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.

This approval does not create any new requirements. Therefore, I certify that this action 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 the regulatory flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of the State action. The Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co.* v. *U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 256–66 (1976).

D. Unfunded Mandates

Under Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (''Unfunded Mandates Act''), signed into law on March 22, 1995, the EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany 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. Under Section 205, the EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires the EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

The EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated today does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of $100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector.

This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new Federal requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or the private sector, result from this action.

E. 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 April 12, 1996. 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, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: October 10, 1995.

Valdas V. Adamkus,

Regional Administrator.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, 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 YY—Wisconsin

2. Section 52.2570 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(83) to read as follows:

§ 52.2570 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(83) A revision to the ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP) was submitted by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources on June 14, 1995. This revision is a volatile organic compound (VOC) regulation which requires controls on facilities that perform autobody refinishing operations.

(i) Incorporation by reference. The following sections of the Wisconsin Administrative Code are incorporated by reference.

(A) NR 422.02(intro.) and (47), 422.03 (1) and (3) and 484.05(1) as amended and published in the (Wisconsin) Register, August, 1995 and effective September 1, 1995.

(B) NR 422.02 (1), (1x), (3m), (12d), (33j), (34s), (34v), (37s), (42n), (47e) and (49m) and 422.095 as created and published in the (Wisconsin) Register, August, 1995 and effective September 1, 1995.

(C) NR 422.02(1s) as renumbered from 422.02(1) and published in the (Wisconsin) Register, August, 1995 and effective September 1, 1995.

[FR Doc. 96–2960 Filed 2–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 52

[WI49–02–7293; FRL–5419–6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Wisconsin; Correction

AGENCY: United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document contains corrections to a final rule which was published Friday, July 28, 1995 (60 FR 38722). The final rule approved a volatile organic compound (VOC) regulation which was incorporated by reference into the Wisconsin State Implementation Plan (SIP).

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action is effective February 12, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen D'Agostino at (312) 886–1767.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 28, 1995 (60 FR 38722), the USEPA approved a revision to the Wisconsin SIP containing a VOC regulation that establishes reasonably available control technology (RACT) for screen printing facilities. However, when these regulations were incorporated by reference into the Wisconsin SIP, USEPA inadvertantly overwrote a more current section of the rule which had previously been incorporated into the SIP.

Need for Correction

As published, the incorrect version of part of this regulation has been incorporated by reference into the State's SIP.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: January 24, 1996.

Valdas V. Adamkus,

Regional Administrator.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the direct final rule published on July 28, 1995 (60 FR 38722), is corrected as follows:

Subpart YY—Wisconsin

On page 38724, in the third column, paragraph 52.2570(c)(82)(i)(D) is corrected to read as follows:

§ 52.2570 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(82) * * *

(i) * * *

(D) NR 439.04(4)(intro.), (5)(a)1. and (5)(a)2. as amended and published in the (Wisconsin) Register, June, 1994, No. 462, effective July 1, 1994.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 96–2959 Filed 2–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

46 CFR Part 514

[Docket No. 95–08]

Service Contract Filing Requirements—Miscellaneous Revisions

AGENCY: Federal Maritime Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Maritime Commission is amending its rules to provide for an optional, abbreviated service contract format; and to require service contracts to include the legal names and business addresses of the signatories and either list affiliates' business addresses or certify that affiliates' business addresses will be provided to the Commission within 10 business days of such request. The final rule in this matter should reduce duplication and Commission and carrier costs, as well as facilitate automation of the Commission's service contract records.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 13, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bryant L. VanBrakle, Director, Bureau of Tariffs, Certification and Licensing, Federal Maritime Commission, 800 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, DC 20573, (202) 523–5796.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Federal Maritime Commission (''Commission'') initiated this proceeding with a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (''NPR'' or ''Proposed Rule'') published in the May 23, 1995 Federal Register.[1] The NPR solicited comments on a proposal to amend the Commission's rules to provide for an optional, abbreviated service contract format, on condition that such filings: (1) Incorporate by reference the corresponding electronic essential terms (''ET'') filed in the Commission's Automated Tariff Filing and Information System (''ATFI''); and (2) certify that, other than for those provisions set forth in the filed service contract, said ET sets forth the parties' true and complete contract. The NPR also proposed requiring contracts to set forth the true and complete names and addresses of contract parties, including affiliates, and the typewritten names, titles and addresses of the representatives signing contracts for the contract parties. The Proposed Rule's purposes are to reduce duplication and Commission and carrier costs, facilitate automation of the Commission's service contract records and facilitate the identification of shipper parties, including named affiliates to certain service contracts.

II. Comments

The NPR elicited three comments: (1) Joint comments of the Asia-North America Eastbound Rate Agreement, the Transpacific Westbound Rate Agreement, and the South Europe/American Conference (''ANERA, *et al.*''); (2) joint comments of the Trans-Pacific Conference of Japan and the Japan-Atlantic and Gulf Freight Conference and their member lines (''Japan Conferences''); and (3) the Trans-Atlantic Conference Agreement (''TACA''). The comments generally support the Proposed Rule, but suggest some modifications concerning the Proposed Rule's requirement for ''true and complete names, * * * and addresses'' of contract parties and information requirements for service contracts involving a significant number of shipper affiliates.

A. Abbreviated Service Contract Format

ANERA, *et al.*, and TACA support the proposed optional abbreviated service contract format, stating that it would reduce costs to them as well as the Commission.

The Japan Conferences do not oppose the abbreviated format, but advise that it might not enjoy widespread usage in their trades. They note that traditional Japanese contracting practices would result in Japanese shippers and most other commercial interests continuing to insist upon single, full-text format contracts instead of ''bifurcated'' versions that include the associated ET publications. They also advise that Japanese shippers, as well as most other commercial interests, have not yet adopted the practice of contracting via Electronic Data Interchange. They therefore urge that this format be ''optional'', as currently proposed.

The Japan Conferences also advise that problems could be associated with requiring contract signatories to certify that the terms set forth in the abbreviated format service contract and ATFI ETs are the true and complete terms covering all aspects of the parties' contract. They believe problems could occur when making certifications about frequently changing terms and conditions in instances where an inadvertent disparity arises between the true contract and the abbreviated version. They contend that the latter would be controlling under the rule but would not reflect the parties' true understanding.

B. Addresses of Contract Signatories

ANERA, *et al.*, support the NPR's proposal to require service contracts to state the contract parties' addresses. TACA opposes the Proposed Rule's use of the term ''true and complete'' with regard to contract parties' names and addresses,[2] because the term might have several meanings. TACA offers several examples in this regard: the name shown on a person's birth certificate; the name that a person commonly uses; the official legal name of a company or corporation shown on its certificate of incorporation; or a commonly used acronym, such as ''AT&T'', rather than ''American Telephone and Telegraph Company''. Further, it contends that a ''true and complete'' address could be the postal address of a person or company rather than the business address. TACA therefore believes that this aspect of the Proposed Rule invites uncertainty and confusion. Moreover, it contends that ocean common carrier service contract filers should be allowed to ''reasonably rely on the form, style, and completeness of the names of those persons executing such contracts on behalf of shipper parties as are provided them.'' As an alternative, TACA suggests that requiring a contract to state the ''names and postal addresses of contract parties and signers'' would be sufficient.[3] To this end, it offers the following revision to the first sentence of 46 CFR 514.7(h)(1)(v):

The names and postal addresses of the contract parties and the typewritten names and titles of the representatives signing the contract for the parties along with their postal address if different than that of the Contract party represented.

[1] 60 FR 27248.

[2] The NPR proposed requiring service contracts to include ''the true and complete names and addresses of the contract parties and the typewritten names, titles, and addresses of the representatives signing the contract for the parties.''

[3] TACA also believes that it is redundant to state the address of a ''contract signer'' when its address, in most cases, is the same as that of the contract party it represents. They believe that the revision which they suggest will also remedy this aspect of the Proposed Rule.