

significant” as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency. EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that are based on health or safety risks, such that the analysis required under section 5–501 of the Order has the potential to influence the regulation.

This proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it is not an economically significant action as defined by Executive Order 12866 and it does not establish an environmental standard intended to mitigate health or safety risks. This action merely extends the current due date for submitting applications under CROMERR for authorized programs with existing electronic document receiving systems, and imposes no additional requirements.

#### *H. Executive Order 13211: Energy Effects*

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, “Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use” (66 FR 28355 (May 22, 2001)) because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

#### *I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act*

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104–113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA directs EPA to provide Congress, through OMB, with explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

Today’s action does not involve technical standards. EPA’s compliance with 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–113, 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272

note)) has been addressed in the preamble of the underlying final rule [70 FR 59848, October 13, 2007].

#### *J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*

Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629 (Feb. 16, 1994)) establishes federal executive policy on environmental justice. Its main provision directs federal agencies, to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, to make environmental justice part of their mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States.

EPA has determined that this proposed rule will not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations because it does not affect the level of protection provided to human health or the environment. This proposed rule merely extends the current regulatory schedule for submitting applications under CROMERR for authorized programs with existing electronic document receiving systems.

#### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 3**

Environmental protection, Conflict of interests, Electronic records, Electronic reporting requirements, Electronic reports, Intergovernmental relations.

Dated: July 26, 2007.

**Stephen L. Johnson,**  
Administrator.

[FR Doc. E7–15014 Filed 8–2–07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

### **40 CFR Part 52**

**[EPA–R05–OAR–2006–0541; FRL–8449–7]**

### **Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; MI**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is approving a request submitted by the Michigan Department of Environmental Management (MDEQ) on March 31, 2006, to revise the Michigan State Implementation Plan (SIP) to amend R336.1627 and R336.2005, and adopt R336.2004. These changes take place within Part 6,

Emission Limitations and Prohibitions—Existing Sources of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions; Delivery Vessels; Vapor Collection Systems; and Part 10, Intermittent Testing and Sampling, respectively.

In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal, because EPA views this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If we do not receive any adverse comments in response to these direct final and proposed rules, we do not contemplate taking any further action in relation to this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, we will withdraw the direct final rule and will respond to all public comments 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 on or before September 4, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R05–OAR–2006–0541 by one of the following methods:

- <http://www.regulations.gov>: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- *E-mail:* [mooney.john@epa.gov](mailto:mooney.john@epa.gov).

- *Fax:* (312)886–5824.

- *Mail:* John M. Mooney, Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

- *Hand Delivery:* John M. Mooney, Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The Regional Office official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. excluding Federal holidays.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Steve Rosenthal, Environmental Engineer, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard,

Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6052, [rosenthal.steven@epa.gov](mailto:rosenthal.steven@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated. 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. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule, and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: July 24, 2007.

**Walter W Kovalick Jr.,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. E7-15012 Filed 8-2-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

### 41 CFR Parts 300-3, 302-3, 302-5, 302-7, 302-12, and 302-16

[FTR Case 2007-304; Docket 2007-0002,  
Sequence 1]

RIN 3090-AI37

### Federal Travel Regulation; FTR Case 2007-304, Relocation Allowances- Governmentwide Relocation Advisory Board

**AGENCY:** Office of Governmentwide Policy, General Services Administration (GSA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The General Services Administration (GSA), Office of Governmentwide Policy (OGP), continually reviews and adjusts policies as a part of its ongoing mission to provide policy assistance to the Government agencies subject to the Federal Travel Regulation (FTR).

Accordingly, GSA created the Governmentwide Relocation Advisory Board (GRAB), consisting of Government and private industry relocation experts, to examine Government relocation policy. To allow for the use of private industry expertise in the rulemaking and possible legislative actions, the GRAB was chartered through the Federal Advisory Committee Act on July 9, 2004. The GRAB submitted a final report of its findings on September 15, 2005. If implemented, the 100 plus recommendations of the GRAB would keep Government relocation practices aligned with private sector best practices, as well as improve the overall management of Government relocation programs and reduce costs. This proposed rule transforms many of the GRAB's recommendations into FTR policy. The GRAB Findings and Recommendations and corresponding documents may be accessed at GSA's Web site at <http://www.gsa.gov/grab>.

**DATES:** Interested parties should submit comments in writing on or before October 2, 2007 to be considered in the formulation of a final rule.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments identified by FTR case 2007-304 by any of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Search for any document by first selecting the proper document types and selecting "General Services Administration - All" as the agency of choice. At the "Keyword" prompt, type in the FTR case number (for example, FTR Case 2007-304) and click on the "Submit" button. You may also search for any document by clicking on the "Advanced search/document search" tab at the top of the screen, selecting from the agency field "General Services Administration - All", and typing the FTR case number in the keyword field. Select the "Submit" button.

- Fax: 202-501-4067.

- Mail: General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (VIR), 1800 F Street, NW., Room 4035, ATTN: Laurieann Duarte, Washington, DC 20405.

**Instructions:** Please submit comments only and cite FTR case 2007-304 in all correspondence related to this case. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Ed Davis, Office of Travel, Transportation and Asset Management (MT), General Services Administration at (202) 208-7638 or e-mail at

[ed.davis@gsa.gov](mailto:ed.davis@gsa.gov) for clarification of content. For information pertaining to status or publication schedules, contact the FAR Secretariat at (202) 501-4755. Please cite FTR case 2007-304.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### A. Background

The General Services Administration (GSA), Office of Governmentwide Policy (OGP), reviews the regulations under its purview to address current Government relocation needs and incorporates private industry policies and best practices, where appropriate. The relocation services industry is complex and changes frequently. Changes in relocation policy need to be made to comport with industry best practices.

With the exception of the Relocation Income Tax Allowance (RITA), which will be addressed in a subsequent proposed rule, most of the cost of a relocation is related to the residence transactions. The Federal Government has traditionally reimbursed up to 10 percent of the selling price of the previous residence and 5 percent of the purchase price of the new home (this is known as direct reimbursement). Currently, the tax implications of this transaction are handled through a two-year RITA process, and there are long delays in getting equity into the hands of the employee so that a new residence can be purchased. Through a homesale program, directed by a contracted vendor, these two issues can be solved for the benefit of both the agency and employee. The result is that the employee receives equity when selling to the contracted vendor, and this transaction if accomplished through a vendor, is not taxable to the employee.

For smaller relocation expenses such as the Miscellaneous Expense Allowance (MEA), much of private industry uses lump-sum payments. These payments have a small one-time administrative cost and do not need to be reconciled in a post-payment audit. The administrative savings and efficiency improvements of such systems are clear because far less staff time is needed to administer, monitor, and audit payments in a lump-sum scenario.

Private industry spends less time on its relocation packages because they are tiered and handle special circumstances more flexibly. Also, in private industry, payment or reimbursement of relocation expenses to the employee or third party vendor rarely extends beyond one year because there are few extensions. The focus is on getting the transferee settled at the new location in permanent quarters as quickly as possible. The main lesson that the Government can