

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this notice, call or email BM1 Adam Kraft, Prevention Department, Coast Guard Sector Lake Michigan, Milwaukee, WI at 414-747-7154, e-mail Adam.D.Kraft@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Coast Guard will enforce the Safety Zone; Chicago Harbor, Navy Pier Southeast, Chicago, IL listed in 33 CFR 165.931 for the following events:

Navy Pier Fireworks; on May 28, 2011 from 10 p.m. through 10:30 p.m.; on June 1, 2011 from 9:15 p.m. through 9:45 p.m.; on June 4, 2011 from 10 p.m. through 10:30 p.m.; on June 8, 2011 from 9:15 p.m. through 9:45 p.m.; on June 11, 2011 from 10 p.m. through 10:30 p.m.; on June 15, 2011 from 9:15 p.m. through 9:45 p.m.; on June 18, 2011 from 10 p.m. through 10:30 p.m.; on June 22, 2011 from 9:15 p.m. through 9:45 p.m.; on June 25, 2011 from 10 p.m. through 10:30 p.m.; and on June 29, 2011 from 9:15 p.m. through 9:45 p.m.

All vessels must obtain permission from the Captain of the Port, Sector Lake Michigan, or his or her on-scene representative to enter, move within or exit the safety zone. Vessels and persons granted permission to enter the safety zone shall obey all lawful orders or directions of the Captain of the Port, Sector Lake Michigan, or his or her on-scene representative. While within a safety zone, all vessels shall operate at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe course.

This notice is issued under authority of 33 CFR 165.931 and 5 U.S.C. 552(a). In addition to this notice in the **Federal Register**, the Coast Guard will provide the maritime community with advance notification of these enforcement periods via broadcast Notice to Mariners or Local Notice to Mariners. The Captain of the Port, Sector Lake Michigan, will issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners notifying the public when enforcement of the safety zone established by this section is suspended. If the Captain of the Port, Sector Lake Michigan, determines that the safety zone need not be enforced for the full duration stated in this notice, he or she may use a Broadcast Notice to Mariners to grant general permission to enter the safety zone. The Captain of the Port, Sector Lake Michigan, or his or her on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

Dated: April 7, 2011.

S.R. Schenk,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Lake Michigan, Acting.

[FR Doc. 2011-9531 Filed 4-19-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R08-OAR-2007-1036; FRL-9297-1]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Interstate Transport of Pollution Revisions for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS: "Interference With Visibility" Requirement

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is partially approving the Colorado Interstate Transport State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision, submitted on March 31, 2010, addressing the requirements of Clean Air Act (CAA) section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) for the 1997 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and the requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and (II) for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Specifically, in this **Federal Register** action EPA is fully approving those portions of the Colorado March 31, 2010 submission that address the section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) requirement prohibiting a state's emissions from interfering with any other state's required measures to protect visibility for the 1997 ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS. This action is being taken under section 110 of the CAA.

DATES: *Effective Date:* This final rule is effective May 20, 2011.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R08-OAR-2007-1036. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the Air Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to view the hard copy of the docket. You may view the hard copy of the docket Monday through

Friday, 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurel Dygowski, Air Program, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 1595 Wynkoop, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129, (303) 312-6144, dygowski.laurel@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Definitions

For the purpose of this document, we are giving meaning to certain words or initials as follows:

- (i) The words or initials *Act* or *CAA* mean or refer to the Clean Air Act, unless the context indicates otherwise.
- (ii) The words *EPA*, *we*, *us* or *our* mean or refer to the United States Environmental Protection Agency.
- (iii) The initials *SIP* mean or refer to State Implementation Plan.
- (iv) The words *Colorado* and *State* mean the State of Colorado.

Table of Contents

- I. Background Information
- II. Final Action
- III. Statutory and Executive Orders Review

I. Background Information

On July 18, 1997, EPA promulgated new NAAQS for 8-hour ozone and for fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). This action is being taken in response to the promulgation of the 1997 8-hour ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Section 110(a)(1) of the CAA requires states to submit SIPs to address a new or revised NAAQS within 3 years after promulgation of such standards, or within such shorter period as EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a)(2) lists the elements that such new SIPs must address, as applicable, including section 110(a)(2)(D)(i), which pertains to interstate transport of certain emissions.

Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) of the CAA requires that a SIP must contain adequate provisions prohibiting any source or other type of emissions activity within the state from emitting any air pollutant in amounts which will: (1) Contribute significantly to nonattainment of the NAAQS in any other state; (2) interfere with maintenance of the NAAQS by any other state; (3) interfere with any other state's required measures to prevent significant deterioration of air quality; or (4) interfere with any other state's required measures to protect visibility.

On June 11, 2008, the State of Colorado submitted to EPA an Interstate Transport SIP addressing all four elements of the interstate transport requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 1997 ozone and

PM_{2.5} NAAQS. In response to EPA's concerns regarding the June 11, 2008 submission, the State later submitted two superceding interstate transport SIP revisions: (a) A June 18, 2009 submission addressing the requirements of elements (1) and (2) of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 1997 ozone NAAQS; and (b) a March 31, 2010 submission addressing the requirements of elements (3) and (4) for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS and of elements (1) through (4) for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

On February 14, 2011, EPA published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPR) for the State of Colorado. The NPR proposed approval of the sections of the Colorado Interstate Transport SIP submitted March 31, 2010 that address the section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) "interference with visibility protection" requirement for the 1997 ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

II. Final Action

EPA is partially approving the sections of the Colorado Interstate Transport SIP submitted March 31, 2010 that address the section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) "interference with visibility protection" requirement for the 1997 ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS. On January 13, 2010, the Colorado Air Quality Control Commission (AQCC) adopted interstate transport SIP revisions addressing the requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) for the 1997 ozone NAAQS, and the requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and (II) for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Colorado submitted these revisions to EPA on March 31, 2010. In this **Federal Register** action EPA is proposing to approve the sections of the March 31, 2010 submissions that address element (4), "interference with visibility protection," of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i).

As noted earlier, in this rulemaking EPA is evaluating only the Colorado SIP revisions of the March 31, 2010 submission that address the requirements of element (4), prohibiting sources in Colorado from emitting pollutants from interfering with any other state's measures to protect visibility, for the 1997 ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS. EPA has already taken final action on elements (1) and (2) for ozone (see 75 FR 31306 and 75 FR 71029, respectively). EPA will be taking action on elements (1)–(3) for PM_{2.5} and element (3) for ozone in a separate action.

III. Statutory and Executive Orders Review

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is

not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule approves pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4).

This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely approves a state rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it approves a state rule implementing a Federal standard.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission,

to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit 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 United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by June 20, 2011. 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, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Sulfur oxides.

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

Dated: April 6, 2011.

Carol Rushin,

Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 8.

40 CFR part 52 is amended to read as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart G—Colorado

■ 2. Section 52.352 is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.352 Interstate transport.

Addition to the Colorado State Implementation Plan of the Colorado Interstate Transport SIP regarding the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the “significant contribution”, the “interfere with maintenance”, and “interference with visibility protection” requirements, submitted by the Governor’s designee on June 18, 2009 and March 31, 2010.

[FR Doc. 2011–9580 Filed 4–19–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA–R09–OAR–2010–1078; FRL–9293–6]

Revision to the South Coast Portion of the California State Implementation Plan, CPV Sentinel Energy Project AB 1318 Tracking System

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to approve a source-specific State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision for the South Coast Air Quality Management District (District) portion of the California SIP. This source-specific SIP revision is known as the CPV Sentinel Energy Project AB 1318 Tracking System. The SIP revision consists of enabling language and the AB 1318 Tracking System to revise the District’s SIP approved New Source Review (NSR) program. The SIP revision allows the District to transfer offsetting emission reductions for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) and one of its precursors, sulfur oxides (SO_x), to the CPV Sentinel Energy Project, which will be a natural gas fired power plant.

DATES: This final rule is effective on May 20, 2011.

Docket: The index to the docket for this action is available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed in the index, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an

appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laura Yannayon, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3524, yannayon.laura@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, “we”, “us”, and “our” refer to EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. Background
- II. Evaluation of Source-Specific SIP Revision
 - A. What action is EPA finalizing?
 - B. Public Comments and Responses to Comments
- III. EPA Action
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
 - A. Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review 13563
 - B. Paperwork Reduction Act
 - C. Regulatory Flexibility Act
 - D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
 - E. Executive Order 13132, Federalism
 - F. Executive Order 13175, Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
 - G. Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
 - H. Executive Order 13211, Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use
 - I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
 - J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Population

I. Background

The proposed Sentinel Energy Project is designed to be a nominally rated 850 megawatt electrical generating facility covering approximately 37 acres within Riverside County, adjacent to Palm Springs, California. EPA’s proposal for this action contained a detailed description of the project and the Clean Air Act’s (CAA) requirements for offsets during New Source Review permitting. 76 FR 2294 (January 13, 2011) With our proposal to approve this SIP revision, EPA attached the complete list of PM₁₀ and SO_x offsetting emission reductions that are being transferred in the AB 1318 Tracking System to our Technical Support Document (TSD). Documentation for each of the offsetting emission reductions listed in the attachment to the TSD was included in the docket for the proposal in hard copy at EPA’s offices as well as other locations. For additional background information please see the January 13, 2011 proposed notice for this action. (76 FR 2294)

II. Evaluation of Source-Specific SIP Revision

A. What is the rule that EPA is finalizing?

EPA is finalizing a SIP revision for the South Coast portion of the California SIP. The SIP revision will be codified in 40 CFR 52.220 by incorporating by reference the Offset Requirements for the Proposed CPV Sentinel Power Plant, including the CPV Sentinel Energy Project AB 1318 Tracking System, as adopted by the District.

The SIP revision provides a federally approved and enforceable mechanism for the District to transfer PM₁₀ and SO_x offsetting emissions reductions from the District’s internal bank to the Sentinel Energy Project and to track those emissions credits through the AB 1318 Tracking System.

B. Public Comment and Final Action

In response to our January 13, 2011 proposed rule, we received four comments, one each from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (District), Michael Carroll of Latham & Watkins LLP, the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), and the Law Offices of Angela Johnson-Mezaros on behalf of California Communities Against Toxics and Communities for a Better Environment (jointly referred to herein as “CCAT”). Copies of each comment letter have been added to the docket and are accessible at [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). The comment from the District supported EPA’s analysis and proposed source-specific SIP revision and provided an errata sheet correcting minor typos and the amount of SO_x offsets available in the AB1318 Tracking System (reduced the quantity by 92 lbs). The comment from Latham & Watkins was also supportive of our proposed action. The comment from NRDC generally opposed the SIP revision but did not provide any specific grounds for its opposition or raise any specific issues. To the extent that NRDC generally opposes the SIP revision, our response to its general opposition is included below with our response to CCAT’s more specific comments. We have summarized CCAT’s comments (based on the structure of their comment letter) and provide our response to each comment below.

Comment I: CCAT comments that EPA did not allow meaningful public participation on the SIP revision for several reasons and that approval of the SIP revision based on the available information would be arbitrary and capricious.

Comment I.A: CCAT contends the regulatory text of the SIP revision is too