

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 CAA; 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).

The SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

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

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: May 1, 2015.

**Shaun L. McGrath,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 8.*

[FR Doc. 2015-11782 Filed 5-15-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R08-OAR-2015-0227; FRL-9927-69-Region 8]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Utah County—Trading of Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets for PM<sub>10</sub> Transportation Conformity

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Utah. On March 9, 2015, the Governor of Utah submitted a revision to the Utah SIP, adding a new rule regarding trading of motor vehicle emission budgets for Utah County. The rule allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary particulate matter of 10 microns or less in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) to the motor vehicle emissions budget for nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) which is a PM<sub>10</sub> precursor. The resulting motor vehicle emissions budgets for NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> may then be used to demonstrate transportation conformity with the SIP. The EPA is proposing approval of this SIP revision in accordance with the requirements of section 110 of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before June 17, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R08-OAR-2015-0227, by one of the following methods:

- <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- *Email:* [russ.tim@epa.gov](mailto:russ.tim@epa.gov).

- *Fax:* (303) 312-6064 (please alert the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** if you are faxing comments).

- *Mail:* Carl Daly, Director, Air Program, EPA, Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129.

- *Hand Delivery:* Carl Daly, Director, Air Program, EPA, Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129. Such deliveries are only accepted Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding federal holidays. 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 instruction on how to submit comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tim Russ, Air Program, EPA, Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129, (303) 312-6479, [russ.tim@epa.gov](mailto:russ.tim@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State’s SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency 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 EPA receives no adverse comments, EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule.

EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. For further information, please see the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on a distinct provision 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. See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title which is located in the Rules and Regulations Section of this **Federal Register**.

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

Dated: May 1, 2015.

**Shaun L. McGrath,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 8.*

[FR Doc. 2015-11783 Filed 5-15-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 60

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0750; FRL-9927-58-OAR]

RIN 2060-AQ60

#### Reconsideration Petition From Dyno Nobel Inc. on the New Source Performance Standards Review for Nitric Acid Plants; Final Action

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final action denying petition for reconsideration.

**SUMMARY:** This action provides notice that on May 11, 2015, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator, Gina McCarthy, signed a letter denying a petition for reconsideration of the final New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for Nitric Acid Plants published in the **Federal Register** on August 14, 2012. (77 FR 48433)

**DATES:** Effective May 18, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Nathan Topham, Sector Policies and Programs Division (D243-02), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number: (919) 541-0483; fax number: (919) 541-3207; email address: [topham.nathan@epa.gov](mailto:topham.nathan@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. How can I get copies of this document and other related information?**

This **Federal Register** document, the petition for reconsideration, and the letter denying the petition for reconsideration are available in the docket the EPA established under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0750. All documents in the docket are listed on the [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., confidential business information or other information whose disclosure 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 [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or in hard copy at the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA WJC West Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566-1744 and the telephone number for the Air Docket is (202) 566-1742. This **Federal Register** document, the petition for reconsideration, and the letter denying the petition can also be found on the EPA's Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/oarpg>.

**II. Judicial Review**

Any petitions for review of the letter and enclosure denying the petition for reconsideration described in this document must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by July 17, 2015.

**III. Description of Action**

*A. Background*

The initial Nitric Acid Plants NSPS were promulgated on December 23, 1971 (36 FR 24881) and codified at 40 CFR part 60, subpart G pursuant to section 111 of the Clean Air Act (CAA). Pursuant to section 111(b)(1)(B) of the CAA, we reviewed the NSPS three times over the past few decades. Based on the results of the third review, which we completed in August 2012, we determined it was appropriate to revise the NSPS. The revised NSPS were published in the **Federal Register** on August 14, 2012 (77 FR 48433). The revised NSPS (also referred to as the "final rule" in this document) included a change in the nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) emission limit, from 3.0 pounds of NO<sub>x</sub> per ton of nitric acid production (3.0 lb/T) on a 3-hour basis to 0.5 lb/T on a 30-day average basis, and additional testing and monitoring requirements. The final rule applies to new, modified or reconstructed nitric acid production units (NAPU) that commence construction, modification or reconstruction after October 14, 2011.

Throughout the rulemaking process, we received comments, data and information that supported these revisions. This information is available in the docket for this action. The revisions were proposed on October 14, 2011 (76 FR 63878). We received additional data and comments during the comment period. These data and comments were considered and analyzed and, where appropriate, revisions to the NSPS were made and incorporated into the final rule published on August 14, 2012.

On October 10, 2012, Dyno Nobel Inc. (DNI) submitted a petition for reconsideration of the final rule for nitric acid plants. Under section 307(d)(7)(B) of the CAA, a petitioner seeking reconsideration must show that the objection or objections raised in its reconsideration petition "is of central relevance to the outcome of the rule." In the EPA's view, an objection is of central relevance to the outcome of the rule only if it provides substantial support for the argument that the promulgated regulation should be revised.

After carefully considering the petition and supporting information, the EPA Administrator, Gina McCarthy, denied the petition for reconsideration on May 11, 2015, in a letter to the petitioner. The EPA denied the petition because the information and analysis submitted by DNI is not of central relevance to the outcome of the rule, in that it does not demonstrate that the

rule should be reconsidered. A summary of the petition issues and the EPA's responses are provided below. The letter from Administrator McCarthy and the accompanying enclosure, which are available in the docket for this action, explain in greater detail the issues presented in the petition, the EPA's responses to those issues, and the EPA's reasons for the denial.

*B. Summary of Petition and the EPA's Responses*

The main issues raised by DNI in their petition for reconsideration are the following: They believe the EPA should have established a subcategory and a different emissions limit for modified or reconstructed nitric acid plants that use non-selective catalytic reduction (NSCR); and they argue the EPA did not meet the legal requirement of having representative emission data to establish a new emission limit.

Regarding the petitioner's argument that the EPA should establish a subcategory for modified or reconstructed plants that use NSCR, we have several reasons why we disagree with this request.

First, the EPA believes it is inappropriate to establish subcategories based on differences in control technologies, so it is inappropriate to establish a subcategory for plants using NSCR.

Second, regarding the petitioner's argument that the EPA did not meet the legal requirement of having representative emission data to set an emission limit, we believe the agency had ample test data to support selective catalytic reduction as the best system of emission reduction and to establish a revised emission limit.

Third, although some units with NSCR may not be able to meet the limit without improving their controls, based on available data we believe it is feasible for some units with NSCR to comply with this NSPS without the need for any additional controls as some existing units with NSCR are already achieving the NSPS emission limit.

Finally, we believe other units with NSCR that are modified or reconstructed, could comply with the NSPS limit by improving their controls at reasonable costs.

Therefore, based on our review and evaluation of all issues raised by the petitioner and relevant available data and information, we have concluded that reconsideration is not warranted.

Dated: May 11, 2015.

**Gina McCarthy**,  
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2015-11958 Filed 5-15-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 648

RIN 0648-BB40

#### Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Omnibus Amendment To Simplify Vessel Baselines

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of fishery management plan amendment; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS announces that the Mid-Atlantic and New England Fishery Management Councils have submitted an Omnibus Amendment to the Fishery Management Plans of the Northeastern United States to simplify vessel baselines. This amendment incorporates a draft Environmental Assessment and preliminary Regulatory Impact Review, for review and approval by the Secretary of Commerce, and NMFS is requesting comments from the public. The Omnibus Amendment to Simplify Vessel Baselines would eliminate the one-time limit on vessel upgrades and remove gross and net tonnages from vessel baseline specifications considered when determining a vessel's baseline for replacement purposes. Implementing these measures would reduce the administrative burden to permit holders and NMFS, and would have little effect on fleet capacity. This action would also remove the requirement for vessels to send in negative fishing reports (*i.e.*, "did not fish" reports) during months or weeks when fishing did not occur.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before July 17, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by NOAA-NMFS-2011-0213, by any one of the following methods.

*Electronic Submission:* Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal.

1. Go to [www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2011-0213](http://www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2011-0213),

2. Click the "Comment Now!" icon, complete the required fields

3. Enter or attach your comments.

*Instructions:* Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) without change. All personal identifying information (*e.g.*, name, address, etc.), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter "N/A" in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous).

Copies of the Omnibus Amendment to Simplify Vessel Baselines, and of the draft Environmental Assessment and preliminary Regulatory Impact Review (EA/RIR), are available from the Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office, 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930 The EA/RIR is also accessible via the Internet at: [www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov](http://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Travis Ford, Fishery Policy Analyst, 978-281-9233.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) requires that each Regional Fishery Management Council submit any Fishery Management Plan (FMP) amendment it prepares to NMFS for review and approval, disapproval, or partial approval. The Magnuson-Stevens Act also requires that NMFS, upon receiving an FMP amendment, immediately publish notification in the **Federal Register** that the amendment is available for public review and comment. The New England Fishery Management Council (NEFMC) and the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC) approved this Baseline Amendment, which would simplify vessel baseline requirements, at their November 18, 2014, and October 8, 2014, meetings, respectively. NMFS prepared the amendment on behalf of the Councils and declared a transmittal date May 12, 2015. Both Councils have reviewed the Baseline Amendment proposed rule regulations as drafted by NMFS and deemed them to be necessary and appropriate as specified in section 303(c) of the MSA. If approved by NMFS, this amendment would simplify the specifications considered when determining a vessel's baseline for

replacement purposes developed by the MAFMC and NEFMC.

#### Background

The MAFMC developed the first limited entry program in 1977 for the surfclam/quahog fishery, which included restrictions on replacement vessels. This program required that a replacement vessel be of "substantially similar capacity" in an effort to maintain and not increase the harvest capacity of the fleet at that time. Over the following two decades, the MAFMC and NEFMC implemented additional limited entry programs. By 1998, there were four different sets of vessel upgrade and replacement restrictions among the various FMPs. The upgrade restrictions became confusing for fishing industry members with more than one limited access permit, because each permit had the potential to have different vessel upgrade regulations apply. In addition, some vessels added limited access permits to their vessel that originally qualified on another vessel that was a different size and/or horsepower. This results in a vessel having multiple baselines. Thus, in 1999, the MAFMC and NEFMC, in consultation with NMFS, developed an amendment to Achieve Regulatory Consistency on Permit Related Provisions for Vessels Issued Limited Access Federal Fishery Permits (64 FR 8263, February 19, 1999) (Consistency Amendment) to streamline and make consistent baseline provisions and upgrade restrictions across FMPs.

The Consistency Amendment standardized definitions and restrictions for vessel baselines, upgrades, and replacements across all limited access fisheries. It simplified regulations for vessel replacements, permit transfers, and vessel upgrades, making them consistent and less restrictive in order to facilitate business transactions. Although the Consistency Amendment did standardize the vessel baseline requirements for the fisheries of the northeast, some burdensome requirements remain. Under current restrictions, a vessel baseline is defined by vessel length overall, gross tonnage, net tonnage, and horsepower. We determine the baseline for a limited access permit based on the size (length, gross tonnage, and net tonnage) and horsepower of the first vessel issued a limited access permit for that fishery or, for fisheries that adopted baseline restrictions through the Consistency Amendment, the permitted vessel at the time the final rule became effective.

Current baseline regulations require that a replacement vessel or an upgrade made to an existing vessel with a