

in tabletop applications and powdered beverage mixes.

**DATES:** Submit either electronic or written comments on the petitioner's environmental assessment by November 26, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit electronic comments to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Submit written comments to the Division of Dockets Management (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Felicia M. Ellison, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS-265), Food and Drug Administration, 5100 Paint Branch Pkwy., College Park, MD 20740-3835, 240-402-1264.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In a notice published in the *Federal Register* of July 21, 2009 (74 FR 35871), FDA announced that a food additive petition (FAP 9A4778) had been filed by Ajinomoto Co., Inc., c/o Ajinomoto Corporate Services LLC, 1120 Connecticut Ave. NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20036 (now c/o Ajinomoto North America, Inc., 400 Kelby St., Fort Lee, NJ 07024). In the notice of filing, FDA announced that the petitioner proposed that the food additive regulations in part 172 *Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption* (21 CFR part 172) be amended to provide for the safe use of N-[N-(3-(3-hydroxy-4-methoxyphenyl) propyl- $\alpha$ -aspartyl)-L-phenylalanine 1-methyl ester, monohydrate (CAS Reg. No. 714229-20-6) as a non-nutritive sweetener in tabletop applications and powdered beverage mixes. The petition was filed under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 348).

Subsequent to publication of the filing notice, Ajinomoto Co., Inc., amended its petition to provide for the safe use of N-[N-(3-(3-hydroxy-4-methoxyphenyl) propyl- $\alpha$ -aspartyl)-L-phenylalanine 1-methyl ester, monohydrate as a non-nutritive sweetener and flavor enhancer in foods generally, except meat and poultry. Therefore, FDA is amending the filing notice of July 21, 2009, to indicate that the petitioner has proposed that the food additive regulations in part 172 be amended to provide for the use of N-[N-(3-(3-hydroxy-4-methoxyphenyl) propyl- $\alpha$ -aspartyl)-L-phenylalanine 1-methyl ester, monohydrate (proposed additive name Advantame, CAS Reg. No. 714229-20-6), as a non-nutritive sweetener and flavor enhancer in foods generally, except meat and poultry.

The potential environmental impact of this petition is being reviewed. To encourage public participation

consistent with regulation issued under the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1501.4(b)), the Agency is placing the environmental assessment submitted with the petition that is the subject of this notice on public display at the Division of Dockets Management (see **DATES** and **ADDRESSES**) for public review and comment.

Interested persons may submit either written comments regarding this document to the Division of Dockets Management (see **ADDRESSES**) or electronic comments to <http://www.regulations.gov>. It is only necessary to send one set of comments. Identify comments with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document. Received comments may be seen in the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, and will be posted to the docket at <http://www.regulations.gov>. FDA will also place on public display any amendments to, or comments on, the petitioner's environmental assessment without further announcement in the *Federal Register*. If, based on its review, the Agency finds that an environmental impact statement is not required, and this petition results in a regulation, the notice of availability of the Agency's finding of no significant impact and the evidence supporting that finding will be published with the regulation in the *Federal Register* in accordance with 21 CFR 25.51(b).

Dated: October 22, 2012.

**Dennis M. Keefe,**

*Director, Office of Food Additive Safety,  
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition.*  
[FR Doc. 2012-26315 Filed 10-25-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4160-01-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0537; FRL-9744-5]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Delaware County (Muncie), Indiana Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision To Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve Indiana's request to revise the Delaware County, Indiana 1997 8-hour ozone maintenance air quality State Implementation Plan (SIP) by replacing

the previously approved motor vehicle emissions budgets (budgets) with budgets developed using EPA's Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES) 2010a emissions model. Indiana submitted this request to EPA for parallel processing with a letter dated June 15, 2012, and followed up with a final submittal after the State public comment period ended on July 18, 2012.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before November 26, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0537, by one of the following methods:

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

2. *Email*: [blakley.pamela@epa.gov](mailto:blakley.pamela@epa.gov).

3. *Fax*: (312) 692-2450.

4. *Mail*: Pamela Blakley, Chief, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

5. *Hand Delivery*: Pamela Blakley, Chief, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The Regional Office official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

*Instructions:* Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0537. 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](http://www.regulations.gov), including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or email. The [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an email comment directly to EPA without going through [www.regulations.gov](http://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 instructions on submitting comments, go to section I of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

*Docket:* All documents in the docket are listed in the [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) index. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. This facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. We recommend that you telephone Patricia Morris, Environmental Scientist, at (312) 353-8656 before visiting the Region 5 office.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Patricia Morris, Environmental Scientist, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-8656, [patricia.morris@epa.gov](mailto:patricia.morris@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

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

- I. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?
- II. What action is EPA proposing to take?
- III. What is the background for this action?
  - a. SIP Budgets and Transportation Conformity
  - b. Prior Approval of Budgets
  - c. The MOVES Emissions Model and Regional Transportation Conformity Grace Period
  - d. Submission of New Budgets Based on MOVES2010a
- IV. What are the criteria for approval?
- V. What is EPA’s analysis of the state’s submittal?
  - a. The Revised Inventories
  - b. Approvability of the MOVES2010a-based Budgets
  - c. Applicability of MOBILE6.2-based Budgets

- VI. What action is EPA taking?
- VII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?**

When submitting comments, remember to:

1. Identify the rulemaking by docket number and other identifying information (subject heading, **Federal Register** date, and page number).
2. Follow directions—EPA may ask you to respond to specific questions or organize comments by referencing a Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part or section number.
3. Explain why you agree or disagree; suggest alternatives and substitute language for your requested changes.
4. Describe any assumptions and provide any technical information and/or data that you used.
5. If you estimate potential costs or burdens, explain how you arrived at your estimate in sufficient detail to allow for it to be reproduced.
6. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns, and suggest alternatives.
7. Explain your views as clearly as possible, avoiding the use of profanity or personal threats.
8. Make sure to submit your comments by the comment period

**II. What action is EPA proposing to take?**

EPA is proposing to approve new MOVES2010a-based budgets for the Delaware County, Indiana 1997 8-hour ozone maintenance area. The Delaware County, Indiana area was redesignated to attainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone standard effective January 3, 2006, (70 FR 69443) and the MOBILE6.2-based budgets were approved in that action. If EPA finalizes this proposed approval, the newly submitted MOVES2010a-based budgets will replace the existing, MOBILE6.2-based budgets in the State’s 1997 8-hour ozone maintenance plan and must then be used in future transportation conformity analyses for the area. At that time, the previously approved MOBILE6 budgets would no longer be applicable for transportation conformity purposes.

If EPA approves the MOVES2010a-based budgets, the Delaware County 1997 8-hour ozone maintenance area must use the MOVES2010a-based budgets starting on the effective date of the final approval. See the official release of the MOVES2010 emissions model (75 FR 9411) for background and section III. (c) below for details.

**III. What is the background for this action?**

*a. SIP Budgets and Transportation Conformity*

Under the Clean Air Act (CAA), states are required to submit, at various times, control strategy SIP revisions and maintenance plans for nonattainment and maintenance areas for a given National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). These emission control strategy SIP revisions (e.g., Reasonable Further Progress (RFP) and attainment demonstration SIP revisions) and maintenance plans include budgets of on-road mobile source emissions for criteria pollutants and/or their precursors to address pollution from cars, trucks and other on-road vehicles. These mobile source SIP budgets are the portions of the total emissions that are allocated to on-road vehicle use that, together with emissions from other sources in the area, will provide for attainment or maintenance if they are not exceeded. The budget serves as a ceiling on emissions from an area’s planned transportation system. For more information about budgets, see the preamble to the November 24, 1993, transportation conformity rule (58 FR 62188).

Under section 176(c) of the CAA, transportation plans, Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs), and transportation projects must “conform” to (i.e., be consistent with) the SIP before they can be adopted or approved. Conformity to the SIP means that transportation activities will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing air quality violations, or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS or delay an interim milestone. The transportation conformity regulations can be found at 40 CFR parts 51, Subpart T, and 93.

In general, before budgets can be used in conformity determinations, EPA must affirmatively find the budgets adequate. However, budgets that are replacing approved budgets must be found adequate and approved before budgets can replace older budgets. If the submitted SIP budgets are meant to replace budgets for the same purpose, as is the case with Indiana’s MOVES2010a 1997 8-hour ozone maintenance plan budgets, EPA must approve the revised SIP and budgets, and must affirm that they are adequate at the same time. Once EPA approves revised budgets into the SIP, they must be used by state and Federal agencies in determining whether transportation activities conform to the SIP as required by section 176(c) of the CAA. EPA’s substantive criteria for determining the

adequacy of budgets are set out in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4).

*b. Prior Approval of Budgets*

EPA had previously approved budgets for the Delaware County, 8-hour ozone maintenance area for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) for the year 2015 on January 3, 2006 (70 FR 69443). These budgets were based on EPA's MOBILE6.2 emissions model. The ozone maintenance plan established 2015 budgets for the Delaware County, Indiana area of 3.50 tons per day (tpd) for VOCs and 4.82 tpd for NO<sub>x</sub>. These budgets demonstrated a reduction in emissions from the monitored attainment year and included a margin of safety.

*c. The MOVES Emissions Model and Regional Transportation Conformity Grace Period*

The MOVES model is EPA's state-of-the-art tool for estimating highway emissions. The model is based on analyses of millions of emission test results and considerable advances in the agency's understanding of vehicle emissions. MOVES incorporates the latest emissions data, more sophisticated calculation algorithms, increased user flexibility, new software design, and significant new capabilities relative to those reflected in MOBILE6.2.

EPA announced the release of MOVES2010 in March 2010 (75 FR 9411). EPA subsequently released two minor model revisions: MOVES2010a in September 2010 and MOVES2010b in April 2012. Both of these minor revisions enhance model performance and do not significantly affect the criteria pollutant emissions results from MOVES2010.

MOVES will be required for new regional emissions analyses for

transportation conformity determinations ("regional conformity analyses") outside of California that begin after March 2, 2013, or when EPA approves MOVES-based budgets, whichever comes first.<sup>1</sup> The MOVES grace period for regional conformity analyses applies to both the use of MOVES2010 and approved minor revisions (e.g., MOVES2010a and MOVES2010b). For more information, see EPA's "Policy Guidance on the Use of MOVES2010 and Subsequent Minor Model Revisions for State Implementation Plan Development, Transportation Conformity, and Other Purposes" (April 2012), available online at: [www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/policy.htm#models](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/policy.htm#models).

EPA has encouraged areas to examine how MOVES would affect future transportation plan and TIP conformity determinations so, if necessary, SIPs and budgets could be revised with MOVES or transportation plans and TIPs could be revised (as appropriate) prior to the end of the regional transportation conformity grace period. EPA has also encouraged state and local air agencies to consider how the release of MOVES would affect analyses supporting SIP submissions under development (77 FR 9411 and 77 FR 11394).

The Delaware-Muncie Metropolitan Plan Commission (DMMPC), which is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Delaware County area, has used MOVES2010a emission rates with the transportation network information to estimate emissions in the years of the transportation plan and also for the SIP. Indiana is revising the budgets at this time using the latest planning assumptions including population and employment updates. In addition, newer vehicle registration data has been used to update the age

distribution of the vehicle fleet. Since MOVES2010 (or a minor model revision) will be required for conformity analyses after the grace period ends, Indiana has concluded that updating the budgets with MOVES2010a will prepare the areas for the transition to using MOVES for conformity analyses and determinations. The interagency consultation group has had extensive consultation on the requirements and need for new budgets.

*d. Submission of New Budgets Based on MOVES2010a*

On June 15, 2012, Indiana submitted for parallel processing replacement budgets based on MOVES2010a for the Delaware County area. Indiana provided public review and comment which ended on July 18, 2012. There were no comments. Indiana submitted the final SIP revision request on August 17, 2012.

The MOVES2010a budgets are proposed to replace the prior approved MOBILE6.2 budgets and are for the same year and pollutants/precursors. The new MOVES2010a budgets are for the year 2015 for both VOCs and NO<sub>x</sub> and are detailed in a Table in section V(b) of this notice. Indiana has also provided total emissions including mobile emissions based on MOVES2010a, for the attainment year of 2002, the interim year 2010 and the 2015 maintenance year. The total safety margin available in 2015 for NO<sub>x</sub> is 15.36 tpd and for VOC is 4.76 tpd. This information is detailed in the submittal and provided in the following table. The safety margin is defined as the reduction in emissions from the base year (in this case the 2002 attainment year) to the final year of the maintenance plan (in this case the 2015 year). The total emissions include point, area, non-road and on-road mobile sources.

TABLE OF TOTAL EMISSIONS WITH MOVES2010A MOBILE EMISSIONS

Year	2002	2010	2015	Safety margin
VOC .....	26.08	21.36	21.32	4.76
NO <sub>x</sub> .....	26.17	15.73	10.81	15.36

Indiana has added only a small portion of the overall safety margin available for NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs to the budgets for 2015. The submittal demonstrates how all emissions decline from the attainment year of 2002. In 2002, the total estimated NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from all sources (including mobile,

point, area and non-road sources) is 26.17 tpd and the total VOC emissions, for the 2002 attainment year, from all sources is 26.08 tpd. The 2015 estimated emissions for total NO<sub>x</sub> from all sources is 10.81 tpd and the total VOC emissions from all sources is 21.32 tpd. This is further discussed in section V of

this notice and detailed in the table of total emissions in section V. This reduction in emissions demonstrates that the area will continue below the attainment level of emissions and maintain the 1997 8-hour ozone standard. The mobile source emissions, when included with point, area, and

<sup>1</sup> Upon the release of MOVES2010, EPA established a two-year grace period before MOVES is required to be used for regional conformity

analyses (75 FR 9411). EPA subsequently promulgated a final rule on February 27, 2012 to provide an additional year before MOVES is

required for these analyses (77 FR 11394). In this case the grace period ends on March 2, 2013.

non-road sources continue to demonstrate maintenance of the attainment level of emissions in the Delaware County area.

No additional control measures were needed to maintain the 1997 ozone standard in the Delaware County area. An appropriate safety margin for NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs was decided by the interagency consultation group (the interagency consultation group as required by the state conformity agreement consists of representatives from the Federal Highway Administration, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM), and EPA). The allocation of safety margin is included in Table 5.2–A of the Indiana submittal. The on-road MOVES2010a based budgets are in Table 5.2–A of the submittal and are listed as 7.02 tpd for NO<sub>x</sub> and 2.53 tpd for VOCs in the year 2015. These budgets will continue to keep emissions in the Delaware County area below the calculated attainment year of emissions.

#### IV. What are the criteria for approval?

EPA requires that revisions to existing SIPs and budgets continue to meet applicable requirements (*e.g.*, RFP, attainment, or maintenance). States that revise their existing SIPs to include MOVES budgets must therefore show that the SIP continues to meet applicable requirements with the new level of motor vehicle emissions contained in the budgets. The SIP must also meet any applicable SIP requirements under CAA section 110.

In addition, the transportation conformity rule (at 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4)(iv)) requires that “the budgets, when considered together with all other emissions sources, is consistent with applicable requirements for RFP, attainment, or maintenance (whichever is relevant to the given implementation plan submission).” This and the other adequacy criteria found at 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4) must be satisfied before EPA can find submitted budgets adequate and approve them for conformity purposes.

In addition, areas can revise their budgets and inventories using MOVES without revising their entire SIP if (1) the SIP continues to meet applicable requirements when the previous motor vehicle emissions inventories are replaced with MOVES base year and milestone, attainment, or maintenance year inventories, and (2) the state can document that growth and control strategy assumptions for non-motor vehicle sources continue to be valid and any minor updates do not change the

overall conclusions of the SIP. For example, the first criterion could be satisfied by demonstrating that the emissions reductions between the baseline/attainment year and maintenance year are the same or greater using MOVES than they were previously. The Indiana submittal meets this requirement as described below in section V.

For more information, see EPA’s latest “Policy Guidance on the Use of MOVES2010 for SIP Development, Transportation Conformity, and Other Purposes” (April 2012), available online at: [www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/policy.htm#models](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/policy.htm#models).

#### V. What is EPA’s analysis of the State’s submittal?

##### a. The Revised Inventories

The Indiana SIP revision request for Delaware County 1997 ozone maintenance seeks to revise only the on-road mobile source inventories and not the non-road inventories, area source inventories or point source inventories for the 2015 year for which the SIP revises the budgets. IDEM has certified that the control strategies remain the same as in the original SIP, and that no other control strategies are necessary. This is confirmed by the monitoring data for Delaware County, which continues to monitor attainment for the 1997 8-hour ozone standard. The area is also monitoring attainment for the 2008 8-hour ozone standard. Thus, the current control strategies are continuing to keep the area in attainment of the NAAQS.

EPA has reviewed the emission estimates for point, area and non-road sources and concluded that no major changes to the projections need to be made. Indiana finds that growth and control strategy assumptions for non-mobile sources (*i.e.*, area, non-road, and point) have not changed significantly from the original submittal for the years 2002, 2010, and 2015. As a result, the growth and control strategy assumptions for the non-mobile sources for the years 2002, 2010, and 2015 continue to be valid and do not affect the overall conclusions of the plan.

Indiana’s submission confirms that the SIP continues to demonstrate its purpose of maintaining the 1997 ozone standard because the emissions are continuing to decrease from the attainment year to the final year of the maintenance plan. The total emissions in the revised SIP (which includes MOVES2010a emissions from mobile sources) are 26.17 tpd for NO<sub>x</sub> and 26.08 tpd for VOCs in the 2002 attainment year. The total emissions

from all sources in the 2015 year are 10.81 tpd for NO<sub>x</sub> and 21.32 tpd for VOCs. These totals demonstrate that emissions in the Delaware County area are continuing to decline and remain below the attainment levels.

Indiana has submitted MOVES2010a-based budgets for the Delaware County area that are clearly identified in Table 5.2–A of the submittal. The on-road budgets for 2015 are 7.02 tpd for NO<sub>x</sub> and 2.53 tpd for VOCs. These are the budgets that are being proposed for approval.

##### b. Approvability of the MOVES2010a-based Budgets

EPA is proposing to approve the MOVES2010a-based budgets submitted by the State for use in determining transportation conformity in the Delaware County 1997 ozone maintenance area. EPA is making this proposal based on our evaluation of these budgets using the adequacy criteria found in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4) and our in-depth evaluation of the State’s submittal and SIP requirements. EPA has determined, based on its evaluation, that the area’s maintenance plan would continue to serve its intended purpose with the submitted MOVES2010a-based budgets and that the budgets themselves meet the adequacy criteria in the conformity rule at 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4).

The adequacy criteria found in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4) are as follows:

- The submitted SIP was endorsed by [the Governor/Governor’s designee] and was subject to a state public hearing (§ 93.118(e)(4)(i));
- Before the control strategy implementation plan was submitted to EPA, consultation among Federal, state, and local agencies occurred, and the state fully documented the submittal (§ 93.118(e)(4)(ii));
- The budgets are clearly identified and precisely quantified (§ 93.118(e)(4)(iii));
- The budgets, when considered together with all other emissions sources, are consistent with applicable requirements for RFP, attainment, or maintenance (§ 93.118(e)(4)(iv));
- The budgets are consistent with and clearly related to the emissions inventory and control measures in the control strategy implementation plan (§ 93.118(e)(4)(v)); and
- The revisions explain and document changes to the previous budgets, impacts on point and area source emissions and changes to established safety margins and reasons for the changes (including the basis for any changes related to emission factors

or vehicle miles traveled) (§ 93.118(e)(4)(vi)).

We find that Indiana has met all of the adequacy criteria. The final submittal is dated August 17, 2012, and signed by the governor's designee. All public hearing materials were submitted with the formal SIP revision request. The interagency consultation group, which is composed of the state air agency, state Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, EPA, and the MPO for the area, has discussed and reviewed the budgets developed with MOVES2010a and the safety margin allocation. The budgets are clearly identified and precisely quantified in the submittal in table 5.2–A. The budgets when considered with other emissions sources (point, area, non-road) are consistent with continued maintenance of the 1997 ozone standard. The budgets are clearly related to the emissions inventory and control measures in the SIP. The changes from the previous budgets are clearly explained with the change in the model from MOBILE6.2 to MOVES2010a and the revised and updated planning assumptions. The inputs to the model are detailed in the Appendix to the submittal. EPA has reviewed the inputs to the MOVES2010a modeling and participated in the consultation process. The Federal Highway Administration—Indiana Division and the Indiana Department of Transportation have taken a lead role in working with the MPO and contractor to provide accurate, timely information and inputs to the MOVES2010a model runs. The DMMPC network model provided the vehicle miles of travel and other necessary data from the travel demand network model.

The CAA requires that revisions to existing SIPs and budgets continue to meet applicable requirements (in this case, maintenance). Therefore, states that revise existing SIPs with MOVES must show that the SIP continues to meet applicable requirements with the new level of motor vehicle emissions calculated by the new model.

To that end, Indiana's submitted MOVES2010a budgets meet EPA's two criteria for revising budgets without revising the entire SIP:

(1) The SIP continues to meet applicable requirements when the previous motor vehicle emissions inventories are replaced with MOVES2010a base year and milestone, attainment, or maintenance year inventories, and

(2) The state can document that growth and control strategy assumptions for non-motor vehicle sources continue to be valid and any minor updates do

not change the overall conclusions of the SIP.

The State has documented that growth and control strategy assumptions continue to be valid and do not change the overall conclusions of the maintenance plan. The emission estimates for point, area and non-road sources have not changed. Indiana finds that growth and control strategy assumptions for non-mobile sources (*i.e.* area, non-road, and point) from the original submittal for the years 2002, 2010, 2015 were developed before the down-turn in the economy over the last several years. Because of this, the factors included in the original submittal may project more growth than actual into the future. As a result, the growth and control strategy assumptions for the non-mobile sources for the years 2002, 2010, and 2015 continue to be valid and do not affect the overall conclusions of the plan.

Indiana's submission confirms that the SIP continues to demonstrate its purpose of maintaining the 1997 ozone standard because the emissions are continuing to decrease from the attainment year to the final year of the maintenance plan. The total emissions in the revised SIP (which includes MOVES2010a emissions for mobile sources) decrease from the 2002 attainment year to the year 2015 (the last year of the maintenance plan). These totals demonstrate that emissions in the Delaware County area are continuing to decline and remain below the attainment levels. The table below, displays total emissions in the Delaware County area including point, area, non-road, and mobile sources and demonstrates the declining emissions from the 2002 attainment year.

TABLE OF TOTAL EMISSIONS WITH MOVES2010A MOBILE EMISSIONS

Year	2002	2010	2015
VOC .....	26.08	21.36	21.32
NO <sub>x</sub> .....	26.17	15.73	10.81

The following table displays the submitted budgets that are proposed in the notice to be approved. The budgets include an appropriate margin of safety while still maintaining total emissions below the attainment level.

TABLE OF MOTOR VEHICLE EMISSION BUDGETS (MOVES) DELAWARE COUNTY, INDIANA FOR YEAR 2015

VOC (tpd) .....	2.53
NO <sub>x</sub> (tpd) .....	7.02

Based on our review of the SIP and the new budgets provided, EPA has determined that the SIP will continue to meet its requirements if the revised motor vehicle emissions inventories are replaced with MOVES2010a inventories.

*c. Applicability of MOBILE6.2-based Budgets*

Pursuant to the State's request, EPA is proposing that, if we finalize the approval of the revised budgets, the State's existing MOBILE6.2-based budgets will no longer be applicable for transportation conformity purposes upon the effective date of that final approval.

In addition, once EPA approves the MOVES2010a-based budgets, the regional transportation conformity grace period for using MOBILE6 instead of MOVES2010 (and subsequent minor revisions) for the pollutants included in these budgets will end for the Delaware County ozone maintenance area on the effective date of that final approval.<sup>2</sup>

**VI. What action is EPA taking?**

EPA is proposing in this action that the Delaware County, Indiana existing approved budgets for VOCs and NO<sub>x</sub> for 2015 for the 1997 8-hour ozone maintenance plan, that were based on the MOBILE6.2 emissions model, be replaced with new budgets based on the MOVES2010a emissions model. Once this proposal is finalized, future transportation conformity determinations would use the new, MOVES2010a-based budgets and would no longer use the existing MOBILE6.2-based budgets. EPA is also proposing to find that the Delaware County area's maintenance plan would continue to meet its requirements as set forth under the CAA when these new budgets are included.

**VII. 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 approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond

<sup>2</sup> For more information, see EPA's "Policy Guidance on the Use of MOVES2010 and Subsequent Minor Revisions for State Implementation Plan Development, Transportation Conformity, and Other Purposes" (April 2012).

those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a “significant regulatory action” subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);
- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the 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 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, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: October 12, 2012.

**Susan Hedman,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 2012–26384 Filed 10–25–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2012–0799; FRL–9747–3]

#### Determination of Attainment for the Sacramento Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard; California; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to determine that the Sacramento nonattainment area in California has attained the 2006 24-hour fine particle (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). This proposed determination is based upon complete, quality-assured, and certified ambient air monitoring data showing that this area has monitored attainment of the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS based on the 2009–2011 monitoring period. EPA is further proposing that, if EPA finalizes this determination of attainment, the requirements for this area to submit an attainment demonstration, together with reasonably available control measures (RACM), a reasonable further progress (RFP) plan, and contingency measures for failure to meet RFP and attainment deadlines shall be suspended for so long as the area continues to attain the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before November 26, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2012–0799 by one of the following methods:

1. Federal eRulemaking Portal, at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), please follow the on-line instructions;
2. Email to [ungvarsky.john@epa.gov](mailto:ungvarsky.john@epa.gov); or
3. Mail or delivery to John Ungvarsky, Air Planning Office, AIR–2, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 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 you consider to be 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 an email directly to EPA, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. 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.

**Docket:** The index to the docket for this action is 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 in the index, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material), and some may not be publicly available at 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:** John Ungvarsky, (415) 972–3963, or by email at [ungvarsky.john@epa.gov](mailto:ungvarsky.john@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, wherever “we”, “us” or “our” are used, we mean EPA. We are providing the following outline to aid in locating information in this proposal.

#### Table of Contents

- I. What determination is EPA making?
- II. What is the background for this action?
  - A. PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS
  - B. Designation of PM<sub>2.5</sub> Nonattainment Areas
  - C. How does EPA make attainment determinations?
- III. What is EPA’s analysis of the relevant air quality data?
  - A. Monitoring Network and Data Considerations
  - B. Evaluation of Current Attainment
- IV. How does EPA’s Clean Data Policy apply to this action?
  - A. Application of EPA’s Clean Data Policy to the 2006 p.m.<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS
  - B. History and Basis of EPA’s Clean Data Policy
- V. EPA’s Proposed Action and Request for Public Comment