

from *Regulations.gov*. For either manner of submission, EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.* on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER**

INFORMATION CONTACT section. For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen D'Agostino, 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) 886-1767, dagostino.kathleen@epa.gov.

Deborah Bredehoft, Air Planning and Development Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7, 11201 Renner Blvd., Lenexa, Kansas 66219, (913) 551-7164, Bredehoft.Deborah@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is making this determination of attainment as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to the rule, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn for the affected area and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of the 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. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: June 15, 2016.

Robert A. Kaplan,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

Dated: June 3, 2016.

Mark Hague,

Regional Administrator, Region 7.

[FR Doc. 2016-15049 Filed 6-24-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0251; FRL-9948-43-Region 4]

Air Plan Approval; SC Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) submission, submitted by the State of South Carolina, through the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SC DHEC) on April 30, 2014, to demonstrate that the State meets the infrastructure requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) for the 2010 nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS). The CAA requires that each state adopt and submit a SIP for the implementation, maintenance and enforcement of each NAAQS promulgated by EPA, which is commonly referred to as an "infrastructure" SIP submission. SC DHEC certified that the South Carolina SIP contains provisions that ensure the 2010 NO₂ NAAQS is implemented, enforced, and maintained in South Carolina. With the exception of provisions pertaining to prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) permitting, and interstate transport provisions pertaining to the contribution to nonattainment or interference with maintenance and visibility in other states, for which EPA is proposing no action through this rulemaking, EPA is proposing to find that South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission, provided to EPA on April 30, 2014, satisfies the required

infrastructure elements for the 2010 NO₂ NAAQS.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before July 27, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0251 at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.* on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard Wong, *Air Regulatory Management Section*, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Mr. Wong can be reached via telephone at (404) 562-8726 or electronic mail at wong.richard@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background and Overview

On February 9, 2010, EPA published a new 1-hour primary NAAQS for NO₂ at a level of 100 parts per billion (ppb), based on a 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the yearly distribution of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations. See 75 FR 6474. Pursuant to section 110(a)(1) of the CAA, states are required to submit SIPs meeting the requirements of section 110(a)(2) within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS or within such shorter period as EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a)(2) requires states to address basic SIP requirements, including emissions inventories, monitoring, and modeling to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. States were required to submit such SIPs for the 2010 1-hour

NO₂ NAAQS to EPA no later than January 22, 2013.¹

Today's action is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission for the applicable requirements of the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS, with the exception of the PSD permitting requirements for major sources of sections 110(a)(2)(C), prong 3 of D(i), and (J) and the interstate transport provisions pertaining to the contribution to nonattainment or interference with maintenance in other states and visibility (*i.e.*, prongs 1, 2, and 4 of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)). On March 18, 2015, EPA approved South Carolina's April 30, 2014, infrastructure SIP submission regarding the PSD permitting requirements for major sources of sections 110(a)(2)(C), prong 3 of D(i), and (J) for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. *See* 80 FR 14019. Therefore, EPA is not proposing any action pertaining to these requirements. With respect to South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission related to interstate transport provisions pertaining to the contribution to nonattainment or interference with maintenance in other states and visibility of prongs 1, 2, and 4 of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i), EPA is not proposing any action today. EPA will act on these provisions in a separate action. For the aspects of South Carolina's submittal proposed for approval today, EPA notes that the Agency is not approving any specific rule, but rather proposing that South Carolina's already approved SIP meets certain CAA requirements.

II. What elements are required under sections 110(a)(1) and (2)?

Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit SIPs to provide for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of a new or revised NAAQS within three years following the promulgation of such NAAQS, or within such shorter period as EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a) imposes the obligation upon states to make a SIP submission to EPA for a new or revised NAAQS, but the contents of that submission may vary depending upon

¹ In these infrastructure SIP submissions states generally certify evidence of compliance with sections 110(a)(1) and (2) of the CAA through a combination of state regulations and statutes, some of which have been incorporated into the federally-approved SIP. In addition, certain federally-approved, non-SIP regulations may also be appropriate for demonstrating compliance with sections 110(a)(1) and (2). Throughout this rulemaking, unless otherwise indicated, the term "South Carolina Air Pollution Control Regulation" or "Regulation" indicates that the cited regulation has been approved into South Carolina's federally-approved SIP. The term "South Carolina statute" indicates cited South Carolina state statutes, which are not a part of the SIP unless otherwise indicated.

the facts and circumstances. In particular, the data and analytical tools available at the time the state develops and submits the SIP for a new or revised NAAQS affects the content of the submission. The contents of such SIP submissions may also vary depending upon what provisions the state's existing SIP already contains. In the case of the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS, states typically have met the basic program elements required in section 110(a)(2) through earlier SIP submissions in connection with previous NAAQS.

More specifically, section 110(a)(1) provides the procedural and timing requirements for SIPs. Section 110(a)(2) lists specific elements that states must meet for "infrastructure" SIP requirements related to a newly established or revised NAAQS. As mentioned above, these requirements include SIP infrastructure elements such as modeling, monitoring, and emissions inventories that are designed to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. The requirements that are the subject of this proposed rulemaking are listed below and in EPA's September 13, 2013, memorandum entitled "Guidance on Infrastructure State Implementation Plan (SIP) Elements under Clean Air Act sections 110(a)(1) and (2)."²

- 110(a)(2)(A): Emission Limits and Other Control Measures
- 110(a)(2)(B): Ambient Air Quality Monitoring/Data System
- 110(a)(2)(C): Programs for Enforcement of Control Measures and for Construction or Modification of Stationary Sources³
- 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and (II): Interstate Pollution Transport
- 110(a)(2)(D)(ii): Interstate Pollution Abatement and International Air Pollution
- 110(a)(2)(E): Adequate Resources and Authority, Conflict of Interest, and Oversight of Local Governments and Regional Agencies

² Two elements identified in section 110(a)(2) are not governed by the three year submission deadline of section 110(a)(1) because SIPs incorporating necessary local nonattainment area controls are not due within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS, but rather due at the time the nonattainment area plan requirements are due pursuant to section 172. 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. Today's proposed rulemaking does not address infrastructure elements related to section 110(a)(2)(I) or the nonattainment planning requirements of 110(a)(2)(C).

³ This rulemaking only addresses requirements for this element as they relate to attainment areas.

- 110(a)(2)(F): Stationary Source Monitoring and Reporting
- 110(a)(2)(G): Emergency Powers
- 110(a)(2)(H): SIP revisions
- 110(a)(2)(I): Plan Revisions for Nonattainment Areas⁴
- 110(a)(2)(J): Consultation with Government Officials, Public Notification, and PSD and Visibility Protection
- 110(a)(2)(K): Air Quality Modeling and Submission of Modeling Data
- 110(a)(2)(L): Permitting fees
- 110(a)(2)(M): Consultation and Participation by Affected Local Entities

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

EPA is acting upon the SIP submission from South Carolina that addresses the infrastructure requirements of CAA sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) for the 2010 NO₂ 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

⁴ As mentioned above, this element is not relevant to today's proposed rulemaking.

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.⁵ 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.⁶ 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,

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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_x 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)).

and section 107(d)(1)(B) allows up to two years, or in some cases three years, for such designations to be promulgated.⁷ This ambiguity illustrates 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.⁸ 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.⁹

⁷ 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, 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.

⁸ 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_{2.5} NSR rule), and “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Infrastructure and Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS,” (78 FR 4337) (January 22, 2013) (EPA’s final action on the infrastructure SIP for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS).

⁹ 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

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 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 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.¹⁰

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

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.

¹⁰ For example, implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS required the deployment of a system of new monitors to measure ambient levels of that new indicator species for the new NAAQS.

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 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.¹¹ EPA most recently issued guidance for infrastructure SIPs on September 13, 2013 (2013 Guidance).¹² 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.¹³ 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 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 implementation plan 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 (J) 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 new source review (NSR) pollutants, including greenhouse gases. 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_{2.5} 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

implementation plan 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 NSR 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.¹⁴ 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

¹⁴ 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.

¹¹ 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.

¹² "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.

¹³ 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 7 (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.

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 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 implementation plan is substantially inadequate to attain or maintain the NAAQS, to mitigate interstate transport, or to otherwise comply with the CAA.¹⁵

¹⁵ 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

Section 110(k)(6) authorizes EPA to correct errors in past actions, such as past approvals of SIP submissions.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷

IV. What is EPA's analysis of how South Carolina addressed the elements of the sections 110(a)(1) and (2) "infrastructure" provisions?

South Carolina's infrastructure submission addresses the provisions of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) as described below.

1. 110(a)(2)(A) *Emission Limits and Other Control Measures*: Section 110(a)(2)(A) requires that each implementation plan include enforceable emission limitations and other control measures, means, or techniques (including economic incentives such as fees, marketable permits, and auctions of emissions rights), as well as schedules and timetables for compliance, as may be necessary or appropriate to meet the applicable requirements. Regulation 61–62.1, *Definitions and General Requirements*, and 61–62.5 (1), *Ambient*

Implementation Plan; Call for Utah State Implementation Plan Revisions," 74 FR 21639 (April 18, 2011).

¹⁶ EPA has used this authority to correct errors in past actions on SIP submissions related to PSD 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).

¹⁷ 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).

Air Quality Standards have been federally approved in the South Carolina SIP and include enforceable emission limitations and other control measures for activities that contribute to NO₂ concentrations in the ambient air. South Carolina statute 48–1–50(23) authorizes SC DHEC to adopt rules for the control of air pollution in order to comply with NAAQS. EPA has made the preliminary determination that the cited provisions are adequate for enforceable emission limitations and other control measures, means, or techniques, as well as schedules and timetables for compliance for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS in the State.

In this action, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing State provisions with regard to excess emissions during SSM of operations at a facility. EPA believes that a number of states have SSM provisions which are contrary to the CAA and existing EPA guidance, "State Implementation Plans: Policy Regarding Excess Emissions During Malfunctions, Startup, and Shutdown" (September 20, 1999), and the Agency is addressing such state regulations in a separate action.¹⁸

Additionally, in this action, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing State rules with regard to director's discretion or variance provisions. EPA believes that a number of states have such provisions which are contrary to the CAA and existing EPA guidance (52 FR 45109 (November 24, 1987)), and the Agency plans to take action in the future to address such state regulations. In the meantime, EPA encourages any state having a director's discretion or variance provision which is contrary to the CAA and EPA guidance to take steps to correct the deficiency as soon as possible.

2. 110(a)(2)(B) *Ambient Air Quality Monitoring/Data System*: SIPs are required to provide for the establishment and operation of ambient air quality monitors, the compilation and analysis of ambient air quality data, and the submission of these data to EPA upon request. Regulation 61–62.5(7), *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, and South Carolina statute 48–1–50(14), Powers of department, provide SC DHEC with the authority to collect and disseminate information relating to air quality and pollution and the prevention, control, supervision, and

¹⁸ On June 12, 2015, EPA published a final action entitled, "State Implementation Plans: Response to Petition for Rulemaking; Restatement and Update of EPA's SSM Policy Applicable to SIPs; Findings of Substantial Inadequacy; and SIP Calls to Amend Provisions Applying to Excess Emissions During Periods of Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction." See 80 FR 33840.

abatement thereof. Annually, states develop and submit to EPA for approval statewide ambient monitoring network plans consistent with the requirements of 40 CFR parts 50, 53, and 58. The annual network plan involves an evaluation of any proposed changes to the monitoring network, includes the annual ambient monitoring network design plan and a certified evaluation of the state's ambient monitors and auxiliary support equipment.¹⁹ On July 20, 2015, South Carolina submitted its monitoring network plan to EPA, and on November 19, 2015, EPA approved this plan. South Carolina's approved monitoring network plan can be accessed at www.regulations.gov using Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0251. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices are adequate for the ambient air quality monitoring and data system related to the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS.

3. 110(a)(2)(C) *Program for Enforcement of Control Measures and for Construction or Modification of Stationary Sources*: This element consists of three sub-elements; enforcement, state-wide regulation of new and modified minor sources and minor modifications of major sources; and preconstruction permitting of major sources and major modifications in areas designated attainment or unclassifiable for the subject NAAQS as required by CAA title I part C (*i.e.*, the major source PSD program). As discussed further below, in this action EPA is only proposing to approve the enforcement, and the regulation of minor sources and minor modifications aspects of South Carolina's section 110(a)(2)(C) infrastructure SIP submission.

Enforcement: SC DHEC cites to its SIP approved permit regulations for enforcement of NO₂ emission limits and control measures and construction permitting for new or modified stationary NO₂ sources (Regulations 61–62.5(7), *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, and 61–62.5(7)(1), *Nonattainment New Source Review*, and Regulation 61–62.1, Section II, *Permit Requirements*). South Carolina cites to statute 48–1–50(11), which provides SC DHEC the authority to administer penalties for violations of any order, permit, regulation or standards. Additionally, SCDHEC is authorized under 48–1–50(3) and (4) to issue orders requiring the discontinuance of the

discharge of air contaminants into the ambient air that create an undesirable level, and seek an injunction to compel compliance with the Pollution Control Act and permits, permit conditions and orders.

Preconstruction PSD Permitting for Major Sources: With respect to South Carolina's April 30, 2014, infrastructure SIP submission related to the PSD permitting requirements for major sources of section 110(a)(2)(C), EPA took final action to approve these provisions for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS on March 18, 2015. See 80 FR 14019.

Regulation of Minor Sources and Modifications: Section 110(a)(2)(C) also requires the SIP to include provisions that govern the minor source program that regulates emissions of the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. South Carolina has a SIP-approved minor NSR permitting program at Regulation 61–62.1, Section II, *Permit Requirements*, that regulates the preconstruction permitting of minor modifications and construction of minor stationary sources.

EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices are adequate for program enforcement of control measures and regulation of minor sources and modifications related to the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS.

4. 110(a)(2)(D)(i) *Interstate Pollution Transport*: Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) has two components; 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II). Each of these components have two subparts resulting in four distinct components, commonly referred to as “prongs,” that must be addressed in infrastructure SIP submissions. The first two prongs, which are codified in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), are provisions that prohibit any source or other type of emissions activity in one state from contributing significantly to nonattainment of the NAAQS in another state (“prong 1”), and interfering with maintenance of the NAAQS in another state (“prong 2”). The third and fourth prongs, which are codified in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II), are provisions that prohibit emissions activity in one state from interfering with measures required to prevent significant deterioration of air quality in another state (“prong 3”), or to protect visibility in another state (“prong 4”).

110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I)—prongs 1 and 2: EPA is not proposing any action in this rulemaking related to the interstate transport provisions pertaining to the contribution to nonattainment or interference with maintenance in other states of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) (prongs 1 and 2) because South Carolina's 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS

infrastructure submission did not address prongs 1 and 2.

110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II)—prong 3: With respect to South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission related to the interstate transport requirements for PSD of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prong 3), EPA took final action to approve South Carolina's April 30, 2014, infrastructure SIP submission regarding prong 3 of D(i) for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS on March 18, 2015. See 80 FR 14019.

110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II)—prong 4: EPA is not proposing any action in this rulemaking related to the interstate transport provisions pertaining to visibility protection in other states of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prong 4) and will consider these requirements in relation South Carolina's 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS infrastructure submission in a separate rulemaking.

5. 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) *Interstate Pollution Abatement and International Air Pollution*: Section 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) requires SIPs to include provisions ensuring compliance with sections 115 and 126 of the Act, relating to interstate and international pollution abatement. Regulation 61–62.5, Standards 7 and 7.1 (q)(2)(iv), *Public Participation*, outlines how South Carolina will notify neighboring states of potential impacts from new or modified sources. EPA is unaware of any pending obligations for the State of South Carolina pursuant to sections 115 or 126 of the CAA. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices are adequate for insuring compliance with the applicable requirements relating to interstate and international pollution abatement for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS.

6. 110(a)(2)(E) *Adequate Resources and Authority, Conflict of Interest, and Oversight of Local Governments and Regional Agencies*: Section 110(a)(2)(E) requires that each implementation plan provide: (i) Necessary assurances that the state will have adequate personnel, funding, and authority under state law to carry out its implementation plan, (ii) that the state comply with the requirements respecting state boards pursuant to section 128 of the Act, and (iii) necessary assurances that, where the state has relied on a local or regional government, agency, or instrumentality for the implementation of any plan provision, the state has responsibility for ensuring adequate implementation of such plan provisions. EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's SIP as meeting the requirements of sections 110(a)(2)(E). EPA's rationale for today's proposals respecting each

¹⁹On occasion, proposed changes to the monitoring network are evaluated outside of the network plan approval process in accordance with 40 CFR part 58.

section of 110(a)(2)(E) is described in turn below.

With respect to section 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii), SC DHEC develops, implements and enforces EPA-approved SIP provisions in the State. S.C. Code Ann. Section 48, Title 1 and S.C. Code Ann § 1–23–40 (the Administrative Procedures Act), as referenced in South Carolina’s infrastructure SIP submission, provides the SC DHEC’s general legal authority to establish a SIP and implement related plans. In particular, S.C. Code Ann. Section 48–1–50(12) grants SC DHEC the statutory authority to “[a]ccept, receive and administer grants or other funds or gifts for the purpose of carrying out any of the purposes of this chapter; [and to] accept, receive and receipt for Federal money given by the Federal government under any Federal law to the State of South Carolina for air or water control activities, surveys or programs.” S.C. Code Ann. Section 48, Title 2 grants SC DHEC statutory authority to establish environmental protection funds, which provide resources for SC DHEC to carry out its obligations under the CAA. Specifically, in Regulation 61–30, *Environmental Protection Fees*, SC DHEC established fees for sources subject to air permitting programs. For Section 110(a)(2)(E)(iii), the submission states that South Carolina does not rely on localities for specific SIP implementation.

The requirements of 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii) are further confirmed when EPA performs a completeness determination for each SIP submittal. This provides additional assurances that each submittal provides evidence that adequate personnel, funding, and legal authority under State law has been used to carry out the State’s implementation plan and related issues. This information is included in all prehearings and final SIP submittal packages for approval by EPA.

As evidence of the adequacy of SC DHEC’s resources, EPA submitted a letter to South Carolina on April 19, 2016, outlining section 105 grant commitments and the current status of these commitments for fiscal year 2015. The letter EPA submitted to South Carolina can be accessed at www.regulations.gov using Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2015–0251. Annually, states update these grant commitments based on current SIP requirements, air quality planning, and applicable requirements related to the NAAQS. South Carolina satisfactorily met all commitments agreed to in the Air Planning Agreement for fiscal year 2015, therefore South Carolina’s grants were finalized.

Section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) requires that states comply with section 128 of the CAA. Section 128 of the CAA requires that states include provisions in their SIP to address conflicts of interest for state boards or bodies that oversee CAA permits and enforcement orders and disclosure of conflict of interest requirements. Specifically, CAA section 128(a)(1) necessitates that each SIP shall require that at least a majority of any board or body which approves permits or enforcement orders shall be subject to the described public interest service and income restrictions therein. Subsection 128(a)(2) requires that the members of any board or body, or the head of an executive agency with similar power to approve permits or enforcement orders under the CAA, shall also be subject to conflict of interest disclosure requirements.

With respect to 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), South Carolina satisfies the requirements of CAA section 128(a)(1) for the SC Board of Health and Environmental Control, which is the “board or body which approves permits and enforcement orders” under the CAA in South Carolina, through South Carolina statute 8–13–730. This statute provides that “[u]nless otherwise provided by law, no person may serve as a member of a governmental regulatory agency that regulates business with which that person is associated,” and statute 8–13–700(A) states in part that “[n]o public official, public member, or public employee may knowingly use his official office, membership, or employment to obtain an economic interest for himself, a member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated.” South Carolina statute 8–13–700(B)(1)–(5) provides for disclosure of any conflicts of interest by public official, public member or public employee, which meets the requirement of CAA Section 128(a)(2) that “any potential conflicts of interest . . . be adequately disclosed.” State statutes 8–13–730, 8–13–700(A), and 8–13–700(B)(1)–(5) have been approved into the South Carolina SIP as required by CAA section 128. Thus, EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina’s SIP and practices are adequate for insuring compliance with the applicable requirements of section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) relating to state boards for the 2010 NO₂ NAAQS.

7. 110(a)(2)(F) *Stationary Source Monitoring System*: Section 110(a)(2)(F) requires SIPs to meet applicable requirements addressing (i) the installation, maintenance, and replacement of equipment, and the

implementation of other necessary steps, by owners or operators of stationary sources to monitor emissions from such sources, (ii) periodic reports on the nature and amounts of emissions and emissions related data from such sources, and (iii) correlation of such reports by the state agency with any emission limitations or standards established pursuant to this section, which reports shall be available at reasonable times for public inspection. South Carolina’s infrastructure SIP submission describes how the State establishes requirements for emissions compliance testing and utilizes emissions sampling and analysis. It further describes how the State ensures the quality of its data through observing emissions and monitoring operations. These infrastructure SIP requirements are codified at Section III, Regulation 61–62.1, *Emissions Inventory*. South Carolina statute 48–1–22 requires owners or operators of stationary sources to compute emissions, submit periodic reports of such emissions and maintain records as specified by various regulations and permits, and to evaluate reports and records for consistency with the applicable emission limitation or standard on a continuing basis over time. The monitoring data collected and records of operations serve as the basis for a source to certify compliance, and can be used by South Carolina as direct evidence of an enforceable violation of the underlying emission limitation or standard. Accordingly, EPA is unaware of any provision preventing the use of credible evidence in the South Carolina SIP.

Additionally, South Carolina is required to submit emissions data to EPA for purposes of the National Emissions Inventory (NEI). The NEI is EPA’s central repository for air emissions data. EPA published the Air Emissions Reporting Rule (AERR) on December 5, 2008, which modified the requirements for collecting and reporting air emissions data (73 FR 76539). The AERR shortened the time states had to report emissions data from 17 to 12 months, giving states one calendar year to submit emissions data. All states are required to submit a comprehensive emissions inventory every three years and report emissions for certain larger sources annually through EPA’s online Emissions Inventory System. States report emissions data for the six criteria pollutants and the precursors that form them—nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, ammonia, lead, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and volatile organic compounds. Many states also

voluntarily report emissions of hazardous air pollutants. South Carolina made its latest update to the 2011 NEI on April 1, 2014. EPA compiles the emissions data, supplementing it where necessary, and releases it to the general public through the Web site <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ei/information.html>. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices are adequate for the stationary source monitoring systems related to the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(F).

8. 110(a)(2)(G) *Emergency Powers*: This section requires that states demonstrate authority comparable with section 303 of the CAA and adequate contingency plans to implement such authority. South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission identifies air pollution emergency episodes and preplanned abatement strategies as outlined in Regulation 61–62.3, *Air Pollution Episodes*. S.C. Code Ann. Section 1–23–130 provides SC DHEC with the authority to immediately promulgate emergency regulations if it finds an imminent peril to public health, safety, or welfare, or to protect or manage natural resources if it finds abnormal or unusual conditions, immediate need, or the state's best interest requires immediate promulgation of emergency regulations. S.C. Code Ann. Section 48–1–50(3) provides SCDHEC with the authority to issue orders requiring the discontinuance of the discharge of air contaminants into the ambient air that create an undesirable level, resulting in pollution in excess of applicable standards, and S.C. Code Ann. Section 48–1–50(4) authorizes SCDHEC to file an action in court to seek injunctive relief to compel compliance with the Pollution Control Act. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices are adequate for emergency powers related to the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submissions with respect to section 110(a)(2)(G).

9. 110(a)(2)(H) *Future SIP Revisions*: Section 110(a)(2)(H), in summary, requires each SIP to provide for revisions of such plan: (i) As may be necessary to take account of revisions of such national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard or the availability of improved or more expeditious methods of attaining such standard, and (ii) whenever the Administrator finds that the plan is

substantially inadequate to attain the NAAQS or to otherwise comply with any additional applicable requirements. SC DHEC has the authority for adopting air quality rules and revising SIPs as needed to attain or maintain the NAAQS in South Carolina as indicated in South Carolina statute 48–1. This Section provides SC DHEC with the ability and authority to respond to calls for SIP revisions, and South Carolina has provided a number of SIP revisions over the years for implementation of the NAAQS. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate a commitment to provide future SIP revisions related to the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS when necessary.

10. 110(a)(2)(J) *Consultation With Government Officials, Public Notification, and PSD and Visibility Protection*: EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS with respect to the general requirement in section 110(a)(2)(J) to include a program in the SIP that provides for meeting the applicable consultation requirements of section 121, the public notification requirements of section 127, and visibility protection requirements of part C of the Act. With respect to South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission related to the preconstruction PSD permitting requirements of section 110(a)(2)(J), EPA took final action to approve South Carolina's April 30, 2014, 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS infrastructure SIP for these requirements on March 18, 2015. See 80 FR 14019. EPA's rationale for its proposed action regarding applicable consultation requirements of section 121, the public notification requirements of section 127, and visibility protection requirements is described below.

110(a)(2)(J) (121 Consultation)—*Consultation With Government Officials*: Section 110(a)(2)(J) of the CAA requires states to provide a process for consultation with local governments, designated organizations and federal land managers (FLMs) carrying out NAAQS implementation requirements pursuant to section 121 relative to consultation. Regulation 61–62.5(7), *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, South Carolina statute 48–1–50(8), *Powers of department*, as well as South Carolina's Regional Haze Implementation Plan (which allows for consultation between appropriate state, local, and tribal air pollution control agencies as well as the corresponding FLMs), provide for consultation with government officials whose jurisdictions might be affected by SIP development

activities. S.C. Code Section 48–1–50(8) provides SC DHEC with the necessary authority to “Cooperate with the governments of the United States or other states or state agencies or organizations, officials, or unofficial, in respect to pollution control matters or for the formulation of interstate pollution control compacts or agreements.” South Carolina adopted state-wide consultation procedures for the implementation of transportation conformity. These consultation procedures include considerations associated with the development of mobile inventories for SIPs. Implementation of transportation conformity as outlined in the consultation procedures requires SC DHEC to consult with Federal, state and local transportation and air quality agency officials on the development of motor vehicle emissions budgets. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with government officials related to the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS when necessary.

110(a)(2)(J) (127 Public Notification)—*Public Notification*: These requirements are met through Regulation 61–62.3, *Air Pollution Episodes*, which requires that SC DHEC notify the public of any air pollution alert, warning, or emergency. The SC DHEC Web site also provides air quality summary data, air quality index reports and links to more information regarding public awareness of measures that can prevent such exceedances and of ways in which the public can participate in regulatory and other efforts to improve air quality. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to provide public notification related to the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS when necessary. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submissions with respect to section 110(a)(2)(J) public notification.

110(a)(2)(J)—*Visibility Protection*: EPA's 2013 Guidance notes that it does not treat the visibility protection aspects of section 110(a)(2)(J) as applicable for purposes of the infrastructure SIP approval process. SC DHEC referenced its regional haze program as germane to the visibility component of section 110(a)(2)(J). EPA recognizes that states are subject to visibility protection and regional haze program requirements under Part C of the Act (which includes sections 169A and 169B). However, there are no newly applicable visibility protection obligations after the promulgation of a new or revised

NAAQS. Thus, EPA has determined that states do not need to address the visibility component of 110(a)(2)(J) in infrastructure SIP submissions so SC DHEC does not need to rely on its regional haze program to fulfill its obligations under section 110(a)(2)(J). As such, EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP submission is approvable for the visibility protection element of section 110(a)(2)(J) and that South Carolina does not need to rely on its regional haze program.

11. 110(a)(2)(K) *Air Quality and Modeling/Data*: Section 110(a)(2)(K) of the CAA requires that SIPs provide for performing air quality modeling so that effects on air quality of emissions from NAAQS pollutants can be predicted and submission of such data to the EPA can be made. Regulation 61–62.1, *Definitions and General Requirements*, 61–62–5(2), *Ambient Air Quality Standards*, and 61–62–5(7), *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, specify that required air modeling be conducted in accordance with 40 CFR part 51, Appendix W “Guideline on Air Quality Models.” The state's permitting and reporting requirements provide the necessary tools to conduct, evaluate, and provide air quality modeling data if necessary. Also, S.C. Code Ann. § 48–1–50(14) provides SC DHEC with the necessary authority to “Collect and disseminate information on air and water control.” These standards demonstrate that South Carolina has the authority to perform air quality monitoring and provide relevant data for the purpose of predicting the effect on ambient air quality of the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. Additionally, South Carolina supports a regional effort to coordinate the development of emissions inventories and conduct regional modeling for NO_x, which includes NO₂. Taken as a whole, South Carolina's air quality regulations demonstrate that SC DHEC has the authority to provide relevant data for the purpose of predicting the effect on ambient air quality of the 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to provide for air quality and modeling, along with analysis of the associated data, related to the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS when necessary.

12. 110(a)(2)(L) *Permitting Fees*: This element requires the owner or operator of each major stationary source to pay to the permitting authority, as a condition of any permit required under the CAA, a fee sufficient to cover: (i) The reasonable costs of reviewing and

acting upon any application for such a permit, and (ii) if the owner or operator receives a permit for such source, the reasonable costs of implementing and enforcing the terms and conditions of any such permit (not including any court costs or other costs associated with any enforcement action), until such fee requirement is superseded with respect to such sources by the Administrator's approval of a fee program under title V.

Funding for the South Carolina air permit program comes from a fees submitted by permit applicants under Regulation 61–30, *Environmental Protection Fees*, which prescribes fees applicable to applicants and holders of permits, licenses, certificates, certifications, and registrations, establishes procedures for the payment of fees, provides for the assessment of penalties for nonpayment, and establishes an appeals process for refunding fees. Also, South Carolina statute 48–2–50, *Fees*, which prescribes that SC DHEC charge fees for environmental programs it administers pursuant to Federal and State law and regulations including those that govern the costs to review, implement and enforce PSD and NNSR permits. Additionally, South Carolina has a fully approved title V operating permit program at Regulation 61–62.70, *Title V Operation Permit Program*,²⁰ that covers the cost of implementation and enforcement of PSD and NNSR permits after they have been issued. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately provide for permitting fees related to the 2010 NO₂ NAAQS, when necessary. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(L).

13. 110(a)(2)(M) *Consultation/Participation by Affected Local Entities*: This element requires states to provide for consultation and participation in SIP development by local political subdivisions affected by the SIP. Regulation 61–62.5(7), *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, and South Carolina statutes 48–1–50(8) and 1–23–40 authorize SC DHEC to cooperate, consult, and enter into agreements with other agencies of the state, the Federal government, other states, interstate agencies, groups, political subdivisions, and industries affected by the provisions of this act, rules, or policies of the department.” Furthermore, SC DHEC has demonstrated consultation

with, and participation by, affected local entities through its work with local political subdivisions during the development of its Transportation Conformity SIP and Regional Haze Implementation Plan. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with affected local entities related to the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS when necessary.

V. Proposed Action

With the exception of the preconstruction PSD permitting requirements for major sources of section 110(a)(2)(C), prong 3 of (D)(i), and (J) and the interstate transport provisions pertaining to the contribution to nonattainment or interference with maintenance in other states and visibility of prongs 1, 2, and 4 of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i), EPA is proposing to approve that South Carolina's April 30, 2014, infrastructure SIP submission for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS has met the above-described infrastructure SIP requirements.

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable federal regulations. See 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 proposed 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 proposed 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);

²⁰ Title V program regulations are federally approved but not incorporated into the federally approved SIP.

- 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).

In addition, this proposed action for the state of South Carolina does not have Tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). The Catawba Indian Nation Reservation is located within the State of South Carolina. Pursuant to the Catawba Indian Claims Settlement Act, South Carolina statute 27–16–120, “all state and local environmental laws and regulations apply to the [Catawba Indian Nation] and Reservation and are fully enforceable by all relevant state and local agencies and authorities.” However, EPA has determined that because this proposed rule does not have substantial direct effects on an Indian Tribe because, as noted above, this action is not approving any specific rule, but rather proposing that South Carolina’s already approved SIP meets certain CAA requirements. EPA notes this action 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, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: June 10, 2016.

Heather McTeer Toney,

Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2016–15145 Filed 6–24–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 122, 123, 124 and 125

[EPA–HQ–OW–2016–0145; FRL–9948–35–OW]

RIN 2040–AF25

Notice of Extension to Comment Period on the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System: Applications and Program Updates Proposed Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Extension of Comment Period.

SUMMARY: EPA is extending the comment period for the notice, “National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES): Applications and Program Updates.” In response to stakeholder requests, EPA is extending the comment period for an additional 15 days, from July 18, 2016 to August 2, 2016.

DATES: The comment period for the notice that was published on May 18, 2016 (81 FR 31344), is extended. Comments must be received on or before August 2, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OW–2016–0145, to the *Federal eRulemaking Portal*: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and

should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Erin Flannery-Keith, Water Permits Division, Office of Wastewater Management, Mail Code 4203M, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460; (202) 566–0689; flannery-keith.erin@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 18, 2016 EPA published in the **Federal Register** (81 FR 31344) a proposed rule that would make targeted revisions to the NPDES regulations. These revisions would make the regulations consistent with the 1987 CWA Amendments and with applicable judicial decisions. These revisions would delete certain regulatory provisions that are no longer in effect and clarify the level of documentation that permit writers must provide for permitting decisions. EPA is also asking for public comments on potential ways to enhance public notice and participation in the permitting process. CWA section 402 established the NPDES permitting program and gives EPA authority to write regulations to implement the NPDES program. 33 U.S.C. 1342(a)(1), (2). The proposed rule, as initially published in the **Federal Register**, provided for written comments to be submitted to EPA on or before July 18, 2016 (a 60-day public comment period). Since publication, EPA has received a request for additional time to submit comments. EPA is extending the public comment period for 15 days until August 2, 2016.

Dated: June 17, 2016.

Joel Beauvais,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Water.

[FR Doc. 2016–15134 Filed 6–24–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P