This action addresses the following CAA elements: 110(a)(2)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (J), (K), (L), and (M). We are not taking action on the visibility portion of (D)(i)(II) or the state board requirements of (E)(ii). We will address these requirements in a separate action. EPA is disapproving the elements related to the prevention of significant deterioration, specifically as they pertain to section 110(a)(2)(C), (D)(i)(II), (D)(ii), and (J); however, Minnesota continues to implement the Federally promulgated rules for this purpose.
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FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sarah Arra, Environmental Scientist, Attainment Planning and Maintenance Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–9401, arra.sarah@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Throughout this document whenever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean EPA. This supplementary information section is arranged as follows:
I. What is the background of these SIP submissions?
II. What is EPA’s review of these SIP submissions?
III. What action is EPA taking?
IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. What is the background of these SIP submissions?
This rulemaking addresses submissions from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) for the 2006 PM_{2.5} and 2008 lead NAAQS. MDEQ submitted its infrastructure SIPs on the following dates: 2006 PM_{2.5}—August 15, 2011, supplemented on July 9, 2012; 2008 lead—April 3, 2012, supplemented August 9, 2013. On July 10, 2014, MDEQ requested that new rules related to state board requirements which it had submitted to be incorporated into the SIP also apply to its 2006 PM_{2.5} and 2008 lead NAAQS infrastructure SIPs. 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.

This specific rulemaking is taking action only on the state board element of the Michigan submittal. The majority of the other infrastructure elements for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS were addressed on October 29, 2012 (77 FR 65478). The other infrastructure elements for the 2008 lead NAAQS were addressed on July 16, 2013 (78 FR 41435). The infrastructure element for state board requirements is found in CAA 110(a)(2)(E). For further discussion on the background of infrastructure submittals, see 77 FR 45992.

II. What is EPA’s review of these SIP submissions?
On September 13, 2013, EPA issued “Guidance on Infrastructure State Implementation Plan (SIP) Elements under Clean Air Act Sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2)” (2013 Memo). As noted in the 2013 Memo, pursuant to CAA section 110(a), states must provide reasonable notice and opportunity for public hearing for all infrastructure SIP submissions. MDEQ provided public comment opportunities on both submittals on which EPA is acting in this direct final rule. MDEQ provided a detailed synopsis of how various components of its SIP meet each of the applicable requirements in section 110(a)(2) for the 2006 PM_{2.5} and 2008 lead NAAQS, as applicable. The following review only evaluates the state’s submissions for CAA section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) requirements.

Section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) requires each SIP to contain provisions that comply with the state board requirements of section 128 of the CAA. That provision contains two explicit requirements: (1) That any board or body which approves permits or enforcement orders under this chapter shall have at least a majority of members who represent the public interest and do not derive any significant portion of their income from persons subject to permits and enforcement orders under this chapter, and (2) that any potential conflicts of interest by members of such board or body or the head of an executive agency with similar powers be adequately disclosed. The 2013 Memo specifies that the provisions that implement CAA section 128 must be contained within the SIP. “EPA would not approve an infrastructure SIP submission that only provides a narrative description of existing air agency laws, rules, and regulations that are not approved into the SIP to address CAA section 128 requirements.” 2013 Memo at 42.

On July 10, 2014, MDEQ submitted Civil Service Rule 2–8.3(a)(1) for incorporation into the SIP, pursuant to section 128 of the CAA. EPA approved this rule as satisfying CAA section 128 requirements on August 31, 2015 (see 80 FR 52399). On July 10, 2014, MDEQ requested that these rules satisfy not only the applicable requirements of section 128 of the CAA, but that they satisfy any applicable requirements of section 110(a)(2)(E) for the 2006 PM_{2.5} and 2008 lead NAAQS. EPA finds that MDEQ has satisfied the applicable infrastructure SIP...
requirements for this section of 110(a)(2)(E) for the 2006 PM$_{2.5}$ and 2008 lead NAAQS.

III. What action is EPA taking?

EPA is approving the state board related infrastructure requirement for Michigan’s 2006 PM$_{2.5}$ and 2008 lead NAAQS submittals as satisfying the infrastructure SIP requirements in CAA sections 110(a)(2)(E)(ii).

We are publishing this action without prior proposal because we view this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipate no adverse comments. However, in the proposed rules section of this Federal Register publication, we are publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve the state plan if relevant adverse written comments are filed. This rule will be effective December 21, 2015 without further notice unless we receive relevant adverse written comments by November 19, 2015. If we receive such comments, we will withdraw this action before the effective date by publishing a subsequent document that will withdraw the final action. All public comments received will then be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed action. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If we do not receive any comments, this action will be effective December 21, 2015.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the 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 CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a “significant regulatory action” subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);
- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Act; and
- Does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, 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).

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 CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by December 21, 2015. 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, Lead, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: October 5, 2015.

Susan Hedman,
Regional Administrator, Region 5.

40 CFR part 52 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.

2. In §52.1170, the table in paragraph (e) is amended by revising the entries for “Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2006 24-Hour PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS” and “Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 lead (Pb) NAAQS” to read as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§52.1170 Identification of plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) * * * * * * * *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EPA-APPROVED MICHIGAN NONREGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of nonregulatory SIP provision</th>
<th>Applicable geographic or nonattainment area</th>
<th>State submittal date</th>
<th>EPA approval date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2006 24-Hour PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS.</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>8/15/2011, 7/9/2012, 7/10/2014</td>
<td>10/20/2015, [insert Federal Register citation].</td>
<td>This action addresses the following CAA elements: 110(a)(2)(A), (B), (C), (D)(ii), (D)(iii), (E), (F), (G), (H), (J), (K), (L), and (M). We are not taking action on the visibility protection requirements of (D)(ii). We will address this requirement in a separate action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 lead (Pb) NAAQS.</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>4/3/2012, 8/9/2013, 7/10/2014</td>
<td>10/20/2015, [insert Federal Register citation].</td>
<td>This action addresses the following CAA elements: 110(a)(2)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (J), (K), (L), and (M).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

45 CFR Parts 1206, 1210, 1211, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1220, 1222, 1226, and 2556

**RIN 3045–AA36**

**Volunteers in Service to America**

**AGENCY:** Corporation for National and Community Service.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) publishes new regulations under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, as amended, and the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as amended, for the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program, including certain changes to update existing regulations.

**DATES:** This rule is effective January 19, 2016.


**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 created the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program. The VISTA program, sometimes referred to as the domestic Peace Corps, has operated since the first VISTA volunteers (VISTAs or VISTA members) were placed in service in December 1964.

In 1971, the VISTA program was transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the former Federal agency, ACTION (the Federal Domestic Volunteer Agency). In 1973, Congress enacted the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (DVSA), the VISTA program’s enabling legislation. The VISTA program continues to retain its purpose, as stated in the DVSA, “to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate and alleviate poverty and poverty-related problems in the United States by encouraging and enabling individuals from all walks of life, all geographical areas, and all age groups, including low-income individuals, elderly and retired Americans, to perform meaningful and constructive volunteer service in agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may assist in the solution of poverty and poverty-related problems and secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement by individuals afflicted with such problems.”

In 1994, the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) was established pursuant to the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993; at this time, the operations of all service programs previously administered by ACTION, including the VISTA program, began to be administered by CNCS. The VISTA program also became known as the AmeriCorps VISTA program, one of three AmeriCorps programs now administered by CNCS. The other two programs were, and continue to be: (1) The AmeriCorps State and National program; and (2) the AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC). Since 1994, the VISTA program continues to be primarily operated and administered under the DVSA. The other two AmeriCorps programs are operated under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (NCSA).

In 2009, Congress enacted the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act of 2009 (Serve America Act), which contained certain amendments to both the DVSA and the NCSA. With regard to the VISTA program, the Serve America Act amendments largely related to the Segal AmeriCorps Education Award, a type of end-of-service award for which a VISTA member may be eligible upon successful completion of a term of VISTA service.

**II. Scope of Final Rule**

This rule covers core aspects of the VISTA program: (a) Entities that are sponsors for VISTA projects; and (b) individuals who are applicants, candidates, and VISTAs (including VISTA leaders and VISTA summer associates), serving at project sites. This rule has four purposes.

First, it conforms the existing regulations to the fact that CNCS administers the VISTA program.

References in the existing regulations to the former Federal agency, ACTION, and the administrative structure of ACTION are changed to reflect CNCS and its administrative structure.

Second, this rule codifies the VISTA rules in the same location as the rules for CNCS’s other programs. The existing VISTA regulations are codified at 45 CFR parts 1206, 1210, 1211, 1216–1220, 1222, and 1226. This rule places the VISTA regulations within the regulations for CNCS and the other CNCS programs at 45 CFR parts 2505–2556.

On a related note, existing program regulations at 45 CFR parts 1206, 1216,