subject to the mandatory reporting requirement, or if it is exempt from the mandatory reporting requirement but chooses to report data voluntarily, either a separate Form BE–82(B) may be filed for each separately organized financial services subsidiary or part of the consolidated U.S. enterprise, or a single BE–82(B) may be filed, representing the sum of covered transactions by all financial services subsidiaries or parts of the enterprise combined.

(*ii*) Reporters that receive the BE–82 survey from BEA, but that are not reporting data in either the mandatory or voluntary section of any Form BE–82(B), must return the Exemption Claim, attached to Form BE–82(A), to BEA.

(ii) [Reserved].

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 95–18803 Filed 8–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–06–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[PA 54–1–6941b; FRL–5256–8]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Approval of Source-Specific VOC and NO_X RACT and Synthetic Minor Permit Conditions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This revision establishes and requires reasonably available control technology (RACT) on eight major sources and establishes permit conditions to limit one source's emissions to below major source levels. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule and the accompanying technical support document. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. 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.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing by September 7, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to Marcia L. Spink, Associate Director, Air Programs, Mailcode 3AT00, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air, Radiation, and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107; and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources Bureau of Air Quality Control, P.O. Box 8468, 400 Market Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cynthia H. Stahl, (215) 597–9337, at the EPA Region III address above.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title which is located in the Rules and Regulations Section of this **Federal Register**.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: June 23, 1995.

W.T. Wisniewski,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 95–19506 Filed 8–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 81

[MI39–01–6921b; FRL–5273–1]

Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Correction of Designation of Nonclassified Ozone Nonattainment Areas; State of Michigan

AGENCY: United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The USEPA proposes to correct erroneous ozone designations made in 1980 for the Allegan County (Allegan County), Barry County (Barry County), Battle Creek (Calhoun County), Benton Harbor (Berrien County), Branch County (Branch County), Cass County (Cass County), Gratiot County (Gratiot County), Hillsdale County (Hillsdale County), Huron County (Huron County), Ionia County (Ionia County), Jackson (Jackson County), Kalamazoo (Kalamazoo County), Lapeer County (Lapeer County), Lenawee County (Lenawee County), Montcalm (Montcalm County), Sanilac County (Sanilac County), Shiawassee County (Shiawassee County), St. Joseph County (St. Joseph County), Tuscola County (Tuscola County), and Van Buren County (Van Buren County) nonattainment nonclassified/incomplete data areas and the Lansing-East Lansing (Clinton County, Eaton County, and Ingham County) nonattainment nonclassified/transitional area. Pursuant to section 110(k)(6) of the Act, which allows the USEPA to correct its actions, the USEPA is proposing to correct their designations to attainment/unclassifiable for ozone.

In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, the USEPA is correcting the designations in a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the correction is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If the USEPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. Please be aware that the USEPA will institute another comment period on this action only if warranted by significant revisions to the rulemaking based on any comments received in response to the direct final rule. Any parties interested in commenting on this notice should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by September 7, 1995. Public comments on this document are requested and will be considered before taking final action on this reclassification.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Toxics and Radiation Branch (AT–18J), United States Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jacqueline Nwia, Air Toxics and Radiation Branch, Regulation Development Section (AT–18J), United States Environmental Protection

Agency, Region 5, Chicago, Illinois, 60604, (312) 886–6081.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, see the information provided in the Direct Final notice which is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**. Copies of the USEPA's analysis are available for inspection at the following address: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604. Telephone Jacqueline Nwia at (312) 886–6081 before visiting the Region 5 Office.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: July 25, 1995.

Carol M. Browner,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–19508 Filed 8–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 90–Day Finding for a Petition to List the Kootenai River Population of the Interior Redband Trout as Threatened or Endangered

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of 90-day petition finding.

SUMMARY: The Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) announces a 90-day finding for a petition to list the Kootenai River population of the interior redband trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss gairdneri*) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. The Service finds that the petition did not present substantial scientific or commercial information indicating that the petitioned actions may be warranted, because it fails to substantiate that the interior redband trout of the Kootenai River are a distinct population segment.

DATES: The finding announced in this document was made on July 11, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Data, information, comments, or questions concerning this petition should be submitted to the Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 4696 Overland Road, Room 576, Boise, Idaho, 83705. The petition, finding, and supporting data are available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia Klahr, staff biologist (refer to **ADDRESSES** section or telephone 208–334–1931).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 4(b)(3)(A) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U. S. C. 1531 *et seq.*), requires that the Service make a finding on whether a petition to list, delist, or reclassify a species presents substantial scientific or commercial information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted. This finding is to be based on all information available to the Service at the time the finding is made. To the maximum extent practicable, this finding is to be made within 90 days of the date the petition was received, and the finding is to be published promptly in the **Federal Register**.

The Service has made a 90-day finding on a petition to list the Kootenai River population of the interior redband trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss gairdneri*). The petition, dated April 4, 1994, was submitted by Brendan M. McManus of the Biodiversity Legal Foundation of Boulder, Colorado, and Donald Kern of Kalispell, Montana, and was received by the Service on April 8, 1994. The petitioner requested the Service list the Kootenai River drainage population of interior redband trout within the contiguous United States as threatened or endangered and designate critical habitat concurrently with the listing. The petitioners state that the best scientific data available indicates that interior redband trout residing in the Kootenai River drainage of Montana, and possibly Idaho, constitutes a separate and distinct vertebrate population segment, appropriate for listing as threatened or endangered according to the Act. The petitioners submitted information about threats to the Kootenai River interior redband trout, including hybridization and competition with non-native trout species, loss of habitat from land and water use practices, and inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms. The petitioners state that hybridization with non-native or introduced trout may be the most serious threat to the long-term persistence of the interior redband trout in the Kootenai River drainage.

The interior redband trout is currently classified as a category 2 candidate species by the Service (59 FR 58982; November 15, 1994). Category 2 includes taxa for which information in the Service's possession indicates that listing is possibly appropriate but for which the Service lacks substantial information upon which to base a proposal to list as endangered or threatened.

The Service has reviewed the petition, the literature cited in the petition, and other literature and information available in the Service's files. On the basis of the best scientific and commercial information available, the Service finds the petition does not present substantial information indicating that the petitioned action may be warranted because information is lacking to show that the interior redband trout of the Kootenai River are a distinct population segment under the Act.

There has been confusion regarding the taxonomic classification of interior redband trout (Behnke 1986, Behnke 1992). This confusion may be a result of similar morphological and meristic characteristics with other rainbow and cutthroat trout species (Berg 1987). It is further complicated by their diversity and adaptability, as ''redband trout'' are found in high mountain streams as well as in hot, arid desert drainages. Behnke (1992) refers to the interior redband trout as the Columbia River redband trout and describes their distribution as the Columbia River basin east of the Cascades to barrier falls on Kootenai, Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Snake Rivers; the upper Fraser River basin above Hell's Gate; and Athabasca River headwaters of the Mackenzie River basin.

The subspecies *gairdneri* includes resident stream populations, populations adapted to lakes (kamloops trout), and anadromous steelhead populations. Resident populations of Columbia River redband trout are found throughout the Columbia River basin east of the Cascades. The native trout of the Oregon and southern Idaho desert basins are considered to be a primitive form of redband trout derived from the Columbia River basin. Kamloops trout occur in lakes in the upper Columbia and upper Fraser basins. Anadromous steelhead populations ascending the Columbia River east of the Cascade Range and into the Salmon and Clearwater River drainages are also currently classified with redband trout (Behnke 1992).

The interior redband trout of the Kootenai River drainage exhibits two distinct life histories, a resident stream form of generally smaller fish and the larger lake dwelling kamloops form (Huston 1994; Behnke 1986; Behnke 1992). The Kootenai River drainage interior redband trout is on the northeastern periphery of the subspecies' range and is believed to be important as a potential source of diversity and adaptability (Doug