

TABLE 5—I/M EMISSIONS MAKE-UP DEMONSTRATION—Continued

Year	MOVES emissions shortfall		SIP credits from shutdown facilities		Trading VOC emissions for NO <sub>x</sub> emissions <sup>5</sup>		Revised SIP credits from shutdown facilities		Difference (shortfall—Credits) <sup>6</sup>	
	VOC (tons)	NO <sub>x</sub> (tons)	VOC (tons)	NO <sub>x</sub> (tons)	VOC (tons)	NO <sub>x</sub> (tons)	VOC (tons)	NO <sub>x</sub> (tons)	VOC (tons)	NO <sub>x</sub> (tons)
2022 .....	103.41	45.37	506.47	72.71	70.00	280.00	436.47	352.71	-333.05	-307.34

<sup>5</sup> 4:1 VOC to NO<sub>x</sub> Ratio (*i.e.*, 1 ton of VOC = 4 tons of NO<sub>x</sub>).

<sup>6</sup> Negative numbers indicate that the emissions shortfall has been adequately covered.

EPA also examined whether the amendments to the approved I/M program in southeast Wisconsin have interfered with attainment of other air quality standards. Southeast Wisconsin is designated attainment for all other standards including sulfur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide. EPA has no reason to believe that the amendments to the approved I/M program in southeast Wisconsin have caused or will cause the area to become nonattainment for any of these pollutants. In addition, EPA believes that the amendments to the approved I/M program in southeast Wisconsin will not interfere with the area's ability to meet any other CAA requirement.

Based on the above discussion and the state's 100(l) demonstration, EPA believes that the changes to the Wisconsin I/M program would not interfere with attainment or maintenance of any of the NAAQS in both the Milwaukee-Racine and Sheboygan County nonattainment areas and would not interfere with any other applicable requirement of the CAA, and thus, are approvable under CAA section 110(l).

**V. What action is EPA taking?**

EPA is proposing to approve the revisions to the Wisconsin ozone SIP submitted on June 7, 2012, concerning the I/M program in southeast Wisconsin. EPA finds that the revisions meet all applicable requirements and will not interfere with reasonable further progress or attainment of any of the NAAQS.

**VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the CAA and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions,

EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- 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);
- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and
- Does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, this rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the SIP is not approved to apply in Indian country located in the state, and EPA notes that it will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

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

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

Dated: April 12, 2013.

**Susan Hedman,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 2013-09536 Filed 4-24-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 98**

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0934; FRL-9789-1]

RIN 2060-AR52

**2013 Revisions to the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule and Proposed Confidentiality Determinations for New or Substantially Revised Data Elements**

*Correction*

In proposed rule document 2013-06093, appearing on pages 19802-19877 in the issue of Tuesday, April 2, 2013, make the following correction:

**§ 98.173 Calculating GHG emissions. [Corrected]**

On page 19854, the equation titled as "(Eq. Q-5)" is corrected to read as set forth below:

$$CO_2 = \frac{44}{12} * \left[ (Iron) * (C_{Iron}) + (Scrap) * (C_{Scrap}) + (Flux) * (C_{Flux}) + (Electrode) * (C_{Electrode}) \right. \\ \left. + (Carbon) * (C_{Carbon}) - (Steel) * (C_{Steel}) + (F_g) * (C_{gf}) * \frac{MW}{MVC} * 0.001 - (Slag) \right. \\ \left. * (C_{Slag}) - (R) * (C_R) \right] \quad (Eq. Q-5)$$

[FR Doc. C1-2013-06093 Filed 4-24-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505-01-D