

which was submitted on December 14, 2011. EPA is soliciting public comments on this proposed approval of Virginia's SIP revision request. These comments will be considered before taking final action.

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the CAA 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 CAA. 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 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 CAA; 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 proposed rule relating to GHG permitting under Virginia's PSD program 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.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Greenhouse Gases, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: April 5, 2012.

W.C. Early,

Action Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 2012-9339 Filed 4-17-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0809; FRL-9659-1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve in part, conditionally approve, and disapprove in part, the State Implementation Plan (SIP) submission, submitted by the State of Florida, through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) on December 13, 2007, and supplemented on April 18, 2008, to demonstrate that the State meets the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) for the 1997 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The CAA requires that each state adopt and submit a SIP for the implementation, maintenance and enforcement of each NAAQS promulgated by the EPA, which is commonly referred to as an "infrastructure" SIP. DEP certified that the Florida SIP contains provisions that ensure the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS are implemented, enforced, and maintained in Florida (hereafter referred to as "infrastructure submission"). EPA is taking four related actions on DEP's infrastructure submission for Florida.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before May 18, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0809, by one of the following methods:

1. *www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
2. *Email:* benjamin.lynorae@epa.gov.
3. *Fax:* (404) 562-9019.
4. *Mail:* "EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0809," Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960.
5. *Hand Delivery or Courier:* Lynorae Benjamin, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office's normal hours of operation. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding federal holidays.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0809. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at 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 through www.regulations.gov or email, information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected. The 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 email comment directly to EPA without going through www.regulations.gov, your email 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://www.epa.gov/epahome/dockets.htm>.

Docket: All documents in the electronic docket are listed in the www.regulations.gov index. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., 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 in www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nacosta C. Ward, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. The telephone number is (404) 562-9140. Ms. Ward can be reached via electronic mail at ward.nacosta@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA is now taking four related actions on DEP's infrastructure submission for Florida. First, EPA is proposing to approve a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for element 110(a)(2)(G), which relates to the authority to implement emergency powers under section 303 of the CAA. Second, EPA is proposing to disapprove in part portions of elements 110(a)(2)(C) and 110(a)(2)(J) of the State's submittal as it relates to the regulation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Third, EPA is proposing to conditionally approve sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), which relates to the State board requirements contained section 128 of the CAA. Fourth, and with the exception of the aforementioned elements, EPA is proposing to determine that Florida's infrastructure submission, provided to EPA on December 13, 2007, as supplemented on

April 18, 2008, addresses all other required infrastructure elements for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

Table of Contents

- I. Background
- II. What elements are required under Sections 110(a)(1) and (2)?
- III. Scope of Infrastructure SIPs
- IV. What is EPA's analysis of how Florida addressed the elements of Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) "Infrastructure" Provisions?
- V. Proposed Action
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Background

On July 18, 1997, EPA promulgated a new NAAQS for ozone based on 8-hour average concentrations. The 8-hour averaging period replaced the previous 1-hour averaging period, and the level of the NAAQS was changed from 0.12 parts per million (ppm) to 0.08 ppm. See 62 FR 38856. Pursuant to section 110(a)(1) of the CAA, states are required to submit SIPs meeting the requirements of section 110(a)(2) within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) requires states to address basic SIP requirements, including emissions inventories, monitoring, and modeling to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. States were required to submit such SIPs for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS to EPA no later than June 2000. However, intervening litigation over the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS created uncertainty about how to proceed and many states did not provide the required "infrastructure" SIP submission for these newly promulgated NAAQS.

On March 4, 2004, Earthjustice submitted a notice of intent to sue related to EPA's failure to issue findings of failure to submit related to the "infrastructure" requirements for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA entered into a consent decree with Earthjustice which required EPA, among other things, to complete a **Federal Register** notice announcing EPA's determinations pursuant to section 110(k)(1)(B) as to whether each state had made complete submissions to meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2) for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS by December 15, 2007. Subsequently, EPA received an extension of the date to complete this **Federal Register** notice until March 17, 2008, based upon agreement to make the findings with respect to submissions made by January 7, 2008. In accordance with the consent decree, EPA made completeness findings for each state based upon what the Agency received from each state as of January 7, 2008.

On March 27, 2008, EPA published a final rulemaking entitled, "Completeness Findings for Section 110(a) State Implementation Plans; 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS," making a finding that each state had submitted or failed to submit a complete SIP that provided the basic program elements of section 110(a)(2) necessary to implement the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. See 73 FR 16205. For those states that did receive findings, such as Florida, the findings of failure to submit for all or a portion of a State's implementation plan established a 24-month deadline for EPA to promulgate a FIP to address the outstanding SIP elements unless, prior to that time, the affected states submitted, and EPA approved, the required SIPs. However, the findings of failure to submit did not impose sanctions or set deadlines for imposing sanctions as described in section 179 of the CAA, because these findings do not pertain to the elements contained in the Title I part D plan for nonattainment areas as required under section 110(a)(2)(I). Additionally, the findings of failure to submit for the infrastructure submittals are not a SIP call pursuant to section 110(k)(5).

The finding that all or portions of a state's submission are complete established a 12-month deadline for EPA to take action upon the complete SIP elements in accordance with section 110(k). Florida's infrastructure submission was received by EPA on December 13, 2007, and was determined to be complete on March 27, 2008, for all elements with the exception of 110(a)(2)(G). Specifically, 110(a)(2)(G) relates to the requirement for states to provide authority comparable to that in section 303 of the CAA, Emergency Power, and adequate contingency plans to implement such authority. Florida was among other states that received a finding of failure to submit because its infrastructure submission was deemed incomplete for element (G) for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS by March 1, 2008. The finding of failure to submit action triggered a 24-month clock for EPA to either issue a FIP or take final action on a SIP revision which corrects the deficiency for which the finding of failure to submit was received. Today's action involves four related proposals to act on DEP's December 13, 2007, submission as supplemented on April 18, 2008.

With regard to the proposal to establish a FIP, which will be discussed in further detail below, preliminary background information is provided as follows. In DEP's December 13, 2007, submission and a letter dated April 18, 2008, DEP cited State statutes as

evidence that Florida has the authority to implement emergency powers for the 1997 8-hour ozone standard. Because these statutes have not been approved into the Florida SIP, as part of today's proposal, EPA is proposing a FIP to correct this deficiency. EPA will take action to approve a FIP for element 110(a)(2)(G) unless Florida submits a SIP revision correcting the deficiency for element 110(a)(2)(G) and EPA takes final action to approve the revision prior to such time that EPA is obligated to take final action on this ozone infrastructure SIP submission, per a settlement agreement signed on November 30, 2011. In a letter dated March 23, 2012, DEP provided a letter with the State's intent to submit a SIP revision to address this deficiency in the very near future. A copy of this letter is in the docket for today's proposed rulemaking. EPA acknowledges Florida's request and if EPA is able to take action on Florida's forthcoming SIP revision prior to finalizing the proposed FIP that is being proposed today, the FIP proposed today will no longer be necessary.

Today's action is proposing to approve Florida's infrastructure submission for which EPA made the completeness determination and findings of failure to submit on March 27, 2008. This action is not approving revisions to any rules; but rather, is proposing that Florida's already approved SIP meets certain CAA infrastructure requirements for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

II. What elements are required under Sections 110(a)(1) and (2)?

Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit SIPs to provide for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of a new or revised NAAQS within three years following the promulgation of such NAAQS, or within such shorter period as EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a) imposes the obligation upon states to make a SIP submission to EPA for a new or revised NAAQS, but the contents of that submission may vary depending upon the facts and circumstances. In particular, the data and analytical tools available at the time the state develops and submits the SIP for a new or revised NAAQS affects the content of the submission. The contents of such SIP submissions may also vary depending upon what provisions the state's existing SIP already contains. In the case of the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS, states typically have met the basic program elements required in section 110(a)(2) through earlier SIP

submissions in connection with previous ozone NAAQS.

More specifically, section 110(a)(1) provides the procedural and timing requirements for SIPs. Section 110(a)(2) lists specific elements that states must meet for "infrastructure" SIP requirements related to a newly established or revised NAAQS. As mentioned above, these requirements include SIP infrastructure elements such as modeling, monitoring, and emissions inventories that are designed to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. The requirements that are the subject of this proposed rulemaking are listed below¹ and in EPA's October 2, 2007, memorandum entitled "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards."

- 110(a)(2)(A): Emission limits and other control measures.
- 110(a)(2)(B): Ambient air quality monitoring/data system.
- 110(a)(2)(C): Program for enforcement of control measures.²
- 110(a)(2)(D): Interstate transport.³
- 110(a)(2)(E): Adequate resources.
- 110(a)(2)(F): Stationary source monitoring system.
- 110(a)(2)(G): Emergency power.
- 110(a)(2)(H): Future SIP revisions.

¹Two elements identified in section 110(a)(2) are not governed by the three year submission deadline of section 110(a)(1) because SIPs incorporating necessary local nonattainment area controls are not due within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS, but rather due at the time the nonattainment area plan requirements are due pursuant to section 172. These requirements are: (1) Submissions required by section 110(a)(2)(C) to the extent that subsection refers to a permit program as required in part D Title I of the CAA; and (2) submissions required by section 110(a)(2)(I) which pertain to the nonattainment planning requirements of part D, Title I of the CAA. Today's proposed rulemaking does not address infrastructure elements related to section 110(a)(2)(I) or the nonattainment planning requirements of 110(a)(2)(C).

²This rulemaking only addresses requirements for this element as they relate to attainment areas.

³Today's proposed rule does not address element 110(a)(2)(D)(i) (Interstate Transport) for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Interstate transport requirements were formerly addressed by Florida consistent with the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR). On December 23, 2008, CAIR was remanded by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, without vacatur, back to EPA. See *North Carolina v. EPA*, 531 F.3d 896 (D.C. Cir. 2008). Prior to this remand, EPA took final action to approve Florida's SIP revision, which was submitted to comply with CAIR. See 72 FR 58016 (October 12, 2007). In so doing, Florida's CAIR SIP revision addressed the interstate transport provisions in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. In response to the remand of CAIR, EPA has recently finalized a new rule to address the interstate transport of NO_x and SO_x in the eastern United States. See 76 FR 48208 (August 8, 2011) ("the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule"). EPA's action on element 110(a)(2)(D)(i) will be addressed in a separate action.

- 110(a)(2)(I): Areas designated nonattainment and meet the applicable requirements of part D.⁴

- 110(a)(2)(J): Consultation with government officials; public notification; and PSD and visibility protection.

- 110(a)(2)(K): Air quality modeling/data.
- 110(a)(2)(L): Permitting fees.
- 110(a)(2)(M): Consultation/participation by affected local entities.

III. Scope of Infrastructure SIPs

EPA is currently acting upon SIPs that address the infrastructure requirements of CAA section 110(a)(1) and (2) for ozone and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) NAAQS for various states across the country. Commenters on EPA's recent proposals for some states raised concerns about EPA statements that it was not addressing certain substantive issues in the context of acting on those infrastructure SIP submissions.⁵ Those Commenters specifically raised concerns involving provisions in existing SIPs and with EPA's statements in other proposals that it would address two issues separately and not as part of actions on the infrastructure SIP submissions: (i) Existing provisions related to excess emissions during periods of start-up, shutdown, or malfunction (SSM) at sources, that may be contrary to the CAA and EPA's policies addressing such excess emissions; and (ii) existing provisions related to "director's variance" or "director's discretion" that purport to permit revisions to SIP approved emissions limits with limited public process or without requiring further approval by EPA, that may be contrary to the CAA (director's discretion). EPA notes that there are two other substantive issues for which EPA likewise stated in other proposals that it would address the issues separately: (i) Existing provisions for minor source new source review programs that may be inconsistent with the requirements of the CAA and EPA's regulations that pertain to such programs (minor source NSR); and (ii) existing provisions for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) programs that may be inconsistent

⁴This requirement was inadvertently omitted from EPA's October 2, 2007, memorandum entitled "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards," but as mentioned above is not relevant to today's proposed rulemaking.

⁵See Comments of Midwest Environmental Defense Center, dated May 31, 2011. Docket # EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1179 (adverse comments on proposals for three states in Region 5). EPA notes that these public comments on another proposal are not relevant to this rulemaking and do not have to be directly addressed in this rulemaking. EPA will respond to these comments in the appropriate rulemaking action to which they apply.

with current requirements of EPA's "Final NSR Improvement Rule," 67 FR 80186 (December 31, 2002), as amended by 72 FR 32526 (June 13, 2007) (NSR Reform). In light of the comments, EPA believes that its statements in various proposed actions on infrastructure SIPs with respect to these four individual issues should be explained in greater depth. It is important to emphasize that EPA is taking the same position with respect to these four substantive issues in this action on the infrastructure SIPs for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS from Florida.

EPA intended the statements in the other proposals concerning these four issues merely to be informational, and to provide general notice of the potential existence of provisions within the existing SIPs of some states that might require future corrective action. EPA did not want states, regulated entities, or members of the public to be under the misconception that the Agency's approval of the infrastructure SIP submission of a given state should be interpreted as a re-approval of certain types of provisions that might exist buried in the larger existing SIP for such state. Thus, for example, EPA explicitly noted that the Agency believes that some states may have existing SIP approved SSM provisions that are contrary to the CAA and EPA policy, but that "in this rulemaking, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing state provisions with regard to excess emissions during SSM of operations at facilities." EPA further explained, for informational purposes, that "EPA plans to address such State regulations in the future." EPA made similar statements, for similar reasons, with respect to the director's discretion, minor source NSR, and NSR Reform issues. EPA's objective was to make clear that approval of an infrastructure SIP for these ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS should not be construed as explicit or implicit re-approval of any existing provisions that relate to these four substantive issues. EPA is reiterating that position in this action on the infrastructure SIP for Florida.

Unfortunately, the Commenters and others evidently interpreted these statements to mean that EPA considered action upon the SSM provisions and the other three substantive issues to be integral parts of acting on an infrastructure SIP submission, and therefore that EPA was merely postponing taking final action on the issues in the context of the infrastructure SIPs. This was not EPA's intention. To the contrary, EPA only meant to convey its awareness of the potential for certain types of

deficiencies in existing SIPs, and to prevent any misunderstanding that it was reapproving any such existing provisions. EPA's intention was to convey its position that the statute does not require that infrastructure SIPs address these specific substantive issues in existing SIPs and that these issues may be dealt with separately, outside the context of acting on the infrastructure SIP submission of a state. To be clear, EPA did not mean to imply that it was not taking a full final agency action on the infrastructure SIP submission with respect to any substantive issue that EPA considers to be a required part of acting on such submissions under section 110(k) or under section 110(c). Given the confusion evidently resulting from EPA's statements in those other proposals, however, we want to explain more fully the Agency's reasons for concluding that these four potential substantive issues in existing SIPs may be addressed separately from actions on infrastructure SIP submissions.

The requirement for the SIP submissions at issue arises out of CAA section 110(a)(1). That provision requires that states must make a SIP submission "within 3 years (or such shorter period as the Administrator may prescribe) after the promulgation of a national primary ambient air quality standard (or any revision thereof)" and that these SIPs are to provide for the "implementation, maintenance, and enforcement" of such NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) includes a list of specific elements that "[e]ach such plan" submission must meet. EPA has historically referred to these particular submissions that states must make after the promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS as "infrastructure SIPs." This specific term does not appear in the statute, but EPA uses the term to distinguish this particular type of SIP submission designed to address basic structural requirements of a SIP from other types of SIP submissions designed to address other different requirements, such as "nonattainment SIP" submissions required to address the nonattainment planning requirements of part D, "regional haze SIP" submissions required to address the visibility protection requirements of CAA section 169A, new source review permitting program submissions required to address the requirements of part D, and a host of other specific types of SIP submissions that address other specific matters.

Although section 110(a)(1) addresses the timing and general requirements for these infrastructure SIPs, and section 110(a)(2) provides more details

concerning the required contents of these infrastructure SIPs, EPA believes that many of the specific statutory provisions are facially ambiguous. In particular, the list of required elements provided in section 110(a)(2) contains a wide variety of disparate provisions, some of which pertain to required legal authority, some of which pertain to required substantive provisions, and some of which pertain to requirements for both authority and substantive provisions.⁶ Some of the elements of section 110(a)(2) are relatively straightforward, but others clearly require interpretation by EPA through rulemaking, or recommendations through guidance, in order to give specific meaning for a particular NAAQS.⁷

Notwithstanding that section 110(a)(2) provides that "each" SIP submission must meet the list of requirements therein, EPA has long noted that this literal reading of the statute is internally inconsistent, insofar as section 110(a)(2)(I) pertains to nonattainment SIP requirements that could not be met on the schedule provided for these SIP submissions in section 110(a)(1).⁸ This illustrates that EPA must determine which provisions of section 110(a)(2) may be applicable for a given infrastructure SIP submission. Similarly, EPA has previously decided that it could take action on different parts of the larger, general "infrastructure SIP" for a given NAAQS without concurrent action on all subsections, such as section 110(a)(2)(D)(i), because the Agency bifurcated the action on these latter "interstate transport" provisions within section 110(a)(2) and worked with states to address each of the four prongs of

⁶ For example, section 110(a)(2)(E) provides that states must provide assurances that they have adequate legal authority under state and local law to carry out the SIP; section 110(a)(2)(C) provides that states must have a substantive program to address certain sources as required by part C of the CAA; section 110(a)(2)(G) provides that states must have both legal authority to address emergencies and substantive contingency plans in the event of such an emergency.

⁷ For example, section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) requires EPA to be sure that each state's SIP contains adequate provisions to prevent significant contribution to nonattainment of the NAAQS in other states. This provision contains numerous terms that require substantial rulemaking by EPA in order to determine such basic points as what constitutes significant contribution. See "Rule To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone (Clean Air Interstate Rule); Revisions to Acid Rain Program; Revisions to the NO_x SIP Call; Final Rule," 70 FR 25162 (May 12, 2005) (defining, among other things, the phrase "contribute significantly to nonattainment").

⁸ See *Id.*, 70 FR 25162, at 63–65 (May 12, 2005) (explaining relationship between timing requirement of section 110(a)(2)(D) versus section 110(a)(2)(I)).

section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) with substantive administrative actions proceeding on different tracks with different schedules.⁹ This illustrates that EPA may conclude that subdividing the applicable requirements of section 110(a)(2) into separate SIP actions may sometimes be appropriate for a given NAAQS where a specific substantive action is necessitated, beyond a mere submission addressing basic structural aspects of the state's implementation plans. Finally, EPA notes that not every element of section 110(a)(2) would be relevant, or as relevant, or relevant in the same way, for each new or revised NAAQS and the attendant infrastructure SIP submission for that NAAQS. For example, the monitoring requirements that might be necessary for purposes of section 110(a)(2)(B) for one NAAQS could be very different than what might be necessary for a different pollutant. Thus, the content of an infrastructure SIP submission to meet this element from a state might be very different for an entirely new NAAQS, versus a minor revision to an existing NAAQS.¹⁰

Similarly, EPA notes that other types of SIP submissions required under the statute also must meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2), and this also demonstrates the need to identify the applicable elements for other SIP submissions. For example, nonattainment SIPs required by part D likewise have to meet the relevant subsections of section 110(a)(2) such as section 110(a)(2)(A) or (E). By contrast, it is clear that nonattainment SIPs would not need to meet the portion of section 110(a)(2)(C) that pertains to part C, *i.e.*, the PSD requirements applicable in attainment areas. Nonattainment SIPs required by part D also would not need to address the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) with respect to emergency episodes, as such requirements would not be limited to nonattainment areas. As this example illustrates, each type of SIP submission may implicate some subsections of section 110(a)(2) and not others.

Given the potential for ambiguity of the statutory language of section

110(a)(1) and (2), EPA believes that it is appropriate for EPA to interpret that language in the context of acting on the infrastructure SIPs for a given NAAQS. Because of the inherent ambiguity of the list of requirements in section 110(a)(2), EPA has adopted an approach in which it reviews infrastructure SIPs against this list of elements "as applicable." In other words, EPA assumes that Congress could not have intended that each and every SIP submission, regardless of the purpose of the submission or the NAAQS in question, would meet each of the requirements, or meet each of them in the same way. EPA elected to use guidance to make recommendations for infrastructure SIPs for these ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

On October 2, 2007, EPA issued guidance making recommendations for the infrastructure SIP submissions for both the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS and the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.¹¹ Within this guidance document, EPA described the duty of states to make these submissions to meet what the Agency characterized as the "infrastructure" elements for SIPs, which it further described as the "basic SIP requirements, including emissions inventories, monitoring, and modeling to assure attainment and maintenance of the standards."¹² As further identification of these basic structural SIP requirements, "attachment A" to the guidance document included a short description of the various elements of section 110(a)(2) and additional information about the types of issues that EPA considered germane in the context of such infrastructure SIPs. EPA emphasized that the description of the basic requirements listed on attachment A was not intended "to constitute an interpretation of" the requirements, and was merely a "brief description of the required elements."¹³ EPA also stated its belief that with one exception, these requirements were "relatively self explanatory, and past experience with SIPs for other NAAQS should enable States to meet these requirements with assistance from EPA Regions."¹⁴

¹¹ See "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8-hour Ozone and PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards," from William T. Harnett, Director Air Quality Policy Division, to Air Division Directors, Regions I–X, dated October 2, 2007 (the "2007 Guidance").

¹² *Id.*, at page 2.

¹³ *Id.*, at attachment A, page 1.

¹⁴ *Id.*, at page 4. In retrospect, the concerns raised by commenters with respect to EPA's approach to some substantive issues indicates that the statute is not so "self explanatory," and indeed is sufficiently ambiguous that EPA needs to interpret it in order to explain why these substantive issues do not need to be addressed in the context of infrastructure SIPs

However, for the one exception to that general assumption (*i.e.*, how states should proceed with respect to the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS), EPA gave much more specific recommendations. But for other infrastructure SIP submissions, and for certain elements of the submissions for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, EPA assumed that each State would work with its corresponding EPA regional office to refine the scope of a State's submittal based on an assessment of how the requirements of section 110(a)(2) should reasonably apply to the basic structure of the State's implementation plans for the NAAQS in question.

On September 25, 2009, EPA issued guidance to make recommendations to states with respect to the infrastructure SIPs for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.¹⁵ In the 2009 Guidance, EPA addressed a number of additional issues that were not germane to the infrastructure SIPs for the 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, but were germane to these SIP submissions for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS (e.g., the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) that EPA had bifurcated from the other infrastructure elements for those specific 1997 ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS). Significantly, neither the 2007 Guidance nor the 2009 Guidance explicitly referred to the SSM, director's discretion, minor source NSR, or NSR Reform issues as among specific substantive issues EPA expected states to address in the context of the infrastructure SIPs, nor did EPA give any more specific recommendations with respect to how states might address such issues even if they elected to do so. The SSM and director's discretion issues implicate section 110(a)(2)(A), and the minor source NSR and NSR Reform issues implicate section 110(a)(2)(C). In the 2007 Guidance and the 2009 Guidance, however, EPA did not indicate to states that it intended to interpret these provisions as requiring a substantive submission to address these specific issues in existing SIP provisions in the context of the infrastructure SIPs for these NAAQS. Instead, EPA's 2007 Guidance merely indicated its belief that the states should make submissions in which they established that they have the basic SIP structure necessary to implement, maintain, and enforce the

and may be addressed at other times and by other means.

¹⁵ See "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)," from William T. Harnett, Director Air Quality Policy Division, to Regional Air Division Directors, Regions I–X, dated September 25, 2009 (the "2009 Guidance").

⁹ EPA issued separate guidance to states with respect to SIP submissions to meet section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 1997 ozone and 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. See "Guidance for State Implementation Plan (SIP) Submissions to Meet Current Outstanding Obligations Under Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 8-Hour Ozone and PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards," from William T. Harnett, Director Air Quality Policy Division OAQPS, to Regional Air Division Director, Regions I–X, dated August 15, 2006.

¹⁰ For example, implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS required the deployment of a system of new monitors to measure ambient levels of that new indicator species for the new NAAQS.

NAAQS. EPA believes that states can establish that they have the basic SIP structure, notwithstanding that there may be potential deficiencies within the existing SIP. Thus, EPA's proposals for other states mentioned these issues not because the Agency considers them issues that must be addressed in the context of an infrastructure SIP as required by section 110(a)(1) and (2), but rather because EPA wanted to be clear that it considers these potential existing SIP problems as separate from the pending infrastructure SIP actions. The same holds true for this action on the infrastructure SIP for Florida.

EPA believes that this approach to the infrastructure SIP requirement is reasonable because it would not be feasible to read section 110(a)(1) and (2) to require a top to bottom, stem to stern, review of each and every provision of an existing SIP merely for purposes of assuring that the state in question has the basic structural elements for a functioning SIP for a new or revised NAAQS. Because SIPs have grown by accretion over the decades as statutory and regulatory requirements under the CAA have evolved, they may include some outmoded provisions and historical artifacts that, while not fully up to date, nevertheless may not pose a significant problem for the purposes of "implementation, maintenance, and enforcement" of a new or revised NAAQS when EPA considers the overall effectiveness of the SIP. To the contrary, EPA believes that a better approach is for EPA to determine which specific SIP elements from section 110(a)(2) are applicable to an infrastructure SIP for a given NAAQS, and to focus attention on those elements that are most likely to need a specific SIP revision in light of the new or revised NAAQS. Thus, for example, EPA's 2007 Guidance specifically directed states to focus on the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS because of the absence of underlying EPA regulations for emergency episodes for this NAAQS and an anticipated absence of relevant provisions in existing SIPs.

Finally, EPA believes that its approach is a reasonable reading of section 110(a)(1) and (2) because the statute provides other avenues and mechanisms to address specific substantive deficiencies in existing SIPs. These other statutory tools allow the Agency to take appropriate tailored action, depending upon the nature and severity of the alleged SIP deficiency. Section 110(k)(5) authorizes EPA to issue a "SIP call" whenever the Agency determines that a state's SIP is substantially inadequate to attain or maintain the NAAQS, to mitigate

interstate transport, or otherwise to comply with the CAA.¹⁶ Section 110(k)(6) authorizes EPA to correct errors in past actions, such as past approvals of SIP submissions.¹⁷ Significantly, EPA's determination that an action on the infrastructure SIP is not the appropriate time and place to address all potential existing SIP problems does not preclude the Agency's subsequent reliance on provisions in section 110(a)(2) as part of the basis for action at a later time. For example, although it may not be appropriate to require a state to eliminate all existing inappropriate director's discretion provisions in the course of acting on the infrastructure SIP, EPA believes that section 110(a)(2)(A) may be among the statutory bases that the Agency cites in the course of addressing the issue in a subsequent action.¹⁸

IV. What is EPA's analysis of how Florida addressed the elements of the Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) "infrastructure" provisions?

EPA is proposing to take four previously described actions in response to Florida's infrastructure SIP submission for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Below is a discussion of Florida's submission organized by each of the sub-elements found in sections 110(a)(1) and (2).

1. *110(a)(2)(A) Emission limits and other control measures:* There are several regulations within Florida's SIP relevant to air quality control regulations which include enforceable emission limitations and other control measures. Chapters 62–204, *Air*

¹⁶ EPA has recently issued a SIP call to rectify a specific SIP deficiency related to the SSM issue. See, "Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Utah State Implementation Plan Revision," 74 FR 21639 (April 18, 2011).

¹⁷ EPA has recently utilized this authority to correct errors in past actions on SIP submissions related to PSD programs. See "Limitation of Approval of Prevention of Significant Deterioration Provisions Concerning Greenhouse Gas Emitting-Sources in State Implementation Plans; Final Rule," 75 FR 82536 (December 30, 2010). EPA has previously used its authority under CAA 110(k)(6) to remove numerous other SIP provisions that the Agency determined it had approved in error. See 61 FR 38664 (July 25, 1996) and 62 FR 34641 (June 27, 1997) (corrections to American Samoa, Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada SIPs); 69 FR 67062 (November 16, 2004) (corrections to California SIP); and 74 FR 57051 (November 3, 2009) (corrections to Arizona and Nevada SIPs).

¹⁸ EPA has recently disapproved a SIP submission from Colorado on the grounds that it would have included a director's discretion provision inconsistent with CAA requirements, including section 110(a)(2)(A). See 75 FR 42342, 42344 (July 21, 2010) (proposed disapproval of director's discretion provisions); 76 FR 4540 (January 26, 2011) (final disapproval of such provisions).

Pollution Control Provisions; 62–210, Stationary Sources—General Requirements; and 62–296, Stationary Sources—Emissions Standards, establish emission limits for ozone and address the required control measures, means and techniques for compliance with the ozone NAAQS respectively. EPA has made the preliminary determination that the provisions contained in these chapters and Florida's practices are adequate to protect the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS in the State.

In this action, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing State provisions with regard to excess emissions during SSM of operations at a facility. EPA believes that a number of states have SSM provisions which are contrary to the CAA and existing EPA guidance, "State Implementation Plans: Policy Regarding Excess Emissions During Malfunctions, Startup, and Shutdown" (September 20, 1999), and the Agency plans to address such state regulations in the future. In the meantime, EPA encourages any state having a deficient SSM provision to take steps to correct it as soon as possible.

Additionally, in this action, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing State rules with regard to director's discretion or variance provisions. EPA believes that a number of states have such provisions which are contrary to the CAA and existing EPA guidance (52 FR 45109 (November 24, 1987)), and the Agency plans to take action in the future to address such state regulations. In the meantime, EPA encourages any state having a director's discretion or variance provision which is contrary to the CAA and EPA guidance to take steps to correct the deficiency as soon as possible.

2. *110(a)(2)(B) Ambient air quality monitoring/data system:* Chapters 62–204, *Air Pollution Control Provisions, 62–210, Stationary Sources—General Requirements, 62–212, Stationary Sources—Preconstruction Review, 62–296, Stationary Sources—Emissions Standards, and 62–297, Stationary Sources—Emissions Monitoring* of the Florida SIP, along with the Florida Network Description and Ambient Air Monitoring Network Plan, provide for an ambient air quality monitoring system in the State. Annually, EPA approves the ambient air monitoring network plan for the state agencies. In May 2011, Florida submitted its monitoring network plan to EPA, and on October 17, 2011, EPA approved this plan. Florida's approved monitoring network plan can be accessed at www.regulations.gov using Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2011–0809. EPA

has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices are adequate for the ambient air quality monitoring and data system related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

3. *110(a)(2)(C) Program for enforcement of control measures including review of proposed new sources:* Florida's authority to regulate new and modified sources of the ozone precursors volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) to assist in the protection of air quality in nonattainment, attainment or unclassifiable areas is established in Chapters 62–210, *Stationary Sources—General Requirements, Section 200—Definitions*, and 62–212, *Stationary Sources—Preconstruction Review, Section 400—Prevention of Significant Deterioration* of the Florida SIP. There are two recent revisions to the Florida SIP (including revisions to Chapters 62–210 and 62–212) that are necessary to meet the requirements of infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(C).

The first revision modifies provisions of Florida's SIP at Chapter 62–210 and 62–212 to recognize NO_x as an ozone precursor as required by the 1997 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS Implementation Rule New Source Review (NSR) Update—Phase 2 final rule (hereafter referred to as the “Ozone Implementation NSR Update” or “Phase 2 Rule”), among other requirements. See 70 FR 71612 (November 29, 2005).

On October 19, 2007, and July 1, 2011, DEP submitted revisions to EPA for approval into the Florida SIP to adopt federal requirements for new source review (NSR) permitting promulgated in the Phase 2 Rule. Both, the October 19, 2007, and July 1, 2011, SIP revisions amend the State's PSD regulations to establish that PSD permit applicants must identify NO_x as an ozone precursor as established in the Phase 2 Rule. In addition to meeting the requirements of the Ozone Implementation NSR Update, these revisions are also necessary to address portions of the infrastructure SIP requirements described at element 110(a)(2)(C). Specifically, these SIP revisions address the Ozone Implementation NSR Update requirements to include NO_x as an ozone precursor for permitting purposes. EPA is currently proposing approval of these provisions into the SIP in a separate action from this rulemaking. On March 23, 2012, the proposed rulemaking of Florida's October 19, 2007, and July 1, 2011, SIP revisions was signed by EPA Region 4.

The second revision pertains to revisions to the PSD program promulgated in EPA's June 3, 2010,

Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule or “GHG Tailoring Rule.” See 75 FR 31514.

Florida did not submit a SIP revision to adopt the appropriate emission thresholds for determining which new stationary sources and modification projects become subject to PSD permitting requirements for their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as promulgated in the GHG Tailoring Rule. Therefore, Florida's federally-approved SIP contained errors that resulted in its failure to address, or provide adequate legal authority for, the implementation of a GHG PSD program in Florida.

Approval of a revision to address GHGs is required to meet 110(a)(2)(C). In the GHG SIP Call,¹⁹ EPA determined that the State of Florida's SIP was substantially inadequate to achieve CAA requirements because its existing PSD program does not apply to GHG-emitting sources; the rule finalized a findings and SIP call for 15 state and local permitting authorities including Florida. EPA explained that if a state, identified in the SIP call, failed to submit the required corrective SIP revision by the applicable deadline, EPA would promulgate a FIP under CAA section 110(c)(1)(A) for that state to govern PSD permitting for GHGs. On December 30, 2010, EPA promulgated a FIP²⁰ because Florida failed to submit, by its December 22, 2010, deadline, the corrective SIP revision to apply its PSD program to sources of GHG consistent with the thresholds described in the GHG Tailoring rule. The FIP ensured that a permitting authority (i.e., EPA) would be available to issue preconstruction PSD permits to GHG-emitting sources in the State of Florida. EPA took these actions through interim final rulemaking, effective upon publication, to ensure the availability of a permitting authority—EPA—in Florida for GHG-emitting sources when they became subject to PSD on January 2, 2011.

Since Florida currently does not have adequate legal authority to address the new GHG PSD permitting requirements at or above the levels of emissions set in the GHG Tailoring Rule, or at other appropriate levels, its SIP does not satisfy portions of elements of the infrastructure requirements. As a result, EPA is proposing disapproval DEP's

submission for infrastructure elements 110(a)(2)(C) and 110(a)(2)(J) as they relate to GHG PSD permitting requirements. EPA's proposed disapproval of these elements does not result in any further obligation on the part of Florida, because EPA has already promulgated a FIP for the Florida PSD program to address permitting GHGs at or above the GHG Tailoring Rule thresholds (76 FR 25178). Thus, today's proposed action to disapprove DEP's submission for elements 110(a)(2)(C) and 110(a)(2)(J), once final, will not require any further action by either DEP or EPA.

Florida's October 19, 2007, and July 1, 2011, SIP revisions²¹ address the requisite requirements of infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(C) related to the Phase 2 Rule, therefore, today's action to propose approval of infrastructure SIP element 110(a)(2)(C) related to the Phase 2 Rule is contingent upon EPA is taking final action to approve each of those revisions into the Florida SIP.

Additionally, the FIP that is currently in place to address GHG requirements in Florida will remain until Florida submits a final submission to EPA for federal approval and EPA takes final action on the submission. Final action regarding today's proposed approval of infrastructure SIP element 110(a)(2)(C) will not occur prior to final approval of the pending related SIP revisions.

EPA also notes that today's action is not proposing to approve or disapprove the State's existing minor NSR program itself to the extent that it is inconsistent with EPA's regulations governing this program. EPA believes that a number of states may have minor NSR provisions that are contrary to the existing EPA regulations for this program. EPA intends to work with states to reconcile state minor NSR programs with EPA's regulatory provisions for the program. The statutory requirements of section 110(a)(2)(C) provide for considerable flexibility in designing minor NSR programs, and EPA believes it may be time to revisit the regulatory requirements for this program to give the states an appropriate level of flexibility to design a program that meets their particular air quality concerns, while assuring reasonable consistency across the country in protecting the NAAQS with respect to new and modified minor sources.

EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices are adequate for program enforcement of control measures

¹⁹ Action to Ensure Authority to Issue Permits Under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program to Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Finding of Substantial Inadequacy and SIP Call, Final Rule, 75 FR 77698 (December 13, 2010).

²⁰ Action to Ensure Authority to Issue Permits Under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program to Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Federal Implementation Plan—Final Rule, 75 FR 82246 (December 30, 2010).

²¹ This pertains to EPA's proposed approval of Florida's PSD/NSR regulations which address the Ozone Implementation NSR Update requirements.

including review of proposed new sources related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. For the portion of this element that EPA is disapproving related to GHG PSD permitting requirements, EPA has made the preliminary determination that the already promulgated FIP for Florida is adequate for program enforcement of control measures including review of proposed new sources related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

4. *110(a)(2)(D)(ii) Interstate and International transport provisions:* Chapter 62–210, *Stationary Sources—General Requirements* of Florida’s SIP, outlines how Florida will notify neighboring states of potential impacts from new or modified sources. Florida does not have any pending obligation under sections 115 and 126 of the CAA. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida’s SIP and practices are adequate for insuring compliance with the applicable requirements relating to interstate and international pollution abatement for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

5. *110(a)(2)(E) Adequate resources:* EPA is proposing two separate actions with respect to the sub-elements required pursuant to section 110(a)(2)(E). Section 110(a)(2)(E) requires that each implementation plan provide (i) necessary assurances that the State will have adequate personnel, funding, and authority under state law to carry out its implementation plan, (ii) that the State comply with the requirements respecting State Boards pursuant to section 128 of the Act, and (iii) necessary assurances that, where the State has relied on a local or regional government, agency, or instrumentality for the implementation of any plan provision, the State has responsibility for ensuring adequate implementation of such plan provisions. EPA is proposing to approve Florida’s SIP as meeting the requirements of sub-elements 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii). With respect to 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) (regarding state boards), EPA is proposing to conditionally approve this sub-element. EPA’s rationale for today’s proposals respecting each sub-element is described in turn below.

In support of EPA’s proposal to approve sub-elements 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii), EPA notes that DEP is responsible for promulgating rules and regulations for the NAAQS, emissions standards general policies, a system of permits, and fee schedules for the review of plans, and other planning needs. As evidence of the adequacy of DEP’s resources, EPA submitted a letter to Florida on March 13, 2012, outlining 105 grant commitments and the current

status of these commitments for fiscal year 2011. The letter EPA submitted to Florida can be accessed at www.regulations.gov using Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2011–0809. Annually, states update these grant commitments based on current SIP requirements, air quality planning, and applicable requirements related to the NAAQS. Florida satisfactorily met all commitments agreed to in the Air Planning Agreement for fiscal year 2011, therefore Florida’s grants were finalized and closed out.

As discussed above, with respect to sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), EPA is proposing to conditionally approve Florida’s infrastructure SIP as to this requirement. Florida’s December 13, 2007, infrastructure certification letter did not certify the adequacy of the State’s implementation plan to meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) (requiring state compliance with section 128 of the CAA), and presently Florida’s SIP does not include provisions to meet section 128 requirements. EPA is proposing to conditionally approve Florida’s infrastructure SIP with respect to element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) based upon a letter dated March 13, 2012, which outlined DEP’s commitment to adopt specific enforceable measures into its SIP within one year to address the applicable portions of section 128.

The section 128(a)(1) State Board requirements—as applicable to the infrastructure SIP pursuant to section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii)—provide that each SIP shall require that any board or body which approves permits or enforcement orders shall be subject to the described public interest and income restrictions therein. Subsection 128(a)(2) requires that any board or body, or the head of an executive agency with similar power to approve permits or enforcement orders under the CAA, shall also be subject to conflict of interest disclosure requirements. EPA’s proposed conditional approval of Florida’s 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) infrastructure SIP requires the State to adopt specific enforceable measures related to 128(a)(2) to address current deficiencies in the Florida SIP.

For purposes of section 128(a)(1), Florida has no boards or bodies with authority over air pollution permits or enforcement actions. Such matters are instead handled by an appointed Secretary. Appeals of final administrative orders and permits are available only through the judicial appellate process described at Florida Statute 120.68. As such, a “board or body” is not responsible for approving permits or enforcement orders in

Florida, and the requirements of section 128(a)(1) are not applicable.

Regarding section 128(a)(2) (also made applicable to the infrastructure SIP pursuant to section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii)), Florida has committed to submit for incorporation into the SIP relevant provisions of Florida Statutes, specifically 112.3143(4) and 112.3144, sufficient to satisfy the conflict of interest provisions applicable to the head of DEP and all public officers within the Department.

In accordance with section 110(k)(4) of the CAA, the commitment from Florida must provide that the State will adopt the specified enforceable provisions, and provide a SIP submission to EPA, by a date certain within one year from EPA’s final action in this matter. In Florida’s letter, dated March 13, 2012, DEP committed to adopt the specified enforceable provisions by October 31, 2012. Failure by the State to adopt these provisions and submit them to EPA for incorporation into the SIP within one year from the effective date of EPA’s final conditional approval action would result in this proposed conditional approval being treated as a disapproval. Should that occur, EPA would provide the public with notice of such a disapproval in the **Federal Register**.²²

As a result of Florida’s formal commitment to correct deficiencies contained in the Florida SIP pertaining to section 128, EPA intends to move forward with finalizing the conditional approval consistent with section 110(k)(4) of the Act. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida has adequate resources for implementation of the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

6. *110(a)(2)(F) Stationary source monitoring system:* Florida’s infrastructure submission describes how the State establishes requirements for emissions compliance testing and utilizes emissions sampling and analysis. It further describes how the State ensures the quality of its data through observing emissions and monitoring operations. Florida DEP uses these data to track progress towards maintaining the NAAQS, develop control and maintenance strategies, identify sources and general emission levels, and determine compliance with emission regulations and additional EPA requirements. These requirements are provided in Chapters 62–210,

²² EPA notes that pursuant to section 110(k)(4), a conditional approval is treated as a disapproval in the event that a State fails to comply with its commitment. Notification of this disapproval action in the **Federal Register** is not subject to public notice and comment.

Stationary Sources—General Requirements; 62–212, *Stationary Sources—Preconstruction Review*; 62–296, *Stationary Sources—Emissions Standards*; and 62–297, *Stationary Sources—Emissions Monitoring*.

Additionally, Florida is required to submit emissions data to EPA for purposes of the National Emissions Inventory (NEI). The NEI is EPA's central repository for air emissions data. EPA published the Air Emissions Reporting Rule (AERR) on December 5, 2008, which modified the requirements for collecting and reporting air emissions data (73 FR 76539). The AERR shortened the time states had to report emissions data from 17 to 12 months, giving states one calendar year to submit emissions data. All states are required to submit a comprehensive emissions inventory every three years and report emissions for certain larger sources annually through EPA's online Emissions Inventory System. States report emissions data for the six criteria pollutants and the precursors that form them—nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, ammonia, lead, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and volatile organic compounds. Many states also voluntarily report emissions of hazardous air pollutants. Florida made its latest update to the NEI on November 22, 2011. EPA compiles the emissions data, supplementing it where necessary, and releases it to the general public through the Web site <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/eiinformation.html>. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices are adequate for the stationary source monitoring systems related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

7. *110(a)(2)(G) Emergency power*: On March 27, 2008, EPA published a final rulemaking entitled, "Completeness Findings for Section 110(a) State Implementation Plans; 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS," making a finding as to whether each state had submitted or failed to submit a complete SIP that provided the basic program elements of section 110(a)(2) necessary to implement the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. See 73 FR 16205. Florida was among other states that received a finding of failure to submit because its infrastructure submission was deemed incomplete for element 110(a)(2)(G) for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS by March 1, 2008. The finding of failure to submit action triggered a 24-month clock for EPA to either issue a FIP or take final action on a SIP revision which corrects the deficiency for which the finding of failure to submit was received. See 42 U.S.C. 7410(c)(1).

In DEP's December 13, 2007, submission and a letter dated April 18, 2008, DEP cited State statutes as evidence that Florida has the authority to implement emergency powers for the 8-hour ozone standard. The April 18, 2008, letter DEP sent to EPA, which includes the specific State statutes cited by DEP, can be accessed at www.regulations.gov using Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0809. Because these statutes have not been adopted into the federally-approved SIP, EPA is proposing a FIP to correct this deficiency. EPA has preliminarily determined that the cited statutes are sufficient to meet the requirements of section 303 of the CAA thus meet the requirements of element 110(a)(2)(G). Through this action, EPA is proposing use of the following parts of Florida's statutes as part of a FIP, to meet the "emergency powers" requirements described at section 110(a)(2)(G) for Florida:

a. *Injunctive relief, remedies.*—

The department may institute a civil action in a court of competent jurisdiction to seek injunctive relief to enforce compliance with this chapter or any rule, regulation, permit certification, or order; to enjoin any violation specified in s. 403.161(1); and to seek injunctive relief to prevent irreparable injury to the air, waters, and property, including animal, plant, and aquatic life, of the state and to protect human health, safety, and welfare caused or threatened by any violation.

b. *Decisions which affect substantial interests.*—

If an agency head finds that an immediate danger to the public health, safety, or welfare requires an immediate final order, it shall recite with particularity the facts underlying such finding in the final order, which shall be appealable or enjoined from the date rendered.

In a letter dated, March 23, 2012, DEP committed to submit a SIP revision correcting deficiencies in the SIP for element 110(a)(2)(G). EPA intends to approve a FIP for element 110(a)(2)(G) unless Florida submits a SIP revision correcting the deficiency for element 110(a)(2)(G). Due to EPA's obligations pursuant to the infrastructure SIP settlement agreement described above, EPA would need to take final action to approve such a SIP revision prior to the date on which EPA is obligated to take final action.²³ Should final approval of a SIP revision related to emergency

powers occur after EPA finalizes a FIP for element 110(a)(2)(G), EPA would act to rescind the FIP at that time.

EPA has made the preliminary determination that the proposed FIP for Florida, as outlined above, is adequate for emergency powers related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

8. *110(a)(2)(H) Future SIP revisions*: DEP is responsible for adopting air quality rules and revising SIPs as needed to attain or maintain the NAAQS in Florida. DEP has the ability and authority to respond to calls for SIP revisions, and has provided a number of SIP revisions over the years for implementation of the NAAQS. Florida does not have any nonattainment areas for the 1997 8-hour ozone standard but has made an infrastructure submission for this standard, which is the subject of this rulemaking. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate a commitment to provide future SIP revisions related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

9. *110(a)(2)(J) (121 consultation) Consultation with government officials*: Chapters 62–204, *Air Pollution Control Provisions* and 62–212, *Stationary Sources—Preconstruction Review*, as well as Florida's Regional Haze Implementation Plan (which allows for consultation between appropriate state, local, and tribal air pollution control agencies as well as the corresponding Federal Land Managers), provide for consultation with government officials whose jurisdictions might be affected by SIP development activities. Florida adopted state-wide consultation procedures for the implementation of transportation conformity. These consultation procedures include considerations associated with the development of mobile inventories for SIPs. Implementation of transportation conformity as outlined in the consultation procedures requires DEP to consult with federal, state and local transportation and air quality agency officials on the development of motor vehicle emissions budgets. EPA approved Florida's consultation procedures on August 11, 2003 (See 68 FR 47468). EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with government officials related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

10. *110(a)(2)(J) (127 public notification) Public notification*: DEP has public notice mechanisms in place to notify the public of ozone and other pollutant forecasting, including an air quality monitoring Web site providing ground level ozone alerts, <http://>

²³ To facilitate an expeditious remedy to this deficiency, upon request of the State, EPA will parallel process such a SIP submittal. See 40 CFR part 51, Appendix V.

www.dep.state.fl.us/air/air_quality/countyqi.htm. Florida also has state statutes, 403.131 *Injunctive relief, remedies* and 120.569(n) (relating to emergency orders) which allows the state to seek injunctive relief to prevent irreparable damage to air quality and federally approved provisions to monitor air pollution episodes for ozone and particulate matter contained in Chapter 62–256.300 *Prohibitions*. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to provide public notification related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

11. 110(a)(2)(J) (PSD) PSD and visibility protection: Florida's authority to regulate new and modified sources of ozone precursors VOCs and NO_x to assist in the protection of air quality in nonattainment, attainment or unclassifiable areas is provided for in Chapters 62–210, *Stationary Sources—General Requirements, Section 200—Definitions*, and 62–212, *Stationary Sources—Preconstruction Review, Section 400—Prevention of Significant Deterioration*. As with infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(C), infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(J) also requires compliance with applicable provisions of the PSD program described in Part C of the Act. Accordingly, the GHG Tailoring Rule revisions to Florida's SIP and pending EPA actions on the Ozone Implementation NSR Update are likewise prerequisites to today's proposed action to approve the State's infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(J). See the discussion for element 110(a)(2)(C) above for a description of these pending revisions to the Florida SIP respecting the Ozone Implementation NSR Update.

The second revision pertains to revisions to the PSD program promulgated in the June 3, 2010, GHG Tailoring Rule (75 FR 31514). Florida did not submit a SIP revision to adopt the appropriate emission thresholds for determining which new stationary sources and modification projects become subject to PSD permitting requirements for their GHG emissions as promulgated in the GHG Tailoring Rule. Therefore, Florida's federally-approved SIP contained errors that resulted in its failure to address, or provide adequate legal authority for, the implementation of a GHG PSD program in Florida. Approval of a revision to address GHGs is required to meet 110(a)(2)(J).

Since Florida currently does not have adequate legal authority to address the new GHG PSD permitting requirements at or above the levels of emissions set in the GHG Tailoring Rule, or at other appropriate levels, its SIP does not

satisfy portions of elements of the infrastructure requirements. As a result, EPA is proposing disapproval of DEP's submission for infrastructure elements 110(a)(2)(C) and 110(a)(2)(J) as they relate to GHG PSD permitting requirements. EPA's proposed disapproval of these elements does not result in any further action, because EPA has already promulgated a FIP for the Florida PSD program to address permitting GHGs at or above the GHG Tailoring Rule thresholds (76 FR 25178). See the discussion for element 110(a)(2)(C) above for a description of the FIP related to GHG PSD permitting requirements in Florida.

Both of the previously discussed proposed Ozone Implementation NSR Update SIP revisions²⁴ address requisite requirements of infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(J), therefore, today's action to propose approval of infrastructure SIP element 110(a)(2)(J) is contingent upon EPA taking final action to approve each of these pending revisions into the Florida SIP. The FIP that is currently in place to address GHG requirements in Florida will remain until Florida submits a final submission to EPA for federal approval and EPA takes final action on the submission. Final action regarding today's proposed approval of infrastructure SIP element 110(a)(2)(J) (PSD and visibility protection) will not occur prior to final approval of the pending related SIP revisions.

EPA also notes that today's action is not proposing to approve or disapprove the State's existing minor NSR program itself to the extent that it is inconsistent with EPA's regulations governing this program. EPA believes that a number of states may have minor NSR provisions that are contrary to the existing EPA regulations for this program. EPA intends to work with states to reconcile state minor NSR programs with EPA's regulatory provisions for the program. The statutory requirements of section 110(a)(2)(J) provide for considerable flexibility in designing minor NSR programs, and EPA believes it may be time to revisit the regulatory requirements for this program to give the states an appropriate level of flexibility to design a program that meets their particular air quality concerns, while assuring reasonable consistency across the country in protecting the NAAQS with respect to new and modified minor sources.

With regard to the applicable requirements for visibility protection,

EPA recognizes that states are subject to visibility and regional haze program requirements under part C of the Act (which includes sections 169A and 169B). In the event of the establishment of a new NAAQS, however, the visibility and regional haze program requirements under Part C do not change. Thus, EPA finds that there is no new visibility obligation "triggered" under section 110(a)(2)(J) when a new NAAQS becomes effective. This would be the case even in the event a secondary PM_{2.5} NAAQS for visibility is established, because this NAAQS would not affect visibility requirements under part C. Florida has submitted SIP revisions for approval to satisfy the requirements of the CAA Section 169A and 169B, and the regional haze and best available retrofit technology rules contained in 40 CFR 51.308. These revisions are currently under review and will be acted on in a separate action.

EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to implement PSD programs and to provide for visibility protection related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary. For the portion of this element that EPA is disapproving related to GHG PSD permitting requirements, EPA has made the preliminary determination that the promulgated FIP for Florida is adequate for program enforcement of control measures including review of proposed new sources related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

12. 110(a)(2)(K) Air quality and modeling/data: Chapter 62–204.800, *Federal Regulations Adopted by Reference*, incorporates by reference 40 CFR 52.21(l), which specifies that air modeling be conducted in accordance with 40 CFR part 51, Appendix W "Guideline on Air Quality Models." These regulations demonstrate that Florida has the authority to provide relevant data for the purpose of predicting the effect on ambient air quality of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Additionally, Florida supports a regional effort to coordinate the development of emissions inventories and conduct regional modeling for several NAAQS, including the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS, for the Southeastern states. Taken as a whole, Florida's air quality regulations demonstrate that DEP has the authority to provide relevant data for the purpose of predicting the effect on ambient air quality of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the

²⁴ This pertains to EPA's proposed approval of Florida's PSD/NSR regulations which address the Ozone Implementation NSR Update requirements.

State's ability to provide for air quality and modeling, along with analysis of the associated data, related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

13. 110(a)(2)(L) Permitting fees:

Florida addresses the review of construction permits as previously discussed in 110(a)(2)(C). Permitting fees in Florida are collected through the State's federally-approved title V fees program, according to State regulation 403.087(6)(a) *Permit Fees*. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices adequately provide for permitting fees related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

14. 110(a)(2)(M) Consultation/participation by affected local entities: Chapter 62–204, *Air Pollution Control Provisions*, requires that SIPs be submitted in accordance with 40 CFR part 51, Subpart F, for permitting purposes. Florida statute 403.061(21) authorizes DEP to “[a]dvise, consult, cooperate and enter into agreements with other agencies of the state, the Federal Government, other states, interstate agencies, groups, political subdivisions, and industries affected by the provisions of this act, rules, or policies of the department.”

Furthermore, DEP has demonstrated consultation with, and participation by, affected local entities through its work with local political subdivisions during the developing of its Transportation Conformity SIP and Regional Haze Implementation Plan. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Florida's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with affected local entities related to the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

V. Proposed Action

As described above, EPA has addressed the elements of the CAA 110(a)(1) and (2) SIP requirements pursuant to EPA's October 2, 2007, guidance to ensure that the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS are implemented, enforced, and maintained in Florida. EPA is now proposing four related actions on Florida's December 13, 2007, submission as supplemented on April 18, 2008. First, EPA is proposing to approve Florida's infrastructure submission for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS, with the specific exceptions as follows. Second, EPA is proposing a FIP to address 110(a)(G) for the 1997 8-hour ozone standard. EPA notes that the proposed FIP will not be necessary if EPA receives, and is able to take action on, a SIP revision to address the 110(a)(2)(G) requirements prior to the Agency's obligation to take final action per the terms of a settlement agreement

related to this action. Third, EPA is proposing to disapprove Florida's submission for portions of elements 110(a)(2)(C) and 110(a)(2)(J) related to the regulation of GHG emissions. Fourth, EPA is proposing to conditionally approve sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) related to section 128 of the CAA.

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, 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 CAA. Accordingly, this proposed 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 proposed 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 CAA; 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 proposed 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.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: March 30, 2012.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2012–9225 Filed 4–17–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R9–OAR–2011–0130; FRL–9661–4]

State of Nevada; Regional Haze State and Federal Implementation Plans; BART Determination for Reid Gardner Generating Station

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Announcement of public hearing.

SUMMARY: EPA is holding a public hearing on May 3, 2012 for the proposed rule, “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Nevada; Regional Haze State and Federal Implementation Plans; BART Determination for Reid Gardner Generating Station.”

DATES: The public hearing will be held on May 3, 2012.

ADDRESSES: We will hold a public hearing at Moapa Valley Empowerment High School, 2400 St. Joseph Street, Overton, Nevada 89040. The hearing will begin at 6:30 p.m. and continue until 8:30 p.m., if necessary. An open house will precede the public hearing at the same location from 5 p.m.–6 p.m. The EPA Region 9 Web site for the rulemaking, which includes the proposal and information about the public hearing, is at <http://www.epa.gov/region9/air/actions/nv.html#reid>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about the public