withdraw the final action. All public comments received will then be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the separate proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If no such comments are received, the public is advised that this action will be effective August 26, 1996.

Under Section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7607(b)(1), petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by August 26, 1996. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for 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) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7607(b)(2)).

This action has been classified as a Table 3 action for signature by the Regional Administrator under the procedures published in the Federal Register on January 19, 1989 (54 FR 2214–2225), as revised by a July 10, 1995, memorandum from Mary Nichols, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from E.O. 12866 review.

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

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 *et seq.*, EPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Alternatively, EPA may certify that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000.

SIP approvals under Section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the CAA 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, I certify 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 CAA, preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The CAA forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs 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) and 7410(k)(3).

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 this state implementation plan or plan revision, the State and any affected local or tribal governments have elected to adopt the revisions provided for under part D of Title I 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 approved by this action will impose no new requirements, since such sources are already subject to these regulations under State law. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action, and therefore there will be no significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. EPA has also determined that this final 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, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: April 19, 1996.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator.

Part 52 of chapter I, title 40, *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. 7401–7671(q).

Subpart L—Georgia

2. Section 52.570 is amended by revising subparagraph (c)(37)(i)(A) to read as follows:

§ 52.570 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(37) * * *

(i) * * *

(A) The following Rules of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Chapter 391–3–1, Air Quality Control, became State effective on January 9, 1991.

391–3–1–.01(jjj);
391–3–1–.02(2)(a)4.;
391–3–1–.02(2)(t);
391–3–1–.02(2)(u)2.(i) and (iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(v)2.(i) and (iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(w)2.(i) and (iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(x)2.(i), (iii), and (x)3.(v);
391–3–1–.02(2)(y)2.(i) and (iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(z)2.(i) and (iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(aa)2.(i) and (iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(bb)1.(ii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(cc);
391–3–1–.02(2)(ee)1.(iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(ff)2.(ii)(V) and 3.(iii)(III);
391–3–1–.02(2)(ii)4.(i) and (iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(jj)2.(i) and (iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(mm)1.(i), (ii), and (iii);
391–3–1–.02(2)(pp);
391–3–1–.02(2)(qq);
391–3–1–.0292)(rr);
391–3–1–.02(2)(ss);
391–3–1–.02(3)(a);
391–3–1–.02(6)(a)3.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 96–16343 Filed 6–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

40 CFR Part 721

[OPPTS–50601H; FRL–5371–7]

Cyclohexanecarbonitrile, 1,3,3-trimethyl-5-oxo-; Revocation of a Significant New Use Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is revoking a significant new use rule (SNUR) promulgated under section 5(a)(2) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) for cyclohexanecarbonitrile, 1,3,3-trimethyl-5-oxo- based on receipt of new data. Based on the data the Agency determined that it could not support a

finding that activities described in the PMN may result in a significant risk.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of this rule is July 29, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan B. Hazen, Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E–543A, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, Telephone: (202) 554–1404, TDD: (202) 554–0551; e-mail: TSCA-Hotline@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Federal Register of September 23, 1992 (57 FR 44050), EPA issued a SNUR (FRL–4001–2) establishing significant new uses for cyclohexanecarbonitrile, 1,3,3-trimethyl-5-oxo-. Because of additional data EPA has received for this substance, EPA is revoking this SNUR.

I. Background

The Agency proposed the revocation of the SNUR for this substance in the Federal Register of September 13, 1995 (60 FR 47531) (FRL–4926–1). The background and reasons for the revocation of the SNUR are set forth in the preamble to the proposed revocation. The Agency received no public comment concerning the proposed revocation. As a result EPA is revoking this SNUR.

II. Background and Rationale for Final SNUR Revocation of the Rule

During review of the premanufacture notice (PMN) submitted for the chemical substance that is the subject of this final SNUR revocation, EPA concluded that regulation was warranted under section 5(e) of TSCA pending the development of information sufficient to make a reasoned evaluation of the environmental effects of the substance, and that the substance is expected to be produced in substantial quantities and there may be significant or substantial human exposure. EPA identified the tests necessary to make a reasoned evaluation of the risks posed by the substance to the human health. Based on these findings, a section 5(e) consent order was negotiated with the PMN submitter and a SNUR was promulgated.

EPA reviewed testing conducted by the PMN submitter pursuant to the consent order for the substance and determined that the information available was sufficient to make a reasoned evaluation of the health effects of the substance. EPA has determined that it could not support a finding that activities described in the PMN may result in a significant risk. The final revocation of SNUR provisions for the substance designated herein is consistent with the revocation of the section 5(e) order.

In light of the above, EPA is finalizing a revocation of SNUR provisions for this chemical substance. When this revocation becomes final, EPA will no longer require notice of any company's intent to manufacture, import, or process this substance. In addition, export notification under section 12(b) of TSCA will no longer be required.

III. Rulemaking Record

The record for the rule which EPA is revoking was established at OPPTS–50601 (P–90–1358). This record includes information considered by the Agency in developing the rule and includes the test data that formed the basis for this finalization.

A public version of the record, without any Confidential Business Information, is available in the OPPT Non-Confidential Information Center (NCIC) from 12 p.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays. The TSCA NCIC is located in the Northeast Mall Basement Rm. B–607, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC.

IV. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

EPA is revoking the requirements of the rule. Any costs or burdens associated with the rule will also be eliminated when the rule is revoked. Therefore, EPA finds that no costs or burdens must be assessed under Executive Order 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), or the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 721

Environmental protection, Chemicals, Hazardous materials, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Significant new uses.

Dated: June 18, 1996.

Charles M. Auer,

Director, Chemical Control Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics.

Therefore, 40 CFR part 721 is amended to read as follows:

PART 721—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 721 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 2604, 2607, and 2625(c).

§ 721.2225 [Removed]

2. By removing § 721.2225.

[FR Doc. 96–16337 Filed 6–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

40 CFR Part 721

[OPPTS–50608D; FRL–5372–1]

Ethane, 1,1,1 Trifluoro-; Revocation of a Significant New Use Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is revoking a significant new use rule (SNUR) promulgated under section 5(a)(2) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) for ethane, 1,1,1 trifluoro, based on receipt of new data. Based on the data the Agency determined that it could not support a finding that activities described in the PMN may result in a significant risk.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of this rule is July 29, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan B. Hazen, Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E–543A, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, Telephone: (202) 554–1404, TDD: (202) 554–0551; e-mail: TSCA-Hotline@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Federal Register of June 8, 1993 (58 FR 32228), EPA issued a SNUR (FRL–4172–3) establishing significant new uses for ethane, 1,1,1 trifluoro-. Because of additional data EPA has received for this substance, EPA is revoking this SNUR.

I. Background

The Agency proposed the revocation of the SNUR for this substance in the Federal Register of September 13, 1995 (60 FR 47533) (FRL–4911–5). The background and reasons for the revocation of the SNUR are set forth in the preamble to the proposed revocation. The Agency received no public comment concerning the proposed revocation. As a result EPA is revoking this SNUR.

II. Background and Rationale for Final SNUR Revocation of the Rule

During review of the premanufacture notice (PMN) submitted for the chemical substance that is the subject of this final SNUR revocation, EPA concluded that regulation was warranted under section 5(e) of TSCA pending the development of information sufficient to make a reasoned evaluation of the health effects of the substance, and that the substance is expected to be produced in substantial quantities and there may be significant or substantial human exposure. EPA identified the