

from the operating regulations is authorized under 33 CFR 117.35.

Dated: September 19, 2014.

**Eric A. Washburn,**

*Bridge Administrator, Western Rivers.*

[FR Doc. 2014–23544 Filed 10–1–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA–R09–OAR–2014–0460; FRL–9915–37–Region 9]

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District**

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD) and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern definitions that are necessary for the creation, modification and understanding of rules that address air pollution. Among other changes, the revised definitions help clarify federal New Source Review (NSR) requirements, update the districts’ exempt volatile organic compounds list to correspond with EPA’s, and improve formatting consistency. We are approving local rules that define terms under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on December 1, 2014 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by November 3, 2014. If we receive such comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this direct final rule will not take effect.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2014–0460, by one of the following methods:

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

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

3. *Mail or deliver:* Andrew Steckel (Air–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

*Instructions:* All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or email. [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) is an “anonymous access” system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send email directly to EPA, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of

encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

*Docket:* Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105–3901. While all documents in the docket are listed at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Arnold Lazarus, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3024, [Lazarus.Arnold@epa.gov](mailto:Lazarus.Arnold@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, “we,” “us,” and “our” refer to EPA.

**Table of Contents**

- I. The State’s Submittal
  - A. What rules did the State submit?
  - B. Are there other versions of these rules?
  - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revisions?
- II. EPA’s Evaluation and Action
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
  - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules
  - D. Public Comment and Final Action
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. The State’s Submittal**

*A. What rules did the State submit?*

Table 1 lists the rules we are approving with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Revised/ amended	Submitted
ICAPCD .....	101	Definitions ...	10/22/13	02/10/14
SJVUAPCD .....	1020	Definitions ...	02/21/13	02/10/14

On April 9, 2014 and May 5, 2014 respectively, EPA determined that the submittal for ICAPCD Rule 101 and SJVUAPCD Rule 1020 met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, Appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

*B. Are there other versions of these rules?*

There are previous versions of ICAPCD Rule 101 and SJVUAPCD Rule 1020 in the SIP. Most recently, on March 7, 2011 (76 FR 12280), we approved a version of ICAPCD Rule 101 that was adopted locally on February 23, 2010; and on August 28, 2009 (74 FR 44291), we approved a version of

SJVUAPCD Rule 1020 that was adopted locally on January 15, 2009.

*C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revisions?*

Section 110(a) of the CAA requires States to submit regulations that control volatile organic compounds, oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter, and other air pollutants which harm human health and the environment. These rules were

developed as part of the local agency's program to control these pollutants.

Imperial County Rule 101 is being amended by adding new definitions, revising definitions for clarity, making various administrative changes, updating the exempt volatile organic compounds list to correspond with EPA's, and deleting two obsolete definitions. EPA's technical support document (TSD) has more detailed information about this rule.

SJVUAPCD amended Rule 1020 to add dimethyl carbonate (DMC) and propylene carbonate (PC) to the District's list of exempt compounds within the definition of VOC as a response to EPA findings that DMC and PC have a low potential to form ozone in the atmosphere. EPA's TSD has more detailed information about this rule.

## II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

### A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?

These rules describe administrative provisions and definitions that support emission controls found in other local agency requirements. In combination with the other requirements, these rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the Act) and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). EPA policy that we used to evaluate enforceability requirements consistently includes the Bluebook ("Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations," EPA, May 25, 1988), the Little Bluebook ("Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule Deficiencies," EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001), and "State Implementation Plans; General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990," 57 FR 13498 (April 16, 1992); 57 FR 18070 (April 28, 1992).

### B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?

We believe these rules are consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability and SIP relaxations. The TSDs have more information on our evaluations.

### C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules

The TSD describes additional rule revisions that we recommend for the next time the local agency modifies the rules.

### D. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving the submitted rules because we believe they fulfill all relevant requirements. We do not think anyone will object to this

approval, so we are finalizing it without proposing it in advance. However, in the Proposed Rules section of this

**Federal Register**, we are simultaneously proposing approval of the same submitted rules. If we receive adverse comments by November 3, 2014, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that the direct final approval will not take effect and we will address the comments in a subsequent final action based on the proposal. If we do not receive timely adverse comments, the direct final approval will be effective without further notice on December 1, 2014. This will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP.

Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

## III. 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 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 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 (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 disproportionate human health or environmental effects with practical, appropriate, 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.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by December 1, 2014. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. Parties with objections to this direct final rule are encouraged to file a comment in response to the parallel notice of proposed rulemaking for this action published in the Proposed Rules section of this **Federal Register**, rather than file an immediate petition for judicial review of this direct final rule,

so that EPA can withdraw this direct final rule and address the comment in the proposed rulemaking. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (see section 307(b)(2)).

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

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

Dated: July 25, 2014.

**Jared Blumenfeld,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

Part 52, Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

#### PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

#### Subpart F—California

■ 2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(442) to read as follows:

##### § 52.220 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(442) New and amended regulations for the following APCDs were submitted on February 10, 2014 by the Governor's Designee.

(i) Incorporation by Reference.

(A) Imperial County Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 101, "Definitions," revised on October 22, 2013.

(B) San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 1020, "Definitions," amended on February 21, 2013.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2014-23400 Filed 10-1-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0247; FRL-9917-38-Region 10]

#### Revision to the Idaho State Implementation Plan; Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans: Idaho, Northern Ada County PM<sub>10</sub> Second Ten-Year Maintenance Plan and Pinehurst PM<sub>10</sub> Contingency Measures

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving the Northern Ada County PM<sub>10</sub> Second Ten-Year Maintenance Plan submitted by the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) on March 11, 2013, for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to ten micrometers (PM<sub>10</sub>). Northern Ada County was identified as an area of concern for PM<sub>10</sub> with the promulgation of the PM<sub>10</sub> NAAQS in 1987, and was formally designated as a moderate PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area upon passage of the 1990 Clean Air Act (CAA) amendments. In October 2003, the EPA approved the Northern Ada County PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan and redesignated the area to attainment for PM<sub>10</sub>. This revised Maintenance Plan addresses maintenance of the PM<sub>10</sub> standard for a second ten-year period beyond redesignation through 2023, extends the horizon years, and contains revised transportation conformity budgets. The EPA is also approving the February 15-16, 2011 high wind exceptional event at the Boise Fire Station monitor, as well as contingency measures for the Pinehurst PM<sub>10</sub> Air Quality Improvement Plan. The EPA is approving the second ten-year PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan for Northern Ada County and the Pinehurst PM<sub>10</sub> contingency measures pursuant to section 110 of the CAA. The EPA is approving the February 2011 exceptional event pursuant to 40 CFR 50.14. The EPA received one set of adverse comments focused primarily on proposed coal export terminals that may be built in Oregon and Washington that may affect Northern Ada County.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective on November 3, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket Identification No. EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0247. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov>

Web site. Although listed in the index, some information may not be publicly available, i.e., Confidential Business Information or other information the disclosure of which is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at EPA Region 10, Office of Air, Waste, and Toxics, AWT-107, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101. The EPA requests that you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lucy Edmondson at (360)753-9082 or [Edmondson.lucy@epa.gov](mailto:Edmondson.lucy@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, wherever "we," "us," or "our" is used, it is intended to refer to the EPA.

#### Table of Contents

- I. Background
- II. Response to Comments
- III. Final Action
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. Background

Northern Ada County was identified as an area of concern for PM<sub>10</sub> with the promulgation of the PM<sub>10</sub> NAAQS in 1987, and was formally designated as a moderate PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area upon passage of the 1990 CAA amendments. Idaho developed a state implementation plan (SIP) and submitted it to the EPA in November 1991, later submitting revisions in December 1994 and July 1995. The EPA approved the Northern Ada County PM<sub>10</sub> SIP on May 30, 1996 (61 FR 27019). Idaho submitted a maintenance plan and a request to redesignate the area to attainment on September 27, 2002, and provided supplemental information on July 10 and 21, 2003. On October 27, 2003, the EPA approved the Northern Ada County PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan and redesignated the area to attainment status for PM<sub>10</sub> (68 FR 61106).

In actions dated August 25, 1994 (59 FR 43475) and May 26, 1995 (60 FR 27891), the EPA conditionally approved the SIP for the Pinehurst, Idaho PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area. The conditional approval concluded that IDEQ had not satisfied the requirement for contingency measures for both the City