

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0312; FRL-9485-4]

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is finalizing approval of revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions were proposed in the **Federal Register** on June 16, 2011, and concern volatile organic compound (VOC)

emissions from architectural coatings. We are approving a local rule that regulates these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* This rule is effective on December 8, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0312 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:** David Grounds, EPA Region IX, (415) 972-3019, [grounds.david@epa.gov](mailto:grounds.david@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 June 16, 2011 (76 FR 35167), EPA proposed to approve the following rule into the California SIP.

Local agency	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SJVUAPCD ..... Rule 4601	Architectural Coatings .....	12/17/09	05/17/10

We proposed to approve this rule because we determined that it complied with the relevant CAA requirements. Our proposed action contains more information on the rule and our evaluation.

**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 rule complies with the relevant CAA requirements. Therefore, as authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving this rule into the California SIP.

**IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

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 provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address

disproportionate human health or environmental effects with practical, appropriate, and legally permissible methods under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

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 January 9, 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. 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.

Dated: October 3, 2011.

**Keith Takata,**

*Acting 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)(379)(i)(C)(6) to read as follows:

##### § 52.220 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*  
(379) \* \* \*  
(i) \* \* \*  
(C) \* \* \*

(6) Rule 4601, “Architectural Coatings”, amended on December 17, 2009.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2011–28788 Filed 11–7–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 372

[EPA–HQ–TRI–2009–0844; FRL–9488–5]

RIN 2025–AA27

### Hydrogen Sulfide; Community Right-to-Know Toxic Chemical Release Reporting

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

**ACTION:** Lifting of Administrative Stay for Hydrogen Sulfide; Correction.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency published in the **Federal Register** of October 17, 2011, a document lifting the Administrative Stay of the reporting requirements for hydrogen sulfide. The Office of the Federal Register mistakenly lifted the stay of the reporting requirements for methyl mercaptan, and the document also inadvertently left out language in the preamble and contained incorrect language in the amendatory instruction section, which section is required by 1 CFR 21.1. This document affirms that the stay on the reporting requirements for methyl mercaptan was not lifted and sets out the language in the preamble and the amendatory instruction section as it should have printed.

**DATES:** Effective on October 17, 2011.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Daniel R. Bushman, Environmental Analysis Division, Office of Information Analysis and Access (2842T), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 566–0743; fax number: (202) 566–0677; email: bushman.daniel@epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Environmental Protection Agency published a document on August 22, 1994 (59 FR 43048) imposing stays on the reporting requirements for hydrogen sulfide and methyl mercaptan found at 40 CFR 372.65. The document published in the **Federal Register** of October 17, 2011 (76 FR 64022) should have lifted the Administrative Stay of the reporting requirements for only hydrogen sulfide. The Office of the Federal Register mistakenly lifted the stay of the reporting requirements for methyl mercaptan as well. The document also inadvertently left out language in the preamble and contained incorrect language in the amendatory instruction section, which section is required by 1 CFR 21.1, regarding the lifted stay of hydrogen sulfide reporting requirements.

In FR Doc. 2011–23534 published on October 17, 2011 (76 FR 64022), make the following corrections.

1. On page 64025, in the second column, add a new paragraph before the beginning of section IV as follows:

“In order to lift the stay, as a procedural matter, EPA must include an instruction to the Office of the Federal Register, as required by 1 CFR 21.1. This instruction does not alter or change the content or text of any regulatory provision.”

2. On page 64037, in the third column following the signature, correctly revise the amendatory language to read as follows:

“Therefore, 40 CFR part 372 is affected as follows:

#### PART 372—[RESTATED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 372 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 11023 and 11048.

#### § 372.65 [Affected]

■ 2. Section 372.65 is affected by lifting the reporting stay on the hydrogen sulfide entry and all related dates under paragraph (a), and by lifting the stay on the entry for CAS No. 7783–06–4 and all related dates under paragraph (b).”

Dated: November 2, 2011.

**Malcolm D. Jackson,**

*Assistant Administrator and Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2011–28888 Filed 11–7–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 622

[Docket No. 110321211–1289–02]

RIN 0648–BA94

### Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Gag Grouper Closure Measures

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Temporary rule; interim measures extended.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS issues this temporary rule to extend the effective date of interim measures to reduce overfishing of gag in the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) implemented by a temporary rule published by NMFS on June 2, 2011. This temporary rule extends the interim measures implemented to reduce overfishing of gag in the Gulf by reducing the commercial quota for gag and, thus, the combined commercial quota for shallow-water grouper species (SWG), establishing a 2-month recreational season for gag, and suspending red grouper multi-use allocation in the Gulf grouper and tilefish individual fishing quota (IFQ) program, as recommended by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council). The intended effect of this rule is to reduce overfishing of the gag resource in the Gulf.