

alternate standard will achieve a level of security and integrity sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the standard it is to replace.

(2) For each enumerated standard for which the TGRA approves an alternate standard, it must submit to the Chair within 30 days, a detailed report, which must include the following:

(i) An explanation of how the alternate standard achieves a level of security and integrity sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the standard it is to replace; and

(ii) The alternate standard as approved and the record on which the approval is based.

(3) In the event that the TGRA or the tribe's government chooses to submit an alternate standard request directly to the Chair for joint government to government review, the TGRA or tribal government may do so without the approval requirement set forth in paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

(b) *Chair Review.*

(1) The Chair may approve or object to an alternate standard granted by a TGRA.

(2) Any objection by the Chair must be in written form with an explanation why the alternate standard as approved by the TGRA does not provide a level of security or integrity sufficient to accomplish the purpose of the standard it is to replace.

(3) If the Chair fails to approve or object in writing within 60 days after the date of receipt of a complete submission, the alternate standard is considered approved by the Chair. The Chair may, upon notification to the TGRA, extend this deadline an additional 60 days.

(4) No alternate standard may be implemented until it has been approved by the TGRA pursuant to paragraph (a)(1) of this section or the Chair has approved pursuant to paragraph (b)(1) of this section.

(c) *Appeal of Chair decision.* A Chair's decision may be appealed pursuant to 25 CFR subchapter H.

Dated this 22nd of May 2012.

**Tracie L. Stevens,**  
*Chairwoman.*

**Steffani A. Cochran,**  
*Vice-Chairwoman.*

**Daniel J. Little,**  
*Commissioner.*

[FR Doc. 2012-12992 Filed 5-31-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7565-01-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R10-OAR-2010-0912; FRL-9680-2]

### Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Oregon

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Oregon (the State) on October 6, 2010, and an August 31, 2011, supplementary letter, for the purpose of establishing transportation conformity criteria and procedures related to interagency consultation, and enforceability of certain transportation related control and mitigation measures.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before July 2, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R10-OAR-2010-0912, by one of the following methods:

- *www.regulations.gov.*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- *Mail:* Claudia Vergnani Vaupel, U.S. EPA Region 10, Office of Air, Waste, and Toxics (AWT-107), 1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, Seattle, Washington 98101

- *Hand Delivery:* US EPA Region 10 Mailroom, 9th Floor, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101. Attention: Claudia Vergnani Vaupel, Office of Air Waste, and Toxics (AWT-107). Such deliveries are only accepted during normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

**Instructions:** Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-R10-OAR-2010-0912. The 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 information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through *www.regulations.gov* or email. The *www.regulations.gov* Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means the 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 the 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, the 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 the EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, the EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

**Docket:** 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 during normal business hours at the Office of Air, Waste and Toxics, EPA Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Claudia Vergnani Vaupel at telephone number: (206) 553-6121, email address: *vaupel.claudia@epa.gov*, or the above EPA, Region 10 address.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document whenever "we," "us," or "our" is used, we mean the EPA. Information is organized as follows:

#### Table of Contents

- I. What is the purpose of this action?
- II. What is the background for this proposed action?
- III. What is the State's process to submit SIP revisions to EPA?
- IV. What is EPA's analysis of Oregon's SIP revision?
- V. Proposed Action
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. What is the purpose of this action?

EPA is proposing to approve revisions to Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR), Division 252 "Transportation Conformity" of the Oregon SIP that address the requirements of section 176 of the CAA and 40 CFR 51.390(b). By approving these revisions to OAR Division 252, EPA is making them part of the federally enforceable SIP for Oregon under the CAA.

## II. What is the background for this proposed action?

Transportation conformity is required under section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) to ensure that federally supported highway, transit projects, and other activities are consistent with (“conform to”) the purpose of the SIP. Transportation conformity currently applies to areas that are designated nonattainment, and to areas that have been redesignated to attainment after 1990 (maintenance areas) with plans developed under section 175A of the Act, for the following transportation related criteria pollutants: Ozone, particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>), carbon monoxide, and nitrogen dioxide.

Conformity to the purpose of the SIP means that transportation activities will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the relevant criteria pollutants, also known as national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The transportation conformity regulation is found in 40 CFR 93 and provisions related to transportation conformity SIPs are found in 40 CFR 51.390.

EPA promulgated the Federal transportation conformity criteria and procedures (“Transportation Conformity Rule”) on November 24, 1993 (58 FR 62188). On August 10, 2005, the “Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users” (SAFETEA-LU) was signed into law. SAFETEA-LU revised section 176(c) of the CAA transportation conformity provisions. One of the changes streamlines the requirements for conformity SIPs. Under SAFETEA-LU, states are required to address and tailor only three sections of the rules in their conformity SIPs: 40 CFR 93.105, 40 CFR 93.122(a)(4)(ii), and, 40 CFR 93.125(c). In general, states are no longer required to submit conformity SIP revisions that address the other sections of the conformity rule. These changes took effect on August 10, 2005, when SAFETEA-LU was signed into law. Oregon’s SIP revision updates the State’s transportation conformity provisions, OAR Division 252, to be consistent with the CAA as amended by SAFETEA-LU and EPA regulations (40 CFR Part 93 and 40 CFR 51.390). Oregon’s SIP revision also adds a provision that requires approval by the air quality agency in order for an MPO to shorten the timeframe of a conformity determination (OAR–340–252–0070).

## III. What is the State’s process to submit SIP revisions to EPA?

Section 110(k) of the CAA addresses EPA’s process to act on State submissions that would revise a SIP. The CAA requires States to observe certain procedural requirements in developing SIP revisions for submittal to us. Section 110(a)(2) of the CAA requires that each SIP revision be adopted after reasonable notice and public hearing. This must occur prior to the revision being submitted by a State to us.

The submission includes evidence that the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) provided adequate public notice of the revisions to OAR 340, Division 252 and held a public hearing on November 23, 2009. The Oregon Department of Transportation submitted comments on three aspects of the proposed rules and ODEQ provided a response on December 4, 2009. This SIP revision became State effective on February 18, 2010, and was submitted to EPA on October 6, 2010.

## IV. What is EPA’s analysis of Oregon’s SIP revision?

EPA has evaluated this SIP submission and finds that the State has addressed the requirements of the Federal transportation conformity rule as described in 40 CFR Part 51, Subpart T and 40 CFR Part 93, Subpart A. The transportation conformity rule requires the states to develop their own processes and procedures for interagency consultation and resolution of conflicts meeting the criteria in 40 CFR 93.105. The SIP revision must include processes and procedures to be followed by the MPO, state DOT, and U.S. DOT in consulting with the state and local air quality agencies and EPA before making transportation conformity determinations. The transportation conformity SIP must also include processes and procedures for the state and local air quality agencies and EPA to coordinate the development of applicable SIPs with MPOs, state DOTs, and U.S. DOT, and requires written commitments to control measures and mitigation measures.

EPA has reviewed the submittal to assure consistency with the CAA as amended by SAFETEA-LU and EPA regulations (40 CFR Part 93 and 40 CFR 51.390) governing state procedures for transportation conformity and interagency consultation and has concluded that the submittal is approvable with the exception of an example in OAR–340–252–0070 for shortening the conformity timeframe.

Details of our review are set forth in a technical support document (TSD), which has been included in the docket for this action. Specifically, in the TSD, we identify how the submitted procedures, as clarified by the State’s August 31, 2011, supplementary letter, satisfy our requirements under 40 CFR 93.105 for interagency consultation with respect to the development of transportation plans and programs, SIPs, and conformity determinations, the resolution of conflicts, and the provision of adequate public consultation, and our requirements under 40 CFR 93.122(a)(4)(ii) and 93.125(c) for enforceability of control measures and mitigation measures.

## V. Proposed Action

EPA is proposing approval of the SIP revision that was submitted by the State of Oregon on October 6, 2010. The SIP revision updates OAR, Division 252 “Transportation Conformity” of the Oregon SIP so as to meet the Federal transportation conformity consultation requirements as described in section 176 of the CAA 42 U.S.C. 7506 and in 40 CFR 51.390(b), 40 CFR 93.105(a) through (e), 40 CFR 93.122(a)(4)(ii), and 40 CFR 125(c).

## VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, the EPA’s role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. 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 Clean Air Act; and

- Does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, this rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the SIP is not approved to apply in Indian country located in the state, and EPA notes that it will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

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

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

Dated: May 22, 2012.

**Dennis J. McLerran,**  
Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2012-13344 Filed 5-31-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0236; FRL-9670-9]

#### Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve a revision to the South Coast Air Quality Management District portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns particulate

matter (PM) emissions from cement manufacturing facilities. We are proposing to approve a local rule to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** Any comments on this proposal must arrive by July 2, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2012,0236, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:*

[www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). Follow the on-line instructions.

2. *Email:* [steckel.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:steckel.andrew@epa.gov).

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

**Instructions:** All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or email.

[www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) is an “anonymous access” system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send email directly to EPA, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

**Docket:** Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christine Vineyard, EPA Region IX,

(415) 947-4125,  
[vineyard.christine@epa.gov](mailto:vineyard.christine@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** *This proposal addresses the following local rule: SCAQMD Rule 1156, Further Reductions of Particulate Emissions from Cement Manufacturing Facilities.* In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, we are approving this local rule in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe these SIP revisions are not controversial. If we receive adverse comments, however, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in subsequent action based on this proposed rule. Please note that if we receive adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, we may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, please see the direct final action.

Dated: April 24, 2012.

**Jared Blumenfeld,**  
Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2012-13302 Filed 5-31-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### 50 CFR Part 17

[Docket No. FWS-R1-ES-2011-0112; 4500030114]

RIN 1018-AX69

#### Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Critical Habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*)

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; availability of supplementary documents.

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce the availability of a draft economic analysis of the proposed revised designation of critical habitat for the northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Also, a draft environmental assessment of this proposed action will