

Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, EPA submitted a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office prior to publication of the rule in today's **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 51

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: August 18, 1997.

Carol M. Browner,
Administrator.

For reasons set forth in the preamble, part 51 of chapter I of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 51—REQUIREMENTS FOR PREPARATION, ADOPTION, AND SUBMITTAL OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

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

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

2. Section 51.100 is amended by revising paragraph (s) introductory text and paragraph (s)(1) to read as follows:

§ 51.100 Definitions.

* * * * *

(s) *Volatile organic compounds (VOC)* means any compound of carbon, excluding carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, carbonic acid, metallic carbides or carbonates, and ammonium carbonate, which participates in atmospheric photochemical reactions.

(1) This includes any such organic compound other than the following, which have been determined to have negligible photochemical reactivity: methane; ethane; methylene chloride (dichloromethane); 1,1,1-trichloroethane (methyl chloroform); 1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (CFC–113); trichlorofluoromethane (CFC–11); dichlorodifluoromethane (CFC–12); chlorodifluoromethane (HCFC–22); trifluoromethane (HFC–23); 1,2-dichloro-1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethane (CFC–114); chloropentafluoroethane (CFC–115); 1,1,1-trifluoro-2,2-dichloroethane (HCFC–123); 1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane (HFC–134a); 1,1-dichloro-1-fluoroethane (HCFC–141b); 1-chloro-1,1-difluoroethane (HCFC–142b); 2-chloro-

1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane (HCFC–124); pentafluoroethane (HFC–125); 1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethane (HFC–134); 1,1,1-trifluoroethane (HFC–143a); 1,1-difluoroethane (HFC–152a); parachlorobenzotrifluoride (PCBTf); cyclic, branched, or linear completely methylated siloxanes; acetone; perchloroethylene (tetrachloroethylene); 3,3-dichloro-1,1,1,2,2-pentafluoropropane (HCFC–225ca); 1,3-dichloro-1,1,2,2,3-pentafluoropropane (HCFC–225cb); 1,1,1,2,3,4,4,5,5,5-decafluoropentane (HFC–43–10mee); difluoromethane (HFC–32); ethylfluoride (HFC–161); 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoropropane (HFC–236fa); 1,1,2,2,3-pentafluoropropane (HFC–245ca); 1,1,2,3,3-pentafluoropropane (HFC–245ea); 1,1,1,2,3-pentafluoropropane (HFC–245eb); 1,1,1,3,3-pentafluoropropane (HFC–245fa); 1,1,1,2,3,3-hexafluoropropane (HFC–236ea); 1,1,1,3,3-pentafluorobutane (HFC–365mfc); chlorofluoromethane (HCFC–31); 1-chloro-1-fluoroethane (HCFC–151a); 1,2-dichloro-1,1,2-trifluoroethane (HCFC–123a); 1,1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4-nonafluoro-4-methoxy-butane (C₄F₉OCH₃); 2-(difluoromethoxymethyl)-1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane ((CF₃)₂CFCF₂OCH₃); 1-ethoxy-1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,4-nonafluorobutane (C₄F₉OC₂H₅); 2-(ethoxydifluoromethyl)-1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane ((CF₃)₂CFCF₂OC₂H₅); and perfluorocarbon compounds which fall into these classes:

- (i) Cyclic, branched, or linear, completely fluorinated alkanes;
- (ii) Cyclic, branched, or linear, completely fluorinated ethers with no unsaturations;
- (iii) Cyclic, branched, or linear, completely fluorinated tertiary amines with no unsaturations; and
- (iv) Sulfur containing perfluorocarbons with no unsaturations and with sulfur bonds only to carbon and fluorine.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 97–22510 Filed 8–22–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[OH104–1A; FRL–5877–9]

Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is approving through "direct final" procedure, a June 10, 1997, request from Ohio, for State Implementation Plan (SIP) maintenance plan revisions for the following areas: Toledo area (including Lucas and Wood counties), the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain area (including Lorain, Cuyahoga, Lake, Ashtabula, Geauga, Medina, Summit and Portage counties), and the Dayton-Springfield area (including Montgomery, Clark, Greene, and Miami counties). The maintenance plan revisions are allocating to the mobile source emission budget for transportation conformity a portion of the existing "Safety Margins." The safety margin is the difference between the attainment inventory level of the total emissions and the projected levels of the total emissions in the final year of the maintenance plan.

DATES: This "direct final" rule is effective on October 24, 1997, unless USEPA receives significant written adverse or critical comments (which have not already been addressed) by September 24, 1997. If the effective date is delayed, timely notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for inspection during normal business hours at the following location: Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604. Please contact Scott Hamilton at (312) 353–4775 before visiting the Region 5 office.

Written comments should be sent to: J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Hamilton, Environmental Scientist, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353–4775.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Clean Air Act in section 176(c) requires conformity of activities to an implementation plan's purpose of attaining and maintaining the National ambient air quality standards. On November 24, 1993, the USEPA promulgated a final rule establishing criteria and procedures for determining

conformity of transportation plans, programs and projects funded or approved under Title 23 U.S.C. of the Federal Transit Act. The State of Ohio finalized and adopted State transportation conformity rules on August 1, 1995, the rules became effective August 21, 1995, and Ohio submitted the rules as a SIP revision request on August 17, 1995. The rules were approved by the USEPA on July 15, 1996 (61 FR 24702).

The transportation conformity rules require, among other things, a comparison to the mobile source emissions budget established by a control strategy SIP. A control strategy SIP is defined by the conformity rules to be a maintenance plan, an attainment demonstration, or a rate of progress plan. The Toledo area, Dayton/Springfield area, and Cleveland/Akron/Lorain area in Ohio are all maintenance areas with approved maintenance plans. The USEPA approval of the maintenance plans established the mobile source budget for transportation conformity purposes.

In the preamble to the November 24, 1993, transportation conformity rule (58 FR 62188) the emissions budget concept is explained. The preamble also

describes how to establish the motor vehicle emissions budget in the SIP and how to revise the emissions budget. The State transportation conformity rule at 3745-101-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code allows the mobile source emissions budget to be changed as long as the total level of emissions from all sources remain below the milestone level. In the case of a maintenance plan the milestone level is the attainment level established in the maintenance plan.

The maintenance plan is designed to plan for future growth while still maintaining the ozone air quality standard. Growth in industries, population and traffic is offset with reductions from cleaner cars and other emissions reduction programs. Through the maintenance plan the State and local agencies can manage the air quality while providing for growth.

II. Evaluation of the State Submittals

On June 10, 1997, Ohio submitted to the USEPA SIP revision requests for the Toledo area (including Lucas and Wood counties), the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain area (including Lorain, Cuyahoga, Lake, Ashtabula, Geauga, Medina, Summit and Portage counties), and the Dayton-

Springfield area (including Montgomery, Clark, Greene, and Miami counties). Public hearings for the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain area and the Dayton-Springfield area regarding these issues were held on June 3, 1997. A public hearing for the Toledo area was held on July 3, 1997. Documentation on the public hearings were submitted to complete the SIP revision requests.

(1) Toledo SIP Revision

Ohio has requested to allocate to the Toledo mobile source budget part of the reductions achieved between the 1990 attainment inventory year and the 2005 projected emissions inventory (57.338 tons/day Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) existing safety margin, and 46.38 tons/day Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) existing safety margin, as described in 60 FR 21456 and 60 FR 21490; May 2, 1995). The SIP revision requests the allocation of 6.0 tons/day VOC, and 10.5 tons/day NO_x, into the area's mobile source budget from the existing safety margin. Table 1 illustrates the approved emissions budgets for VOC and NO_x from point, mobile (on-road) and area sources. The safety margin allocations are shown in table 2.

TABLE 1.—NO_x AND VOC EMISSIONS BUDGET; AND SAFETY MARGIN DETERMINATIONS, TOLEDO
[Tons/day]

Source category	1990	1996	2000	2005
VOC Emissions:				
Point	60.08	39.49	39.31	38.87
Mobile (on-road)	66.33	51.28	41.25	¹ 29.85
Area	37.25	37.35	37.56	37.60
Totals	163.66	128.12	118.12	106.32
Safety Margin=1990 total emissions—2005 total emissions=57.34 tons/day VOC.				
NO_x Emissions:				
Point	73.97	73.40	40.15	40.69
Mobile (on-road)	37.82	32.56	29.06	24.69
Area	10.26	10.27	10.28	10.29
Totals	122.05	116.23	79.49	75.67
Safety Margin=1990 total emissions—2005 total emissions=46.38 tons/day NO _x				

¹ On May 2, 1995, the USEPA approved the addition of 1.142 tons/day VOC of the existing "safety margin" into the year 2005 VOC mobile source budget for purposes of conformity. (60 FR 21458; May 2, 1995)

TABLE 2.—ALLOCATION OF SAFETY MARGIN TO THE 2005 MOBILE SOURCE BUDGET, TOLEDO
[Tons/day]

Source category	1990	1996	2000	2005
VOC Emissions:				
Point	60.08	39.49	39.31	38.87
Mobile (on-road)	66.33	51.28	41.25	35.85
Area	37.25	37.35	37.56	37.60
Totals	163.66	128.12	118.12	112.32
Remaining Safety Margin=1990 total emissions—2005 total emissions=51.34 tons/day VOC.				
NO_x Emissions:				
Point	73.97	73.40	40.15	40.69
Mobile (on-road)	37.82	32.56	29.06	35.19

TABLE 2.—ALLOCATION OF SAFETY MARGIN TO THE 2005 MOBILE SOURCE BUDGET, TOLEDO—Continued
[Tons/day]

Source category	1990	1996	2000	2005
Area	10.26	10.27	10.28	10.29
Totals	122.05	116.23	79.49	86.17

Remaining Safety Margin=1990 total emissions—2005 total emissions=35.88 tons/day NO_x.

Table 2 illustrates that the requested portion of the safety margin can be allocated to the mobile source budget and still remain at or below the 1990 attainment level of total emissions for the Toledo area. This allocation is allowed by the conformity rule since the area would still be at or below the 1990 attainment level for the total emissions in the area.

(2) *Cleveland-Akron-Lorain SIP Revision*

Ohio has requested to allocate to the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain mobile source budget, part of the reduction achieved between the 1993 attainment inventory year and the 2006 projected emissions inventory (120.2 tons/day VOC existing safety margin, and 41.5 tons/day NO_x existing safety margin, as described in

61 FR 20458; May 7, 1996). The SIP revision requests the allocation of 33.9 tons/day VOC, and 29.0 tons/day NO_x, into the area's mobile source budget. Table 3 illustrates the approved emissions budgets for VOC and NO_x from point, mobile (on-road) and area sources. The safety margin allocations are shown in table 4.

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF NO_x AND VOC EMISSIONS BUDGET; AND SAFETY MARGIN DETERMINATIONS, CLEVELAND/AKRON/LORAIN
[Tons/day]

Source category	1990	1993	1996	2000	2006
VOC Emissions:					
Point	82.22	75.75	78.55	82.44	88.63
Mobile (on-road)	248.4	181.4	131.2	78.4	48.8
Area	201.05	201.37	201.45	201.63	200.86
Totals	531.7	458.5	411.2	362.5	338.3
Safety Margin=1993 total emissions—2006 total emissions=120.2 tons/day VOC.					
NO _x Emissions:					
Point	245.59	254.61	263.91	277.05	298.00
Mobile (on-road)	176.6	159.9	142.2	95.5	75.4
Area	80.46	80.56	80.51	80.61	80.18
Totals	502.6	495.1	486.6	453.2	453.6
Safety Margin=1993 total emissions—2006 total emissions=41.5 tons/day NO _x .					

TABLE 4.—ALLOCATION OF VOC EMISSIONS TO THE 2006 MOBILE SOURCE BUDGET, CLEVELAND/AKRON/LORAIN
[Tons/day]

Source category	1990	1993	1996	2000	2006
VOC Emissions:					
Point	82.22	75.75	78.55	82.44	88.63
Mobile (on-road)	248.4	181.4	131.2	78.4	82.7
Area	201.05	201.37	201.45	201.63	200.86
Totals	531.7	458.5	411.2	362.5	372.2
Remaining Safety Margin=1993 total emissions—2006 total emissions=86.3 tons/day VOC.					
NO _x Emissions:					
Point	245.59	254.61	263.91	277.05	298.00
Mobile (on-road)	176.6	159.9	142.2	95.5	104.4
Area	80.46	80.56	80.51	80.61	80.18
Totals	502.6	495.1	486.6	453.2	482.6
Remaining Safety Margin=1993 total emissions—2006 total emissions=12.5 tons/day NO _x .					

Tables 3 and 4 illustrate that the SIP revision request can be granted to allocate a portion of the safety margin to the mobile source budget and still remain at or below the 1993 attainment

year inventory total for the Cleveland/Akron/Lorain area. This allocation is allowed by the conformity rule since the area would still be at or below the 1993

attainment level for the total emissions in the area.

(3) Dayton-Springfield SIP Revision

Ohio has requested to allocate to the Dayton-Springfield mobile source budget, the reduction achieved between the 1990 attainment inventory year and

the 2005 projected emissions inventory (2.4 tons/day VOC existing safety margin, as described in 60 FR 22289; May 5, 1995). The SIP revision requests the allocation of the 2.4 tons/day VOC safety margin into the area's mobile

source budget. Table 5 illustrates the approved emissions budgets for VOC from point, mobile (on-road) and area sources. The safety margin allocations are shown in table 6.

TABLE 5.—VOC EMISSIONS BUDGET; AND SAFETY MARGIN DETERMINATIONS, DAYTON-SPRINGFIELD
[Tons/day]

Source category	1990	1996	2000	2005
VOC Emissions:				
Point	37.4	61.6	77.7	97.4
Biogenic	105.2	105.2	105.2	105.2
Mobile (on-road)	103.6	45.5	39.4	31.7
Area	54.9	58.3	60.6	64.4
Totals	301.1	270.6	282.9	298.7

Safety Margin=1990 total emissions – 2005 total emissions=2.4 tons/day VOC.

TABLE 6.—ALLOCATION OF VOC EMISSIONS TO THE 2005 MOBILE SOURCE BUDGET, DAYTON-SPRINGFIELD
[Tons/day]

Source category	1990	1996	2000	2005
VOC Emissions:				
Point	37.4	61.6	77.7	97.4
Biogenic	105.2	105.2	105.2	105.2
Mobile (on-road)	103.6	45.5	39.4	34.1
Area	54.9	58.3	60.6	64.4
Totals	301.1	270.6	282.9	301.1

Remaining Safety Margin=1990 total emissions – 2005 total emissions=0.0 tons/day VOC.

As illustrated by Tables 5 and 6 the SIP revision requests to allocate all of the VOC safety margin to the mobile source budget. This allocation is allowed by the conformity rule since the area would still be at the 1990 attainment level for the total emissions in the area.

The USEPA's review of the SIP revision requests finds that the requested allocation of the safety margins for the Toledo, Cleveland/Akron/Lorain and Dayton/Springfield areas are approvable since the approval of the new mobile source emissions budgets will keep the total emissions for the area at or below the attainment year inventory level as required by the transportation conformity regulations.

III. USEPA Action

The USEPA approves the requested allocation of the safety margin to the mobile source budget for the Toledo, Cleveland-Akron-Lorain, and Dayton-Springfield areas. This action will be effective on October 24, 1997 unless, by September 24, 1997, significant written adverse or critical comments on the approval are received.

If the USEPA receives such written adverse comments, the approval will be withdrawn before the effective date by

publishing a subsequent rulemaking that will withdraw the final action. All written public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this action serving as a proposed rule. The USEPA does not plan to institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If no such written comments are received, the public is advised that this action will be effective on October 24, 1997.

IV. Administrative Requirements

(A) Future Requests

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting, allowing or establishing a precedent for any future request for revision to any SIP. Each request for revision to the SIP shall be considered separately in light of specific technical, economic, and environmental factors and in relation to relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

(B) Executive Order 12866

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

(C) Regulatory Flexibility

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 *et seq.*, USEPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Alternatively, USEPA 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 USEPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co. v. USEPA.*

427 U.S. 246, 256–66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

(D) *Unfunded Mandates*

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, signed into law on March 22, 1995, USEPA 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.

(E) *Audit Privilege and Immunity Law*

Nothing in this action should be construed as making any determination or expressing any position regarding Ohio's audit privilege and immunity law (Sections 3745.70–3745.73 of the Ohio Revised Code). U.S. EPA will be reviewing the effect of the Ohio audit privilege and immunity law on various Ohio environmental programs, including those under the Clean Air Act, and taking appropriate action(s), if any, after thorough analysis and opportunity for Ohio to state and explain its views and positions on the issues raised by the law. The action taken herein does not express or imply any viewpoint on the question of whether there are legal deficiencies in this or any Ohio CAA program resulting from the effect of the audit privilege and immunity law. As a consequence of the review process, the regulations subject to the action taken herein may be disapproved, federal approval for the Clean Air Act program under which they are implemented may be withdrawn, or other appropriate action may be taken, as necessary.

(F) *Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office*

Under section 801(a)(1)(A) as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, USEPA submitted a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office prior to publication of the rule in today's **Federal Register**. This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 804(2).

(G) *Petitions for Judicial Review*

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this

action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by October 24, 1997. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2)).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Nitrogen Oxides, Transportation conformity.

Dated: August 8, 1997.

David A. Ullrich,
Acting Regional Administrator.

Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Subpart KK—Ohio

2. Section 52.1885 is amended by adding paragraph (a)(6) to read as follows:

§ 52.1885 Control strategy: Ozone.

(a) * * *

(6) Approval—On June 10, 1997, Ohio submitted revisions to the maintenance plans for the Toledo area (including Lucas and Wood counties), the Cleveland/Akron/Lorain area (including Lorain, Cuyahoga, Lake, Ashtabula, Geauga, Medina, Summit and Portage counties), and the Dayton-Springfield area (including Montgomery, Clark, Greene, and Miami counties). The revisions consist of an allocation of a portion of the safety margin in each area to the transportation conformity mobile source budget for that area. The mobile source budgets for transportation conformity purposes for Toledo are now: 35.85 tons per day of volatile organic compound emissions for the year 2005 and 35.19 tons per day of oxides of nitrogen emissions for the year 2005. The mobile source budgets for transportation conformity purposes for Cleveland-Akron-Lorain are now: 82.7 tons per day of volatile organic compound emissions for the year 2006 and 104.4 tons per day of oxides of nitrogen emissions for the year 2006.

For the Dayton-Springfield area, the oxides of nitrogen mobile source budget remains the same and the mobile source budget for volatile organic compounds is now 34.1 tons per day.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 97–22067 Filed 8–22–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 034–0049a FRL–5880–4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Bay Area Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action on a revision to the California State Implementation Plan. The revision concerns a rule from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). This approval action will incorporate this rule into the federally approved SIP. The intended effect of approving this rule is to regulate emissions of VOCs in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). This revised rule controls VOC emissions from stationary storage tanks containing organic liquids. Thus, EPA is finalizing the approval of the BAAQMD rule revision into the California SIP under provisions of the CAA regarding EPA action on SIP submittals, EPA's general rulemaking authority, plan submissions, and enforceability guidelines. This rule is being incorporated into the SIP in accordance with the area's ozone maintenance plan for redesignation to attainment.

DATES: This action is effective on October 24, 1997 unless adverse or critical comments are received by September 24, 1997. If the effective date is delayed, a timely notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Comments must be submitted to Andrew Steckel at the Region IX office listed below. Copies of the rule revisions and EPA's evaluation report for BAAQMD Rule 8–5, Storage of Organic Liquids, are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule revisions are available for inspection at the following locations: