likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction. This rule involves the establishment of a safety zone established to protect the public from the dangers associated with dredging operations and therefore, is categorically excluded.

An environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination will be available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

§ 165.09–0124 Safety Zone; St. Louis River, Tallas Island, Duluth, MN

(a) Location. The following area is a temporary safety zone: near Tallas Island on the St. Louis River to include all waters contained within the zone located at 46°42′30″ N 092°11′56″ W and then run northeast to position; 46°42′53″ N 092°11′30″ W and then run northwest to position; 46°43′5 N 092°11′41″ W and then run southwest to position; 46°42′37″ N 092°12′11″ W and then running southeast back to the starting point (NAD 83). The safety zone’s boundary is approximately 3500 ft. by 1500 ft. on the long end, extending behind Tallas Island, and 3000 ft by 1500 ft on the short end, extending into open waters.

(b) Effective Dates. This rule is effective from 12:01 a.m. May 1, 2010 until 11:59 p.m. November 30, 2010.

(c) Regulations. (1) In accordance with the general regulations in section 165.23 of this part, entry into this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Duluth, or his designated on-scene representative.

(2) This safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the Captain of the Port Duluth or his designated on-scene representative.

(3) The “on-scene representative” of the Captain of the Port is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port to act on his behalf. The on-scene representative of the Captain of the Port will be aboard either a Coast Guard or Coast Guard Auxiliary vessel. The Captain of the Port or his designated on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone shall contact the Captain of the Port Duluth or his on-scene representative to obtain permission to do so. Vessel operators permitted to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with the instructions given to them by the Captain of the Port Duluth or his on-scene representative.


M.P. Lebsack,
Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Duluth.

[FR Doc. 2010–10498 Filed 5–4–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52


Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Volatile Organic Compound Automobile Refinishing Rules for Indiana

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving into the Indiana State Implementation Plan (SIP) amendments to Indiana’s automobile refinishing rule. These rule revisions extend the applicability of Indiana’s approved volatile organic compound (VOC) automobile refining rules to all persons in Indiana who sell or manufacture automobile refining coatings or who refinish motor vehicles. The rules are approvable because they are consistent with the Clean Air Act (Act) and EPA regulations, and should result in additional VOC emission reductions throughout Indiana. EPA proposed these rules for approval on January 14, 2010, and received one favorable comment.

DATES: This final rule is effective on June 4, 2010.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID Nos. EPA–R05–OAR–2009–0513. All documents in the docket are listed on the http://www.regulations.gov Web site. Although listed in the index, 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 either electronically through http://www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. This facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. We recommend that
you telephone Steven Rosenthal, Environmental Engineer, at (312) 886–6052 before visiting the Region 5 office.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Rosenthal, Environmental Engineer, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–6052.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document whenever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean EPA. This supplementary information section is arranged as follows:

I. What public comments were received on the proposed approval and what is EPA’s response?

II. What action is EPA taking today and what is the purpose of this action?

III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews.

I. What public comments were received on the proposed approval and what is EPA’s response?

One comment in support of Indiana’s rule revision was received.

II. What action is EPA taking today and what is the purpose of this action?

EPA is approving rule revisions that broaden the coverage of Indiana’s VOC automobile refinishing SIP rules to include all persons in Indiana who sell or manufacture automobile refinishing coatings or who refinish motor vehicles. These rules had previously applied only in Clark, Floyd, Lake, Porter, and Vanderburgh Counties. Given the revised rule’s focus on VOC coating limitations and work practice standards, Indiana has also deleted references to control technology requirements.

In EPA’s January 14, 2010, proposal (75 FR 2000), we present a detailed legal and technical analysis of the State’s submission. The reader is referred to that notice for additional background on the submission and the bases for EPA’s approval.

III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the 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 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 Act; 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).

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 Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed with the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by July 6, 2010. 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, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: March 31, 2010.

Walter W. Kovalick Jr., Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

40 CFR part 52 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 P—Indiana

2. Section 52.770 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(195) to read as follows:

§ 52.770 Identification of plan.

(c) * * *

(195) On June 5, 2009, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management submitted amendments to Indiana’s automobile refinishing rule for approval into its state implementation plan (SIP). These rule revisions extend the applicability of Indiana’s approved volatile organic compound (VOC) automobile refinishing rules to all persons in Indiana who sell or manufacture automobile refinishing coatings or who refinish motor vehicles.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Indiana Administrative Code Title 326: Air Pollution Control Board, Article 8: Volatile Organic Compound Rules, Rule 10: Automobile Refinishing, filed with the Publisher of the Indiana Register on March 27, 2009, and became effective on April 26, 2009. Published in
the Indiana Register on April 22, 2009 (DIN: 20090422–IR–326060603FRA).

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52


Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, and South Coast Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD), Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD), and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from petroleum facilities, chemical plants, and facilities which use organic solvents. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on July 6, 2010 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by June 4, 2010. 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 comments, identified by docket number [EPA–R09–OAR–2010–0218], by one of the following methods:


2. E-mail: steckel.andrew@epa.gov.

3. Mail or deliver: Andrew Steckel (Air-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

Instructions: All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through http://www.regulations.gov or e-mail. http://www.regulations.gov is an “anonymous access” system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send e-mail directly to EPA, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. 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. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

Docket: The index to the docket for this action is available electronically at http://www.regulations.gov and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed in the index, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material), 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: Nicole Law, EPA Region IX, (415) 947–4126, law.nicole@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, “we,” “us,” and “our” refer to EPA.
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I. The State’s Submittal
A. What rules did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rules we are approving with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board.

Table 1—Submitted Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local agency</th>
<th>Rule No.</th>
<th>Rule title</th>
<th>Adopted/ amended</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCAPCD</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Organic Solvent Cleaning and Degreasing Operations</td>
<td>12/11/03</td>
<td>07/18/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>Solvent Cleaning</td>
<td>05/23/02</td>
<td>09/15/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJVUAPCD</td>
<td>4661</td>
<td>Organic Solvents</td>
<td>09/20/07</td>
<td>03/07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>Control of Volatile Organic Compound Leaks and Releases from Components at Petroleum Facilities and Chemical Plants</td>
<td>02/06/09</td>
<td>01/10/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On January 21, 2010, EPA determined that the submittal for SMAQMD Rule 466 met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR Part 51 Appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review. On April 17, 2008, EPA determined that the submittal for SJVUAPCD Rule 4661 met the completeness criteria. On February 4, 2010, EPA determined that the submittal for SCAQMD Rule 1173 met the completeness criteria. The July 18, 2008 submittal for PCAPCD Rule 216 became complete by operation of law on January 18, 2009.

B. Are there other versions of these rules?

There are no previous versions of SMAQMD Rule 466 in the SIP. We approved earlier versions of PCAPCD Rule 216, SJVUAPCD Rule 4661, and SCAQMD Rule 1173 into the SIP on April 30, 1996 (61 FR 18962), July 27, 2002 (67 FR 47701), and August 25,