

Dated: April 22, 2014.

**Susan Hedman,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 2014–10115 Filed 5–1–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R02–OAR–2013–0527, FRL–9910–16–Region 2]

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide Primary Standard

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve certain elements of New York's State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted to demonstrate that the State meets the requirements of section 110(a)(1) and (2) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) for the 2010 National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). Section 110(a) of the CAA requires that each state adopt and submit a SIP for the implementation, maintenance and enforcement of each NAAQS promulgated by the EPA and is commonly referred to as an infrastructure SIP.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before June 2, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID number EPA–R02–OAR–2013–0527, by one of the following methods:

- *www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- Email: [Ruvo.Richard@epa.gov](mailto:Ruvo.Richard@epa.gov).
- Fax: 212–637–3901.
- Mail: Richard Ruvo, Chief, Air Programs Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 Office, 290 Broadway, 25th Floor, New York, New York 10007–1866.
- Hand Delivery: Richard Ruvo, Chief, Air Programs Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 Office, 290 Broadway, 25th Floor, New York, New York 10007–1866. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office's normal hours of operation. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30 excluding Federal holidays.

*Instructions:* Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–R02–OAR–2013–

0527. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at *www.regulations.gov*, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through *www.regulations.gov* or email. The *www.regulations.gov* Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means 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* 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 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://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 <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 Office, Air Programs Branch, 290 Broadway, 25th Floor, New York, New York 10007–1866. EPA requests, if at all possible, that you contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to view the hard copy of the docket. You may view the hard copy of the docket Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Anthony (Ted) Gardella, Air Programs Branch, Environmental Protection

Agency, 290 Broadway, 25th Floor, New York, New York 10007–1866, (212) 637–4249, or by email at [gardella.anthony@epa.gov](mailto:gardella.anthony@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. What action is EPA proposing?
- II. What is the background information?
- III. What elements are required under section 110(a)(1) and (2)?
- IV. What is EPA's approach to the review of infrastructure SIP submissions?
- V. What did New York submit?
- VI. How has the State addressed the elements of the section 110(a)(1) and (2) "infrastructure" provisions?
- VII. What action is EPA taking?
- VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. What action is EPA proposing?

EPA is proposing to approve certain elements of the State of New York Infrastructure SIP as meeting the section 110(a) infrastructure requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA) for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS or standard). As explained below, the State has the necessary infrastructure, resources, and general authority to implement the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> standard.

#### II. What is the background information?

On February 9, 2010, EPA promulgated a new, 1-hour primary NAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub> (2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS) while retaining the annual primary NAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub> (75 FR 6474). The 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS is based on 1-hour three year average concentrations.<sup>1</sup> The 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS is 100 parts per billion (ppb) and the new standard supplements the existing primary annual standard of 53 ppb. The secondary NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS remains unchanged and is the same as the primary annual average NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, i.e., 53 ppb.<sup>2</sup>

Section 110(a)(1) provides the procedural and timing requirements for State Implementation Plans (SIPs). Section 110(a)(2) lists specific elements that states must meet for SIP requirements related to a newly established or revised NAAQS. Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) of the CAA require, in part, that states submit to EPA plans to implement, maintain and enforce each of the NAAQS promulgated by EPA. By statute, SIPs meeting the requirements of section 110(a)(1) and (2) are to be submitted by states within three years

<sup>1</sup> The 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS is expressed as the three year average of the 98th percentile of the annual distribution of daily maximum 1-hour average concentrations.

<sup>2</sup> The official level of the annual NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS is 0.053 parts per million (ppm), equal to 53 ppb which is shown here for the purpose of clearer comparison to the 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

after promulgation of a new or revised standard. These SIPs are commonly called infrastructure SIPs. Based on the February 9, 2010 promulgation date, infrastructure SIPs for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS were due on February 9, 2013.

### III. What elements are required under section 110(a)(1) and (2)?

The infrastructure requirements are listed in EPA's October 2, 2007, memorandum entitled "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards" and September 25, 2009, memorandum entitled "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standards. In addition, in a memorandum dated September 13, 2013, EPA released new guidance entitled "Guidance on Infrastructure State Implementation Plan (SIP) Elements under Clean Air Act Sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2)," <sup>3</sup> This new guidance (2013 Guidance) addresses the 2008 ozone, 2010 NO<sub>2</sub>, 2010 SO<sub>2</sub>, and 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, as well as infrastructure SIPs for new or revised NAAQS promulgated in the future. The 14 elements required to be addressed are as follows: (1) Emission limits and other control measures; (2) ambient air quality monitoring/data system; (3) program for enforcement of control measures; (4) interstate transport; (5) adequate resources; (6) stationary source monitoring system; (7) emergency power; (8) future SIP revisions; (9) consultation with government officials; (10) public notification; (11) prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) and visibility protection; (12) air quality modeling/data; (13) permitting fees, and (14) consultation/participation by affected local entities.

Two elements identified in section 110(a)(2) are not governed by the 3 year submission deadline of section 110(a)(1) because SIPs incorporating necessary local nonattainment area controls are not due within 3 years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS, but rather due at the time that the nonattainment area plan requirements are due pursuant to section 172. See 77 FR 46354 (August 3, 2012); 77 FR 60308 (October 3, 2012, footnote 1). These requirements are: (1) submissions required by section 110(a)(2)(C) to the extent that subsection

refers to a permit program as required in part D Title I of the CAA, and (2) submissions required by section 110(a)(2)(I) which pertain to the nonattainment planning requirements of part D, Title I of the CAA. As a result, this action does not address the nonattainment planning requirements related to section 110(a)(2)(C) or 110(a)(2)(I).

### IV. What is EPA's approach to the review of infrastructure SIP submissions?

EPA is acting upon the SIP submission from New York State that addresses the infrastructure requirements of CAA sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. The requirement for states to make a SIP submission of this type arises out of CAA section 110(a)(1). Pursuant to section 110(a)(1), states must make SIP submissions "within 3 years (or such shorter period as the Administrator may prescribe) after the promulgation of a national primary ambient air quality standard (or any revision thereof)," and these SIP submissions are to provide for the "implementation, maintenance, and enforcement" of such NAAQS. The statute directly imposes on states the duty to make these SIP submissions, and the requirement to make the submissions is not conditioned upon EPA's taking any action other than promulgating a new or revised NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) includes a list of specific elements that "[e]ach such plan" submission must address.

EPA has historically referred to these SIP submissions made for the purpose of satisfying the requirements of CAA sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) as "infrastructure SIP" submissions. Although the term "infrastructure SIP" does not appear in the CAA, EPA uses the term to distinguish this particular type of SIP submission from submissions that are intended to satisfy other SIP requirements under the CAA, such as "nonattainment SIP" or "attainment plan SIP" submissions to address the nonattainment planning requirements of part D of title I of the CAA, "regional haze SIP" submissions required by EPA rule to address the visibility protection requirements of CAA section 169A, and nonattainment new source review permit program submissions to address the permit requirements of CAA, title I, part D.

Section 110(a)(1) addresses the timing and general requirements for infrastructure SIP submissions, and section 110(a)(2) provides more details concerning the required contents of these submissions. The list of required elements provided in section 110(a)(2)

contains a wide variety of disparate provisions, some of which pertain to required legal authority, some of which pertain to required substantive program provisions, and some of which pertain to requirements for both authority and substantive program provisions.<sup>4</sup> EPA therefore believes that while the timing requirement in section 110(a)(1) is unambiguous, some of the other statutory provisions are ambiguous. In particular, EPA believes that the list of required elements for infrastructure SIP submissions provided in section 110(a)(2) contains ambiguities concerning what is required for inclusion in an infrastructure SIP submission.

The following examples of ambiguities illustrate the need for EPA to interpret some section 110(a)(1) and section 110(a)(2) requirements with respect to infrastructure SIP submissions for a given new or revised NAAQS. One example of ambiguity is that section 110(a)(2) requires that "each" SIP submission must meet the list of requirements therein, while EPA has long noted that this literal reading of the statute is internally inconsistent and would create a conflict with the nonattainment provisions in part D of title I of the Act, which specifically address nonattainment SIP requirements.<sup>5</sup> Section 110(a)(2)(I) pertains to nonattainment SIP requirements and part D addresses when attainment plan SIP submissions to address nonattainment area requirements are due. For example, section 172(b) requires EPA to establish a schedule for submission of such plans for certain pollutants when the Administrator promulgates the designation of an area as nonattainment, and section 107(d)(1)(B) allows up to two years, or in some cases three years, for such designations to be promulgated.<sup>6</sup> This ambiguity illustrates

<sup>4</sup> For example: Section 110(a)(2)(E)(i) provides that states must provide assurances that they have adequate legal authority under state and local law to carry out the SIP; section 110(a)(2)(C) provides that states must have a SIP-approved program to address certain sources as required by part C of title I of the CAA; and section 110(a)(2)(G) provides that states must have legal authority to address emergencies as well as contingency plans that are triggered in the event of such emergencies.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., "Rule To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone (Clean Air Interstate Rule); Revisions to Acid Rain Program; Revisions to the NO<sub>x</sub> SIP Call; Final Rule," 70 FR 25162, at 25163-65 (May 12, 2005) (explaining relationship between timing requirement of section 110(a)(2)(D) versus section 110(a)(2)(I)).

<sup>6</sup> EPA notes that this ambiguity within section 110(a)(2) is heightened by the fact that various subparts of part D set specific dates for submission of certain types of SIP submissions in designated nonattainment areas for various pollutants. Note,

<sup>3</sup> "Guidance on Infrastructure State Implementation Plan (SIP) Elements under Clean Air Act Sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2)" can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/airquality/urbanair/sipstatus/infrastructure.html>.

that rather than apply all the stated requirements of section 110(a)(2) in a strict literal sense, EPA must determine which provisions of section 110(a)(2) are applicable for a particular infrastructure SIP submission.

Another example of ambiguity within sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) with respect to infrastructure SIPs pertains to whether states must meet all of the infrastructure SIP requirements in a single SIP submission, and whether EPA must act upon such SIP submission in a single action. Although section 110(a)(1) directs states to submit “a plan” to meet these requirements, EPA interprets the CAA to allow states to make multiple SIP submissions separately addressing infrastructure SIP elements for the same NAAQS. If states elect to make such multiple SIP submissions to meet the infrastructure SIP requirements, EPA can elect to act on such submissions either individually or in a larger combined action.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, EPA interprets the CAA to allow it to take action on the individual parts of one larger, comprehensive infrastructure SIP submission for a given NAAQS without concurrent action on the entire submission. For example, EPA has sometimes elected to act at different times on various elements and sub-elements of the same infrastructure SIP submission.<sup>8</sup>

Ambiguities within sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) may also arise with respect to infrastructure SIP submission requirements for different NAAQS. Thus, EPA notes that not every element

e.g., that section 182(a)(1) provides specific dates for submission of emissions inventories for the ozone NAAQS. Some of these specific dates are necessarily later than three years after promulgation of the new or revised NAAQS.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Revisions to the New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR) Permitting,” 78 FR 4339 (January 22, 2013) (EPA’s final action approving the structural PSD elements of the New Mexico SIP submitted by the State separately to meet the requirements of EPA’s 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NSR rule), and “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Infrastructure and Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS,” (78 FR 4337) (January 22, 2013) (EPA’s final action on the infrastructure SIP for the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS).

<sup>8</sup> On December 14, 2007, the State of Tennessee, through the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, made a SIP revision to EPA demonstrating that the State meets the requirements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2). EPA proposed action for infrastructure SIP elements (C) and (J) on January 23, 2012 (77 FR 3213) and took final action on March 14, 2012 (77 FR 14976). On April 16, 2012 (77 FR 22533) and July 23, 2012 (77 FR 42997), EPA took separate proposed and final actions on all other section 110(a)(2) infrastructure SIP elements of Tennessee’s December 14, 2007 submittal.

of section 110(a)(2) would be relevant, or as relevant, or relevant in the same way, for each new or revised NAAQS. The states’ attendant infrastructure SIP submissions for each NAAQS therefore could be different. For example, the monitoring requirements that a state might need to meet in its infrastructure SIP submission for purposes of section 110(a)(2)(B) could be very different for different pollutants, for example because the content and scope of a state’s infrastructure SIP submission to meet this element might be very different for an entirely new NAAQS than for a minor revision to an existing NAAQS.<sup>9</sup>

EPA notes that interpretation of section 110(a)(2) is also necessary when EPA reviews other types of SIP submissions required under the CAA. Therefore, as with infrastructure SIP submissions, EPA also has to identify and interpret the relevant elements of section 110(a)(2) that logically apply to these other types of SIP submissions. For example, section 172(c)(7) requires that attainment plan SIP submissions required by part D have to meet the “applicable requirements” of section 110(a)(2). Thus, for example, attainment plan SIP submissions must meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(A) regarding enforceable emission limits and control measures and section 110(a)(2)(E)(i) regarding air agency resources and authority. By contrast, it is clear that attainment plan SIP submissions required by part D would not need to meet the portion of section 110(a)(2)(C) that pertains to the PSD program required in part C of title I of the CAA, because PSD does not apply to a pollutant for which an area is designated nonattainment and thus subject to part D planning requirements. As this example illustrates, each type of SIP submission may implicate some elements of section 110(a)(2) but not others.

Given the potential for ambiguity in some of the statutory language of section 110(a)(1) and section 110(a)(2), EPA believes that it is appropriate to interpret the ambiguous portions of section 110(a)(1) and section 110(a)(2) in the context of acting on a particular SIP submission. In other words, EPA assumes that Congress could not have intended that each and every SIP submission, regardless of the NAAQS in question or the history of SIP development for the relevant pollutant, would meet each of the requirements, or

<sup>9</sup> For example, implementation of the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS required the deployment of a system of new monitors to measure ambient levels of that new indicator species for the new NAAQS.

meet each of them in the same way. Therefore, EPA has adopted an approach under which it reviews infrastructure SIP submissions against the list of elements in section 110(a)(2), but only to the extent each element applies for that particular NAAQS.

Historically, EPA has elected to use guidance documents to make recommendations to states for infrastructure SIPs, in some cases conveying needed interpretations on newly arising issues and in some cases conveying interpretations that have already been developed and applied to individual SIP submissions for particular elements.<sup>10</sup> EPA most recently issued guidance for infrastructure SIPs on September 13, 2013 (2013 Guidance).<sup>11</sup> EPA developed this document to provide states with up-to-date guidance for infrastructure SIPs for any new or revised NAAQS. Within this guidance, EPA describes the duty of states to make infrastructure SIP submissions to meet basic structural SIP requirements within three years of promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS. EPA also made recommendations about many specific subsections of section 110(a)(2) that are relevant in the context of infrastructure SIP submissions.<sup>12</sup> The guidance also discusses the substantively important issues that are germane to certain subsections of section 110(a)(2). Significantly, EPA interprets sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) such that infrastructure SIP submissions need to address certain issues and need not address others. Accordingly, EPA reviews each infrastructure SIP submission for compliance with the

<sup>10</sup> EPA notes, however, that nothing in the CAA requires EPA to provide guidance or to promulgate regulations for infrastructure SIP submissions. The CAA directly applies to states and requires the submission of infrastructure SIP submissions, regardless of whether or not EPA provides guidance or regulations pertaining to such submissions. EPA elects to issue such guidance in order to assist states, as appropriate.

<sup>11</sup> “Guidance on Infrastructure State Implementation Plan (SIP) Elements under Clean Air Act Sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2),” Memorandum from Stephen D. Page, September 13, 2013.

<sup>12</sup> EPA’s September 13, 2013, guidance did not make recommendations with respect to infrastructure SIP submissions to address section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I). EPA issued the guidance shortly after the U.S. Supreme Court agreed to review the D.C. Circuit decision in *EME Homer City*, 696 F.3d (D.C. Cir. 2012) which had interpreted the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I). In light of the uncertainty created by ongoing litigation, EPA elected not to provide additional guidance on the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) at that time. As the guidance is neither binding nor required by statute, whether EPA elects to provide guidance on a particular section has no impact on a state’s CAA obligations.

applicable statutory provisions of section 110(a)(2), as appropriate.

As an example, section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) is a required element of section 110(a)(2) for infrastructure SIP submissions. Under this element, a state must meet the substantive requirements of section 128, which pertain to state boards that approve permits or enforcement orders and heads of executive agencies with similar powers. Thus, EPA reviews infrastructure SIP submissions to ensure that the state's SIP appropriately addresses the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) and section 128. The 2013 Guidance explains EPA's interpretation that there may be a variety of ways by which states can appropriately address these substantive statutory requirements, depending on the structure of an individual state's permitting or enforcement program (e.g., whether permits and enforcement orders are approved by a multi-member board or by a head of an executive agency). However they are addressed by the state, the substantive requirements of section 128 are necessarily included in EPA's evaluation of infrastructure SIP submissions because section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) explicitly requires that the state satisfy the provisions of section 128.

As another example, EPA's review of infrastructure SIP submissions with respect to the PSD program requirements in sections 110(a)(2)(C), (D)(i)(II), and (F) focuses upon the structural PSD program requirements contained in part C and EPA's PSD regulations. Structural PSD program requirements include provisions necessary for the PSD program to address all regulated sources and NSR pollutants, including GHGs. By contrast, structural PSD program requirements do not include provisions that are not required under EPA's regulations at 40 CFR 51.166 but are merely available as an option for the state, such as the option to provide grandfathering of complete permit applications with respect to the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. Accordingly, the latter optional provisions are types of provisions EPA considers irrelevant in the context of an infrastructure SIP action.

For other section 110(a)(2) elements, however, EPA's review of a state's infrastructure SIP submission focuses on assuring that the state's SIP meets basic structural requirements. For example, section 110(a)(2)(C) includes, *inter alia*, the requirement that states have a program to regulate minor new sources. Thus, EPA evaluates whether the state has an EPA-approved minor new source review program and

whether the program addresses the pollutants relevant to that NAAQS. In the context of acting on an infrastructure SIP submission, however, EPA does not think it is necessary to conduct a review of each and every provision of a state's existing minor source program (i.e., already in the existing SIP) for compliance with the requirements of the CAA and EPA's regulations that pertain to such programs.

With respect to certain other issues, EPA does not believe that an action on a state's infrastructure SIP submission is necessarily the appropriate type of action in which to address possible deficiencies in a state's existing SIP. These issues include: (i) Existing provisions related to excess emissions from sources during periods of startup, shutdown, or malfunction that may be contrary to the CAA and EPA's policies addressing such excess emissions ("SSM"); (ii) existing provisions related to "director's variance" or "director's discretion" that may be contrary to the CAA because they purport to allow revisions to SIP-approved emissions limits while limiting public process or not requiring further approval by EPA; and (iii) existing provisions for PSD programs that may be inconsistent with current requirements of EPA's "Final NSR Improvement Rule," 67 FR 80186 (December 31, 2002), as amended by 72 FR 32526 (June 13, 2007) ("NSR Reform"). Thus, EPA believes it may approve an infrastructure SIP submission without scrutinizing the totality of the existing SIP for such potentially deficient provisions and may approve the submission even if it is aware of such existing provisions.<sup>13</sup> It is important to note that EPA's approval of a state's infrastructure SIP submission should not be construed as explicit or implicit re-approval of any existing potentially deficient provisions that relate to the three specific issues just described.

EPA's approach to review of infrastructure SIP submissions is to identify the CAA requirements that are logically applicable to that submission. EPA believes that this approach to the review of a particular infrastructure SIP submission is appropriate, because it would not be reasonable to read the general requirements of section 110(a)(1) and the list of elements in

<sup>13</sup> By contrast, EPA notes that if a state were to include a new provision in an infrastructure SIP submission that contained a legal deficiency, such as a new exemption for excess emissions during SSM events, then EPA would need to evaluate that provision for compliance against the rubric of applicable CAA requirements in the context of the action on the infrastructure SIP.

110(a)(2) as requiring review of each and every provision of a state's existing SIP against all requirements in the CAA and EPA regulations merely for purposes of assuring that the state in question has the basic structural elements for a functioning SIP for a new or revised NAAQS. Because SIPs have grown by accretion over the decades as statutory and regulatory requirements under the CAA have evolved, they may include some outmoded provisions and historical artifacts. These provisions, while not fully up to date, nevertheless may not pose a significant problem for the purposes of "implementation, maintenance, and enforcement" of a new or revised NAAQS when EPA evaluates adequacy of the infrastructure SIP submission. EPA believes that a better approach is for states and EPA to focus attention on those elements of section 110(a)(2) of the CAA most likely to warrant a specific SIP revision due to the promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS or other factors.

For example, EPA's 2013 Guidance gives simpler recommendations with respect to carbon monoxide than other NAAQS pollutants to meet the visibility requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II), because carbon monoxide does not affect visibility. As a result, an infrastructure SIP submission for any future new or revised NAAQS for carbon monoxide need only state this fact in order to address the visibility prong of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II). Finally, EPA believes that its approach with respect to infrastructure SIP requirements is based on a reasonable reading of sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) because the CAA provides other avenues and mechanisms to address specific substantive deficiencies in existing SIPs. These other statutory tools allow EPA to take appropriately tailored action, depending upon the nature and severity of the alleged SIP deficiency. Section 110(k)(5) authorizes EPA to issue a "SIP call" whenever the Agency determines that a state's SIP is substantially inadequate to attain or maintain the NAAQS, to mitigate interstate transport, or to otherwise comply with the CAA.<sup>14</sup> Section 110(k)(6) authorizes EPA to correct errors in past actions, such as past approvals of SIP submissions.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> For example, EPA issued a SIP call to Utah to address specific existing SIP deficiencies related to the treatment of excess emissions during SSM events. See "Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Utah State Implementation Plan Revisions," 74 FR 21639 (April 18, 2011).

<sup>15</sup> EPA has used this authority to correct errors in past actions on SIP submissions related to PSD

Significantly, EPA's determination that an action on a state's infrastructure SIP submission is not the appropriate time and place to address all potential existing SIP deficiencies does not preclude EPA's subsequent reliance on provisions in section 110(a)(2) as part of the basis for action to correct those deficiencies at a later time. For example, although it may not be appropriate to require a state to eliminate all existing inappropriate director's discretion provisions in the course of acting on an infrastructure SIP submission, EPA believes that section 110(a)(2)(A) may be among the statutory bases that EPA relies upon in the course of addressing such deficiency in a subsequent action.<sup>16</sup>

#### V. What did New York submit?

New York's section 110 infrastructure submittal was submitted by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) on May 8, 2013, as supplemented on May 23, 2013, and addressed the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. New York's May 2013 section 110 submittals demonstrate how the State, where applicable, has a plan in place that meets the requirements of section 110 for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. This plan references the current New York Air Quality SIP, the New York Codes of Rules and Regulations (NYCRR), the New York Environmental Conservation Law (ECL) and the New York Public Officer's Law (POL). The NYCRR, ECL and POL referenced in the submittal are publicly available. New York's SIP and air pollution control regulations that have been previously approved by EPA and incorporated into the New York SIP can be found at 40 CFR 52.1670 and are posted on the Internet at: [http://www.epa.gov/region02/air/sip/ny\\_reg.htm](http://www.epa.gov/region02/air/sip/ny_reg.htm).

programs. See "Limitation of Approval of Prevention of Significant Deterioration Provisions Concerning Greenhouse Gas Emitting-Sources in State Implementation Plans; Final Rule," 75 FR 82536 (December 30, 2010). EPA has previously used its authority under CAA section 110(k)(6) to remove numerous other SIP provisions that the Agency determined it had approved in error. See, e.g., 61 FR 38664 (July 25, 1996) and 62 FR 34641 (June 27, 1997) (corrections to American Samoa, Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada SIPs); 69 FR 67062 (November 16, 2004) (corrections to California SIP); and 74 FR 57051 (November 3, 2009) (corrections to Arizona and Nevada SIPs).

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., EPA's disapproval of a SIP submission from Colorado on the grounds that it would have included a director's discretion provision inconsistent with CAA requirements, including section 110(a)(2)(A). See, e.g., 75 FR 42342 at 42344 (July 21, 2010) (proposed disapproval of director's discretion provisions); 76 FR 4540 (Jan. 26, 2011) (final disapproval of such provisions).

#### VI. How has the State addressed the elements of the section 110(a)(1) and (2) "infrastructure" provisions?

EPA compared New York's Infrastructure SIP submittals for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS to New York's Infrastructure SIP submittals for the 1997 8-hour ozone and the 1997 and 2006 fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) NAAQS. On June 20, 2013, EPA took final action [see 78 FR 37122] approving certain elements and sub-elements of New York's 1997 8-hour ozone and the 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Infrastructure SIPs. Based upon EPA's comparison, EPA has determined that the information provided in New York's 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> Infrastructure SIP is nearly identical to the information provided in New York's Infrastructure SIP submittals for the 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. Infrastructure SIPs for different criteria pollutants can have common aspects which are identical for each NAAQS (e.g., authority to promulgate emission limitations, enforcement, air quality modeling capabilities, adequate personnel, resources and legal authority). The rationale for approving certain elements of New York's Infrastructure SIP for NO<sub>2</sub> is the same as the rationale for approving those elements of New York's 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Infrastructure SIPs. Since the rationale for approving certain elements of New York's NO<sub>2</sub> Infrastructure SIP is the same as the rationale for approving certain elements of New York's 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Infrastructure SIPs, EPA is not repeating this evaluation in today's proposal. Instead, the reader is referred to EPA's evaluation of the three SIP submittals (the 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Infrastructure SIPs) detailed in the following three documents: (1) "Technical Support Document for EPA's Proposed Rulemaking for the New York's State Implementation Plan Revision: State Implementation Plan Revision For Meeting the Infrastructure Requirements In the Clean Air Act Dated December 13, 2007, October 2, 2008 and March 15, 2010" (TSD); (2) EPA's proposed approval dated April 30, 2013 (78 FR 25236); and, (3) EPA's June 20, 2013 final rule approving certain elements of New York's Infrastructure SIPs for the 1997 8-hour ozone and the 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS (78 FR 37122). These three documents are available in the electronic docket for today's proposed action at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). We are, of course, accepting comments on that rationale as it applies to our proposed

approval of New York's Infrastructure SIP for the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

EPA is proposing approval of the following elements and sub-elements of New York's Infrastructure SIP for NO<sub>2</sub>: 110(a)(2)(A) [Emission limits and other control measures]; 110(a)(2)(B) [Ambient air quality monitoring/data system]; 110(a)(2)(C) [Program for enforcement of control measures]; 110(a)(2)(D) [Interstate transport]; 110(a)(2)(E) [Adequate resources]; 110(a)(2)(F) [Stationary source monitoring]; 110(a)(2)(G) [Emergency power]; 110(a)(2)(H) [Future SIP Revisions]; 110(a)(2)(J) [Consultation with government official, public notification, PSD, and visibility protection]; 110(a)(2)(K) [Air quality and modeling/data]; 110(a)(2)(L) [Permitting fees]; 110(a)(2)(M) [Consultation/participation by affected local entities].

As stated above, there are certain aspects of the elements of New York's Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS that are common to New York's 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Infrastructure SIPs that EPA approved on June 20, 2013 and therefore EPA is not repeating the rationale for approving the following elements of New York's Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS in today's proposal: Elements A, D(i)(II), D(ii), E, F, H, I, J, K, L, and M.

As discussed in the following sections, for those elements of New York's NO<sub>2</sub> Infrastructure SIP that differ from New York's 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Infrastructure SIPs, EPA has reviewed and evaluated the aspects of those elements, namely elements B, C, D(i)(I) and G.

*Element B: Ambient air quality monitoring/data system:* Section 110(a)(2)(B) requires SIPs to include provisions to provide for establishment and operation of ambient air quality monitors, to monitor, compile and analyze ambient air quality data, and to make these data available to EPA upon request. EPA requires that states establish a new ambient air quality monitoring and reporting requirements for NO<sub>2</sub> as follows: (1) In urban areas near major roads and other locations where maximum concentration is expected; (2) community wide monitoring in large urban areas; and (3) in locations where EPA identifies monitoring will help protect communities that are susceptible and vulnerable to NO<sub>2</sub>-related health effects. New York addressed EPA's new monitoring requirements when it submitted its Annual Monitoring Network Review Plan (Plan) of 2013 on July 18, 2013. EPA approved this Plan on September 5, 2013. EPA is therefore

proposing to determine that New York has met the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(B) of the CAA with respect to the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. A copy of New York's 2013 Monitoring Plan and EPA's September 5, 2013 approval letter are in the docket for today's proposal at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov).

*Element C: Program for enforcement of control measures:* Section 110(a)(2)(C) requires states to have a plan that includes a program providing for enforcement of all SIP measures and the regulation of the modification and construction of any stationary source, including a program to meet Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) of Air Quality and minor source new source review.

New York's Infrastructure SIP for NO<sub>2</sub> references the State's PSD and Nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR) permitting requirements contained in 6 NYCRR Part 231, Part 200 and Part 201. EPA approved these rules into the SIP on November 17, 2010 (75 FR 70140). New York's minor source new source review program is regulated under Part 201.

EPA has reviewed and evaluated New York's Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS for meeting the requirements of element C. While the Infrastructure SIP does not specifically reference NO<sub>2</sub>, it refers to the State's PSD permitting requirements in Part 231 which regulates oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) which includes NO<sub>2</sub>. In addition, element C of New York's Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS refers to 8-hour ozone. NO<sub>x</sub> is a precursor of ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub> is one of the components of NO<sub>x</sub>. Moreover, the PSD portion of Part 231 regulates the construction of proposed new or modified facilities that are required to demonstrate in their permit application that allowable emission increases from the facilities, in conjunction with all other applicable emission increases or reductions (including secondary emissions), would not, among other things, cause or significantly contribute to air pollution in violation of any national ambient air quality standard<sup>17</sup> in any air quality control region. Since NO<sub>2</sub> is a NAAQS, the PSD provisions of Part 231 are applicable to NO<sub>2</sub>. For these reasons, EPA concludes that by referencing Part 231, which is part of New York's approved SIP, New York's Infrastructure SIP addresses the PSD

requirements of section 110(a)(2)(C) for NO<sub>2</sub>.

Therefore, EPA proposes to find that the State has adequate authority and regulations to ensure that SIP-approved control measures are enforced. EPA also finds that based on the approval of New York's PSD program, New York has the authority to regulate the construction of new or modified stationary sources to meet the PSD program requirements. EPA is proposing to determine that New York has met the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(C) and (J) of the CAA with respect to the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. It should be noted that the PSD provisions of Part 231 address the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(J) as well as section 110(a)(2)(C).

*Element D: Interstate transport:* Section 110(a)(2)(D) of the Clean Air Act is divided into two subsections, 110(a)(2)(D)(i) and 110(a)(2)(D)(ii). The first of these, 110(a)(2)(D)(i), in turn, contains four "prongs" the first two of which appear in 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and the second two of which appear in 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II). The two prongs in 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) prohibit any source or other type of emissions activity within the State from emitting any air pollutants in amounts which will contribute significantly to nonattainment in any other state with respect to any primary or secondary NAAQS (prong 1), or interfere with maintenance by any other state with respect to any primary or secondary NAAQS (prong 2). The two prongs in 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) prohibit any source or other type of emissions activity within the State from emitting any air pollutants in amounts which will interfere with measures required to be included in the applicable implementation plan for any other state under part C to prevent significant deterioration of air quality (prong 3) or to protect visibility (prong 4). Subsection 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) addresses interstate and international pollution abatement, and requires SIPs to include provisions insuring compliance with sections 115 and 126 of the CAA, relating to interstate and international pollution abatement.

In this action, EPA is proposing to approve the 110(a)(2)(D) portion of the New York SIP submission and determine that the existing New York SIP contains provisions sufficient to satisfy all of the requirements of 110(a)(2)(D) for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. With respect to the requirements of 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II), i.e., prongs 3 and 4, and 110(a)(2)(D)(ii), EPA is proposing to approve the SIP submission based on the rationale presented in a June 20, 2013 **Federal Register** notice approving

New York's Infrastructure SIP for the 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS (78 FR 37122; June 20, 2013). As that rationale was presented in some detail in the June 20, 2013 notice, it is not repeated in today's proposal. We are, of course, accepting comments on that rationale as it applies to our proposed approval of New York's Infrastructure SIP for the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

The New York SIP contains provisions to address the requirements of 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), i.e. prongs 1 and 2 of 110(a)(2)(D)(i), with respect to the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.<sup>18</sup> EPA reviewed New York's May 8, 2013 infrastructure SIP submission for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS and, based on that review and EPA's review of relevant air quality data, EPA is proposing to determine that New York's SIP includes adequate provisions to prohibit sources or other emission activities within the State from emitting NO<sub>x</sub> in amounts that will contribute significantly to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance by any other state with respect specifically to the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. NO<sub>2</sub> is a component of NO<sub>x</sub>.

The EPA approved New York SIP presently includes requirements for emissions limits on NO<sub>x</sub> including, but not limited to, Title 6 of the New York Codes, Rules and Regulations (6 NYCRR) Parts 212, 217, 218, 219, 220, 224, 227–2, and 249. *See* 40 CFR 40 CFR 52.1670(c).

- Part 212—Imposes reasonably available control technology (RACT) on major stationary sources not otherwise covered by other regulations.
- Part 217—Requires enhanced inspection and maintenance of light-duty motor vehicles.
- Part 218—Establishes emission standards for motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines.
- Part 219—Imposes controls on various type of incinerators.
- Part 220—Imposes RACT on emissions from cement kilns.
- Part 224—Imposes controls on NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from nitric acid plants.

<sup>18</sup> In accordance with the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, EPA at this time is not treating the 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) portion of the SIP submission from New York (which is part of the larger May 8, 2013 SIP submission for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS) as a required SIP submission. *See EME Homer City Generation, L.P. v. EPA*, 696 F.3d 7 (D.C. Cir. 2012), cert. granted 133 S.Ct. 2857 (2013). On June 24, 2013, the Supreme Court granted the petitions of the United States and others and agreed to review the merits of the D.C. Circuit decision in *EME Homer City* during the Court's 2013 term. Regardless of whether a particular SIP submission is considered "required," however, section 110(k)(2) of the CAA requires EPA to act on the submission.

<sup>17</sup> EPA has set NAAQS for six principal pollutants, as follows: Carbon monoxide (CO), lead (Pb), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), particle pollution (PM), and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>).

—Part 227–2—Imposes RACT on utility and industrial boilers, combustion turbines, stationary internal combustion engines and other combustion installations (major facility of NO<sub>x</sub> that contains an emission source type not regulated under the other Parts). Major facilities existing prior to June 1, 2010 must comply with new NO<sub>x</sub> RACT emission limits by July 1, 2014.

—Part 249—Applies best available retrofit technology (BART) to any stationary source that has been determined to be BART-eligible and whose emissions require control for the purpose of reducing regional haze. Part 249 requires facilities to submit source-specific BART proposals to New York. This rule applies to applicable BART eligible sources including utility boilers and industrial sources such as boilers, cement plants etc.

In addition, all major stationary sources of NO<sub>2</sub> are subject to the SIP-approved requirements for prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) and nonattainment new source review with Emission Offset Provisions in 6 NYCRR

Part 231 which provide preconstruction review and permitting requirements in attainment and nonattainment areas. The requirements of Part 231 help ensure that no new or modified NO<sub>2</sub> emitting source will cause or contribute to any potential exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

On February 17, 2012 (77 FR 9532), EPA promulgated a rule that established air quality designations for all areas of the country for the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS based on air quality monitoring data for the period 2008–2010. Based upon this 2008–2010 air quality monitoring data, EPA determined that no area of the country is violating the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. EPA reviewed 2008–2012 NO<sub>2</sub> air quality monitoring data for New York, including the Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe, as well as the states surrounding or bordering New York within 50 kilometers of New York’s borders, including Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. EPA selected fifty kilometers from New York for reviewing design values at monitors because 50 kilometers is the standard distance for modeling analysis in EPA’s Guideline on Air Quality Models (Appendix W to

40 CFR Part 51) and EPA is acting consistent with that Guideline. The most recent design values<sup>19</sup> (DVs) that are computed using quality-assured and certified ambient air monitoring data using the Federal Reference method or equivalent data is reported by states, tribes and local agencies to EPA’s Air Quality System (AQS). Data for 2008–2010, 2009–2011 and 2010–2012 for monitors in states surrounding or bordering New York within 50 kilometers of New York are in Table 1 below and show that the DVs are well below the NAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub>. The level of the 1-hour NAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub> is 100 parts per billion (ppb) and the form is the 3-year average of the annual 98th percentile of the daily 1-hour maximum. In the states surrounding and bordering New York within the 50 kilometers reviewed by EPA, there are no areas with design values for 2008–2010, 2009–2011 and 2010–2012 that exceed the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. For example, the highest DV for 2008–2010 is 73 (Union, NJ), well below the 100 ppb NAAQS. See Table 1 below for DVs surrounding and bordering New York within 50 kilometers of New York.

TABLE 1—DESIGN VALUES SURROUNDING AND BORDERING NEW YORK STATE<sup>20</sup>

State	County	Site	2008–2010 Final DV (ppb)	2009–2011 Final DV (ppb)	2010–2012 Final DV (ppb)
NY	Bronx	36–005–0133	67	66	63
NY	Erie	36–029–0005	71		
NY	Nassau	36–059–0005	57		
NY	Queens	36–081–0124	68		
NY	Steuben	36–101–0003		14	
MA	Hampden	25–013–0016	49	50	47
MA	Hampshire	25–015–4002	28	31	27
Conn	Fairfield	09–001–9003	50		
Conn	Hartford	09–003–1003	45	49	46
Conn	New Haven	09–009–0027		59	57
NJ	Bergen	34–003–0006	67		
NJ	Essex	34–013–1003	62	64	60
NJ	Hudson	34–017–0006		65	
NJ	Mercer	34–021–0005	41		
NJ	Middlesex	34–023–0011	49	48	45
NJ	Morris	34–027–3001	38	38	37
NJ	Union	34–039–0004	73	71	70
PA	Erie	42–049–0003	45		
PA	Lackawanna	42–069–2006	44	45	41
VT	Chittenden	50–007–0014	41		
VT	Rutland	50–021–0002	41		

Based on this air quality monitoring data analysis and EPA’s review of NO<sub>x</sub> emission trends within New York, EPA does not expect NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in New York to increase significantly particularly in light of the New York SIP

approved emission limits and New Source Review provisions.

EPA’s analysis of the air quality monitoring data and emission trends also supports EPA’s conclusion that NO<sub>2</sub> emissions are not increasing

significantly in the states surrounding New York and do not appear likely to significantly increase as a result of emissions from New York especially with the New York SIP approved provisions for NO<sub>x</sub>. EPA therefore does

<sup>19</sup> For the most recent design values, see <http://www.epa.gov/airtrends/values.html>.

<sup>20</sup> DVs for the Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe of New York are not shown in Table 1 since EPA determined there is no valid data. Wherever there

is no data shown in Table 1, EPA has no data for those time periods.

not expect monitors identified in the table above which all have DVs well below the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS to have difficulty maintaining the NAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub>. EPA proposes to conclude that New York emission sources are not significantly contributing to nonattainment in another state for the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS and are not likely to interfere with maintenance of the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS in another state.

Because the 2008–2010, the 2009–2011 and also the 2010–2012 quality-assured and certified air quality monitoring data identified above for areas surrounding or bordering New York State within 50 kilometers of New York are well below the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS and because NO<sub>x</sub> emission trends from New York sources do not appear to be increasing, EPA proposes to find that New York's federally enforceable SIP provisions with NO<sub>x</sub> emission limits for NO<sub>x</sub> emission sources contain adequate provisions to ensure New York emission sources will not interfere with maintenance or contribute significantly to nonattainment in another state with respect to the NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

Based upon EPA's review of the air quality data and the State's submittal, EPA is proposing to determine that the State has met its obligations pursuant to 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) with respect to the 2010 NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

*Element G: Emergency power:* Section 110(a)(2)(G) requires states to provide for authority to address activities causing imminent and substantial endangerment to public health, including contingency plans to implement the emergency episode provisions in their SIPs.

EPA requires that Infrastructure SIP submittals should meet the applicable contingency plan requirements of 40 CFR part 51, subpart H (40 CFR 51.150 through 51.153) ("Prevention of Air Pollution Emergency Episodes"). Subpart H requires states that have air quality control regions identified as either Priority I, Priority IA or Priority II to develop emergency episode contingency plans. States are required to develop emergency episode plans for any area that has monitored and recorded annual arithmetic mean NO<sub>2</sub> levels greater than 100 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (0.06 ppm (60 ppb)).<sup>21</sup> Areas which do not meet this level are considered to be Priority III. 40 CFR 51.150(f). In accordance with the guidance, Priority III regions are not required to develop emergency episode

plans which EPA interprets to mean the contingency plans otherwise required under section 51.152. 40 CFR 51.152(c).

Since 2010, air-quality monitors in New York State show that annual arithmetic mean NO<sub>2</sub> levels have been below the 100 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (0.06 ppm (60 ppb)) threshold. In addition, since 2010, ambient air quality levels in New York State have been below the 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS of 100 ppb. Based on certified and quality assured air quality data, New York should be classified as a Priority III region and, therefore, emergency episode plans for NO<sub>2</sub> are not required.

However, in general and for the NO<sub>2</sub> standard, the section 110(a)(2)(G) requirements are addressed by New York's ECL, Articles 3 and 19, which are implemented through 6 NYCRR Part 207, "Control Measures for Air Pollution Episodes." Among other things, 6 NYCRR Part 207 requires persons who own a significant air contamination source to submit a proposed episode action plan to the NYSDEC Commissioner, and enable the Commissioner to designate air pollution episodes which trigger the action plans. Pursuant to Part 207.3(a), the NYSDEC Commissioner shall have on file and make available the criteria used in determining the need to designate episodes. The NYSDEC maintains an "Episode Action Plan" with guidelines and protocols/criteria to be followed in case of an air pollution emergency. The NYSDEC's Episode Action Plan has been updated to reflect the Significant Harm Levels (SHLs) that address the 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS proposed by EPA on July 15, 2009. Therefore, EPA proposes that New York has met the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) for the 2010 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

#### VII. What action is EPA taking?

EPA is proposing to approve New York's submittal as fully meeting the infrastructure requirements for the 2010 primary NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS for all section 110(a)(2) elements and sub-elements, as follows: (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (J), (K), (L), and (M).

EPA is not acting on New York's submittal as it relates to nonattainment provisions, the NSR program required by part D in section 110(a)(2)(C) and the measures for attainment required by section 110(a)(2)(I), as part of the infrastructure SIPs because the State's infrastructure SIP submittal does not include nonattainment requirements and EPA will act on them when, if necessary, they are submitted.

EPA is soliciting public comments on the issues discussed in this proposal. These comments will be considered

before EPA takes final action. Interested parties may participate in the Federal rulemaking procedure by submitting written comments to the EPA Regional Office listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this **Federal Register**, or by submitting comments electronically, by mail, or through hand delivery or courier following the directions in the **ADDRESSES** section of this **Federal Register**.

#### VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the 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 Clean Air Act. 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 (Public Law 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

<sup>21</sup> Section 51.150, Classification of regions for episode plans, was last amended on July 20, 1993 (58 FR 38822) and therefore does not include ambient concentration levels for establishing Priority I Regions for the 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS that was promulgated on February 9, 2010 (75 FR 6474).

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, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: April 21, 2014.

**Judith A. Enck,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 2.*

[FR Doc. 2014-09982 Filed 5-1-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R10-OAR-2008-0122; FRL-9910-03-Region 10]

#### Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Washington; Puget Sound Ozone Maintenance Plan

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is proposing to approve a maintenance plan for the Central Puget Sound area to maintain the 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) through 2015. This plan was submitted by the Washington Department of Ecology as a revision to its State Implementation Plan on January 10, 2008. The maintenance plan for this area meets all Clean Air Act requirements, and demonstrates that the Central Puget Sound area will remain in attainment with the 1997 and 2008 ozone NAAQS through 2015.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before June 2, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R10-OAR-2008-0122, by any of the following methods:

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

- Email: [R10-Public\\_Comments@epa.gov](mailto:R10-Public_Comments@epa.gov).

- Mail: Mr. Keith Rose, U.S. EPA Region 10, Office of Air, Waste and Toxics, AWT-107, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, Seattle, WA 98101.

- Hand Delivery/Courier: U.S. EPA Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, Seattle WA 98101. Attention: Keith Rose, Office of Air, Waste and Toxics, AWT-107. Such deliveries are only accepted during normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

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:** Keith Rose at telephone number: (206) 553-1949, email address: [rose.keith@epa.gov](mailto:rose.keith@epa.gov), or the above EPA, Region 10 address.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For further information, please see the direct final action, of the same title, which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**. The EPA is simultaneously approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the EPA views this as a noncontroversial SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the preamble to the direct final rule. If the EPA receives no adverse comments, the EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule.

If the EPA receives adverse comments, the EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. The EPA will address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if we receive adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, the EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

Dated: April 10, 2014.

**Michelle L. Pirzadeh,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.*

[FR Doc. 2014-09880 Filed 5-1-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 80

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0546; FRL-9910-24-OAR]

RIN 2060-AS21

#### Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Cellulosic Biofuel Standard

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to revise the 2013 cellulosic biofuel standard published on August 15, 2013. This action follows from EPA having granted two petitioners' requests for reconsideration of the 2013 cellulosic biofuel standard. EPA granted reconsideration because one of the two companies that EPA expected to produce cellulosic biofuel in 2013 announced soon after EPA signed its final rule that it intended to produce substantially lower volumes of cellulosic biofuel in 2013 than it had earlier reported to EPA. Since the cellulosic biofuel standard was based on EPA's projection of cellulosic biofuel production in 2013, EPA deemed this new information to be of central relevance to the rule, warranting reconsideration. On reconsideration, EPA is directed to base the standard on the lower of "projected" production of cellulosic fuel in 2013 or the cellulosic biofuel applicable volume set forth in the statute. Since data are available to show actual production volumes for 2013, EPA's "projection" and proposal are based on actual cellulosic biofuel production in 2013. This action only affects the 2013 cellulosic biofuel standard; all other RFS standards remain unchanged. EPA is proposing a revised cellulosic biofuel standard of 0.0005% for 2013. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, we are making this same amendment as a direct final rule. If we receive no adverse comment, the direct final rule will go into effect and we will not take further action on this proposed rule.

**DATES:** A request for a public hearing must be received by May 19, 2014. If a public hearing request is received, EPA will publish a document in the **Federal Register** indicating the time and place for the hearing. If a public hearing is held, written comments must be received within 30 days after the date of the hearing. If no public hearing is held