-Marietta area has attained the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. For ozone, an area may be considered to be attaining the 8-hour ozone NAAQS if there are no violations, as determined in accordance with 40 CFR 50.10 and part 50, appendix I, based on three complete, consecutive

calendar years of quality-assured air quality monitoring data. For each monitor in the area, EPA computes the 3-year average of each year's fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentrations. The area is attaining the standard if all monitors have average concentrations at or below 0.08 ppm. Based on the rounding convention described in 40 CFR part 50, appendix I, the standard is attained if the design value is 0.084 ppm or below. The data must be collected and quality-assured in accordance with 40 CFR part 58, and recorded in the Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS). The monitors generally should have remained at the same location for the duration of the monitoring period required for demonstrating attainment.

Ohio submitted ozone monitoring data for the 2002–2004 and the 2003–2005 ozone seasons. This submittal included data from both the Ohio and West Virginia portions of Parkersburg-Marietta. The Ohio EPA and the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection quality assured the ambient monitoring data in accordance with 40 CFR part 58.10, and recorded it in the AIRS database, thus making the data publicly available. The data meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR 50, Appendix I, which requires a minimum completeness of 75 percent annually and 90 percent over each three year period. A summary of the monitoring data is presented in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1.—ANNUAL 4TH HIGH DAILY MAXIMUM 8-HOUR OZONE CONCENTRATION AND 3-YEAR AVERAGES OF 4TH HIGH DAILY MAXIMUM 8-HOUR OZONE CONCENTRATIONS

Area	Monitor	2002 4th high (ppm)	2003 4th high (ppm)	2004 4th high (ppm)	2005 4th high (ppm)	2002–2004 average (ppm)	2003–2005 average (ppm)
Parkersburg-Marietta-Vienna ..	Washington .....	.095	.080	.077	.088	.084	.081
	39–167–0004 .....						
	Wood (WV) .....	.095	.083	.069	.084	.082	.078
	54–107–1002 .....						

In addition, as discussed below with respect to the maintenance plans, Ohio has committed to continue operating an EPA-approved monitoring network in accordance with 40 CFR part 58. In summary, EPA finds that the data submitted by Ohio provide an adequate demonstration that the Parkersburg-Marietta area has attained the 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

**2. The Area Has Met All Applicable Requirements Under Section 110 and Part D; and the Area Has a Fully Approved SIP Under Section 110(k) (Sections 107(d)(3)(E)(v) and 107(d)(3)(E)(ii))**

We have determined that Ohio has met all currently applicable SIP requirements for purposes of redesignation for Washington County under Section 110 of the CAA (general SIP requirements). We have also determined that the Ohio SIP meets all SIP requirements currently applicable for purposes of redesignation under Part D of Title I of the CAA (requirements

specific to Subpart 1 nonattainment areas), in accordance with section 107(d)(3)(E)(v). In addition, we have determined that the SIP is fully approved with respect to all applicable requirements for purposes of redesignation, in accordance with section 107(d)(3)(E)(ii). In making these determinations, we have ascertained what SIP requirements are applicable to the area for purposes of redesignation, and have determined that the portions of the SIP meeting these requirements are fully approved under section 110(k) of the CAA. As discussed more fully below, SIPs must be fully approved only

with respect to currently applicable requirements of the CAA.

*a. Washington County has met all applicable requirements under section 110 and part D of the CAA.*

The September 4, 1992 Calcagni memorandum (see "Procedures for Processing Requests to Redesignate Areas to Attainment," Memorandum from John Calcagni, Director, Air Quality Management Division, September 4, 1992) describes EPA's interpretation of section 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA. Under this interpretation, a state and the area it wishes to redesignate must meet the relevant CAA requirements that are due prior to the state's submittal of a complete redesignation request for the area. See also the September 17, 1993 Michael Shapiro memorandum and 60 FR 12459, 12465-66 (March 7, 1995) (redesignation of Detroit-Ann Arbor, Michigan to attainment of the 1-hour ozone NAAQS). Applicable requirements of the CAA that come due subsequent to the state's submittal of a complete request remain applicable until a redesignation to attainment is approved, but are not required as a prerequisite to redesignation. See section 175A(c) of the CAA. *Sierra Club v. EPA*, 375 F.3d 537 (7th Cir. 2004). See also 68 FR 25424, 25427 (May 12, 2003) (redesignation of the St. Louis/East St. Louis area to attainment of the 1-hour ozone NAAQS).

*General SIP requirements.* Section 110(a) of title I of the CAA contains the general requirements for a SIP. Section 110(a)(2) provides that the implementation plan submitted by a state must have been adopted by the state after reasonable public notice and hearing, and that, among other things, it includes enforceable emission limitations and other control measures, means or techniques necessary to meet the requirements of the CAA; provides for establishment and operation of appropriate devices, methods, systems and procedures necessary to monitor ambient air quality; provides for implementation of a source permit program to regulate the modification and construction of any stationary source within the areas covered by the plan; includes provisions for the implementation of part C, Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and part D, New Source Review (NSR) permit programs; includes criteria for stationary source emission control measures, monitoring, and reporting; includes provisions for air quality modeling; and provides for public and local agency participation in planning and emission control rule development.

Section 110(a)(2)(D) of the CAA requires that SIPs contain measures to prevent sources in a state from significantly contributing to air quality problems in another state. To implement this provision, EPA has required certain states to establish programs to address transport of air pollutants (NO<sub>x</sub> SIP Call (63 FR 57356), Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) (70 FR 25162)). However, the section 110(a)(2)(D) requirements for a state are not linked with a particular nonattainment area's designation and classification.

EPA believes that the requirements linked with a particular nonattainment area's designation and classification are the relevant measures to evaluate in reviewing a redesignation request. When the transport SIP submittal requirements are applicable to a state, they will continue to apply to the state regardless of the attainment designation of any one particular area in the state. Therefore, we believe that these requirements should not be construed to be applicable requirements for purposes of redesignation. Further, we believe that the other section 110 elements described above that are not connected with nonattainment plan submissions and not linked with an area's attainment status are also not applicable requirements for purposes of redesignation. A state remains subject to these requirements after an area is redesignated to attainment. We conclude that only the section 110 and part D requirements which are linked with a particular area's designation and classification are the relevant measures which we may consider in evaluating a redesignation request. This approach is consistent with EPA's existing policy on applicability of conformity and oxygenated fuels requirements for redesignation purposes, as well as with section 184 ozone transport requirements. See Reading, Pennsylvania, proposed and final rulemakings (61 FR 53174-53176, October 10, 1996), (62 FR 24826, May 7, 1997); Cleveland-Akron-Lorain, Ohio, final rulemaking (61 FR 20458, May 7, 1996); and Tampa, Florida, final rulemaking (60 FR 62748, December 7, 1995). See also the discussion on this issue in the Cincinnati ozone redesignation (65 FR 37890, June 19, 2000), and in the Pittsburgh ozone redesignation (66 FR 50399, October 19, 2001).

As discussed above, we believe that section 110 elements which are not linked to the area's nonattainment status are not applicable for purposes of redesignation. Because there are no section 110 requirements linked to the

part D requirements for 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas that have become due, as explained below, there are no Part D requirements applicable for purposes of redesignation under the 8-hour standard.

*Part D Requirements.* EPA has determined that the Ohio SIP meets applicable SIP requirements under part D of the CAA, since no requirements applicable for purposes of redesignation became due for the 8-hour ozone standard prior to Ohio's submission of the redesignation request for Washington County. Under part D, an area's classification determines the requirements to which it will be subject. Subpart 1 of part D, found in sections 172-176 of the CAA, sets forth the basic nonattainment requirements applicable to all nonattainment areas. Section 182 of the CAA, found in subpart 2 of part D, establishes additional specific requirements depending on the area's nonattainment classification. Parkersburg-Marietta, which includes Washington County, Ohio, was classified as a subpart 1 nonattainment area, and, therefore, subpart 2 requirements do not apply.

*Part D, Subpart 1 applicable SIP requirements.* For purposes of evaluating these redesignation requests, the applicable part D, subpart 1 SIP requirements for Washington County are contained in sections 172(c)(1)-(9).

No 8-hour ozone planning requirements applicable for purposes of redesignation under part D became due prior to submission of the redesignation request, and, therefore, none are applicable to the area for purposes of redesignation. Since Ohio has submitted complete ozone redesignation requests for Washington County prior to the deadline for any submissions required for purposes of redesignation, we have determined that these requirements do not apply to Washington County for purposes of redesignation.

*Section 176 conformity requirements.* Section 176(c) of the CAA requires states to establish criteria and procedures to ensure that federally-supported or funded activities, including highway projects, conform to the air quality planning goals in the applicable SIPs. The requirement to determine conformity applies to transportation plans, programs and projects developed, funded or approved under Title 23 of the U.S. Code and the Federal Transit Act (transportation conformity) as well as to all other federally-supported or funded projects (general conformity). State conformity revisions must be consistent with federal conformity regulations relating to consultation, enforcement and

enforceability, which EPA promulgated pursuant to CAA requirements.

EPA approved Ohio's general and transportation conformity SIPs on March 11, 1996 (61 FR 9646) and May 30, 2000 (65 FR 34395), respectively. In summary, Washington County has satisfied all applicable requirements under section 110 and part D of the CAA.

*b. Washington County has a fully approved applicable SIP under section 110(k) of the CAA.*

EPA has fully approved the Ohio SIP for Washington County under section 110(k) of the CAA for all requirements applicable for purposes of redesignation. In approving a redesignation request, EPA may rely on prior SIP approvals plus any additional measures it may approve in conjunction with a redesignation action (See the September 4, 1992 John Calcagni memorandum, page 3, *Southwestern Pennsylvania Growth Alliance v. Browner*, 144 F.3d 984, 989–990 (6th Cir. 1998), *Wall v. EPA*, 265 F.3d 426 (6th Cir. 2001)). Since the passage of the CAA of 1970, Ohio has adopted and submitted, and EPA has fully approved, provisions addressing the various required SIP elements applicable to Washington County under the 1-hour ozone standard. No Washington County SIP provisions are currently disapproved, conditionally approved, or partially approved.

3. The Improvement in Air Quality Is Due to Permanent and Enforceable Reductions in Emissions (Section 107(d)(3)(E)(iii))

EPA finds that Ohio has demonstrated that the observed air quality improvement in the Parkersburg-

Marietta area is due to permanent and enforceable reductions in emissions resulting from implementation of the SIP, federal measures, and other state-adopted measures.

In making this demonstration, the State has calculated the change in emissions between 2002 and 2004, one of the years the Parkersburg-Marietta area monitored attainment. The reduction in emissions and the corresponding improvement in air quality over this time period can be attributed to a number of regulatory control measures that Ohio has implemented.

*a. Permanent and enforceable controls implemented.*

The following is a discussion of permanent and enforceable measures that have been implemented in the area:

*NO<sub>x</sub> rules.* In compliance with EPA's NO<sub>x</sub> SIP call, Ohio developed rules to control NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from Electric Generating Units (EGUs), major non-EGU industrial boilers, and major cement kilns. These rules required sources to begin reducing NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in 2004. However, statewide NO<sub>x</sub> emissions actually had begun to decline before 2004, as sources phased in emission controls needed to comply with the State's NO<sub>x</sub> emission control regulations. From 2004 on, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from EGUs in the Eastern United States have been capped at a level well below pre-2002 levels, such that EGU emissions in the Parkersburg-Marietta area and elsewhere in Ohio and West Virginia can be expected to remain well below 2002 levels. Ohio expects that NO<sub>x</sub> emissions will further decline as the State meets the requirements of EPA's Phase II NO<sub>x</sub> SIP call (69 FR 21604 (April 21, 2004)).

*Federal Emission Control Measures.* Reductions in VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions have occurred statewide as a result of federal emission control measures, with additional emission reductions expected to occur in the future as the State implements additional emission controls. Federal emission control measures include: Tier 2 emission standards for vehicles, gasoline sulfur limits, low sulfur diesel fuel standards, and heavy-duty diesel engine standards. In addition, in 2004, EPA issued the Clean Air Non-road Diesel Rule (69 FR 38958 (July 29, 2004)). EPA expects this rule to reduce off-road diesel emissions through 2010, with emission reductions starting in 2008.

*b. Emission reductions.*

Ohio is using 2002 for the inventory and included area, mobile and point source emissions. Area sources were taken from the Ohio 2002 periodic inventory submitted to EPA. These projections were made from the United States Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis growth factors, with some updated local information. Mobile source emissions were calculated from MOBILE6.2 produced emission factors. Non-road emissions were generated using the EPA's National Mobile Inventory Model (NMIM) 2002 application. Point source information was compiled from Ohio's 2002 annual emission inventory database and the 2002 EPA Clean Air Markets Acid Rain database.

Based on the inventories described above, Ohio's submittal documents changes in VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from 2002 to 2004. Summaries of emissions data are shown in Tables 2 through 4.

TABLE 2.—WASHINGTON COUNTY, OHIO AND WOOD COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA: TOTAL VOC AND NO<sub>x</sub> EMISSIONS FOR NONATTAINMENT YEAR 2002 (TPD)

	Washington		Wood		Total	
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>
Point .....	2.08	94.58	1.80	2.60	3.88	97.18
Area .....	2.97	0.21	7.60	0.70	10.57	0.91
Nonroad .....	1.25	5.33	2.80	4.90	4.05	10.23
Onroad .....	4.40	5.66	4.70	6.10	9.10	11.76
Total .....	10.70	105.78	16.90	14.30	27.60	120.08

TABLE 3.—WASHINGTON COUNTY, OHIO AND WOOD COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA: TOTAL VOC AND NO<sub>x</sub> EMISSIONS FOR ATTAINMENT YEAR 2004 (TPD)

	Washington		Wood		Total	
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>
Point .....	2.06	71.87	2.10	2.60	4.16	74.47
Area .....	2.92	0.22	7.80	0.70	10.72	0.92
Nonroad .....	1.17	5.00	2.80	6.20	3.97	11.20

TABLE 3.—WASHINGTON COUNTY, OHIO AND WOOD COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA: TOTAL VOC AND NO<sub>x</sub> EMISSIONS FOR ATTAINMENT YEAR 2004 (TPD)—Continued

	Washington		Wood		Total	
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>
Onroad .....	3.40	4.85	4.00	5.70	7.40	10.55
Total .....	9.55	81.94	16.70	15.20	26.25	97.14

TALBE 4.—WASHINGTON COUNTY, OHIO AND WOOD COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA: COMPARISON OF 2002 AND 2004 VOC AND NO<sub>x</sub> EMISSIONS (TPD)

Sector	VOC			NO <sub>x</sub>		
	2002	2004	Net change (2002–2004)	2002	2004	Net change (2002–2004)
Point .....	3.88	4.16	+0.28	97.18	74.47	– 22.71
Area .....	10.57	10.72	+0.15	0.91	0.92	+0.01
Nonroad .....	4.05	3.97	– 0.08	10.23	11.20	+0.97
Onroad .....	9.10	7.40	– 1.70	11.76	10.55	– 1.21
Total .....	27.60	26.25	– 1.35	120.08	97.14	– 22.94

Table 4 shows that the area reduced VOC emissions by 1.35 tpd, and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by 22.94 tpd, between 2002 and 2004.

Based on the information summarized above, Ohio has adequately demonstrated that the improvement in air quality is due to permanent and enforceable emissions reductions.

4. The Area Has a Fully Approved Maintenance Plan Pursuant to Section 175a of the CAA (Section 107(d)(3)(E)(iv))

In conjunction with its request to redesignate Washington County to attainment status, Ohio submitted SIP revisions to provide for the maintenance of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS in this area through 2018.

a. What is required in a maintenance plan?

Section 175A of the CAA sets forth the required elements of a maintenance plan for areas seeking redesignation from nonattainment to attainment. Under section 175A, the plan must demonstrate continued attainment of the applicable NAAQS for at least ten years after the Administrator approves a redesignation to attainment. Eight years after the redesignation, the State must submit a revised maintenance plan which demonstrates that attainment will continue to be maintained for ten years following the initial ten-year maintenance period. To address the possibility of future NAAQS violations, the maintenance plan must contain contingency measures with a schedule for implementation as EPA deems necessary to assure prompt correction of any future 8-hour ozone violations.

The September 4, 1992 John Calcagni memorandum provides additional guidance on the content of a maintenance plan. The memorandum clarifies that an ozone maintenance plan should address the following items: The attainment VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions inventories, a maintenance demonstration showing maintenance for the ten years of the maintenance period, a commitment to maintain the existing monitoring network, factors and procedures to be used for verification of continued attainment of the NAAQS, and a contingency plan to prevent or correct future violations of the NAAQS.

b. Attainment Inventory

Ohio developed a baseline emissions inventory for 2004, one of the years used to demonstrate monitored attainment of the 8-hour NAAQS. The attainment level of emissions is summarized in Table 5, below.

TABLE 5.—WASHINGTON COUNTY, OHIO AND WOOD COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA: TOTAL VOC AND NO<sub>x</sub> EMISSIONS FOR ATTAINMENT YEAR 2004 (TPD)

	Washington		Wood		Total	
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>
Point .....	2.06	71.87	2.10	2.60	4.16	74.47
Area .....	2.92	0.22	7.80	0.70	10.72	0.92
Nonroad .....	1.17	5.00	2.80	6.20	3.97	11.20
Onroad .....	3.40	4.85	4.00	5.70	7.40	10.55
Total .....	9.55	81.94	16.70	15.20	26.25	97.14

c. Demonstration of Maintenance

Ohio submitted revisions to the 8-hour ozone SIP to include 12-year

maintenance plans for Washington County, in compliance with section 175A of the CAA. Information was also

provided regarding the West Virginia maintenance plan SIP revision. This demonstration shows maintenance of

the 8-hour ozone standard by assuring that current and future emissions of VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> area remain at or below attainment year emission levels. A maintenance demonstration need not be based on modeling. See *Wall v. EPA*,

265 F.3d 426 (6th Cir. 2001), *Sierra Club v. EPA*, 375 F. 3d 537 (7th Cir. 2004). See also 66 FR 53094, 53099–53100 (October 19, 2001), 68 FR 25413, 25430–25432 (May 12, 2003).

Ohio is using projected inventories for the years 2009 and 2018. These emission estimates are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6.—WASHINGTON COUNTY, OHIO AND WOOD COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA: COMPARISON OF 2004–2018 VOC AND NO<sub>x</sub> EMISSIONS (TPD)

Sector	VOC				NO <sub>x</sub>			
	2004	2009	2018	Net Change 2004–2018	2004	2009	2018	Net Change 2004–2018
Point .....	4.16	3.68	4.40	+0.24	74.47	17.67	24.76	–49.71
Area .....	10.72	10.01	10.90	+0.18	0.92	0.94	1.05	+0.13
Nonroad .....	3.97	3.36	2.77	–1.20	11.20	8.57	7.39	–3.81
Onroad .....	7.40	5.59	3.57	–3.83	10.55	7.68	3.76	–6.79
Total .....	26.25	22.64	21.64	–4.61	97.14	34.86	36.96	–60.18

The emission projections show that Ohio does not expect emissions in the area to exceed the level of the 2004 attainment year inventory during the maintenance period. In the area, Ohio projects that VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions will decrease by 4.61 tpd and 60.18 tpd, respectively.

As part of its maintenance plan, the State elected to include a “safety margin” for the area. A “safety margin” is the difference between the attainment level of emissions (from all sources) and the projected level of emissions (from all sources) in the maintenance plan which continues to demonstrate attainment of the standard. The attainment level of emissions is the level of emissions during one of the years in which the area met the NAAQS. Ohio used 2004 as the attainment level of emissions for the area. In the maintenance plan, Ohio projected the emissions levels for 2018. The emissions from point, area, non-road, and mobile sources in 2004 equaled 26.25 tpd of VOC. Ohio projected VOC emissions for the year 2018 to be 21.64 tpd of VOC. The SIP submission demonstrates that the area will continue to maintain the standard. The safety margin for VOC is calculated to be the difference between these amounts or, in this case, 4.61 tpd of VOC for 2018. The safety margin, or a portion thereof, can be allocated to any of the source categories, as long as the total attainment level of emissions is maintained.

*d. Monitoring Network*

Ohio currently operates one ozone monitor in Washington County. Ohio has committed to continue operating and maintaining an approved ozone monitor network in accordance with 40 CFR part 58. West Virginia has also

made a similar commitment with respect to its monitor.

*e. Verification of Continued Attainment*

Continued attainment of the ozone NAAQS in the area depends, in part, on the State’s efforts toward tracking indicators of continued attainment during the maintenance period. The State’s plan for verifying continued attainment of the 8-hour standard in the area consists of plans to continue ambient ozone monitoring in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR part 58 and to consider monitoring data that West Virginia will be collecting. In addition, Ohio will periodically review and revise the VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions inventories for the area, as required by the Consolidated Emissions Reporting Rule (40 CFR part 51), to track levels of emissions in the future.

*f. Contingency Plan*

The contingency plan provisions of the CAA are designed to result in prompt correction or prevention of violations of the NAAQS that might occur after redesignation of an area to attainment of the NAAQS. Section 175A of the CAA requires that a maintenance plan include such contingency measures as EPA deems necessary to assure that the State will promptly correct a violation of the NAAQS that might occur after redesignation. The maintenance plan must identify the contingency measures to be considered for possible adoption, a schedule and procedure for adoption and implementation of the selected contingency measures, and a time limit for action by the State. The State should also identify specific indicators to be used to determine when the contingency measures need to be

adopted and implemented. The maintenance plan must include a requirement that the State will implement all measures with respect to control of the pollutant(s) that were included in the SIP before the redesignation of the area to attainment. See section 175A(d) of the CAA.

As required by section 175A of the CAA, Ohio has adopted a contingency plan to address possible future ozone air quality issues. The contingency plan has two levels of actions/responses depending on whether a violation of the 8-hour ozone standard is only threatened (Warning Level Response) or has actually occurred or appears to be very imminent (Action Level Response).

A Warning Level Response will be triggered whenever an annual (1-year) fourth-high monitored 8-hour ozone concentration of 88 ppb occurs within the ozone maintenance area (Parkersburg-Marietta area). A Warning Level Response will consist of a study to determine whether the ozone value indicates a trend toward higher ozone concentrations or whether emissions appear to be increasing. The study will evaluate whether the trend, if any, is likely to continue and, if so, the control measures necessary to reverse the trend, taking into consideration ease and timing for implementation, as well as economic and social consideration. Implementation of necessary controls in response to a Warning Level Response triggering will take place as expeditiously as possible, but in no event later than 12 months from the conclusion of the most recent ozone season.

An Action Level Response will be triggered whenever a two-year average annual fourth-high monitored 8-hour ozone concentration of 85 ppb or greater occurs within the maintenance area

(Parkersburg-Marietta area). A violation of the 8-hour ozone standard (three-year average fourth-high value of 85 ppb or greater) will also prompt an Action Level Response. In the event that an Action Level Response is triggered and is not due to an exceptional event, malfunction, or noncompliance with a source permit condition or rule requirement, Ohio will determine the additional emission control measures needed to assure future attainment of the ozone NAAQS. Emission control measures that can be implemented in a short time will be selected in order to be in place within 18 months from the close of the ozone season that prompted the Action Level Response. Any new emission control measure that is selected for implementation will be given a public review. If a new emission control measure is already promulgated and scheduled to be implemented at the Federal or State level and that emission control measure is determined to be sufficient to address the increase in peak ozone concentrations, additional local measures may be unnecessary. Ohio will submit to the EPA an analysis to assess whether the proposed emission control measures are adequate to reverse the increase in peak ozone concentrations and to maintain the 8-hour ozone standard in the area. The selection of emission control measures will be based on cost-effectiveness, emission reduction potential, economic and social considerations, or other factors that Ohio deems to be appropriate. Selected emission control measures will be subject to public review and the State will seek public input prior to selecting new emission control measures.

The State's ozone redesignation request lists the following possible emission control measures as contingency measures in the ozone maintenance portion of the State's submittal:

- i. Lower Reid vapor pressure gasoline requirements;
- ii. Tighten RACT on existing source covered by USEPA Control Techniques Guidelines issued in response to the 1990 Clean Air Act;
- iii. Apply RACT to smaller existing sources;
- iv. One or more transportation control measures sufficient to achieve at least half a percent reduction in actual area wide VOC emissions. Transportation measures will be selected from the following, based upon the factors listed above after consultation with affected local governments;
  - a. Trip reduction programs, including, but not limited to, employer-based transportation management plans, area

wide rideshare programs, work schedule changes, and telecommuting;

- b. Traffic flow and transit improvements; and
- c. Other new or innovative transportation measures not yet in widespread use that affects state and local governments deemed appropriate.
- v. Alternative fuel and diesel retrofit programs for fleet vehicle operations.
- vi. Controls on consumer products consistent with those adopted elsewhere in the United States.
- vii. Require VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions offsets for new and modified major sources.
- viii. Require VOC or NO<sub>x</sub> emission offsets for new or modified minor sources.
- ix. Increase the ratio of emission offsets required for new sources.
- x. Require VOC or NO<sub>x</sub> controls on new minor sources (less than 100 tons).

*g. Provisions for Future Updates of the Ozone Maintenance Plan*

As required by section 175A(b) of the CAA, Ohio commits to submit to the EPA updated ozone maintenance plans eight years after redesignation to cover an additional 10-year period beyond the initial 10-year maintenance period. Ohio has committed to retain the control measures for VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions that were contained in the SIP before redesignation of the area to attainment, as required by section 175(A) of the CAA.

EPA has concluded that the maintenance plan adequately addresses the five basic components of a maintenance plan: attainment inventory, maintenance demonstration, monitoring network, verification of continued attainment, and a contingency plan. The maintenance plan SIP revision has met the requirements of section 175A of the CAA.

*B. Adequacy of Ohio's Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (MVEBs)*

*1. How Are MVEBs Developed and What Are the MVEBs for the Area?*

Under the CAA, states are required to submit, at various times, control strategy SIP revisions and ozone maintenance plans for ozone nonattainment areas and for areas seeking redesignation to attainment of the ozone standard. These emission control strategy SIP revisions (e.g., reasonable further progress SIP and attainment demonstration SIP revisions) and ozone maintenance plans create MVEBs based on onroad mobile source emissions for criteria pollutants and/or their precursors to address pollution from cars and trucks. The

MVEBs are the portions of the total allowable emissions that are allocated to highway and transit vehicle use that, together with emissions from other sources in the area, will provide for attainment or maintenance.

Under 40 CFR part 93, a MVEB for an area seeking a redesignation to attainment is established for the last year of the maintenance plan. The MVEB serves as a ceiling on emissions from an area's planned transportation system. The MVEB concept is further explained in the preamble to the November 24, 1993, transportation conformity rule (58 FR 62188). The preamble also describes how to establish the MVEB in the SIP and how to revise the MVEB if needed.

Under section 176(c) of the CAA, new transportation projects, such as the construction of new highways, must "conform" to (i.e., be consistent with) the part of the SIP that addresses emissions from cars and trucks. Conformity to the SIP means that transportation activities will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing air quality violations, or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS. If a transportation plan does not conform, most new transportation projects that would expand the capacity of roadways cannot go forward. Regulations at 40 CFR part 93 set forth EPA policy, criteria, and procedures for demonstrating and assuring conformity of such transportation activities to a SIP.

When reviewing SIP revisions containing MVEBs, including attainment strategies, rate-of-progress plans, and maintenance plans, EPA must affirmatively find that the MVEBs are "adequate" for use in determining transportation conformity. Once EPA affirmatively finds the submitted MVEBs to be adequate for transportation conformity purposes, the MVEBs are used by state and federal agencies in determining whether proposed transportation projects conform to the SIP as required by section 176(c) of the CAA. EPA's substantive criteria for determining the adequacy of MVEBs are set out in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4).

EPA's process for determining adequacy of a MVEB consists of three basic steps: (1) Providing public notification of a SIP submission; (2) providing the public the opportunity to comment on the MVEB during a public comment period; and (3) EPA's finding of adequacy. The process of determining the adequacy of submitted SIP MVEBs was initially outlined in EPA's May 14, 1999, guidance, "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999, Conformity Court Decision." This guidance was codified in the

Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the “New 8-Hour Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Miscellaneous Revisions for Existing Areas; Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments—Response to Court Decision and Additional Rule Change,” published on July 1, 2004 (69 FR 40004). EPA follows this guidance and rulemaking in making its adequacy determinations.

Conformity in the Parkersburg-Marietta area is managed by establishing and adhering to separate budgets for Washington County, Ohio and Wood County, West Virginia. This rulemaking is addressing a budget that Ohio requested for its portion of the area. A separate rulemaking will address the adequacy of West Virginia’s requested budget for the West Virginia portion of the area. The Washington County maintenance plan contains new VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> MVEBs for the year 2018. The availability of the SIP submissions with these 2018 MVEBs was announced for public comment on EPA’s Adequacy Web page on November 20, 2006, at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/cursrips.htm>. The EPA public comment period on adequacy of the 2018 MVEBs closed on December 20, 2006. No requests for these submittals or adverse comments on these submittals were received during the adequacy comment period. In a letter dated, December 28 2006, EPA informed Ohio that we had found the 2018 MVEBs to be adequate for use in transportation conformity analyses.

EPA, through this rulemaking, is proposing to approve the MVEBs for use in determining transportation conformity in Washington County because the EPA has determined that the area can maintain attainment of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS for the relevant maintenance period with mobile source emissions at the levels of the MVEBs. Ohio has determined the 2009 MVEBs for Washington County to be 2.59 tpd VOC and 3.58 tpd of NO<sub>x</sub> and the 2018 MVEBs for Washington County to be 1.67 tpd for VOC and 1.76 tpd for NO<sub>x</sub>. Ohio decided to include 15 percent safety margins in the MVEBs to provide for mobile source growth not anticipated in the projected 2018 emissions.

## 2. What Is a Safety Margin?

A “safety margin” is the difference between the attainment level of emissions (from all sources) and the projected level of emissions (from all sources) in the maintenance plan. As noted in Table 6, the Parkersburg-Marietta area VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions

are projected to have safety margins of 4.61 tpd for VOC and 60.18 tpd for NO<sub>x</sub> in 2018 (the difference between the attainment year, 2004, emissions and the projected 2018 emissions for all sources in the Parkersburg-Marietta 8-hour ozone nonattainment area (Washington County, Ohio and Wood County, West Virginia). Even if emissions reach the full level of the safety margin, the counties would still demonstrate maintenance since emission levels would equal those in the attainment year.

## VIII. What Actions Is EPA Taking?

EPA is proposing to make determinations that the Parkersburg-Marietta area has attained the 8-hour ozone NAAQS and EPA is proposing to approve Ohio’s maintenance plan for assuring that the area will continue to attain this standard. EPA is also proposing to find that Washington County meets the redesignation criteria set forth in section 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA, and on this basis, EPA is proposing to approve the redesignation of Washington County from nonattainment to attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard.

Finally, EPA is finding adequate and proposing to approve the 2018 VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> MVEBs submitted by Ohio in conjunction with the redesignation request.

## IX. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

### *Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review*

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a “significant regulatory action” and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget.

### *Paperwork Reduction Act*

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.*).

### *Regulatory Flexibility Act*

This proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Redesignation of an area to attainment under section 107(d)(3)(E) of the Clean Air Act does not impose any new requirements on small entities. Redesignation is an action that affects the status of a geographical area and does not impose any new regulatory requirements on sources. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies 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.*).

### *Unfunded Mandates Reform Act*

Because this rule proposes to approve pre-existing 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).

### *Executive Order 13132: Federalism*

This 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). Redesignation is an action that merely affects the status of a geographical area, does not impose any new requirements on sources, or allows a state to avoid adopting or implementing other requirements, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act.

### *Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments*

Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000) requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure “meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications.” This proposed rule also does not have tribal implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175, because redesignation is an action that affects the status of a geographical area and does not impose any new regulatory requirements on tribes, impact any existing sources of air pollution on tribal lands, nor impair the maintenance of ozone national ambient air quality standards in tribal lands. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule.

Although Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule, EPA met with interested tribes in Michigan to discuss the redesignation process and the impact of a change in designation status of these areas on the tribes.

*Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks*

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.

*Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use*

Because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 or a "significant energy action," this 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).

*National Technology Transfer Advancement Act*

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTA), 15 U.S.C. 272, requires Federal agencies to use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus to carry out policy objectives, so long as such standards are not inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impracticable. In reviewing program submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Absent a prior existing requirement for the state to use voluntary consensus standards, EPA has no authority to disapprove a program submission for failure to use such standards, and it would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in place of a program submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Act. Redesignation is an action that affects the status of a geographical area but does not impose any new requirements on sources. 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.

**List of Subjects**

*40 CFR Part 52*

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Volatile organic compounds.

*40 CFR Part 81*

Air Pollution Control, Environmental protection, National parks, Wilderness areas.

Dated: January 4, 2007.

**Bharat Mathur,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. E7-520 Filed 1-16-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Railroad Administration**

**49 CFR Part 262**

**[Docket No. FRA 2005-23774, Notice No. 1]**

**RIN 2130-AB74**

**Implementation of Program for Capital Grants for Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Projects**

**AGENCY:** Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** Section 9002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) (Pub. L. 109-59, August 10, 2005) amends chapter 201 of Title 49 of the United States Code by adding section 20154. Section 20154 authorizes—but does not appropriate—\$350,000,000 per year for each of the fiscal years (FY) 2006 through 2009 for the purpose of funding a grant program to provide financial assistance for local rail line relocation and improvement projects. Section 20154 directs the Secretary of Transportation (Secretary) to issue regulations implementing this grant program, and the Secretary has delegated this responsibility to FRA. This NPRM proposes a regulation intended to carry out that statutory mandate. As of the publication of this NPRM, Congress had not appropriated any funding for the program for FY 2006 or FY 2007.

**DATES:** (1) *Written Comments:* Written comments must be received on or before March 5, 2007. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent possible without incurring additional expense or delay.

(2) *Public Hearing:* Requests for a public hearing must be in writing and must be submitted to the Department of Transportation Docket Management System at the address below on or before March 5, 2007. If a public hearing is requested and scheduled, FRA will announce the date, location, and additional details concerning the hearing by separate notice in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by DOT DMS Docket Number FRA 2005-23774 by any of the following methods:

- *Web site:* <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic docket site.

- *Fax:* 1-202-493-2251.

- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590-001.

- *Hand Delivery:* Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 am and 5 pm, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

*Instructions:* All submissions must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Identification Number (RIN) for this rulemaking. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://dms.dot.gov>, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document for Privacy Act information related to any submitted comments or materials.

*Docket:* For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://dms.dot.gov> at any time or to Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 am and 5 pm, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John A. Winkle, Transportation Industry Analyst, Office of Railroad Development, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Mail Stop 13, Washington, DC 20590 ([John.Winkle@fra.dot.gov](mailto:John.Winkle@fra.dot.gov) or 202-493-6320); or Elizabeth A. Sorrells, Attorney-Advisor, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Mail Stop 10, Washington, DC 20590 ([Betty.Sorrells@fra.dot.gov](mailto:Betty.Sorrells@fra.dot.gov) or 202-493-6057).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

Much of the economic growth of the United States can be linked directly to the expansion of rail service. As the nation moved westward, railroads expanded to provide transportation services to growing communities. No