for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements which have subsequently changed; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Respondents/Affected Entities: These data and information are collected by State, local, and Tribal air quality management agencies.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 211.

Frequency of Response: Annual.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 70.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: $4,582 in labor costs.

Dated: July 1, 2010.

John Moses, Director, Collection Strategies Division.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Khesha Reed at the address noted below.

Any party may also submit written comments either before or after the workshop. All comments are due by August 20, 2010.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: EPA intends to review any information submitted by any party at the public workshop and any other written comments submitted to the Agency. Materials relevant to this proceeding are contained in the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, maintained in Docket No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0444. The docket is located at the Air Docket, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460, and may be viewed between 8 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. The telephone is (202) 566–1742. A reasonable fee may be charged by EPA for copying dockets.

Additionally, an electronic version of the public docket is available through the Federal government’s electronic public docket and comment system. You may access EPA dockets at http://www.regulations.gov. After opening the http://www.regulations.gov Web site, enter EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0444 in “Search Documents” to view documents in the record. Although a part of the official docket, the public docket does not include Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Khesha Reed, Compliance and Innovative Strategies Division (6405J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW., Washington, DC 20460. E-mail address: reed.khesha@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

I. Background: Several heavy duty diesel engine manufacturers have recently begun utilizing a NOX emission control technology called selective catalyst reduction (SCR) to meet EPA standards and other requirements. SCR is an established technology that has been shown to meet stringent emissions requirements while enabling fuel efficiency benefits.

Currently certified heavy-duty engines utilizing SCR use a nitrogen containing reducing agent (aqueous urea) injected into the exhaust gas upstream of the catalyst. Other types of reducing agents may also be used by SCR technology. The reducing agent needs to be replenished periodically. Without the reducing agent, the efficiency of the system drops to zero and NOx emissions can potentially increase substantially. The efficiency of the SCR system can also be affected by the use of improper reducing agent or tampering with the SCR system. The need to replenish the reducing agent (hereafter called diesel exhaust fluid, or DEF, although the reducing agent need not be fluid) and the possibility that SCR technology could be rendered ineffective by operation on an empty DEF tank are addressed by EPA’s existing regulations regarding allowable and necessary maintenance and adjustable parameters. These regulations also apply in the case where inadequate DEF could be used or where the SCR system may be subject to tampering. Certified engine configurations include provisions and inducements designed to address these regulatory concerns.

EPA has previously provided guidance to heavy-duty diesel engine manufacturers in March 2007 and December 2009 to facilitate manufacturer planning in advance of certification.1 In addition, in November 2009 EPA published in the Federal Register the approval of specific maintenance intervals for DEF refills for certain manufacturers.2

II. Public Workshop: EPA is commencing a public process designed to provide a thorough review of EPA’s policies regarding the operation of SCR-equipped heavy-duty diesel engines without DEF, with improper DEF, or when tampering (or some other defect in the SCR system) is detected for future 2011 and later model year engines, in order to ensure, among other things, that SCR-equipped engines are designed to properly control emissions as required under applicable law and regulations. Although EPA has previously provided guidance to manufacturers regarding the initial introduction and certification of SCR-equipped heavy-duty diesel engines, consistent with past practice we believe it is appropriate for EPA to review and reexamine its policies as technologies are introduced into the market place. As part of this process, EPA intends to review any information that has become available to determine whether its policies regarding SCR-equipped engines should be revised. The scope of the review includes review of the “Revised Guidance for Certification of Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines Using Selective Catalyst Reduction (SCR) Technologies” dated December 30, 2009. As part of EPA’s


2 See 74 FR 57671 (November 9, 2009).
review we will take into consideration the use of other reductants, in addition to
current aqueous urea DEF, and will
reevaluate requisite infrastructure
needs, any issues regarding the emission
of unregulated pollutants, and any
potential safety concerns. EPA is
conducting the workshop with the
California Air Resources Board in order
that all relevant information be timely
shared and considered by all affected
parties; however, any final policies
reached by EPA will be independently
made and based upon applicable federal
law and regulations. Any
representations made by the California
Air Resources Board regarding this
matter are not binding upon EPA.

Procedures for Public Participation:
Submit your comments, identified by
Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–
0444, by one of the following methods:
• http://www.regulations.gov: Follow
the on-line instructions for submitting
comments.
• E-mail: a-and-r-docket@epa.gov;
Fax: (202) 566–1741.
• Mail: Air and Radiation Docket,
Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–
0444, Environmental Protection Agency,
Mailcode: 6102T, 1200 Pennsylvania
Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460.
Please include a total of two copies.
• Hand Delivery: EPA Docket Center,
Public Reading Room, EPA West
Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution
Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460.
Such deliveries are only accepted
during the Docket’s normal hours of
operation, and special arrangements
should be made for deliveries of boxed
information.
• Instructions: Direct your comments
to Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–
0444. EPA’s policy is that all comments
received 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 information
claimed to be Confidential Business
Information (CBI) or other information
whose disclosure is restricted by statute.
Do not submit information that you
consider to be CBI or otherwise
protected through http://
www.regulations.gov or e-mail. The
http://www.regulations.gov Web site is
an “anonymous access” system, which
means EPA will not know your identity
or contact information unless you
provide it in the body of your comment.
If you send an e-mail comment directly
to EPA without going through
http://
www.regulations.gov, your e-mail
address will be automatically captured
and included as part of the comment
that is placed in the public docket and
made available on the Internet. If you
submit an electronic comment, EPA
recommends that you include your
name and other contact information in
the body of your comment and with any
disk or CD–ROM you submit. 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. For additional information
about EPA’s public docket visit the EPA
Docket Center homepage at http://

Persons with comments containing
proprietary information must
distinguish such information from other
comments to the greatest possible extent
and label it as “Confidential Business
Information” (CBI). If a person making
comments wants EPA to base its
decision in part on a submission labeled
as CBI, then a non-confidential version
of the document that summarizes the
key data or information should be
submitted for the public docket. To
ensure that proprietary information is
not inadvertently placed in the docket,
submissions containing such
information should be sent directly to
the contact person listed above and not
to the public docket. Information
covered by a claim of confidentiality
will be disclosed by EPA only to the
extent allowed and by the procedures
set forth in 40 CFR Part 2. If no claim
of confidentiality accompanies the
submission when EPA receives it, EPA
will make it available to the public
without further notice to the person
making comments.

Dated: July 1, 2010.
Margo Tsirigotis Oge,
Director, Office of Transportation and Air
Quality.

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY

[FR Doc. 2010–16702 Filed 7–7–10; 8:45 am]

Release of Final Documents Related to
the Review of the National Ambient Air
Quality Standards for Particulate Matter

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: The Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS) of
EPA is announcing the availability of
two final documents titled, Quantitative Health Risk Assessment for Particulate
Matter and Particulate Matter Urban-
Focused Visibility Assessment. These
two documents describe the quantitative
analyses that have been conducted as
part of the review of the national
ambient air quality standards (NAAQS)
for particulate matter (PM).

DATES: These documents will be
available on or about June 30, 2010.

ADDRESSES: The documents will be
available primarily via the Internet at
the following Web site: http://
www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/standards/pm/
s_pm_2007_risk.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For
questions related to the final document
titled, Quantitative Health Risk
Assessment for Particulate Matter,
please contact Dr. Zachary Pekar, Office
of Air Quality Planning and Standards
(Mail code CS04–06), U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency,
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711;
email: pekar.zachary@epa.gov;
telephone: 919–541–3704; fax: 919–
541–0237.

For questions related to the final
document titled, Particulate Matter
Urban–Focused Visibility Assessment,
please contact Ms. Vicki Sandiford,
Office of Air Quality Planning and
Standards (Mail code CS04–06), U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency,
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711;
email: sandiford.vicki@epa.gov;
telephone: 919–541–2629; fax: 919–
541–0237.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under
section 108(a) of the Clean Air Act
(CAA), the Administrator identifies
and lists certain pollutants which “cause or
contribute to air pollution which may
reasonably be anticipated to endanger
public health or welfare.” The EPA then
issues air quality criteria for these listed
pollutants, which are commonly
referred to as “criteria pollutants.” The
air quality criteria are to “accurately
reflect the latest scientific knowledge
useful in indicating the kind and extent
of all identifiable effects on public
health or welfare which may be
expected from the presence of [a]
pollutant in the ambient air, in varying
quantities.” Under section 109 of the
CAA, EPA establishes primary (health-
based) and secondary (welfare-based)
NAAQS for pollutants for which air
quality criteria are issued. Section
109(d) of the CAA requires periodic
review and, if appropriate, revision of
existing air quality criteria. The revised
air quality criteria reflect advances in
scientific knowledge on the effects of
the pollutant on public health or
welfare. The EPA is also required to