

that were promulgated in 2013. Washington State also requested EPA approval of section 173–476–100 WAC *Ambient Air Quality Standard for Particulate Matter, PM-10* consistent with the EPA's 24-hour coarse particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) NAAQS contained in 40 CFR 50.6. The EPA has reviewed this revision to the WAC for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> and has made the determination that these changes are consistent with federal regulations; thus, the EPA is proposing to approve these changes to Washington's SIP.

#### f. Sulfur Dioxide

In the November 20, 2013 SIP submission, Washington requested EPA approval of section 173–476–130 WAC *Ambient Air Quality Standards for Sulfur Oxides (Sulfur Dioxide)* consistent with the 1-hour sulfur dioxide NAAQS promulgated by the EPA on June 22, 2010, the 3-hour sulfur dioxide NAAQS promulgated by the EPA on May 22, 1996, and the 24-hour sulfur dioxide NAAQS also promulgated by the EPA on May 22, 1996. See 75 FR 35520 and 61 FR 25580. Lastly, Ecology requested EPA approval of the state annual sulfur dioxide air quality standard that is more stringent than the corresponding federal NAAQS. Under the provisions of 40 CFR 50.2(d) states are permitted to establish more stringent standards than the national standards. The EPA has reviewed this revision to the WAC and has made the determination that this change is consistent with federal regulations; thus, the EPA is proposing approval of this change to Washington's SIP.

### III. Proposed Action

The EPA is proposing approval of Chapter 173–476 WAC *Ambient Air Quality Standards* into the State of Washington's SIP. These changes are consistent with, or more stringent than, the EPA's standards for carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide. Secondly, Ecology repealed Chapter 173–470 WAC that contained outdated standards for particulate matter, previously approved into the SIP on January 15, 1993 (58 FR 4578). Ecology asked the EPA to remove Chapter 173–470 from the SIP because all current particulate matter standards are now consolidated in the newly created Chapter 173–476 WAC. The EPA is proposing to approve this request.

### IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission

that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this 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 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 it will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law. The SIP is not approved to apply in Indian country located in the state, except for non-trust land within the exterior boundaries of the Puyallup Indian Reservation, also known as the 1873 Survey Area. Under the *Puyallup Tribe of Indians Settlement Act of 1989*, 25

U.S.C. 1773, Congress explicitly provided state and local agencies in Washington authority over activities on non-trust lands within the 1873 Survey Area and the EPA is therefore approving this SIP on such lands. Consistent with EPA policy, the EPA nonetheless provided a consultation opportunity to the Puyallup Tribe in a letter dated September 3, 2013. The EPA did not receive a request for consultation.

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

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

Dated: December 19, 2013.

**Dennis J. McLerran,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 10.*

[FR Doc. 2013–31262 Filed 12–30–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 271

[EPA–R01–RCRA–2013–0554; FRL–9904–46–Region 1]

### Vermont: Proposed Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA proposes to grant final authorization to the State of Vermont for changes to its hazardous waste program. In the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register** we are authorizing the changes to the Vermont hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) as a direct final rule without prior proposed rule. EPA has determined that these changes satisfy all requirements needed to qualify for final authorization. If we receive no adverse comment, we will not take further action on this proposed rule.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received by January 30, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R01–RCRA–2013–0554, by mail to Sharon Leitch, RCRA Waste Management and UST Section, Office of Site Remediation and Restoration (OSRR07–1), US EPA Region 1, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Boston, MA 02109–3912.

Comments may also be submitted electronically or thorough hand delivery/courier by following the detailed instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section of the direct final rule located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Sharon Leitch, RCRA Waste Management and UST Section, Office of Site Remediation and Restoration (OSRR07-1), US EPA Region 1, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Boston, MA 02109-3912; telephone number: (617) 918-1647; fax number: (617) 918-0647; email address: [leitch.sharon@epa.gov](mailto:leitch.sharon@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is authorizing these changes by a direct final rule. EPA did not make a proposal prior to the direct final rule because we believe this action is not controversial and do not expect adverse comments that oppose it. We have explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the direct final rule. Unless we receive written adverse comments which oppose this authorization during the comment period, the direct final rule will become effective on the date it establishes, and we will not take further

action on this proposal. If we get comments that oppose this action, we will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take immediate effect. We will then respond to public comments in a later final rule based on this proposal. You may not have another opportunity for comment. If you want to comment on this action, you should do so at this time.

Dated: November 5, 2013.

**H. Curtis Spalding,**

*Regional Administrator, EPA Region 1.*

[FR Doc. 2013-31125 Filed 12-30-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**