

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 proposed rulemaking that the Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle-York, Allentown, Johnstown, and Lancaster PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas have clean data for the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard 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, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: January 3, 2012.

**W.C. Early,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.*

[FR Doc. 2012-1120 Filed 1-19-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0523; FRL-9619-8]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Illinois; Redesignation of the Illinois Portion of the St. Louis, MO-IL Area to Attainment for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; extension of public comment period.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is extending the comment period for a proposed rule published December 22, 2011 (76 FR 79579). On December 22, 2011, EPA proposed to approve the State of Illinois' request to redesignate the Illinois portion of the St. Louis, MO-IL nonattainment area (Jersey, Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair Counties) to attainment for the 1997 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). In conjunction with the proposed approval of the redesignation request, EPA proposed to approve, as a revision to the Illinois State Implementation Plan, the State's plan for maintaining the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS through 2025 in the area. EPA also proposed to approve the 2002 emissions inventory as meeting the comprehensive emissions inventory requirement of the Clean Air Act for the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area. Finally, EPA proposed to approve the State's 2008 and 2025 Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets for the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area. In response to a December 22, 2011, request from David C. Bender, EPA is extending the comment period for 30 days.

**DATES:** Comments. The public comment period for the proposed rule published December 22, 2011 (76 FR 79579) is being extended for 30 days to February 22, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0523, to: Douglas Aburano, Chief, Attainment Planning and Maintenance Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-6960, [aburano.douglas@epa.gov](mailto:aburano.douglas@epa.gov). Additional instructions to comment can be found in the notice of proposed rulemaking published December 22, 2011 (76 FR 79579).

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kathleen D'Agostino, Environmental Engineer, Attainment Planning and Maintenance Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-1767, [dagostino.kathleen@epa.gov](mailto:dagostino.kathleen@epa.gov).

Dated: January 9, 2012.

**Susan Hedman,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 2012-1123 Filed 1-19-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### 50 CFR Part 17

[Docket No. FWS-R2-ES-2011-0042; MO 92210-0-0009]

**RIN 1018-AV86**

#### Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Proposed Endangered Status for the Chupadera Springsnail (*Pyrgulopsis chupaderae*) and Proposed Designation of Critical Habitat

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; reopening of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce the reopening of the public comment period on our August 2, 2011, proposed endangered status and designation of critical habitat for the Chupadera springsnail (*Pyrgulopsis chupaderae*) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). We also announce the availability of a draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment of the proposed designation of critical habitat and an amended required determinations section of the proposal. We are reopening the comment period to allow all interested parties an opportunity to comment simultaneously on the revised proposed rule, the associated draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment, and the amended required determinations section. Comments previously submitted need not be resubmitted, as they will be fully considered in preparation of the final rule.

**DATES:** We will consider comments received on or before February 21, 2012. Comments must be received by 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the closing date. Any comments that we receive after the closing date may not be considered in the final decision on this action.

**ADDRESSES:** *Document availability:* You may obtain copies of the proposed rule, draft economic analysis, and draft environmental assessment on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> at Docket Number FWS-R2-ES-2011-0042, or by mail from the New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

*Comment submission:* You may submit written comments by one of the following methods:

(1) *Electronically:* Go to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://>

[www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). Search for Docket No. FWS-R2-ES-2011-0042, which is the docket number for this rulemaking.

(2) *By hard copy:* Submit by U.S. mail or hand-delivery to: Public Comments Processing, Attn: FWS-R2-ES-2011-0042; Division of Policy and Directives Management; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, MS 2042-PDM; Arlington, VA 22203.

We request that you send comments only by the methods described above. We will post all comments on <http://www.regulations.gov>. This generally means that we will post any personal information you provide us (see the Public Comments section below for more information).

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Wally "J" Murphy, Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office, 2105 Osuna NE., Albuquerque, NM 87113, by telephone ((505) 346-2525), or by facsimile ((505) 346-2542). Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at (800) 877-8339.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Public Comments

We will accept written comments and information during this reopened comment period on our proposed listing as endangered and our proposed designation of critical habitat for the Chupadera springsnail that was published in the **Federal Register** on August 2, 2011 (76 FR 46218), our draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment of the proposed designation, and the amended required determinations provided in this document. We will consider information and recommendations from all interested parties. We are particularly interested in comments concerning:

(1) The reasons why we should or should not designate habitat as "critical habitat" under section 4 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), including whether there are threats to the species from human activity, the degree of which can be expected to increase due to the designation, and whether that increase in threat outweighs the benefit of designation such that the designation of critical habitat is not prudent.

(2) Specific information on:

(a) The distribution of the Chupadera springsnail;

(b) The amount and distribution of Chupadera springsnail habitat; and

(c) What areas occupied by the species at the time of listing that contain features essential for the conservation of

the species we should include in the designation and why; and

(d) What areas not occupied at the time of listing are essential for the conservation of the species and why.

(3) Land use designations and current or planned activities in the subject areas and their possible impacts on proposed critical habitat.

(4) Any foreseeable economic, national security, or other relevant impacts that may result from designating any area that may be included in the final designation. We are particularly interested in any impacts on small entities, and the benefits of including or excluding areas from the proposed designation that are subject to these impacts.

(5) The projected and reasonably likely impacts of climate change on the Chupadera springsnail and on the critical habitat we are proposing.

(6) Whether our approach to designating critical habitat could be improved or modified in any way to provide for greater public participation and understanding, or to assist us in accommodating public concerns and comments.

(7) Information on the extent to which the description of economic impacts in the draft economic analysis is complete and accurate.

(8) The likelihood of adverse social reactions to the designation of critical habitat, as discussed in the draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment, and how the consequences of such reactions, if likely to occur, would relate to the conservation and regulatory benefits of the proposed critical habitat designation.

If you submitted comments or information on the proposed rule (76 FR 46218) during the initial comment period from August 2, 2011, to October 3, 2011, please do not resubmit them.

We will incorporate them into the public record as part of this comment period, and we will fully consider them in the preparation of our final determination. Our final determination concerning revised critical habitat will take into consideration all written comments and any additional information we receive during both comment periods. On the basis of public comments, we may, during the development of our final determination, find that areas proposed are not essential, are appropriate for exclusion under section 4(b)(2) of the Act, or are not appropriate for exclusion.

You may submit your comments and materials concerning the proposed rule, draft economic analysis, or draft environmental assessment by one of the

methods listed in **ADDRESSES**. We request that you send comments only by the methods described in **ADDRESSES**.

If you submit a comment via <http://www.regulations.gov>, your entire comment—including any personal identifying information—will be posted on the Web site. We will post all hardcopy comments on <http://www.regulations.gov> as well. If you submit a hardcopy comment that includes personal identifying information, you may request at the top of your document that we withhold this information from public review. However, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Comments and materials we receive, as well as supporting documentation we used in preparing the proposed rule, draft economic analysis, and draft environmental assessment, will be available for public inspection on <http://www.regulations.gov> at Docket No. FWS-R2-ES-2011-0042, or by appointment, during normal business hours, at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

##### Background

It is our intent to discuss only those topics directly relevant to the proposed listing and designation of critical habitat for the Chupadera springsnail in this document. For more information on previous Federal actions concerning the Chupadera springsnail, refer to the proposed listing and designation of critical habitat published in the **Federal Register** on August 2, 2011 (76 FR 46218), which is available online at <http://www.regulations.gov> (at Docket Number FWS-R2-ES-2011-0042) or from the New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

##### Previous Federal Actions

On August 2, 2011 (76 FR 46218), we published a proposed rule to list as endangered and designate critical habitat for the Chupadera springsnail. We proposed to designate approximately 1.9 acres (ac) (0.7 hectares (ha)) in two units located in Socorro County, New Mexico, as critical habitat. That proposal had a 60-day comment period, ending October 3, 2011. We received no request for a public hearing; therefore, no public hearing will be held.

##### Critical Habitat

Section 3 of the Act defines critical habitat as the specific areas within the geographical area occupied by a species, at the time it is listed in accordance

with the Act, on which are found those physical or biological features essential to the conservation of the species and that may require special management considerations or protection, and specific areas outside the geographical area occupied by a species at the time it is listed, upon a determination that such areas are essential for the conservation of the species. If the proposed rule is made final, section 7 of the Act will prohibit destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat by any activity funded, authorized, or carried out by any Federal agency. Federal agencies proposing actions affecting critical habitat must consult with us on the effects of their proposed actions, under section 7(a)(2) of the Act.

#### **Consideration of Impacts Under Section 4(b)(2) of the Act**

Section 4(b)(2) of the Act requires that we designate or revise critical habitat based upon the best scientific data available, after taking into consideration the economic impact, impact on national security, or any other relevant impact of specifying any particular area as critical habitat. We may exclude an area from critical habitat if we determine that the benefits of excluding the area outweigh the benefits of including the area as critical habitat, provided such exclusion will not result in the extinction of the species.

When considering the benefits of inclusion for an area, we consider the additional regulatory benefits that area would receive from the protection from adverse modification or destruction as a result of actions with a Federal nexus (activities conducted, funded, permitted, or authorized by Federal agencies), the educational benefits of mapping areas containing essential features that aid in the recovery of the listed species, and any benefits that may result from designation due to State or Federal laws that may apply to critical habitat.

When considering the benefits of exclusion, we consider, among other things, whether exclusion of a specific area is likely to result in conservation; the continuation, strengthening, or encouragement of partnerships; or implementation of a management plan. In the case of the Chupadera springsnail, the benefits of critical habitat include public awareness of the presence of the Chupadera springsnail and the importance of habitat protection, and, where a Federal nexus exists, increased habitat protection for the Chupadera springsnail due to protection from adverse modification or destruction of critical habitat. In practice, situations with a Federal nexus

exist primarily on Federal lands or for projects undertaken by Federal agencies.

We have not proposed to exclude any areas from critical habitat. However, the final decision on whether to exclude any areas will be based on the best scientific data available at the time of the final designation, including information obtained during the comment period and information about the economic impact of designation. Accordingly, we have prepared a draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment concerning the proposed critical habitat designation, which are available for review and comment (see **ADDRESSES**).

#### *Draft Economic Analysis*

The purpose of the draft economic analysis is to identify and analyze the potential economic impacts associated with the proposed critical habitat designation for the Chupadera springsnail. The draft economic analysis describes the economic impacts of all potential conservation efforts for the Chupadera springsnail; some of these costs will likely be incurred regardless of whether we designate critical habitat. The economic impact of the proposed critical habitat designation is analyzed by comparing scenarios both “with critical habitat” and “without critical habitat.” The “without critical habitat” scenario represents the baseline for the analysis, considering protections already in place for the species (e.g., under the Federal listing and other Federal, State, and local regulations). The baseline, therefore, represents the costs incurred regardless of whether critical habitat is designated. The “with critical habitat” scenario describes the incremental impacts associated specifically with the designation of critical habitat for the species. The incremental conservation efforts and associated impacts are those not expected to occur absent the designation of critical habitat for the species. In other words, the incremental costs are those attributable solely to the designation of critical habitat, above and beyond the baseline costs; these are the costs we may consider in the final designation of critical habitat when evaluating the benefits of excluding particular areas under section 4(b)(2) of the Act. The analysis looks at baseline impacts incurred from the listing of the species and forecasts both baseline and incremental impacts likely to occur if we finalize the proposed critical habitat designation. For a further description of the methodology of the analysis, see “Framework for the Analysis,” of the draft economic analysis.

The draft economic analysis provides estimated costs of the foreseeable potential economic impacts of the proposed critical habitat designation for the Chupadera springsnail. It identifies potential incremental costs as a result of the proposed critical habitat designation; these are those costs attributed to critical habitat over and above those baseline costs attributed to listing. The draft economic analysis quantifies economic impacts of Chupadera springsnail conservation efforts associated with residential development and ranch activities.

Existing and planned subdivision development in the area can lead to groundwater depletion, threatening the springsnail and its habitat by reducing water flow at the spring that supports the species. Residential activities can also lead to modification of the area around the springhead and springbrook, causing habitat degradation through inundation and changes in water flow and chemistry. However, a Federal nexus consultation under section 7 of the Act is unlikely to exist, as each parcel will have its own groundwater well, which is regulated by the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer with no Federal involvement. Unit 1 is not slated for development; therefore, it is unlikely the landowners will apply for a permit under section 404 of the Clean Water Act. We are unaware of the plans for Unit 2, but we believe that any development would avoid the spring and therefore avoid the need for a section 404 permit. Because there are no foreseeable activities with a Federal nexus, the draft economic analysis found no economic impact of the proposed designation of critical habitat beyond a possible “stigma effect” to land values. This stigma effect arises from the perception of landowners that designation of critical habitat may impede future land development and, therefore, depress land values. Our economic analysis was unable to quantify the economic value of any possible stigma effects.

As we stated earlier, we are soliciting data and comments from the public on the draft economic analysis, draft environmental assessment, and all aspects of the proposed rule and our amended required determinations. We may revise the proposed rule or supporting documents to incorporate or address information we receive during the public comment period. In particular, we may exclude an area from critical habitat if we determine that the benefits of excluding the area outweigh the benefits of including the area, provided the exclusion will not result in the extinction of this species.

### *Draft Environmental Assessment*

The purpose of an environmental assessment is to identify and disclose the environmental consequences associated with the proposed critical habitat designation for the Chupadera springsnail in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. The draft environmental assessment found the preferred alternative of designating critical habitat for the Chupadera springsnail at the two proposed locations would not have significant impacts to the human environment.

### **Required Determinations—Amended**

In our August 2, 2011, proposed rule (76 FR 46218), we indicated that we would defer our determination of compliance with several statutes and executive orders until the information concerning potential economic impacts of the designation and potential effects on landowners and stakeholders became available in the draft economic analysis. We have now made use of the draft economic analysis data to make these determinations. In this document, we affirm the information in our proposed rule concerning Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), E.O. 12630 (Takings), E.O. 13132 (Federalism), E.O. 12988 (Civil Justice Reform), E.O. 13211 (Energy, Supply, Distribution, and Use), the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*), the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), and the President's memorandum of April 29, 1994, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments" (59 FR 22951). However, based on the draft economic analysis data, we are amending our required determination concerning the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*).

### *Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)*

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA; 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA; 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), whenever an agency is required to publish a notice of rulemaking for any proposed or final rule, it must prepare and make available for public comment a regulatory flexibility analysis that describes the effects of the rule on small entities (i.e., small businesses, small organizations, and small government jurisdictions). However, no regulatory flexibility analysis is required if the head of the agency certifies the rule will

not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The SBREFA amended the RFA to require Federal agencies to provide a certification statement of the factual basis for certifying that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Based on our draft economic analysis of the proposed designation, we provide our analysis for determining whether the proposed rule would result in a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Based on comments we receive, we may revise this determination as part of our final rulemaking.

According to the Small Business Administration, small entities include small organizations such as independent nonprofit organizations; small governmental jurisdictions, including school boards and city and town governments that serve fewer than 50,000 residents; and small businesses (13 CFR 121.201). Small businesses include manufacturing and mining concerns with fewer than 500 employees, wholesale trade entities with fewer than 100 employees, retail and service businesses with less than \$5 million in annual sales, general and heavy construction businesses with less than \$27.5 million in annual business, special trade contractors doing less than \$11.5 million in annual business, and agricultural businesses with annual sales less than \$750,000. To determine if potential economic impacts to these small entities are significant, we considered the types of activities that might trigger regulatory impacts under this designation as well as types of project modifications that may result. In general, the term "significant economic impact" is meant to apply to a typical small business firm's business operations.

To determine if the proposed designation of critical habitat for the Chupadera springsnail would affect a substantial number of small entities, we considered the number of small entities affected within particular types of economic activities, such as residential development and ranch activities. In order to determine whether it is appropriate for our agency to certify that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, we considered each industry or category individually. In estimating the numbers of small entities potentially affected, we also considered whether their activities have any Federal involvement. Critical habitat designation will not affect activities that do not have any Federal involvement; designation of critical

habitat only affects activities conducted, funded, permitted, or authorized by Federal agencies. In areas where the Chupadera springsnail is present, Federal agencies already are required to consult with us under section 7 of the Act on activities they fund, permit, or implement that may affect the species. If we finalize this proposed critical habitat designation, consultations to avoid the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat would be incorporated into the existing consultation process.

In the draft economic analysis, we evaluated the potential economic effects on small entities resulting from implementation of conservation actions related to the proposed designation of critical habitat for the Chupadera springsnail. Information in the draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment indicates the proposed critical habitat designation will have no effect on any small entities. Please refer to the draft economic analysis of the proposed critical habitat designation for a more detailed discussion of potential economic impacts.

In summary, we have considered whether the proposed designation would result in a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Information for this analysis was gathered from the Small Business Administration, stakeholders, and the Service. We have identified no small entity that may be impacted by the proposed critical habitat designation. For the above reasons and based on currently available information, we certify that, if promulgated, the proposed critical habitat designation would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small business entities. Therefore, an initial regulatory flexibility analysis is not required.

### **Authors**

The primary authors of this notice are the staff members of the New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office, Southwest Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

### **Authority**

The authority for this action is the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: January 10, 2012.

**Eileen Sobeck,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.*

[FR Doc. 2012-1147 Filed 1-19-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**