

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**[Petition IV–2010–4; FRL–9701–1]****Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to State Operating Permit for Cash Creek Generation, LLC—Cash Creek Generation Station; Henderson County, KY****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Notice of final order on petition to object to a state operating permit.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Clean Air Act (CAA), the EPA Administrator signed an Order, dated June 22, 2012, partially granting and partially denying a petition to object to a CAA merged prevention of significant deterioration and title V operating permit issued by the Kentucky Division for Air Quality (KDAQ) to Cash Creek Generation, LLC for its Cash Creek Generation Station (Cash Creek) located near Owensboro in Henderson County, Kentucky. This Order constitutes a final action on the petition submitted by Environmental Policy & Law Center on behalf of Sierra Club, Ursuline Sisters of Saint Joseph, and Valley Watch (Petitioners) and received by EPA on June 18, 2010. A petition for judicial review of those parts of the Order that deny issues in the petition may be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days from the date this notice is published in the **Federal Register**.

DATES: September 17, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the Order, the petition, and all pertinent information relating thereto are on file at the following location: EPA Region 4; Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division; 61 Forsyth Street, SW; Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. The Order is also available electronically at the following address: http://www.epa.gov/region07/air/title5/petitiondb/petitions/cashcreek_response2010.pdf.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Art Hofmeister, Air Permits Section, EPA Region 4, at (404) 562–9115 or hofmeister.art@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The CAA affords EPA a 45-day period to review and, as appropriate, the authority to object to operating permits proposed by state permitting authorities under title V of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7661–7661f. Section 505(b)(2) of the CAA and 40 CFR 70.8(d) authorize any person to petition the EPA Administrator to object to a title V operating permit within 60 days after the expiration of EPA's 45-

day review period if EPA has not objected on its own initiative. Petitions must be based only on objections to the permit that were raised with reasonable specificity during the public comment period provided by the state, unless the petitioner demonstrates that it was impracticable to raise these issues during the comment period or the grounds for the issues arose after this period.

Petitioners submitted a petition regarding Cash Creek (received by EPA on June 18, 2010), requesting that EPA object to the CAA title V operating permit (#V–09–006). Petitioners alleged that the permit was not consistent with the CAA because: (1) KDAQ failed to provide an opportunity for meaningful public participation; (2) KDAQ's calculation of the proposed facility's potential to emit volatile organic compounds (VOC), hydrogen sulfide and hazardous air pollutants (HAP) failed to account for full emissions from active flaring; (3) the permit's source-wide VOC emission limit was not enforceable as a practical matter; (4) the best available control technology (BACT) limits applicable to the flare during startup and steady-state operations were not supported by a proper BACT analysis; (5) the BACT limits applicable to the flare did not cover shutdown and malfunction periods; (6) the applicant incorrectly estimated fugitive emissions from equipment leaks; (7) KDAQ omitted numerous control options and relied on a faulty cost-effectiveness analysis in selecting BACT for equipment leaks; (8) KDAQ improperly determined that the source was minor for HAPs; (9) Cash Creek's calculation of particulate matter emissions from material handling assumed an unreasonably high control efficiency for wet suppression control methods and used an unreasonably low silt loading factor; (10) permit terms and conditions governing material handling were unenforceably vague and did not equate to the assumed control efficiencies; and (11) Cash Creek failed to perform an adequate ozone impacts analysis.

On June 22, 2012, the Administrator issued an Order partially granting and partially denying the petition. The Order explains EPA's rationale for partially granting and partially denying the petition.

Dated: July 6, 2012.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2012–17635 Filed 7–18–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**[FRL–9699–9]****Proposed Consent Decree Relating to the New Source Performance Standards for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Notice of proposed consent decree; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with of the Clean Air Act, as amended (“Act”), notice is hereby given of a proposed consent decree to settle an action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (Environmental Defense Fund v. Jackson, Case No. 11 Civ. 04492 (KBF) ECF Case) alleging that EPA failed to perform its obligations under the Act as they relate to the new source performance standards (“NSPS”) for municipal solid waste landfills (“MSW Landfills”). The Act requires EPA to review, and if appropriate, revise NSPS not later than 8 years after their promulgation unless EPA determines that such review is not appropriate in light of readily available information on the efficacy of the standard. Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, EPA agrees that: (1) By May 1, 2013, EPA shall: (i) Perform an appropriate review and sign for publication one or a combination of the following: (A) a proposed rule containing revisions to the MSW Landfills NSPS; or (B) a proposed determination not to revise the MSW Landfills NSPS; or (ii) sign for publication a determination that review is not appropriate; and, (2) if EPA signs a proposed rule or a proposed determination, then no later than May 1, 2014, sign one or a combination of the following: (i) A final rule containing revisions to the MSW Landfills NSPS, based on appropriate review; or, (ii) a final determination not to revise the MSW Landfills NSPS, based on an appropriate review.

DATES: Written comments on the proposed consent decree must be received by August 20, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID number EPA–HQ–OGC–2012–0490, online at www.regulations.gov (EPA's preferred method); by email to oei.docket@epa.gov; by mail to EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mailcode: 2822T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; or by hand delivery or courier to EPA Docket

Center, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC, between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. Comments on a disk or CD-ROM should be formatted in Word or ASCII file, avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption, and may be mailed to the mailing address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Richard H. Vetter, Air and Radiation Law Office, Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, at Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Sector Policies and Program Division (D205-01) 109 T.W. Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711; telephone: (919) 541-2127; fax number (919) 541-4991; email address: vetter.rick@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Additional Information About the Proposed Settlement Agreement

This proposed consent decree would potentially resolve a law suit filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York by the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF). EDF alleges that EPA failed to perform its obligations under section 111(b)(1)(B) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7411(b)(1)(B), as they relate to the new source performance standards ("NSPS") for municipal solid waste landfills ("MSW Landfills"), 40 CFR part 60, subpart WWW (40 CFR 60.750–60.759). Section 111(b)(1)(B) of the Act requires EPA to review, and if appropriate, revise NSPS not later than 8 years after their promulgation unless EPA determines that such review is not appropriate in light of readily available information on the efficacy of the standard. Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, EPA agrees that: (1) By May 1, 2013, EPA shall: (i) Perform an appropriate review and sign for publication one or a combination of the following: (A) a proposed rule containing revisions to NSPS Subpart WWW; or (B) a proposed determination not to revise NSPS Subpart WWW; or (ii) sign for publication a determination that review is not appropriate; and, (2) if EPA signs a proposed rule or a proposed determination, then no later than May 1, 2014, sign one or a combination of the following: (i) A final rule containing revisions to NSPS Subpart WWW, based on appropriate review; or, (ii) a final determination not to revise Subpart WWW, based on an appropriate review.

For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will accept written comments relating to the proposed

consent decree from persons who were not named as parties or intervenors to the litigation in question. EPA or the Department of Justice may withdraw or withhold consent to the proposed consent decree if the comments disclose facts or considerations that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the Act. Unless EPA or the Department of Justice determines, based on any comment submitted, that consent to this proposed consent decree should be withdrawn, the terms of the consent decree will be affirmed and the consent decree will be submitted for entry by the court.

II. Additional Information About Commenting on the Proposed Consent Decree

A. How can I get a copy of the consent decree?

The official public docket for this action (identified by Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OGC-2012-0490) contains a copy of the proposed consent decree. The official public docket is available for public viewing at the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) Docket in the EPA Docket Center, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the OEI Docket is (202) 566-1752.

An electronic version of the public docket is available through www.regulations.gov. You may use the www.regulations.gov to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, key in the appropriate docket identification number then select "search".

It is important to note that EPA's policy is that public comments, whether submitted electronically or in paper, will be made available for public viewing online at www.regulations.gov without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, CBI, or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information claimed as CBI and other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute is not included in the official public docket or in the electronic public docket. EPA's policy is that copyrighted material, including copyrighted material contained in a public comment, will not

be placed in EPA's electronic public docket but will be available only in printed, paper form in the official public docket. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the EPA Docket Center.

B. How and to whom do I submit comments?

You may submit comments as provided in the **ADDRESSES** section. Please ensure that your comments are submitted within the specified comment period. Comments received after the close of the comment period will be marked "late." EPA is not required to consider these late comments.

If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name, mailing address, and an email address or other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD ROM you submit. This ensures that you can be identified as the submitter of the comment and allows EPA to contact you in case EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties or needs further information on the substance of your comment. Any identifying or contact information provided in the body of a comment will be included as part of the comment that is placed in the official public docket, and made available in EPA's electronic public docket. 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.

Use of the www.regulations.gov Web site to submit comments to EPA electronically is EPA's preferred method for receiving comments. The electronic public docket system is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity, email address, or other contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. In contrast to EPA's electronic public docket, EPA's electronic mail (email) system is not an "anonymous access" system. If you send an email comment directly to the Docket without going through www.regulations.gov, your email address is automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the official public docket, and made available in EPA's electronic public docket.

Dated: July 5, 2012.

Patricia A. Embrey,
Acting Associate General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2012-17627 Filed 7-18-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P