5. Isolated commands and detachments at which DoD newspapers are not readily available.

Appendix E to Part 247—DoD Command Newspaper and Magazine Review System

A. *Purpose.* The purpose of the DoD command newspaper and magazine review system is to assist commanders in establishing and maintaining cost-effective internal communications essential to mission accomplishment. The system also enables internal information managers to assess the cost and effective use of resources devoted to command newspapers and to provide requested reports.

B. *Policy.* DoD newspapers and magazines shall be reviewed and reported biennially. The review process is not intended to replace day-to-day quality assurance procedures or established critique programs.

C. *Review criteria.* Each newspaper and magazine shall be evaluated on the basis of mission essentiality, communication effectiveness, cost-effectiveness, and compliance with applicable regulations.

D. Reporting requirements.

1. The DoD Components (less the Military Departments) shall forward, by January 31 of each even numbered year, the information indicated at attachment 1 to this Appendix for each newspaper published to: Director, American Forces Information Service, ATTN: Print Media Plans and Policy, 601 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, VA 22314–2007.

2. No later than April 15 of each even-numbered year, the Secretary (or designee) of each Military Department shall forward to the address above a report of the Military Department's review of newspapers and magazines. This report shall include summary data on total number of newspapers and magazines, along with a listing of the information indicated at attachment 1 to this appendix.

3. One information copy of each issue of all DoD newspapers and magazines shall be forwarded on publication date to the address in paragraph H.1. of this appendix.

4. Information copies of CE contracts shall be forwarded to the address in paragraph H.1. of this appendix, upon request.

5. Administrative Instructions shall be issued by the Director, AFIS, for the annual review and reporting of newspapers and magazines.

Attachment 1 to Appendix E to Part 247—Newspaper and Magazine Reporting Data

As required by section H. of this appendix, the following information shall be provided biennially regarding newspapers and magazines:

A. Name of newspaper or magazine.

B. Publishing command and mailing address.

C. Printing arrangement:

1. Government equipment.

2. Government contract with commercial printer.

3. CE contract with commercial publisher (provide name, mailing address, and phone number of commercial publisher).

D. Frequency and number of issues per year.

E. Number of copies printed and estimated readership.

F. Paper size (metro, tabloid, or magazine format).

Dated: August 5, 1997.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 97–21091 Filed 8–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

32 CFR Part 286

[DoD 5400.7–R]

DoD Freedom of Information Act Program; Correction

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense published a final rule concerning the DoD Freedom of Information Act Program on July 1, 1997 (62 FR 35351). This document is published to correct administrative errors published.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 22, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. C. Talbott, telephone 703–697–1171.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 286

Freedom of information.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 286 is amended to read as follows:

PART 286—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 286 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552.

2. Section 286.3, definition *Appellate authority*, is amended by revising ''*initial denital*'' to to read ''*initial denial*''.

3. Section 286.28(d)(3)(ii)(A), next to last sentence, is amended after the word ''section'' by adding the word ''apply''.

Dated: August 5, 1997.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 97–21090 Filed 8–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[GA–34–2–9716; FRL–5865–9]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Georgia; Enhanced Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Interim final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is granting interim approval of a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by Georgia. This revision establishes and requires the implementation of an enhanced motor vehicle inspection and maintenance (I/M) program in 13 metro Atlanta counties. This action approves the State's enhanced I/M program for an 18 month interim period based upon the State's good faith estimate of the program's performance. This action is being taken under section 110 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and section 348 of the National Highway Systems Designation Act (NHSDA).

DATES: This final rule is effective on September 10, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations:

Air, Pesticides, and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia, 30303

Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division, Air Protection Branch, 4244 International Parkway, Suite 120, Atlanta, Georgia, 30354

Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (Air Docket 6102) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ben Franco, by telephone at: (404) 562–9039, or via e-mail at: Franco.Ben@epamail.epa.gov. The mailing address is U.S. EPA Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia, 30303.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On December 13, 1996 (61 FR 65496), EPA published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPR) for the State of Georgia. The NPR proposed conditional interim approval of Georgia's enhanced

I/M program, submitted to satisfy the applicable requirements of both the CAA and the NHSDA. The formal SIP revision was submitted by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) on March 27, 1996. A lack of Acceleration Simulation Mode (ASM) test method specifications was the reason for the conditional approval.

The NHSDA directs EPA to grant interim approval for a period of 18 months to approvable I/M submittals under this Act. The NHSDA also directs EPA and the states to review the interim program results at the end of that 18-month period, and to make a determination as to the effectiveness of the interim program. Following this demonstration, EPA will adjust any credit claims made by the State in its good faith effort, to reflect the emissions reductions actually measured by the State during the program evaluation period. The NHSDA is clear that the interim approval shall last for only 18 months, and that the program evaluation is due to EPA at the end of that period. Therefore, EPA believes Congress intended for these programs to begin as soon as possible, which EPA believes should be on or before November 15, 1997, so that, assuming a twelve month planning period before program implementation, at least six months of operational program data can be collected to evaluate the interim programs. EPA believes that in setting such a strict timetable for program evaluations under the NHSDA, Congress recognized and attempted to mitigate any further delay with the start-up of this program. If the State fails to start its program according to this schedule, this interim approval granted under the provisions of the NHSDA will convert to a disapproval after a finding letter is sent to the State. Unlike the other specified conditions of this rulemaking, which are explicit conditions under section 110(k)(4) of the CAA and which will trigger an automatic disapproval should the State fail to meet its commitments, the start date provision will only trigger a disapproval upon EPA's notification to the State by letter that the start date has been missed. This letter will not only notify the State that this rulemaking action has been converted to a disapproval, but also that the sanctions clock associated with this disapproval has been triggered as a result of this failure. Because the start date condition is not imposed pursuant to a commitment to correct a deficient SIP under 110(k)(4), EPA does not believe it is necessary to have the SIP approval convert to a disapproval automatically if the start date is missed. EPA is imposing the start date condition under its general SIP approval authority of section 110(k)(3), which does not require automatic conversion.

On January 31, 1997, the Georgia EPD submitted necessary ASM specifications that were the reason for the condition in the December 13, 1996, notice. These specifications were largely based upon EPA's specifications for the ASM test. Therefore, the condition noted in the December 13, 1996, proposal has been met and is removed. Georgia has also begun its implementation of the I/M program as scheduled and has met all milestones to date. Georgia has also committed to meet the ECOS/EPA/STAPPA evaluation workgroup protocol which will meet the requirements of 40 CFR 51.353(c)(3).

As per the NHSDA requirements, this interim rulemaking will expire on February 11, 1999. A full approval of Georgia's final I/M SIP revision is still necessary under section 110 and under section 182, 184 or 187 of the CAA. After EPA reviews Georgia's submitted program evaluation and regulations, final rulemaking on the State's full SIP revision will occur.

Additional detailed discussion of the Georgia enhanced I/M SIP and the rationale for EPA's action are explained in the proposal notice published December 13, 1996, at 61 FR 65496–65504 and will not be restated here.

II. Final Rulemaking Action

EPA had initially proposed to grant conditional interim approval to the Georgia enhanced I/M SIP revision due to the lack of the ASM specification. However, Georgia has since submitted the required ASM specifications, thereby meeting the requirements of the condition. EPA notes the State has demonstrated its good faith efforts by meeting its I/M program implementation schedule to date.

Under the terms of EPA's December 13, 1996, proposed interim conditional approval rulemaking, Georgia was required to make commitments (within 30 days) to remedy one major deficiency with the I/M program SIP (as specified in the NPR), within twelve months of final interim approval. On January 10, 1997, Georgia submitted a letter from Ronald Methier, Chief of the Air Protection Branch, Georgia Environmental Protection Division, to EPA committing to satisfy the ASM condition cited in the NPR, by certain dates specified in the letter. Subsequently, on January 31, 1997, the Georgia EPD submitted the required ASM specifications. Since the condition has been met by EPA's receipt of the ASM specifications, and since no comments were received concerning the December 13, 1996, proposal, EPA is granting final interim approval to the Georgia I/M SIP under section 110 of the CAA. As discussed in detail later in this notice, this approval is being granted on an interim basis, for an 18-month period under authority of the NHSDA.

III. Further Requirements for Permanent I/M SIP Approval

This approval is being granted on an interim basis for a period of 18 months, under the authority of section 348 of the NHSDA of 1995. At the end of this period, the approval will lapse. At that time, EPA must take final rulemaking action upon the SIP, under the authority of section 110 of the CAA. Final approval of the State's plan will be granted based upon the following criteria:

(1) EPA's review of the Georgia program evaluation confirms that the appropriate amount of program credit was claimed by the State and achieved with the interim program.

IV. Administrative Requirements

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting or 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.

A. Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from E.O. 12866 review.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

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.

C. SIP Approval Actions

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 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. EPA,* 427 U.S. 246, 255–66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2) and 7410(k)(3).

D. Unfunded Mandates

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (''Unfunded Mandates Act''), signed into law on March 22, 1995, 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, 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 EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated 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 requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

E. Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office

Under 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A) as added by the Small Business Regulatory 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).

F. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by October 10, 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, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: July 12, 1997.

John H. Hankinson, Jr.,

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. 7401–7671q.

Subpart L—Georgia

2. Section 52.570 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(50) to read as follows:

§ 52.570 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(50) Georgia Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance submitted to EPA by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources on March 27, 1996.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Chapter 391–3–20 Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance program effective on September 24, 1996.

(ii) Other material. None.

[FR Doc. 97–20576 Filed 8–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[AD–FRL–5872–7]

National Emission Standards for Chromium Emissions From Hard and Decorative Chromium Electroplating and Chromium Anodizing Tanks

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: On January 25, 1995, the EPA issued national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990, for Hard and Decorative Chromium Electroplating and Chromium Anodizing Tanks. The NESHAP requires existing and new major and area sources to control emissions of hazardous air pollutants by meeting emission limits that are based on the use of maximum achievable control technology (MACT). On January 30, 1997, the EPA issued an interim final rule that revised the compliance date for some provisions for some of the sources subject to this standard. Specifically, the interim rule extended the compliance date for the monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping (MRR) requirements for hard chromium electroplaters and chromium anodizing operations in California from January 25, 1997 to July 24, 1997.

Based on the comments received on the interim final rule, the EPA has reconsidered the extension deadline and is promulgating these revisions in today's action. Specifically, today's action further extends the compliance date for performance test requirements and all the monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping (MRR) requirements for hard chromium electroplaters and chromium anodizing operations in California to January 25, 1998.

DATES: The final rule will be effective August 11, 1997.

ADDRESSES: *Docket.* Docket No. A–88–02 containing the supporting information for the original NESHAP and this action, are available for public inspection and copying between 8:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the EPA's Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, Waterside Mall, room M–1500, first floor, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460, or by calling (202) 260–7548 or 260–7549. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Lalit Banker, Emission Standards Division (MD–13), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541–5420.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulated Entities

The regulated category and entities affected by this action include the hard chromium electroplating and chromium anodizing operations in the State of California only. To determine whether your facility is regulated by this action, you should carefully examine the applicability criteria in § 63.340 of the regulation. If you have questions