

Questions

The FHWA requests input on each of the following questions. In addition, comments and input may be offered on any part of this notice.

1. Regardless of the ultimate restructuring format chosen, would you support separating the current material in the MUTCD into two documents? Please explain your reasoning for supporting or opposing the concept of having two documents.

2. Referring to the examples shown for Chapter 2B, should the format of the MUTCD and the Applications Supplement remain consistent between the two documents? For example, should the same headings, such as "Support" and "Option" be used in the Applications Supplement? Should the type of section, figure, and table numbering remain consistent between the MUTCD and the Applications Supplement? Should the sections in the Applications Supplement have a one-to-one correspondence to the sections of the MUTCD, even if that means that some sections of the Applications Supplement would either be skipped or simply have a sentence that says something such as "No additional guidance is available for this section"?

3. Regarding the philosophy of the type of material to retain in the MUTCD versus the Applications Supplement, does Option A move enough material to the Applications Supplement, thus achieving the goal of a streamlined MUTCD, or does Option B better achieve the intended result while maintaining the appropriate balance to retain material deemed critical to traffic control device design and road user safety in the MUTCD? Please explain the reasoning for your response to this question.

4. How would restructuring the MUTCD affect the approval process of the MUTCD in your State? If your State develops a supplement to the MUTCD or creates its own State MUTCD that is in substantial conformance with the National MUTCD, how would restructuring the National MUTCD impact your organization?

5. Describe the use of the printed version of the MUTCD within your agency compared to the electronic version. Which users prefer the printed version and which users prefer the electronic version? Why?

6. In addition to providing hotlinks between the new MUTCD and the Applications Supplement, would providing hotlinks in the Applications Supplement to supplementary documents or additional resources be helpful or more cumbersome for

MUTCD users? Should the important elements of the additional resources be incorporated into the Applications Supplement?

7. After the initial edition of the Applications Supplement is developed by the FHWA as a part of the process of developing the next edition of the MUTCD, should the FHWA continue to maintain and update the Applications Supplement, or should some other organization or group take on this responsibility? Please explain the reasoning for your response to this question. If you feel that another organization should be responsible for the Applications Supplement, please provide thoughts on the appropriate organization and why.

8. Is there an advantage to the FHWA (or some other organization or group) making revisions to the Applications Supplement without seeking public comments and why? Should there be a structured process for making revisions to the Applications Supplement? If yes, what should this involve and who should be included in the process? How often should this occur?

9. Should the FHWA consider other options for splitting MUTCD content into separate documents? Please explain.

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 101(a), 104, 109(d), 114(a), 217, 315, and 402(a); 23 CFR 1.32; and, 49 CFR 1.85.

Issued on: December 20, 2012.

Victor M. Mendez,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2013-00373 Filed 1-10-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

36 CFR Part 242

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 100

[Docket No. FWS-R7-SM-2012-0104;
FXFR13350700640-134-FF07J00000]

RIN 1018-AY85

Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska—2014–15 and 2015–16 Subsistence Taking of Wildlife Regulations

AGENCY: Forest Service, Agriculture; Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would establish regulations for hunting and trapping seasons, harvest limits, methods and means related to taking of wildlife for subsistence uses during the 2014–15 and 2015–16 regulatory years. The Federal Subsistence Board is on a schedule of completing the process of revising subsistence taking of wildlife regulations in even-numbered years and subsistence taking of fish and shellfish regulations in odd-numbered years; public proposal and review processes take place during the preceding year. The Board also addresses customary and traditional use determinations during the applicable cycle. When final, the resulting rulemaking will replace the existing subsistence wildlife taking regulations. This rule would also amend the general regulations on subsistence taking of fish and wildlife.

DATES: Public meetings: The Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils will hold public meetings to receive comments and make proposals to change this proposed rule on several dates between February 12 and March 26, 2013, and then hold another round of public meetings to discuss and receive comments on the proposals, and make recommendations on the proposals to the Federal Subsistence Board, on several dates between August 19 and October 30, 2013. The Board will discuss and evaluate proposed regulatory changes during a public meeting in Anchorage, AK, in January 2014. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for specific information on dates and locations of the public meetings.

Public comments: Comments and proposals to change this proposed rule must be received or postmarked by March 29, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Public meetings: The Federal Subsistence Board and the Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils' public meetings will be held at various locations in Alaska. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for specific information on dates and locations of the public meetings.

Public comments: You may submit comments by one of the following methods:

- **Electronically:** Go to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for FWS-R7-SM-2012-0104, which is the docket number for this rulemaking.

- **By hard copy:** U.S. mail or hand-delivery to: USFWS, Office of Subsistence Management, 1011 East Tudor Road, MS 121, Attn: Theo Matuskowitz, Anchorage, AK 99503-6199, or hand delivery to the Designated Federal Official attending any of the

Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council public meetings. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for additional information on locations of the public meetings.

We will post all comments on <http://www.regulations.gov>. This generally means that we will post any personal information you provide us (see the Public Review Process section below for more information).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, c/o U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Attention: Peter J. Probasco, Office of Subsistence Management; (907) 786-3888 or subsistence@fws.gov. For questions specific to National Forest System lands, contact Steve Kessler, Regional Subsistence Program Leader, USDA, Forest Service, Alaska Region; (907) 743-9461 or skessler@fs.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) (16 U.S.C. 3111-3126), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretaries) jointly implement the Federal Subsistence Management Program. This program provides a preference for take of fish and wildlife resources for subsistence uses on Federal public lands and waters in Alaska. The Secretaries published temporary regulations to carry out this program in

the **Federal Register** on June 29, 1990 (55 FR 27114), and final regulations were published in the **Federal Register** on May 29, 1992 (57 FR 22940). The Program has subsequently amended these regulations a number of times. Because this program is a joint effort between Interior and Agriculture, these regulations are located in two titles of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR): Title 36, "Parks, Forests, and Public Property," and Title 50, "Wildlife and Fisheries," at 36 CFR 242.1-28 and 50 CFR 100.1-28, respectively. The regulations contain subparts as follows: Subpart A, General Provisions; Subpart B, Program Structure; Subpart C, Board Determinations; and Subpart D, Subsistence Taking of Fish and Wildlife.

Consistent with subpart B of these regulations, the Secretaries established a Federal Subsistence Board to administer the Federal Subsistence Management Program. The Board comprises:

- A Chair appointed by the Secretary of the Interior with concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture;
- The Alaska Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;
- The Alaska Regional Director, U.S. National Park Service;
- The Alaska State Director, U.S. Bureau of Land Management;
- The Alaska Regional Director, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs; and
- The Alaska Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service.

- Two public members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior with concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Through the Board, these agencies and public members participate in the development of regulations for subparts C and D, which, among other things, set forth program eligibility and specific harvest seasons and limits.

In administering the program, the Secretaries divided Alaska into 10 subsistence resource regions, each of which is represented by a Regional Advisory Council. The Regional Advisory Councils provide a forum for rural residents with personal knowledge of local conditions and resource requirements to have a meaningful role in the subsistence management of fish and wildlife on Federal public lands in Alaska. The Regional Advisory Council members represent varied geographical, cultural, and user interests within each region.

Public Review Process—Comments, Proposals, and Public Meetings

The Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils have a substantial role in reviewing this proposed rule and making recommendations for the final rule. The Federal Subsistence Board, through the Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils, will hold public meetings on this proposed rule at the following locations in Alaska, on the following dates:

Region 1—Southeast Regional Council	Ketchikan	March 12, 2013.
Region 2—Southcentral Regional Council	Anchorage	February 20, 2013.
Region 3—Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Council	Kodiak	March 26, 2013.
Region 4—Bristol Bay Regional Council	Naknek	February 12, 2013.
Region 5—Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council	Hooper Bay	February 27, 2013.
Region 6—Western Interior Regional Council	Galena	March 5, 2013.
Region 7—Seward Peninsula Regional Council	Nome	March 12, 2013.
Region 8—Northwest Arctic Regional Council	Kotzebue	March 5, 2013.
Region 9—Eastern Interior Regional Council	Tok	February 20, 2013.
Region 10—North Slope Regional Council	Barrow	February 26, 2013.

During April 2013, the written proposals to change the subpart D, take of wildlife regulations and subpart C, customary and traditional use determinations, will be compiled and distributed for public review. During the

30-day public comment period, which is presently scheduled to end on June 7, 2013, written public comments will be accepted on the distributed proposals.

The Board, through the Regional Advisory Councils, will hold a second

series of public meetings in August through October 2013, to receive comments on specific proposals and to develop recommendations to the Board at the following locations in Alaska, on the following dates:

Region 1—Southeast Regional Council	Petersburg	September 24, 2013.
Region 2—Southcentral Regional Council	Copper Center	October 2, 2013.
Region 3—Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Council	Cold Bay	September 24, 2013.
Region 4—Bristol Bay Regional Council	Dillingham	October 29, 2013.
Region 5—Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council	St. Marys	September 25, 2013.
Region 6—Western Interior Regional Council	Fairbanks	October 8, 2013.
Region 7—Seward Peninsula Regional Council	Nome	October 8, 2013.
Region 8—Northwest Arctic Regional Council	Kiana	August 21, 2013.
Region 9—Eastern Interior Regional Council	Fairbanks	October 16, 2013.
Region 10—North Slope Regional Council	Barrow	August 19, 2013.

A notice will be published of specific dates, times, and meeting locations in local and statewide newspapers prior to both series of meetings. Locations and dates may change based on weather or local circumstances. The amount of work on each Regional Advisory Council's agenda determines the length of each Regional Advisory Council meeting.

The Board will discuss and evaluate proposed changes to the subsistence management regulations during a public meeting scheduled to be held in Anchorage, Alaska, in January 2014. The Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council Chairs, or their designated representatives, will present their respective Councils' recommendations at the Board meeting. Additional oral testimony may be provided on specific proposals before the Board at that time. At that public meeting, the Board will deliberate and take final action on proposals received that request changes to this proposed rule.

Proposals to the Board to modify the general fish and wildlife regulations, wildlife harvest regulations, and customary and traditional use determinations must include the following information:

- a. Name, address, and telephone number of the requestor;
- b. Each section and/or paragraph designation in this proposed rule for which changes are suggested, if applicable;
- c. A description of the regulatory change(s) desired;
- d. A statement explaining why each change is necessary;
- e. Proposed wording changes; and
- f. Any additional information that you believe will help the Board in evaluating the proposed change.

The Board immediately rejects proposals that fail to include the above information, or proposals that are beyond the scope of authorities in § ___.24, subpart C (the regulations governing customary and traditional use determinations), and §§ ___.25 and ___.26, subpart D (the general and specific regulations governing the subsistence take of wildlife). If a proposal needs clarification, prior to being distributed for public review, the proponent may be contacted, and the proposal could be revised based on their input. Once distributed for public review no additional changes may be made as part of the original submission. During the January 2014 meeting, the Board may defer review and action on some proposals to allow time for cooperative planning efforts, or to acquire additional needed information.

The Board may elect to defer taking action on any given proposal if the workload of staff, Regional Advisory Councils, or the Board becomes excessive. These deferrals may be based on recommendations by the affected Regional Advisory Council(s) or staff members, or on the basis of the Board's intention to do least harm to the subsistence user and the resource involved. A proponent of a proposal may withdraw the proposal provided it has not been considered, and a recommendation has not been made, by a Regional Advisory Council. The Board may consider and act on alternatives that address the intent of a proposal while differing in approach.

Tribal Consultation and Comment

As expressed in Executive Order 13175, "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments," the Federal officials that have been delegated authority by the Secretaries are committed to honoring the unique government-to-government political relationship that exists between the Federal Government and Federally Recognized Indian Tribes (Tribes) as listed in 75 FR 60810 (October 1, 2010). Consultation with Alaska Native corporations is based on Public Law 108-199, div. H, Sec. 161, Jan. 23, 2004, 118 Stat. 452, as amended by Public Law 108-447, div. H, title V, Sec. 518, Dec. 8, 2004, 118 Stat. 3267, which provides that: "The Director of the Office of Management and Budget and all Federal agencies shall hereafter consult with Alaska Native corporations on the same basis as Indian tribes under Executive Order No. 13175."

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act does not provide specific rights to Tribes for the subsistence taking of wildlife, fish, and shellfish. However, because tribal members are affected by subsistence fishing, hunting, and trapping regulations, the Secretaries, through the Board, will provide Federally recognized Tribes and Alaska Native corporations an opportunity to consult on this rule.

The Board will engage in outreach efforts for this rule, including a notification letter, to ensure that Tribes and Alaska Native corporations are advised of the mechanisms by which they can participate. The Board provides a variety of opportunities for consultation: Proposing changes to the existing rule; commenting on proposed changes to the existing rule; engaging in dialogue at the Regional Council meetings; engaging in dialogue at the Board's meetings; and providing input in person, by mail, email, or phone at

any time during the rulemaking process. The Board will commit to efficiently and adequately providing an opportunity to Tribes and Alaska Native corporations for consultation in regard to subsistence rulemaking.

The Board will consider Tribes' and Alaska Native corporations' information, input, and recommendations, and address their concerns as much as practicable.

Developing the 2014-15 and 2015-16 Wildlife Seasons and Harvest Limit Regulations

Subpart C and D regulations are subject to periodic review and revision. The Federal Subsistence Board currently completes the process of revising subsistence take of wildlife regulations in even-numbered years and fish and shellfish regulations in odd-numbered years; public proposal and review processes take place during the preceding year. The Board also addresses customary and traditional use determinations during the applicable cycle.

The text of the final rule published June 13, 2012 (77 FR 35482) for the 2012-14 subparts C and D regulations is the text of this proposed rule. These regulations will remain in effect until subsequent Board action changes elements as a result of the public review process outlined above in this document.

Compliance With Statutory and Regulatory Authorities

National Environmental Policy Act

A Draft Environmental Impact Statement that described four alternatives for developing a Federal Subsistence Management Program was distributed for public comment on October 7, 1991. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was published on February 28, 1992. The Record of Decision (ROD) on Subsistence Management for Federal Public Lands in Alaska was signed April 6, 1992. The selected alternative in the FEIS (Alternative IV) defined the administrative framework of an annual regulatory cycle for subsistence regulations.

A 1997 environmental assessment dealt with the expansion of Federal jurisdiction over fisheries and is available at the office listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. The Secretary of the Interior, with concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture, determined that expansion of Federal jurisdiction does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the human

environment and, therefore, signed a Finding of No Significant Impact.

Section 810 of ANILCA

An ANILCA § 810 analysis was completed as part of the FEIS process on the Federal Subsistence Management Program. The intent of all Federal subsistence regulations is to accord subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on public lands a priority over the taking of fish and wildlife on such lands for other purposes, unless restriction is necessary to conserve healthy fish and wildlife populations. The final § 810 analysis determination appeared in the April 6, 1992, ROD and concluded that the Federal Subsistence Management Program, under Alternative IV with an annual process for setting subsistence regulations, may have some local impacts on subsistence uses, but will not likely restrict subsistence uses significantly.

During the subsequent environmental assessment process for extending fisheries jurisdiction, an evaluation of the effects of this rule was conducted in accordance with § 810. That evaluation also supported the Secretaries' determination that the rule will not reach the "may significantly restrict" threshold that would require notice and hearings under ANILCA § 810(a).

Paperwork Reduction Act

An agency may not conduct or sponsor and you are not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. This proposed rule does not contain any new collections of information that require OMB approval. OMB has reviewed and approved the following collections of information associated with the subsistence regulations at 36 CFR 242 and 50 CFR 100: Subsistence hunting and fishing applications, permits, and reports, Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council Membership Application/Nomination and Interview Forms (OMB Control No. 1018-0075 expires January 31, 2013).

Regulatory Planning and Review (Executive Order 12866)

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined that this proposed rule is not significant and has not reviewed this rule under Executive Order 12866. OMB bases its determination upon the following four criteria:

(a) Whether the rule will have an annual effect of \$100 million or more on the economy or adversely affect an economic sector, productivity, jobs, the

environment, or other units of the government.

(b) Whether the rule will create inconsistencies with other agencies' actions.

(c) Whether the rule will materially affect entitlements, grants, user fees, loan programs, or the rights and obligations of their recipients.

(d) Whether the rule raises novel legal or policy issues.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) requires preparation of flexibility analyses for rules that will have a significant effect on a substantial number of small entities, which include small businesses, organizations, or governmental jurisdictions. In general, the resources to be harvested under this rule are already being harvested and consumed by the local harvester and do not result in an additional dollar benefit to the economy. However, we estimate that two million pounds of meat are harvested by subsistence users annually and, if given an estimated dollar value of \$3.00 per pound, this amount would equate to about \$6 million in food value statewide. Based upon the amounts and values cited above, the Departments certify that this rulemaking will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

Under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (5 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), this rule is not a major rule. It does not have an effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, and does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S.-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises.

Executive Order 12630

Title VIII of ANILCA requires the Secretaries to administer a subsistence priority on public lands. The scope of this program is limited by definition to certain public lands. Likewise, these regulations have no potential takings of private property implications as defined by Executive Order 12630.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Secretaries have determined and certify pursuant to the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, 2 U.S.C. 1502 et seq., that this rulemaking will not

impose a cost of \$100 million or more in any given year on local or State governments or private entities. The implementation of this rule is by Federal agencies and there is no cost imposed on any State or local entities or tribal governments.

Executive Order 12988

The Secretaries have determined that these regulations meet the applicable standards provided in §§ 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, regarding civil justice reform.

Executive Order 13132

In accordance with Executive Order 13132, the proposed rule does not have sufficient Federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment. Title VIII of ANILCA precludes the State from exercising subsistence management authority over fish and wildlife resources on Federal lands unless it meets certain requirements.

Executive Order 13175

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, Title VIII, does not provide specific rights to tribes for the subsistence taking of wildlife, fish, and shellfish. However, the Board will provide Federally recognized Tribes and Alaska Native corporations an opportunity to consult on this rule. Consultation with Alaska Native corporations are based on Public Law 108-199, div. H, Sec. 161, Jan. 23, 2004, 118 Stat. 452, as amended by Public Law 108-447, div. H, title V, Sec. 518, Dec. 8, 2004, 118 Stat. 3267, which provides that: "The Director of the Office of Management and Budget and all Federal agencies shall hereafter consult with Alaska Native corporations on the same basis as Indian tribes under Executive Order No. 13175."

The Secretaries, through the Board, will provide a variety of opportunities for consultation: Commenting on proposed changes to the existing rule; engaging in dialogue at the Regional Council meetings; engaging in dialogue at the Board's meetings; and providing input in person, by mail, email, or phone at any time during the rulemaking process.

Executive Order 13211

This Executive Order requires agencies to prepare Statements of Energy Effects when undertaking certain actions. However, this proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under E.O. 13211, affecting energy supply, distribution, or use, and no Statement of Energy Effects is required.

Drafting Information

Theo Matuskowitz drafted these regulations under the guidance of Peter J. Probasco of the Office of Subsistence Management, Alaska Regional Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska. Additional assistance was provided by:

- Daniel Sharp, Alaska State Office, Bureau of Land Management;
- Sandy Rabinowitch and Nancy Swanton, Alaska Regional Office, National Park Service;
- Dr. Glenn Chen, Alaska Regional Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs;
- Jerry Berg and Jack Lorrigan, Alaska Regional Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and
- Steve Kessler, Alaska Regional Office, U.S. Forest Service.

List of Subjects*36 CFR Part 242*

Administrative practice and procedure, Alaska, Fish, National forests, Public lands, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wildlife.

50 CFR Part 100

Administrative practice and procedure, Alaska, Fish, National forests, Public lands, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wildlife.

Proposed Regulation Promulgation

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Federal Subsistence Board proposes to amend 36 CFR 242 and 50 CFR 100 for the 2014–15 and 2015–16 regulatory years. The text of the proposed amendments to 36 CFR 242.24, 242.25, and 242.26 and 50 CFR 100.24, 100.25, and 100.26 is the final rule for the 2012–14 regulatory period (77 FR 35482; June 13, 2012).

Dated: December 11, 2012.

Peter J. Probasco,

Assistant Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board.

Steve Kessler,

Subsistence Program Leader, USDA-Forest Service.

[FR Doc. 2013–00325 Filed 1–10–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P; 4310–55–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA–R06–OAR–2012–0639; FRL–9769–9]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is proposing to approve two revisions to the Arkansas State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) to EPA on February 17, 2010 and November 6, 2012. The February 17, 2010 proposed SIP revision to the Arkansas New Source Review (NSR) Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program updates the Arkansas SIP to incorporate by reference (IBR) requirements for the Federal PSD permitting program under EPA's November 29, 2005 Phase 2 8-hour Ozone Implementation rule. The November 6, 2012 proposed SIP revision to the Arkansas NSR PSD program provides the state of Arkansas with the authority to issue PSD permits governing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and establishes appropriate emission thresholds for determining which new stationary sources and modifications to existing stationary sources become subject to Arkansas's PSD permitting requirements for their GHG emissions. The November 6, 2012 proposed SIP revision also defers until July 21, 2014 application of the PSD permitting requirements to biogenic carbon dioxide emissions from bioenergy and other biogenic stationary sources. EPA is proposing to approve the February 17, 2010, and November 6, 2012 SIP revisions to the Arkansas NSR PSD permitting program as consistent with Federal requirements for PSD permitting. EPA is also proposing to rescind the GHG PSD Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for Arkansas that was put in place to ensure the availability of a permitting authority for GHG permitting in Arkansas, upon final approval of the November 6, 2012 PSD SIP revisions. EPA is proposing this action under the Clean Air Act (the Act).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 11, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R06–OAR–2012–0639, by one of the following methods:

• *Federal Rulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

• *Email:* Mr. Mike Miller at miller.michael@epa.gov.

• *Fax:* Mr. Mike Miller, Air Permits Section (6PD–R), at fax number 214–665–6762.

• *Mail:* Mr. Mike Miller, Air Permits Section (6PD–R), Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733.

• *Hand or Courier Delivery:* Mr. Mike Miller, Air Permits Section (6PD–R), Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733. Such deliveries are accepted only between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. weekdays, and not on legal holidays. Special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–R06–OAR–2012–0639. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information the disclosure of which is restricted by statute. Do not submit information through <http://www.regulations.gov> or email, if you believe that it is CBI or otherwise protected from disclosure. The <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means that 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 <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 along with any disk or CD–ROM submitted. 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 and any form of encryption and should 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 docket are listed in the <http://>