content tagging; includes document formats such as PDF/X).
  c. Other structured or markup formats:
     (i) Widely-used serials or journal non-
         proprietary XML-based DTDs/schemas with
         presentation stylesheets(s).
     (ii) Proprietary XML-based format for
         serials or journals (with documentation) with
         DTD/schema and presentation stylesheet(s).
     (iii) XHTML or HTML, with DOCTYPE
          declaration and presentation stylesheet(s).
     (iv) XML-based document formats (widely-
          used and publicly documented). With
          presentation stylesheets, if applicable.
          Includes ODF (ISO/IEC 26300) and OOXML
          (ISO/IEC 29500).
     d. PDF (web-optimized with searchable
        text).
  e. Other formats:
     (i) Rich text format.
     (ii) Plain text.
     (iii) Widely-used proprietary word
          processing or page-layout formats.
      (iv) Other text formats not listed here.
  2. Metadata Elements: If included with
     published version of work, descriptive data
     (metadata) as described below should
     accompany the deposited material:
     a. Title level metadata: Serial or journal
        title, ISSN, publisher, frequency, place of
        publication.
     b. Article level metadata, as relevant or
        applicable: Volume(s), number(s), issue
        date(s), article title(s), article author(s),
        article identifier (DOI, etc.).
     c. With other descriptive metadata (e.g.,
        subject heading(s), descriptor(s), abstract(s)),
        rather than without.
  3. Completeness:
     a. All elements considered integral to the
        publication and offered for sale or
        distribution must be deposited—e.g.,
        articles, table(s) of contents, front matter,
        back matter, etc. Includes all associated
        external files and fonts considered integral to
        or necessary to view the work as published.
     b. All updates, supplements, releases, and
        supersessions published as part of the work
        and offered for sale or distribution must be
        deposited and received in a regular and
        timely manner for proper maintenance of the
        deposit.
  B. Electronic-Only Books:
     1. Content Format:
        a. Book-specific structured/markup format,
           i.e., XML-based markup formats, with
           included or accessible DTD/schema, XSD/
           XSLT stylesheet(s), and explicitly
           stated character encoding:
          (i) BITS-compliant (NLM Book DTD).
          (ii) EPUB-compliant.
          (iii) Other widely-used book DTD/schemas
               (e.g., TEI, DocBook, etc.).
      b. Page-oriented rendition:
         (i) PDF/UA (Portable Document Format/
              Universal Accessibility; compliant with ISO
              14289–1).
         (ii) PDF/A (Portable Document Format/
              Archival; compliant with ISO 19005).
         (iii) PDF (Portable Document Format;
              highest quality available, with features
              such as searchable text, embedded fonts,
              lossless compression, high resolution images,
              device-
              independent specification of color space;
              content tagging; includes document formats
              such as PDF/X).
     c. Other structured markup formats:
        (i) XHTML or HTML, with DOCTYPE
            declaration and presentation stylesheet(s).
        (ii) XML-based document formats (widely-
            used and publicly documented), with
            presentation style sheet(s) if applicable.
            Includes ODF (ISO/IEC 26300) and OOXML
            (ISO/IEC 29500).
     d. PDF (web-optimized with searchable
        text).
     e. Other formats:
        (i) Rich text format.
        (ii) Plain text.
        (iii) Widely-used proprietary word
             processing formats.
      (iv) Other text formats not listed here.
  2. Metadata Elements: If included with
     published version of work, descriptive data
     (metadata) as described below should
     accompany the deposited material:
     a. As supported by format (e.g., standards-
        based formats such as ONIX, XMP, MODS,
        or MARCXML either embedded in or
        accompanying the digital item): Title, creator,
        creation date, place of publication, publisher/
        producer/distributor, ISBN, contact
        information.
      b. Include if part of published version of
          work: Language of work, other relevant
          identifiers (e.g., DOI, LCCN, etc.), edition,
          subject descriptors, abstracts.
  3. Rarity and Special Features:
     a. Limited editions (including those with
        special features such as high resolution
        images.)
     b. Editions with the greatest number of
        unique features (such as additional content,
        multimedia, interactive elements.)
  4. Completeness:
     a. For items published in a finite number of
        separate components, all elements
        published as part of the work and offered for
        sale or distribution must be deposited.
        Includes all associated external files and
        fonts considered integral to or necessary to
        view the work as published.
     b. All updates, supplements, releases, and
        supersessions published as part of the work
        and offered for sale or distribution must be
        submitted and received in a regular and
        timely manner for proper maintenance of the
        deposit.
  Dated: April 6, 2018.

Sarang Vijay Damle,
General Counsel and Associate Register of
Copyrights.
[FR Doc. 2018–07484 Filed 4–13–18; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 1410–30–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

Air Plan Approval; GA; Permitting Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve changes to the Georgia State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the State of Georgia, through the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GA EPD) of the Department of Natural Resources, on April 11, 2003. EPA is proposing to approve portions of a SIP revision which includes changes to Georgia’s rules regarding emissions standards and permitting. This action is being proposed pursuant to the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) and its implementing regulations.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before May 16, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2006–0651 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, or Joel Huey, 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 by telephone at (404) 562—8726 or via electronic mail at wong.richard@epa.gov. Mr. Huey can be reached by telephone at (404) 562—9104 or via electronic mail at huey.joel@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On April 11, 2003, GA EPD submitted a SIP revision to EPA for approval that involves changes to Georgia’s SIP regulations. In this action, EPA is proposing to approve the portion of the Georgia submission revising GA EPD Rule 391—3–1–03(11)[b]—Permit by Rule Standards. This submission also seeks to revise Rule 391—3—1—02(2)[nnn]—NOx Emissions from Large Stationary Gas Turbines and Rule 391—3—1—02(5)—Open Burning. EPA is not taking action on the proposed changes to Rule 391—3—1—02(2)[nnn] and Rule 391—3—1—02(5) at this time. On October 21, 2009, GA EPD submitted a letter withdrawing from the submittal a proposed revision to Georgia Rule 391—3—1—02(2)[qqq]—Volatile Organic Compound From Extruded Polystyrene Products Manufacturing Utilizing a Blowing Agent. On January 5, 2017 (82 FR 1206), EPA approved changes to Rule 391—3—1—01—Definitions that were also included in the April 11, 2003, submittal.

II. Analysis of State’s Submittal

Rule 391—3—1—03(11)[b]—Permit by Rule Standards

GA EPD’s Rule 391—3—1—03(11)[b]6 establishes “permit by rule” standards for cotton ginning operations and applies to facilities with a potential to emit in excess of the Part 70 program major source thresholds. The rule provides that cotton ginning operations shall be deemed to have a “permit by rule” if they (1) maintain a log of the monthly production, and (2) limit annual production to 65,000 standard bales of cotton during any twelve consecutive months. The rule also stipulates that sources having potential emissions greater than major source thresholds even after meeting these conditions, or that are unable to meet these conditions, must obtain a Title V operating permit pursuant to Georgia’s Part 70 program. GA EPD’s March 14, 2003, submittal would change the annual production threshold to qualify for a “permit by rule” from 65,000 standard bales of cotton ginned per year (bales/year) to 120,000 bales/year. Because of the mostly mechanical nature of the cotton ginning processes and the agricultural material handled, particulate matter (PM) is the primary regulated pollutant of concern. Georgia Rule 391—3—1—02(2)[q] uses a process weight calculation to establish allowable PM emission rates (in pounds per hour) from cotton gins based upon the number of bales processed per hour. In support of GA EPD’s April 11, 2003, submittal, the State provided a technical rationale intending to show, based upon the allowable emission rate under Rule 391—3—1—02(2)[q], that increasing the cotton ginning “permit by rule” threshold of Rule 391—3—1—03(11)[b]6 to 120,000 bales/year would still ensure that source emissions would not exceed the major source threshold.5 EPA notes, however, that an allowable emission rate alone does not constrain a source’s “potential to emit,” which is the maximum capacity of a stationary source to emit a pollutant under its physical and operational design. See, e.g., 40 CFR 52.21(b)(4) and 40 CFR 70.2. In addition, the emission rate that is allowable under Rule 391—3—1—02(2)[q] changes according to a source’s process rate (i.e., bales ginned per hour) at any particular time. Therefore, EPA’s evaluation of potential cotton ginning emissions is based upon the Agency’s review of available PM emission factors for cotton ginning operations, in particular emission factors for PM10 and PM2.5.

In addition, GA EPD Rule 391—3—1—03(11)[a]2 requires that a facility wishing to operate under the cotton ginning “permit by rule” shall certify its qualification in writing to the permitting authority, and the permitting authority shall grant the conditions and terms of the “permit by rule” by Certification letter to the facility.

4 Email from Jimmy Johnston, GA EPD, to Stacey Harder, EPA Region 4, May 30, 2007.

4 Since at least 1995, EPA has considered the regulated form of PM for title V purposes to be particles with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 2.5 micrometers, or PM2.5. See 62 FR 38652 (July 18, 1997). The definition of “regulated air pollutant” in 40 CFR 70.2 includes any pollutant for which a NAAQS has been promulgated, including PM2.5.

5 Figure 9.7–1 of AP–42 shows a flow diagram of a typical cotton ginning-process, which includes an unloading system, No. 1 dryer and cleaner, No. 2 dryer and cleaner, No. 1 lint cleaner, No. 2 lint cleaner, mole fan, battery condenser and bagging system, master trash fan and overflow system.


8 Figure 9.7–1 of AP–42 shows a flow diagram of a typical cotton ginning-process, which includes an unloading system, No. 1 dryer and cleaner, No. 2 dryer and cleaner, No. 1 lint cleaner, No. 2 lint cleaner, mole fan, battery condenser and bagging system, master trash fan and overflow system.


10 EPA’s Compilation of Air Emission Factors, AP–42, lists emission factors for typical cotton ginning configurations of 0.82 pound of PM10 per bale (for Configuration No. 1, gins with high-efficiency cyclones on all exhaust streams) and 1.2 pounds of PM10 per bale (for Configuration No. 2, gins with screened drums or cages on the lint cleaners and a battery condenser). But these are “D” and “E”-rated factors, meaning reliability of the factors is below average to poor. The AP–42 emission factors for cotton ginning were last updated in 1996 and do not include emission factors for PM2.5. EPA’s 1998 “Potential to Emit (PTE) Guidance for Specific Source Categories” (1998 PTE Guidance)7 suggested possible prohibitory rule thresholds of 90,000 bales/year or 72,000 bales/year (for gins similar to Configuration No. 1 and Configuration No. 2, respectively). These numbers were derived by taking 90 percent (to provide a 10 percent safety margin) of the 100 tons per year (tpy) title V major source threshold and dividing by a “worst case” emission rate. The 90,000 bale/year and 72,000 bale/year thresholds were based upon emission factors of 2.0 pounds of PM10 per bale and 2.5 pounds of PM10 per bale, depending on the gin configuration, and were considered “very conservative (worse than the typical ‘worst-case’).”

EPA notes that there is more recent preliminary data to consider regarding cotton ginning emission factors. In an effort to develop PM emission factors that are representative of actual cotton ginning emissions, cotton gin associations across the U.S. funded a national study that was conducted during the period 2008–2012 and utilized data collection methodologies defined by EPA.8 Peer reviewed articles published on the data gathered from the study suggest a PM10 emission factor of an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 2.5 micrometers, or PM2.5. See 62 FR 38652 (July 18, 1997). The definition of “regulated air pollutant” in 40 CFR 70.2 includes any pollutant for which a NAAQS has been promulgated, including PM2.5.
close to 1.3 pounds per bale 8 and a
PM2.5 emission factor of about 0.15
pound per bale 10 for the most common
cotton gin configurations. Subsequently,
an environmental scientist analyzed this
national study data in light of the 1996
AP–42 data and EPA’s 2013 emission
deployment procedures 11 and
developed a suggested PM10 emission
factor of 1.0 pound per bale and a
suggested PM2.5 emission factor of 0.10
pound per bale from typical cotton
ginning operations. 12

As noted above, GA EPD’s March 14,
2003, submittal would change the
cotton ginning “permit by rule”
threshold from 65,000 bales/year to
120,000 bales/year. The approach of
EPA’s 1998 PTE Guidance for
development of a “permit by rule” was
to set thresholds that would provide a
10 percent margin of safety from the 100
tpy Part 70 program applicability
criterion. Using Georgia’s proposed
cotton ginning “permit by rule”
threshold of 120,000 bales/year, an
emission factor of 1.5 pounds per bale
would result in maximum annual
emissions of 90 tpy. According to AP–
42, typical cotton gin emission factors
for PM10 fall into the range of the
0.82
pound per bale to 1.2 pounds per bale,
which results in estimated annual PM10
emissions of 49 tpy to 72 tpy from 120,000
bales ginned. And based upon
data from the national study, a typical
cotton gin emission factor is likely to be
in the range of 1.0 pound per bale to 1.3
pounds per bale, which would result in
estimated annual PM10 emissions in the
range of 60 tpy to 78 tpy from 120,000
bales ginned. Thus, the level of annual
PM10 emissions from typical cotton
ginning operations, as suggested by
emission factors from AP–42 and the
national study, provides a significant
margin of safety from the 100 tpy Part 70
program threshold. Estimated PM2.5
emissions would be much lower due to
the significantly lower emission factor
for that size indicator of total PM. This
analysis supports approval of GA EPD’s
revision to its “permit by rule”
threshold for cotton gins.

EPA believes that GA EPD’s revision
to Rule 391–3–1–03(11)(b)6 will not
degrade air quality because it does not
change the level of pollutant emissions
allowable for cotton ginning operations
under the SIP. The impact of the
revision would be that cotton ginning
operations which process cotton in the
range of 65,000 bales/year to 120,000
bales/year (i.e., from the current “permit
by rule” threshold to the new threshold)
would now be able to choose to operate
under a “permit by rule” rather than a
standard operating permit as long as
such sources maintain records of their
production, in accordance with Rule
391–3–1–03(11)(b)(6)(ii). In addition,
all cotton ginning operations in Georgia
will still be required to comply with the
State’s existing PM emission limit at
Rule 391–3–1–02(2)(q), which remains
unchanged and requires compliance
with a numerical limit on PM emissions
based on the number of bales ginned per
hour. Further, EPA notes that there are
currently no PM nonattainment areas in
the State of Georgia and that cotton gins
in the State are located primarily in
areas which tend to have ambient PM
concentrations well below the PM
NAAQS. Accordingly, EPA is proposing
to approve this change to Rule 391–3–
1–03(11)(b)6 from GA EPD’s April 11,
2003, submittal.

III. Incorporation by Reference

In this rule, EPA is proposing to
include in a final EPA rule regulatory
text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with
requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, EPA is
proposing to incorporate by reference
the GA EPD Rule 391–3–1–03(11)(b)6—
Cotton ginning operations, effective
March 26, 2003, which revises
permitting requirements for cotton
ginning operations. EPA has made, and
will continue to make, these materials
generally available through
www.regulations.gov and at the EPA
Region 8 Cotton Air Quality Program
person identified in the FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION CONTACT section of this
preamble for more information).

IV. Proposed Action

EPA is proposing to approve a portion of the State of Georgia’s April 11, 2003
submittal. Specifically, EPA is
proposing to approve the change to GA EPD Rule 391–3–1–03(11)(b)6—
Cotton ginning operations. EPA believes that the proposed change to the regulatory
portion of the SIP is consistent with section 110 of the CAA and meets the
regulatory requirements pertaining to SIPs. EPA also believes that the
proposed change is consistent with CAA section 110(l), which states that the
Administrator shall not approve a revision of a plan if the revision would interfere with
any applicable requirement concerning attainment and reasonable further progress (as defined in
CAA section 171), or any other applicable requirement of the Act.

V. 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 action
merely proposes to approve 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
• 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
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

8 Boykin, J.C., Buser, M.D., Whitelock, D.P., and
Holt, G.A., (multiple articles), Journal of Cotton
248–257, 258–267, 300–308, and 338–347 (2014),
available at www.cotton.org/journal/2014-18-
index.cfm.
9 Boykin, J.C., Buser, M.D., Whitelock, D.P., and
Holt, G.A., (several articles), Journal of Cotton
391–401, 402–413, 447–456, 489–499; and 357–367
(2013), available at www.cotton.org/journal/
2013-17/index.cfm.
10 See generally Eastern Research Group, Inc.,
Recommended Procedures for Development of
Emissions Factors and Use of the WebFIRE
Database (No. EPA–453/D–13–001) (August 2013),
available at http://www.epa.gov/trtnche1/efrac/
procedures/webfire20132.pdf.
11 See Thomas W. Moore, Proposed Updates for
AP–42 Cotton Gin Emission Factors, p. 82 table 27b,
M.S. Thesis, Oklahoma State University (May
2015).
12 See Holt, G.A., (several articles), Journal of Cotton
391–401, 402–413, 447–456, 489–499; and 357–367
(2013), available at www.cotton.org/journal/
2013-17/index.cfm.
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 as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor will it 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, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: April 5, 2018.

Onis "Trey" Glenn, III,
Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2016–07899 Filed 4–13–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52


Air Plan Approval; Tennessee; Revisions to Stage I and Stage II Vapor Recovery Requirements

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 Tennessee through the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) on November 11, 2017, for the purpose of establishing minor changes to the gasoline dispensing regulations, including adding clarifying language and effective and compliance dates and specifying the counties subject to the reporting requirement rule. EPA has preliminarily determined that Tennessee’s November 11, 2017, SIP revision is approvable because it is consistent with the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) and with EPA’s regulations and guidance.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 16, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–RO4–OAR–2017–0740 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: Kelly Scheckler, 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. The telephone number is (404) 562–9222. Ms. Scheckler can also be reached via electronic mail at scheckler.kelly@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On July 15, 2016, Tennessee submitted a SIP revision to EPA seeking to modify SIP requirements related to Stage II and Stage I vapor recovery systems. In relation to Stage II, TDEC sought the removal of the Stage II vapor recovery requirements from Tennessee Air Pollution Control Regulation TAPCR 1200–3–18–24 through two mechanisms: (1) The addition of requirements for decommissioning; and (2) the phase out of the Stage II vapor recovery systems over a 3-year period from January 1, 2016, to January 1, 2019, in Davidson, Rutherford, Sumner, Williamson and Wilson Counties. TDEC also sought to amend the Stage I requirements for gasoline dispensing facilities by adopting by reference the federal requirements of 40 CFR part 63, subpart CCCCCC and removing from the SIP the state-specific language for Stage I vapor recovery.

On September 20, 2016 (81 FR 64354), EPA approved in a final action, Tennessee’s July 15, 2016, SIP revision that changed Tennessee Gasoline Dispensing Facilities, Stage I and II Vapor Recovery, rule 1200–03–18–24, to: (1) Allow for the removal of the Stage II requirement and the orderly decommissioning of Stage II equipment; and (2) incorporate by reference Federal rule 40 CFR part 63, subpart CCCCCC, and remove certain non-state-specific requirements for the Stage I.

II. Analysis of the State’s Submittal

On November 11, 2017, TDEC submitted a SIP revision to EPA seeking to add clarity for the benefit of the regulated community with gasoline dispensing facilities. Tennessee is making a minor change to its rules regarding gasoline dispensing facilities (GDF) at subparagraph (1)(d) of rule 1200–03–18–24—“For any GDF otherwise exempt from subparagraph (c) of this paragraph based on monthly throughput, if the GDF ever exceeds the applicability threshold specified in subparagraph (c) of this paragraph, it shall be subject to the requirements of subparagraph (c) of this paragraph and shall remain subject to those requirements even if its throughput later falls below the threshold. The owner or operator shall inform the Technical Secretary within 30 days following the exceedance.” The revision clarifies the meaning and application of subparagraph (1)(d) of rule 1200–03–18–24 by adding the words “ever” and “and shall remain subject to those requirements” italicized above.

In addition, this revision replaces the phrase “the effective date of this rule” with the actual effective date of the rule (July 14, 2016) and replaces “three years after effective date” with the actual date of the rule for compliance (August 14, 2019). Finally, this revision adds the list of counties (Davidson, Rutherford, Shelby, Sumner, Knox, Anderson, Williamson and Wilson) that need to report to their permitting authority (if they emit more than 25 tons in a calendar year) and the cross reference to the existing reporting requirement in rule 1200–03–18–02 to simplify the issuances of notices of authorization under pending permit-by-rule provisions.

Pursuant to CAA section 110(l), the Administrator shall not approve a revision of a plan if the revision would interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment and reasonable further progress (as defined in CAA section 171), or any other applicable requirement of the Act. The State’s addition of clarifying language,