

and its legislative history call for the Administrator to find the rule to be of “nationwide scope or effect” and for venue to be in the District of Columbia Circuit.

Thus, any petitions for review of this action related to a finding of failure to submit SIPs related to the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) of the CAA must be filed in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit within 60 days from the date final action is published in the **Federal Register**.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: July 1, 2011.

**Gina McCarthy,**

*Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 2011-17738 Filed 7-19-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0460; FRL-9438-6]

#### Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is finalizing both an approval and a limited approval and limited disapproval of permitting rules submitted for the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD or District) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions were proposed in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 2011 and concern New Source Review (NSR) and Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit programs for new and modified major stationary sources of air pollution. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA).

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* This rule is effective on August 19, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0460 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 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 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) 972-3534, [yannayon.laura@epa.gov](mailto:yannayon.laura@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 May 19, 2011 (76 FR 28942), EPA proposed to approve the following rule that was submitted for incorporation into the California SIP.

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Amended	Submitted
SMAQMD .....	203	Prevention of Significant Deterioration .....	1/27/11	1/28/11

We proposed to approve this rule because we determined that it complied with the applicable CAA requirements. Our proposed rule and related Technical Support Document (TSD)

contain more information on the basis for this rulemaking and on our evaluation of the submittal.

On May 19, 2011 (76 FR 28942), EPA also 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	Amended	Submitted
SMAQMD .....	214	Federal New Source Review .....	10/28/10	12/07/10

We proposed a limited approval because we determined that this rule improves the SIP and is largely consistent with the applicable CAA requirements. We simultaneously proposed a limited disapproval because some rule provisions do not satisfy the requirements of section 110 and part D of the CAA.

Specifically:

- The rule is missing definitions for the terms “begin actual construction,” “federally enforceable” and “necessary preconstruction approvals or permits.”

- The rule is missing adequate public notice requirements for minor sources.

- The rule is missing provisions meeting the requirements of 40 CFR 51.165(a)(5)(ii) and 40 CFR 51.307(b)(2).

- The rule contains a cross reference to Rule 207—Title V—Federal Operating Permit Program, which is not SIP approved.

Our proposed rule and related TSD contain 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 that the submitted SMAQMD Rule 203 complies with the applicable CAA requirements. Therefore, under CAA section 110(k)(3) and for the reasons set forth in our May 19, 2011 proposed rule, we are finalizing a full approval of Rule 203.

Additionally, no comments were submitted that change our basis for proposing a limited approval and limited disapproval of submitted SMAQMD Rule 214. Therefore, under CAA sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a), we are finalizing a limited approval and limited disapproval of Rule 214. We are finalizing a limited approval of the submitted rule because we continue to believe that the rule improves the SIP and is largely consistent with relevant CAA requirements. This action incorporates the submitted rule into the District portion of the California SIP, including those provisions identified as deficient. As authorized under sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a), EPA is simultaneously finalizing a limited disapproval of Rule 214. As a result, sanctions will be imposed unless EPA approves subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rule deficiencies within 18 months of the effective date of this action. These sanctions will be imposed under section 179 of the Act according to 40 CFR 52.31. In addition, EPA must promulgate a federal implementation plan (FIP) under section 110(c) unless we approve subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rule deficiencies within 24 months. Note that the submitted rule has been adopted by the SMAQMD, and EPA's final limited disapproval does not prevent the local agency from enforcing it. 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>.

#### IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

##### A. Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866, entitled "Regulatory Planning and Review."

##### B. Paperwork Reduction Act

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.3(b).

##### C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on

a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals and limited approvals/limited disapprovals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because this limited approval/limited disapproval action does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of State action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co., v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255–66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

##### D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Under sections 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the limited approval/limited disapproval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

##### E. Executive Order 13132, Federalism

Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Orders 12612 (Federalism) and 12875 (Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership). Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that 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." Under Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This rule will 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, because it 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. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this rule.

##### F. Executive Order 13175, Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

Executive Order 13175, entitled "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments" (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications." This final rule does not have tribal implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175. It will not have

substantial direct effects on tribal governments, 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. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule.

*G. Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*

EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) as applying only to those regulatory actions that concern health or safety risks, such that the analysis required under section 5–501 of the Executive Order has the potential to influence the regulation. This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045, because it approves a State rule implementing a Federal standard.

*H. Executive Order 13211, Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use*

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 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing a new regulation. To comply with NTTAA, EPA must consider and use “voluntary consensus standards” (VCS) if available and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

The EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to this action. Today’s action does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

*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 lacks the discretionary authority to address environmental justice in this rulemaking.

*K. Congressional Review Act*

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. section 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. section 804(2). This rule will be effective on August 19, 2011.

*L. Petitions for Judicial Review*

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 September 19, 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**

Air pollution control, Environmental protection, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: June 30, 2011.

**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 52.220 is amended by adding paragraphs (c)(389) and (390) to read as follows:

**§ 52.220 Identification of plan.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(389) New and amended regulations were submitted on December 7, 2010, by the Governor’s Designee.

(i) Incorporation by Reference.

(A) Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

(1) Rule 214, “Federal New Source Review,” as adopted on October 28, 2010.

(390) Amended regulations were submitted on January 28, 2011, by the Governor’s Designee.

(i) Incorporation by Reference.

(A) Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

(1) Rule 203, “Prevention of Significant Deterioration,” as amended on January 27, 2011.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2011–18152 Filed 7–19–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 55**

[EPA–R03–OAR–2011–0140; FRL– 9434–5 ]

**Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Virginia**

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking direct final action to approve an update to a portion of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Air Regulations. Requirements applying to OCS sources located within 25 miles of a State’s seaward boundary must be updated periodically to maintain continuity and ensure consistency with the regulations of the corresponding onshore area (COA), as mandated by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAA). The specific portion of the OCS air regulation that is being updated pertains to the requirements for OCS sources in the Commonwealth of Virginia (Virginia). The intended effect of approving the OCS requirements for Virginia is to regulate emissions from