

determination is based upon complete, quality assured, and certified ambient air monitoring data that show the area has monitored attainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS for the 2009–2011 monitoring period. Available preliminary 2012 data is consistent with continued attainment. Pursuant to 40 CFR 51.918, if this clean data determination is finalized, it would suspend the requirements for the Pittsburgh Area to submit an attainment demonstration and associated RACM, RFP plan, contingency measures, and any other planning requirements related to attainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS for so long as the area continues to attain the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

Finalizing both of these determinations or either of them would not constitute a redesignation of the Pittsburgh Area to attainment for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS under CAA section 107(d)(3). Neither determination of attainment involves approving a maintenance plan for the Pittsburgh Area, nor determines that the Pittsburgh Area has met all the requirements for redesignation under the CAA, including that the attainment be due to permanent and enforceable measures.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the designation status of the Pittsburgh Area will remain nonattainment for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS until such time as EPA takes final rulemaking action to determine that the Pittsburgh Area meets the CAA requirements for redesignation to attainment. EPA is soliciting public comments on the issues discussed in this document. These comments will be considered before EPA takes final action.

#### V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action proposes to make determinations based on air quality, and would, if finalized, result in the suspension of certain federal requirements, and/or would not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, these proposed actions:

- Are 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);

<sup>1</sup> The monitoring data from the 2007–2009, 2008–2010, and 2009–2011 monitoring periods that is relied on in this notice may be impacted by reductions associated with the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR), which was remanded to EPA in 2008. *North Carolina v. EPA*, 531 F.3d 896, as modified on reh’g, 550 F.3d 1176 (DC Cir. 2008). Nonetheless, because this action addresses only whether the monitoring data shows attainment, EPA need not address at this time whether such attainment was due to the remanded CAIR.

- Do not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);

- Are 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.*);

- Do 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);

- Do not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);

- Are not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);

- Are not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);

- Are 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

- Do 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, these proposed determinations of the Pittsburgh Area attained the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS do not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the determinations do not 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, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 21, 2012.

**W.C. Early,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.*

[FR Doc. 2012–29790 Filed 12–7–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2012–0732; FRL–9739–4]

#### Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Eastern Kern, Imperial County, Placer County, and Yolo-Solano; Prevention of Significant Deterioration

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing approval of revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) under the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act). EPA is proposing approval of four permitting rules submitted for the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District (EKAPCD), Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD), Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD), and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) portions of the California SIP. The State of California is required under Part C of title I of the Act to adopt and implement a SIP-approved Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit program. We are proposing to revise the SIP to incorporate EKAPCD Rule 210.4—Prevention of Significant Deterioration, ICAPCD Rule 904—Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permit Program, PCAPCD Rule 518—Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permit Program, and YSAQMD Rule 3.24—Prevention of Significant Deterioration. The approval of these rules would establish a PSD permit program in each District for pre-construction review of certain new and modified major stationary sources in attainment or unclassifiable areas. We are soliciting comments on this proposal. In the “Rules” section of this **Federal Register**, we are approving these California SIP revisions as a direct final rule without a prior proposed rule. If we receive no adverse comment, we will not take further action on this proposed rule. If we receive adverse comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public that this rule, or the relevant provisions of the rule, will not take effect, and all public comments received will be addressed in any subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule.

**DATES:** Any comments must be submitted no later than January 9, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA–R09–

OAR–2012–0732, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). Follow the on-line instructions.

2. *Email:* [R9airpermits@epa.gov](mailto:R9airpermits@epa.gov).

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

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the “Rules” section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lisa Beckham, Permits Office (AIR–3), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 972–3811, [beckham.lisa@epa.gov](mailto:beckham.lisa@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This document proposes to approve revisions to the California SIP to incorporate EKAPCD Rule 210.4—Prevention of Significant Deterioration, ICAPCD Rule 904—Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permit Program, PCAPCD Rule 518—Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permit Program, and YSAQMD Rule 3.24—Prevention of Significant Deterioration. The State of California is required under Part C of title I of the Act to adopt and implement a SIP-approved PSD permit program. The approval of these rules would establish a PSD permit program in each District for pre-construction review of certain new and modified major stationary sources in attainment or unclassifiable areas. Because the State of California does not currently have a SIP-approved PSD program within EKAPCD, ICAPCD, PCAPCD, and YSAQMD (referred to hereinafter as the “Districts”), EPA is currently the PSD permitting authority for each District. Inclusion of these rules into the SIP will transfer PSD permitting authority from EPA to the Districts. EPA will assume the role of overseeing the PSD permitting program within each District.

We have published a direct final rule approving these revisions in the “Rules” section of this **Federal Register** because we view this as a noncontroversial action and anticipate no adverse comment. We have explained our reasons for this action and provided detailed information about the action in the preamble to the direct final rule. The regulatory text for this proposal is identical to that for the direct final rule. For additional information, including the regulatory text, see the direct final rule in the “Rules” section of this **Federal Register**.

If no adverse comments are received, we will not take further action on this

proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public that this rule will not take effect, and all public comments received will be addressed in any subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on a distinct provision of this rule and that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment. In such case, EPA would publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** indicating which provisions we are withdrawing. The provisions that are not withdrawn would then become effective on the date set out in the direct final rule, notwithstanding adverse comment on any other provision.

EPA does not intend to institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action must do so at this time. For further information about commenting on this action, please see the information provided in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document and refer to the direct final rule in the “Rules” section of this **Federal Register**.

#### 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.

Dated: September 25, 2012.

**Jared Blumenfeld,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 2012–29536 Filed 12–7–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2012–0808; FRL–9750–3]

### Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns opacity standards

related to multiple pollutants, including particulate matter (PM) emissions from several different types of sources, ranging from fugitive dust to gas turbines. We are proposing to approve a local rule to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** Any comments on this proposal must arrive by January 9, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2012–0808, 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 94105–3901. 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.