

EPA-APPROVED GEORGIA NON-REGULATORY PROVISIONS

Name of nonregulatory SIP provision	Applicable geographic or nonattainment area	State submittal date/Effective date	EPA approval date
31. Atlanta 1997 Fine Particulate Matter 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory.	Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett, Hall, Henry, Newton, Paulding, Rockdale, Spalding and Walton Counties in their entireties and portions of Heard and Putnam Counties.	07/06/2010	3/1/2012. [Insert citation of publication].

[FR Doc. 2012-4988 Filed 2-29-12; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0020; FRL-9634-3]

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District**

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern negative declarations for volatile organic compound (VOC) and oxides of sulfur source categories for the AVAQMD and SJVUAPCD. We are approving these negative declarations under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on April 30, 2012 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by April 2, 2012. If we receive such comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this direct final rule will not take effect.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0020, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). Follow the on-line instructions.

2. *Email:* [steckel.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:steckel.andrew@epa.gov).  
 3. *Mail or deliver:* Andrew Steckel (Air-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

*Instructions:* All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or email. [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) is an “anonymous access” system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send email directly to EPA, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment.

*Docket:* The index to the docket for this action is available electronically at [www.regulations.gov](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:** Cynthia Allen, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-4120, [allen.cynthia@epa.gov](mailto:allen.cynthia@epa.gov).

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

**Table of Contents**

- I. The State’s Submittal
  - A. What negative declarations did the State submit?
  - B. Are there other versions of these negative declarations?
  - C. What is the purpose of the submitted negative declarations?
- II. EPA’s Evaluation and Action.
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the negative declarations?
  - B. Do the negative declarations meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. Public Comment and Final Action
- III. Administrative Requirements

**I. The State’s Submittal**

*A. What negative declarations did the State submit?*

Table 1 lists the negative declarations we are approving with the dates that they were adopted by the AVAQMD and SJVUAPCD and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1—NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS

Local agency	Title	Adopted	Submitted
AVAQMD .....	Petroleum Coke Calcining Operations—Oxides of Sulfur .....	01/18/11	06/20/11
SJVUAPCD .....	Synthesized Pharmaceutical Products Manufacturing .....	04/16/09	06/18/09
SJVUAPCD .....	Coating Operations at Shipbuilding/Ship Repair Facilities .....	04/16/09	06/18/09
SJVUAPCD .....	Manufacture of Pneumatic Rubber Tire .....	12/16/10	06/20/11

On December 11, 2009, EPA determined that the SJVUAPCD Negative Declarations submitted on June 18, 2009, meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR Part 51 Appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

On December 20, 2011, the submittal for Antelope Valley AQMD and SJVUAPCD Negative Declarations submitted on June 20, 2011, was deemed by operation of law to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR Part 51 Appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

*B. Are there other versions of these negative declarations?*

There are no previous versions of these negative declarations.

*C. What is the purpose of the submitted negative declarations?*

For SJVUAPCD, the negative declarations were submitted to meet the requirements of CAA section 182(b)(2). Nonattainment areas are required to adopt volatile organic compound (VOC) regulations for the published Control Techniques Guidelines (CTG) categories. If a nonattainment area does not have stationary sources covered under a CTG, then the area is required to submit a negative declaration. The negative declarations were submitted because there are no applicable sources within the SJVAPCD jurisdiction.

For AVAQMD, the negative declaration was submitted to rescind Rule 1119 because there are no sources within the jurisdiction of AVAQMD subject to the provisions of the rule.

EPA's technical support document (TSD) has more information about these negative declarations.

## II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

*A. How is EPA evaluating the negative declarations?*

The negative declarations are submitted as SIP revisions and must be consistent with Clean Air Act requirements for Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) (see section 182(b)(2)) and SIP relaxation (see sections 110(1) and 193.) To do so, the submittal should provide reasonable assurance that no sources subject to Rule 1119 and the CTG requirements currently exist or are planned for the AVAQMD and SJVUAPCD.

*B. Do the negative declarations meet the evaluation criteria?*

We believe these negative declarations are consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding RACT and SIP relaxations. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

### C. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving the submitted negative declarations as additional information to the SIP because we believe they fulfill all relevant requirements. We do not think anyone will object to this approval, so we are finalizing it without proposing it in advance. However, in the Proposed Rules section of this **Federal Register**, we are simultaneously proposing approval of these negative declarations. If we receive adverse comments by April 2, 2012, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that the direct final approval will not take effect and we will address the comments in a subsequent final action based on the proposal. If we do not receive timely adverse comments, the direct final approval will be effective without further notice on April 30, 2012.

### III. Administrative Requirements

Under the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve State choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Accordingly, this action merely approves State law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by State law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- 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);
- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive 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 Clean Air Act; and

- Does not interfere with Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629 (Feb. 16, 1994)) because EPA lacks the discretionary authority to address environmental justice in this rulemaking.

In addition, this rule 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.

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 action 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 April 30, 2012. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action 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. Parties with objections to this direct final rule are encouraged to file a comment in response to the parallel notice of proposed rulemaking for this action published in the Proposed Rules section of today's **Federal Register**, rather than file an immediate petition for judicial review of this direct final rule, so that EPA can withdraw this direct final rule and address the comment in the proposed rulemaking. 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, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds, oxides of sulfur.

Dated: February 9, 2012.

**Jared Blumenfeld,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

Part 52, Chapter I, Title 40 of the 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 *et seq.*

**Subpart F—California**

■ 2. Section 52.222 is amended by adding paragraphs (a)(6)(ix) and (a)(8) to read as follows:

**§ 52.222 Negative declarations.**

- (a) \* \* \*
- (6) \* \* \*

(ix) Petroleum Coke Calcining Operations—Oxides of Sulfur submitted on June 20, 2011 and adopted on January 18, 2011.

\* \* \* \* \*

(8) San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.

(i) Synthesized Pharmaceutical Products Manufacturing and Coating Operations at Shipbuilding/Ship Repair

Facilities submitted on June 18, 2009 and adopted on April 16, 2009.

(ii) Rubber Tire Manufacturing submitted on June 20, 2011 and adopted on September 20, 2010.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2012–4667 Filed 2–29–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

**[EPA–R09–OAR–2011–0900; FRL–9626–3]**

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Feather River Air Quality Management District**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is finalizing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This action was proposed in the **Federal Register** on December 6, 2011 and concerns oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions from internal combustion engines. Under authority of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act), this action simultaneously approves a local rule that regulates these emission sources and directs California to correct rule deficiencies.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* This rule is effective on April 2, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2011–0900 for this action. Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed at <http://www.regulations.gov>, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps, multi-volume reports), and some may not be available in either location (e.g., confidential business information (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:** Idalia Perez, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3248, [perez.idalia@epa.gov](mailto:perez.idalia@epa.gov).

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

**Table of Contents**

- I. Proposed Action
- II. Public Comments and EPA Responses
- III. EPA Action
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. Proposed Action**

On December 6, 2011 (76 FR 76115), EPA proposed a limited approval and limited disapproval of the following rule that was submitted for incorporation into the California SIP.

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
FRAQMD .....	3.22 <sup>1</sup>	Internal Combustion Engines .....	06/01/09	01/10/10

<sup>1</sup> In some sections of the published proposal, we incorrectly used the number 2.33 instead of the correct 3.22 to refer to the rule on which we were proposing action. The name of the rule was correctly stated in the proposal and the correct rule was available in the docket for reviewing. We believe that this error did not negatively impact the public’s opportunity to comment or the intent of our proposal.

We proposed a limited approval because we determined that this rule improves the SIP and is largely consistent with the relevant CAA requirements. We simultaneously proposed a limited disapproval because the following rule provision conflicts with section 110 and part D of the Act which prevents full approval of the SIP revision. Section G.1.g allows for alternate testing without including sufficient QA/QC requirements to demonstrate compliance. This undermines enforceability of the rule which contradicts CAA requirements for enforceability.

Our proposed action contains more information on the basis for this rulemaking and on our evaluation of the submittal.

**II. Public Comments and EPA Responses**

EPA’s proposed action provided a 30-day public comment period. During this period, we received no comments.

**III. EPA Action**

No comments were submitted that change our assessment of the rule as described in our proposed action. Therefore, as authorized in sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the Act, EPA is finalizing a limited approval of the

submitted rule. This action incorporates the submitted rule into the California SIP, including those provisions identified as deficient. As authorized under section 110(k)(3), EPA is simultaneously finalizing a limited disapproval of the rule. Neither sanctions nor a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) will be imposed due to this limited disapproval. The limited disapproval also does not prevent any portion of the rule from being incorporated by reference into the federally enforceable SIP as discussed in a July 9, 1992 EPA memo found at: <http://www.epa.gov/nsr/ttnnsr01/gen/pdf/memo-s.pdf>.