

economic reasonableness of state action. The Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIP's on such grounds. *Union Electric Co. v. U.S.E.P.A.*, 427 U.S. 246, 256-66 (S.Ct. 1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

The OMB has exempted this action from review under Executive Order 12866.

Unfunded Mandates

Under sections 202, 203, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act") signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must undertake various actions in association with proposed or final rules that include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to the private sector, or to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate.

Through submission of these SIP revisions, the State and any affected local or tribal governments have elected to adopt the program provided for under sections 110 and 182 of the CAA. These rules may bind State, local, and tribal governments to perform certain actions and also require the private sector to perform certain duties. To the extent that the rules being proposed for approval will impose any mandate upon the State, local, or tribal governments either as the owner or operator of a source or as a regulator, or would impose any mandate upon the private sector, EPA's action will impose no new requirements; such sources are already subject to these requirements under State law. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action. EPA has also determined that this proposed action does not include a mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate or to the private sector.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Oxides of nitrogen, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: July 5, 1995.

Felicia Marcus,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-20600 Filed 8-18-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 126-1-7083b; FRL-5267-8]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP), which concern the control of volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from cutback and emulsified asphalt and the storage and transfer of organic liquids.

The intended effect of proposing approval of these rules is to regulate emissions of VOCs in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the state's SIP revisions as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views these as noncontroversial revision amendments and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for this 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 these rules. 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 document. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by September 20, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to: Daniel A. Meer, Rulemaking Section (A-5-3), Air and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Copies of the rules and EPA's evaluation reports of the rules are available for public inspection at EPA's Region 9 office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rules are also available for inspection at the following locations:

California Air Resources Board,
Stationary Source Division, Rule
Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street,
Sacramento, CA 95814;

El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667;
Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, 1947 Galileo Court, Suite 103, Davis, CA 95616.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Duane F. James, Rulemaking Section (A-5-3), Air and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901, Telephone: (415) 744-1191.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document concerns the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District's Rule 224, "Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials," and the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District's Rule 2.21, "Vapor Control for Organic Liquid Storage and Transfer." These rules were submitted to EPA on November 30, 1994, by the California Air Resources Board. For further information, please see the information provided in the Direct Final action which is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: July 21, 1995.

John Wise,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-20595 Filed 8-18-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-W

40 CFR Part 52

[IL62-1-5674B; FRL-5281-5]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) proposes to approve a requested revision to the Chicago ozone Federal Implementation Plan as it pertains to the American Decal and Manufacturing Company's plant in Chicago, Illinois. This action lists the FIP revision that USEPA is proposing to approve and provides an opportunity to request a public hearing. A rationale for approving this request is presented in the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, where USEPA is approving the revision request as a direct final rule without prior proposal because USEPA views this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipates no adverse comments. If no adverse comments or requests for a public hearing are received in response to that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated