

Rule title	State effective date	Final rule citation, date	Comments
X. Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program			
Section X.A. General Requirements and Applicability	12/5/2012	80 FR 54237, 9/9/2015 ..	
Section X.B. Davis County	2/14/1997	62 FR 38213, 7/17/1997	
Section X.C. Salt Lake County	10/7/2004	70 FR 44055, 8/1/2005 ..	
Section X.D. Utah County	5/18/2004	70 FR 66264, 11/2/2005	
Section X.E. Weber County	11/4/2004	70 FR 54267, 9/14/2005	
Section X.F. Cache County	11/6/2013	80 FR 54237, 9/9/2015 ..	
Section XI. Other Control Measures for Mobile Sources	11/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XII. Transportation Conformity Consultation	5/2/2007	73 FR 51222, 9/2/2008 ..	
Section XIII. Analysis of Plan Impact	11/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XIV. Emission Inventory Development	2/25/2000	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XV. Title 19, Chapter 2 Utah Code Annotated, 1993	11/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVI. Public Notification	11/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	

XVII. Visibility Protection			
Section XVII.A. Introduction	2/25/2000	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVII.B. Background	4/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVII.C. Visibility Protection	4/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVII.D. Visibility Monitoring	2/25/2000	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVII.E. New or Modified Source Analysis of Visibility Impact	2/25/2000	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVII.F. Existing Source Visibility Impact and BART	4/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVII.G. Regional Haze	4/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVII.H. Long Term Plan to Show Progress Toward Improved Visibility.	4/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVII.I. Visibility Progress Report	4/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVII.J. Policy of the Air Conservation Committee Concerning the Protection of Scenic Views Associated with Mandatory Class I Areas from Significant Impairment for Visibility.	4/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XVIII. Demonstration of GEP Stack Height	2/25/2000	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XIX. Small Business Assistance Program	11/12/1993	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XX.G. Long-Term Strategy for Fire Programs	4/7/2011	78 FR 4071, 1/18/2013 ..	
Section XXII. General Conformity	1/1/2003	68 FR 37744, 6/25/2003	
Section XXIII. Interstate Transport	2/9/2007	73 FR 16543, 3/28/2008	

Maintenance Plans			
Ogden Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plan Summary.			
Salt Lake and Davis County Ozone Maintenance Plan Summary.			
Salt Lake and Tooele Counties Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂) Plan Summary.			
Salt Lake City Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plan.			
Salt Lake County Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀) Attainment Plan Summary.			
Utah County Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀) Attainment Plan Summary.			

[FR Doc. 2016-14099 Filed 6-15-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0838; FRL-9947-76-Region 3]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving a state implementation plan (SIP) revision

submitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia (Virginia) pursuant to the Clean Air Act (CAA). Whenever new or revised national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) are promulgated, the CAA requires states to submit a plan to address basic program elements, including but not limited to regulatory structure, monitoring, modeling, legal authority, and adequate resources necessary to assure implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of the NAAQS. These elements are referred to as infrastructure requirements. The Commonwealth of Virginia made a submittal addressing the infrastructure requirements for the 2012 fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) NAAQS.

DATES: This final rule is effective on July 18, 2016.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID Number EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0838. All

documents in the docket are listed in the www.regulations.gov Web site. Although listed in the electronic docket, some information is not publicly available, *i.e.*, 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 through www.regulations.gov or may be viewed during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Copies of the state submittal are available at Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Ellen Schmitt, (215) 814-5787, or by
email at schmitt.ellen@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On July 18, 1997, the EPA promulgated a new 24-hour and a new annual NAAQS for PM_{2.5} (62 FR 38652). Subsequently, on December 14, 2012, the EPA revised the level of the health based (primary) annual PM_{2.5} standard to 12 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³). See 78 FR 3086 (January 15, 2013).¹

Pursuant to section 110(a)(1) of the CAA, states are required to submit SIPs meeting the applicable requirements of section 110(a)(2) within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS or within such shorter period as EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a)(2) requires states to address basic SIP elements such as requirements for monitoring, basic program requirements, and legal authority that are designed to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. Section 110(a) imposes the obligation upon states to make a SIP submission to EPA for a new or revised NAAQS, but the contents of that submission may vary depending upon the facts and circumstances. In particular, the data and analytical tools available at the time the state develops and submits the SIP for a new or revised NAAQS affect the content of the submission. The content of such SIP submission may also vary depending upon what provisions the state's existing SIP already contains.

II. Summary of SIP Revision

On July 16, 2015, the Commonwealth of Virginia, through the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ), submitted a SIP revision that addresses the infrastructure elements specified in section 110(a)(2) of the CAA necessary to implement, maintain, and enforce the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.² On March 7, 2016 (81 FR 11711), EPA published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPR) proposing approval of the Virginia July 16, 2015 submittal. In

¹ In EPA's 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS revision, EPA left unchanged the existing welfare (secondary) standards for PM_{2.5} to address PM related effects such as visibility impairment, ecological effects, damage to materials and climate impacts. This includes an annual secondary standard of 15 µg/m³ and a 24-hour standard of 35 µg/m³.

² To clarify, the "2013 PM_{2.5} NAAQS" referred to in the Virginia SIP submittal is the same as the "2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS" EPA refers to in this rulemaking action. The final rule for this NAAQS was signed by the EPA Administrator on December 14, 2012, thereby it has been called the "2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS." However, the final rule was published in the **Federal Register** on January 15, 2013, with an effective date of March 13, 2013, resulting in it also being referred to as the "2013 PM_{2.5} NAAQS."

the NPR, EPA proposed approval of the following infrastructure elements: Section 110(a)(2)(A), (B), (C), (D)(i)(II) (prevention of significant deterioration), (D)(ii), (E), (F), (G), (H), (J), (K), (L), and (M).

At this time, EPA is not taking action on section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) of the CAA relating to interstate transport of emissions because Virginia's July 16, 2016 infrastructure SIP submittal did not include provisions for this element; therefore EPA will take later, separate action on section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS for Virginia as explained in the NPR. Additionally, EPA is not at this time taking action on section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) for visibility protection for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS as explained in the NPR. Although Virginia's infrastructure SIP submittal for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS referred to Virginia's regional haze SIP for section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) for visibility protection, EPA intends to take later, separate action on Virginia's submittal for these elements as explained in the NPR and the Technical Support Document (TSD) which accompanied the NPR. Finally, Virginia did not submit section 110(a)(2)(I) which pertains to the nonattainment requirements of part D, Title I of the CAA, because this element is not required to be submitted by the 3-year submission deadline of section 110(a)(1) and will be addressed in a separate process if necessary.

The rationale supporting EPA's proposed rulemaking action, including the scope of infrastructure SIPs in general, is explained in the published NPR and the TSD accompanying the NPR and will not be restated here. The NPR and TSD are available in the docket for this rulemaking at www.regulations.gov, Docket ID Number EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0838. No public comments were received on the NPR.

III. Final Action

EPA is approving, as a revision to the Virginia SIP, the following elements of Virginia's July 16, 2015 SIP revision for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS: Section 110(a)(2)(A), (B), (C), (D)(i)(II) (prevention of significant deterioration), (D)(ii), (E), (F), (G), (H), (J), (K), (L), and (M). Virginia's SIP revision provides the basic program elements specified in section 110(a)(2) necessary to implement, maintain, and enforce the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. This final rulemaking action does not include action on sections 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) (interstate transport of emissions), and (D)(i)(II) (visibility protection) for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS as previously discussed. Additionally, EPA is not

taking action on section 110(a)(2)(I) which pertains to the nonattainment planning requirements of part D, title I of the CAA, because this element is not required to be submitted by the 3-year submission deadline of section 110(a)(1) of the CAA, and will be addressed in a separate process if necessary.

IV. General Information Pertaining to SIP Submittals From the Commonwealth of Virginia

In 1995, Virginia adopted legislation that provides, subject to certain conditions, for an environmental assessment (audit) "privilege" for voluntary compliance evaluations performed by a regulated entity. The legislation further addresses the relative burden of proof for parties either asserting the privilege or seeking disclosure of documents for which the privilege is claimed. Virginia's legislation also provides, subject to certain conditions, for a penalty waiver for violations of environmental laws when a regulated entity discovers such violations pursuant to a voluntary compliance evaluation and voluntarily discloses such violations to the Commonwealth and takes prompt and appropriate measures to remedy the violations. Virginia's Voluntary Environmental Assessment Privilege Law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1-1198, provides a privilege that protects from disclosure documents and information about the content of those documents that are the product of a voluntary environmental assessment. The Privilege Law does not extend to documents or information that: (1) Are generated or developed before the commencement of a voluntary environmental assessment; (2) are prepared independently of the assessment process; (3) demonstrate a clear, imminent and substantial danger to the public health or environment; or (4) are required by law.

On January 12, 1998, the Commonwealth of Virginia Office of the Attorney General provided a legal opinion that states that the Privilege law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1-1198, precludes granting a privilege to documents and information "required by law," including documents and information "required by federal law to maintain program delegation, authorization or approval," since Virginia must "enforce federally authorized environmental programs in a manner that is no less stringent than their federal counterparts. . . ." The opinion concludes that "[r]egarding § 10.1-1198, therefore, documents or other information needed for civil or criminal enforcement under one of these programs could not be privileged because such documents and

information are essential to pursuing enforcement in a manner required by federal law to maintain program delegation, authorization or approval.”

Virginia’s Immunity law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1–1199, provides that “[t]o the extent consistent with requirements imposed by federal law,” any person making a voluntary disclosure of information to a state agency regarding a violation of an environmental statute, regulation, permit, or administrative order is granted immunity from administrative or civil penalty. The Attorney General’s January 12, 1998 opinion states that the quoted language renders this statute inapplicable to enforcement of any federally authorized programs, since “no immunity could be afforded from administrative, civil, or criminal penalties because granting such immunity would not be consistent with federal law, which is one of the criteria for immunity.”

Therefore, EPA has determined that Virginia’s Privilege and Immunity statutes will not preclude the Commonwealth from enforcing its program consistent with the federal requirements. In any event, because EPA has also determined that a state audit privilege and immunity law can affect only state enforcement and cannot have any impact on federal enforcement authorities, EPA may at any time invoke its authority under the CAA, including, for example, sections 113, 167, 205, 211 or 213, to enforce the requirements or prohibitions of the state plan, independently of any state enforcement effort. In addition, citizen enforcement under section 304 of the CAA is likewise unaffected by this, or any, state audit privilege or immunity law.

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

A. General Requirements

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the CAA 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 CAA. 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 Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);

- 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 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).

The SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land as defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151 or in any other area where EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

B. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

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).

C. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by August 15, 2016. 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. This action, which satisfies certain infrastructure requirements of section 110(a)(2) of the CAA for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS for the Commonwealth of Virginia, 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, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: May 27, 2016.

Shawn M. Garvin,

Regional Administrator, Region III.

40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

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

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

Subpart VV—Virginia

- 2. In § 52.2420, the table in paragraph (e) is amended by adding, to the end of the table, an entry for “Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 Particulate Matter NAAQS.” The added text reads as follows:

§ 52.2420 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

Name of non-regulatory SIP revision	Applicable geographic area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
* Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 Particulate Matter NAAQS.	* Statewide	* 7/16/15	* 6/16/16, [Insert Federal Register citation].	* Docket #2015–0838. This action addresses the following CAA elements, or portions thereof: 110(a)(2)(A), (B), (C), (D)(i)(II)(PSD), (D)(ii), (E), (F), (G), (H), (J), (K), (L), and (M).

[FR Doc. 2016–14181 Filed 6–15–16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2016–0124; FRL–9946–38–Region 9]

Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) and Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District (EKAPCD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern, respectively, the definition of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and emissions of VOCs from the surface coating operations of wood products. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on August 15, 2016 without further notice, unless the EPA receives adverse comments by July 18, 2016. 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 your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2016–0124 at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to Steckel.Andrew@epa.gov. For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). For either manner of submission, the EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.* on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the **FOR**

FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section. For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Arnold Lazarus, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3024, lazarus.arnold@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

- I. The State’s Submittal
 - A. What rules did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of these rules?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule and rule revision?
- II. The EPA’s Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is the EPA evaluating the rules?
 - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules
 - D. Public Comment and Final Action
- III. Incorporation by Reference
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. The State’s Submittal

A. What rules did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rules addressed by this action with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted/ amended/ revised	Submitted
EKAPCD	410.9	Wood Products Surface Coating Operations	3/13/2014	7/25/2014
YSAQMD	1.1	General Provisions and Definitions	7/08/2015	11/13/2015

On September 11, 2014, and January 19, 2016, the EPA determined that the submittals for EKAPCD Rule 410.9 and YSAQMD Rule 1.1 respectively met 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 rules?

There are no previous versions of Rule 410.9 in the SIP. We approved an earlier version of Rule 1.1 into the SIP on April 28, 2015 (80 FR 23449).

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule and rule revision?

VOCs help produce ground-level ozone, smog and PM, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires States to submit regulations that control