

Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). Nevertheless, the EPA offered consultation and coordination to Washington tribes in letters dated July 6, 2017.

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

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

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

Dated: May 17, 2018.

**Chris Hladick,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 10.*

[FR Doc. 2018–11572 Filed 5–30–18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 62

[EPA–R04–OAR–2018–0186; FRL–9978–94–Region 4]

#### Approval of TN Plan for Control of Emissions From Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a state plan submitted by the State of Tennessee, through the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) on May 12, 2017, and supplemented on February 9, 2018, for implementing and enforcing the Emissions Guidelines (EG) applicable to existing Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration (CISWI) units. The state plan provides for implementation and enforcement of the EG, as finalized by EPA on June 23, 2016, applicable to existing CISWI units for which construction commenced on or before June 4, 2010, or for which modification or reconstruction commenced after June 4, 2010, but no later than August 7, 2013. The state plan establishes emission limits, monitoring, operating, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements for affected CISWI units. Since all the CISWI units in the State are located at the Eastman Chemical Company in Kingsport, Tennessee, the State has issued the facility an operating permit the terms of which are the

relevant provisions of the EG and has submitted the permit as part of its state plan.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before July 2, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. [EPA–R04–OAR–2018–0186] at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. 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. 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, 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:

Mark Bloeth, South Air Enforcement and Toxics Section, Air Enforcement and Toxics Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303. Mr. Bloeth can be reached via telephone at 404–562–9013 and via email at [bloeth.mark@epa.gov](mailto:bloeth.mark@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

Section 129 of the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act) directs the Administrator to develop regulations under section 111(d) of the Act limiting emissions of nine air pollutants (particulate matter, carbon monoxide, dioxins/furans, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, hydrogen chloride, lead, mercury, and cadmium) from four categories of solid waste incineration units: Municipal solid waste; hospital, medical, and infectious solid waste; commercial and industrial solid waste; and other solid waste.

On December 1, 2000, EPA promulgated new source performance standards (NSPS) and EG to reduce air pollution from CISWI units, which are codified at 40 CFR part 60, subparts CCCC and DDDD, respectively. *See* 65 FR 75338. EPA revised the NSPS and

EG for CISWI units on March 21, 2011. *See* 76 FR 15704. Following promulgation of the 2011 CISWI rule, EPA received petitions for reconsideration requesting that EPA reconsider numerous provisions in the rule. EPA granted reconsideration on certain issues and promulgated a CISWI reconsideration rule on February 7, 2013. *See* 78 FR 9112. Subsequently, EPA received petitions to further reconsider certain provisions of the 2013 NSPS and EG for CISWI units. On January 21, 2015, EPA granted reconsideration on four specific issues and finalized reconsideration of the CISWI NSPS and EG on June 23, 2016. *See* 81 FR 40956.

Section 129(b)(2) of the CAA requires states to submit to EPA for approval state plans and revisions that implement and enforce the EG—in this case, 40 CFR part 60, subpart DDDD. State plans and revisions must be at least as protective as the EG, and become federally enforceable upon approval by EPA. The procedures for adoption and submittal of state plans and revisions are codified in 40 CFR part 60, subpart B.

##### II. Review of Tennessee's CISWI State Plan Submittal

Tennessee submitted a state plan to implement and enforce the EG for existing CISWI units in the state<sup>1</sup> on May 12, 2017, and supplemented its submittal on February 9, 2018. EPA has reviewed the plan for existing CISWI units in the context of the requirements of 40 CFR part 60, subparts B and DDDD. State plans must include the following nine essential elements: Identification of legal authority; identification of mechanism for implementation; inventory of affected facilities; emissions inventory; emissions limits; compliance schedules; testing, monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting; public hearing records; and annual state progress reports on facility compliance. Since all the CISWI units identified in the State are located at Eastman Chemical Company's facility in Kingsport, Tennessee ("Eastman"), the State has issued the facility an operating permit (permit number 072397) the terms of which are the relevant provisions of the EG and has submitted the permit as the legal mechanism to implement its state plan.

##### A. Identification of Legal Authority

Under 40 CFR 60.26 and 60.2515(a)(9), an approvable state plan must demonstrate that the State has

<sup>1</sup> The submitted state plan does not apply to Indian country located in the state.

legal authority to adopt and implement the EG's emission standards and compliance schedule. In its submittal, Tennessee cites the following State law provisions and/or subsections thereof, among other provisions, for its authority to implement and enforce the plan: Tennessee Air Pollution Control Regulations (TAPCR) 1200–03–09–.03(8) (authority to include CAA requirements and federal regulations in permits); T.C.A. 68–201–111 (authority to bring civil action for injunction relief to prevent violations), 68–201–116(a) (authority to issue orders to correct violations), 68–201–105(b)(2) (authority to collection information from sources), 68–201–105(b)(3) (inspection authority), and 68–201–105(b)(8) (authority to institute judicial proceedings to compel compliance). EPA has reviewed the cited authorities and has preliminarily concluded that the State has adequately demonstrated legal authority to implement and enforce the CISWI state plan in Tennessee.

#### *B. Identification of Enforceable State Mechanisms for Implementing the Plan*

Under 40 CFR 60.24(a), a state plan must include emission standards, defined at 40 CFR 60.21(f) as “a legally enforceable regulation setting forth an allowable rate of emissions into the atmosphere, or prescribing equipment specifications for control of air pollution emissions.” See also 40 CFR 60.2515(a)(8). The State has adopted enforceable emission standards for affected CISWI units via state operating permit number 072397, issued to Eastman on May 10, 2017. EPA has preliminarily concluded that the permit terms meet the emission standard requirement under 40 CFR 60.24(a).

#### *C. Inventory of Affected Units*

Under 40 CFR 60.25(a) and 60.2515(a)(1), a state plan must include a complete source inventory of all CISWI units. Tennessee has identified seven affected units at one facility: Boilers 18–24 at Eastman. Omission from this inventory of CISWI units does not exempt an affected facility from the applicable section 111(d)/129 requirements. EPA has preliminarily concluded that Tennessee has met the affected unit inventory requirements under 40 CFR 60.25(a) and 60.2515(a)(1).

#### *D. Inventory of Emissions From Affected CISWI Units*

Under 40 CFR 60.25(a) and 60.2515(a)(2), a state plan must include an emissions inventory of the pollutants regulated by the EG. Emissions from CISWI units may contain cadmium,

carbon monoxide, dioxins/furans, hydrogen chloride, lead, mercury, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide. Tennessee submitted, and later supplemented, an emissions inventory of CISWI units as part of its state plan. This emissions inventory contains CISWI unit emissions rates for each regulated pollutant. EPA has preliminarily concluded that Tennessee has met the emission inventory requirements of 40 CFR 60.25(a) and 60.2515(a)(2).

#### *E. Emission Limitations, Operator Training and Qualification, Waste Management Plan, and Operating Limits for CISWI Units*

Under 40 CFR 60.24(c) and 60.2515(a)(4), the state plan must include emission standards that are no less stringent than the EG. 40 CFR 60.2515(a)(4) also requires a state plan to include operating training and qualifications requirements, a waste management plan, and operating limits that are at least as protective as the EG. Since all of the CISWI units identified in the State are located at Eastman, the State has issued the facility an operating permit the terms of which are the relevant provisions of the EG. EPA has preliminarily concluded that Tennessee's CISWI plan satisfies the requirements of 40 CFR 60.24(c) and 60.2515(a)(4).

#### *F. Compliance Schedules*

Under 40 CFR 60.24(a), (c), and (e) and 40 CFR 60.2515(a)(3), each state plan must include a compliance schedule, which requires affected CISWI units to expeditiously comply with the state plan requirements. In Eastman's state operating permit number 072397, Eastman is required to comply with the EG initial compliance requirements for CISWI units, which EPA has codified at 40 CFR 60.2700 through 60.2706. EPA has preliminarily concluded that Tennessee's CISWI plan satisfies the requirements of 40 CFR 60.24(a), (c), and (e) and 40 CFR 60.2515(a)(3).

#### *G. Testing, Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting Requirements*

Under 40 CFR 60.24(b)(2), 60.25(b), and 60.2515(a)(5), an approvable state plan must require that sources conduct testing, monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting. Tennessee's state plan incorporates the model rule provisions of the EG in state operating permit number 072397. EPA has preliminarily concluded that Tennessee's CISWI plan satisfies the requirements of 40 CFR 60.24(b)(2), 60.25(b), and 60.2515(a)(5).

#### *H. A Record of Public Hearing on the State Plan Revision*

40 CFR 60.23 sets forth the public participation requirements for each state plan. The State must conduct a public hearing, make all relevant plan materials available to the public prior to the hearing, and provide notice of such hearing to the public, the Administrator of EPA, each local air pollution control agency, and, in the case of an interstate region, each state within the region. 40 CFR 60.2515(a)(6) requires that each state plan include certification that the hearing was held, a list of witnesses and their organizational affiliations, if any, appearing at the hearing, and a brief written summary of each presentation or written submission. In its submittal, Tennessee submitted records, including transcripts, of a public hearing held on April 19, 2017. Tennessee provided notice and made all relevant plan materials available prior to the hearing. Tennessee certifies in its submittal that a hearing was held and that the State received no oral comments on the plan, and it describes the written submissions received. Thus, EPA has preliminarily concluded that Tennessee's CISWI plan satisfies the requirements of 40 CFR 60.23 and 60.2515(a)(6).

#### *I. Annual State Progress Reports to EPA*

Under 40 CFR 60.25(e) and (f) and 40 CFR 60.2515(a)(7), the State must provide in its state plan for annual reports to EPA on progress in enforcement of the plan. Accordingly, Tennessee provides in its plan that it will submit reports on progress in plan enforcement to EPA on an annual (calendar year) basis, commencing with the first full reporting period after plan revision approval. EPA has preliminarily concluded that Tennessee's CISWI plan satisfies the requirements of 40 CFR 60.25(e) and (f) and 40 CFR 60.2515(a)(7).

### **III. Proposed Action**

Pursuant to CAA section 111(d), CAA section 129, and 40 CFR part 60, subparts B and DDDD, EPA is proposing to approve Tennessee's state plan for regulation of CISWI units as submitted on May 21, 2017. In addition, EPA is proposing to amend 40 CFR part 62, subpart RR to reflect this action.

### **IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a 111(d)/129 plan submission that complies with the provisions of the CAA and applicable Federal regulations. In reviewing 111(d)/129 plan submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided

they meet the criteria and objectives of the CAA and EPA's implementing regulations. Accordingly, this action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this proposed 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).

In addition, this rule 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. It also 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). And it does not have Tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because EPA is not proposing to approve the submitted rule to apply in Indian country located in the state, and because the submitted rule will not impose substantial direct costs on Tribal governments or preempt Tribal law.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 62

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Aluminum, Fertilizers, Fluoride, Intergovernmental relations, Manufacturing, Phosphate,

Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Waste treatment and disposal.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7411.

Dated: May 15, 2018.

**Onis "Trey" Glenn, III,**  
*Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

[FR Doc. 2018-11754 Filed 5-30-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

**49 CFR Parts 571, 580, 581, 582, 583, 585, 587, 588, 591, 592, 593, 594, and 595**

**[Docket No. NHTSA-2018-0064]**

### Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Plain Language and Small Business Impacts of Motor Vehicle Safety

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notification of regulatory review; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** NHTSA seeks comments on the economic impact of its regulations on small entities. As required by Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, we are attempting to identify rules that may have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. We also request comments on ways to make these regulations easier to read and understand. The focus of this notification is rules that specifically relate to passenger cars, multipurpose passenger vehicles, trucks, buses, trailers, motorcycles, and motor vehicle equipment.

**DATES:** You should submit comments early enough to ensure that Docket Management receives them not later than July 30, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments [identified by Docket Number NHTSA-2018-0064] by any of the following methods:

- **Internet:** To submit comments electronically, go to the U.S. Government regulations website at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- **Mail:** Send comments to Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590.

- **Hand Delivery:** If you plan to submit written comments by hand or courier, please do so at 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, Washington, DC between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except federal holidays.

- **Fax:** Written comments may be faxed to 202-493-2251.

- You may call Docket Management at 1-800-647-5527.

**Instructions:** For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional Information, see the COMMENTS heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jonathan Roth, Office of Regulatory Analysis and Evaluation, National Center for Statistics and Analysis, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone 202-366-0818, fax 202-366-3189).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act

##### A. Background and Purpose

Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96-354), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-121), requires agencies to conduct periodic reviews of final rules that have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small business entities. The purpose of the reviews is to determine whether such rules should be continued without change, or should be amended or rescinded, consistent with the objectives of applicable statutes, to minimize any significant economic impact of the rules on a substantial number of such small entities.

##### B. Review Schedule

On December 1, 2008, NHTSA published in the **Federal Register** (73 FR 72758) a 10-year review plan for its existing regulations. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA, "we") has divided its rules into 10 groups by subject area. Each group will be reviewed once every 10 years, undergoing a two-stage process—an Analysis Year and a Review Year. For purposes of these reviews, a year