

Emissions Budgets (MVEBs) for 2017. Finally, we are proposing approval of the use of TATU's tool and its Unmonitored Area analysis as acceptable for meeting the recommended evaluation of ozone levels in the Unmonitored Area analysis for this SIP proposed approval action.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, the 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);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866;
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);
- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the 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, 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 proposed rule does not have tribal implications and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: April 25, 2018.

Anne Idsal,

Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 2018-09313 Filed 5-2-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0104; FRL-9977-33-Region 9]

Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a revision to the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD or "District") portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from architectural coatings. We are proposing to approve a local rule to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by June 4, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R09-

OAR-2018-0104 at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to Arnold Lazarus, at lazarus.arnold@epa.gov. For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](http://www.Regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be removed or edited from [Regulations.gov](http://www.Regulations.gov). For either manner of submission, the 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. The 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: Arnold Lazarus, EPA Region IX, (415) 972 3024, Lazarus.Arnold@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to the EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. The State's Submittal
 - A. What rule did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revision?
- II. The EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is the EPA evaluating the rule?
 - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rule
 - D. Public Comment and Proposed Action
- III. Incorporation by Reference
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. The State's Submittal

A. What rule did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rule addressed by this proposal with the date that the revision was adopted by the YSAQMD and the date that it was submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to the EPA.

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Revised	Submitted
YSAQMD	2.14	Architectural Coatings	10/12/2016	01/24/2017

On April 17, 2017, the EPA determined that the submittal for YSAQMD Rule 2.14 met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51 Appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

B. Are there other versions of this rule?

On January 2, 2004 (69 FR 34), the EPA finalized a limited approval and limited disapproval of a previous submission of Rule 2.14 with no sanctions because the part of the rule that was disapproved, “Appendix A,” expired by its own terms on January 1, 2005. For additional information, please see the technical support document (TSD) for today’s rulemaking.

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

VOCs contribute to the production of ground-level ozone, smog and particulate matter, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control VOC emissions. Architectural coatings are coatings that are applied to stationary structures and their accessories. They include house paints, stains, industrial maintenance coatings, traffic coatings, and many other products. VOCs are emitted from the coatings during application and curing, and from the associated solvents used for thinning and clean-up.

YSAQMD Rule 2.14 controls VOC emissions from architectural coatings by establishing VOC limits on architectural coatings supplied, sold, offered for sale, manufactured, blended, or repackaged for use within the YSAQMD, as well as architectural coatings applied or solicited for application within the District. The revisions to Rule 2.14 include the elimination of the averaging provision, which was the basis for the EPA’s 2004 limited disapproval of a prior version of this rule, and the tightening of many of the Rule’s VOC limits. The TSD has more information about this rule.

II. The EPA’s Evaluation and Action

A. How is the EPA evaluating the rule?

SIP rules must be enforceable (see CAA section 110(a)(2)), must not interfere with applicable requirements concerning attainment and reasonable further progress or other CAA

requirements (see CAA section 110(l)), and must not modify certain SIP control requirements in nonattainment areas without ensuring equivalent or greater emissions reductions (see CAA section 193).

Generally, SIP rules must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for each category of sources covered by a Control Techniques Guidelines (CTG) document, and each major source of VOCs in ozone nonattainment areas classified as moderate or above (see CAA section 182(b)(2)). The YSAQMD regulates an ozone nonattainment area classified as severe nonattainment for the 2008 and the 1997 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (40 CFR 81.305).

Because there is no relevant EPA CTG document and because there are no major architectural coating sources within the District, architectural coatings are not subject to RACT requirements. However, architectural coatings are subject to other VOC content limits and control measures described in the TSD.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to evaluate the enforceability, revision/relaxation, and stringency requirements for this rule include the following:

1. “State Implementation Plans; General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990,” (57 FR 13498, April 16, 1992 and 57 FR 18070, April 28, 1992).
2. “Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations” (“the Bluebook,” U.S. EPA, May 25, 1988; revised January 11, 1990).
3. “Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule Deficiencies” (“the Little Bluebook,” EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001).
4. National Volatile Organic Compound Emission Standards for Architectural Coatings, 40 CFR 59, Subpart D.
5. CARB “Suggested Control Measure for Architectural Coatings,” Approved 2007.
6. YSAQMD Rule 2.14, “Architectural Coatings,” EPA Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval on January 2, 2004 (69 FR 34).

B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?

This rule is consistent with CAA requirements and relevant guidance regarding enforceability, stringency, and SIP revisions. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rule

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

D. Public Comment and Proposed Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, the EPA proposes to fully approve the submitted rule because it fulfills all relevant requirements. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal until June 4, 2018. If we take final action to approve the submitted rule, our final action will incorporate this rule into the federally enforceable SIP.

III. Incorporation by Reference

In this rule, the 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, the EPA is proposing to incorporate by reference the YSAQMD rule described in Table 1 of this preamble. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials available through www.regulations.gov and at the EPA Region IX Office (please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble for more information).

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, the EPA’s role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Accordingly, this proposed 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 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);

- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866;

- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);

- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);

- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);

- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);

- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);

- Is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Act; and

- Does not provide the EPA with the discretionary authority to address disproportionate human health or environmental effects with practical, appropriate, and legally permissible methods under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

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

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

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

Dated: April 18, 2018.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2018–09213 Filed 5–2–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R05–OAR–2017–0100; FRL–9977–53–Region 5]

Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Revisions to Part 9 Miscellaneous Rules

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a request submitted by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) on February 2, 2017, and supplemented on November 8, 2017, to revise the Michigan state implementation plan (SIP) for carbon monoxide (CO). The revision incorporates changes to Michigan’s Air Pollution Control Rules entitled “Emissions Limitations and Prohibitions—Miscellaneous.” The revision updates existing source-specific rule requirements for ferrous cupola operations by removing obsolete rule language and makes a minor change to correct the citation to a Federal test method. The revision continues to result in attainment of the CO national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 4, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R05–OAR–2017–0100 at <http://www.regulations.gov> or via email to blakley.pamela@epa.gov. For comments submitted at *Regulations.gov*, follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed 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:

Charles Hatten, Environmental Engineer, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–3031, hatten.charles@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document whenever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean EPA. This supplementary information section is arranged as follows:

- I. What are the State rule revisions?
- II. Did the State hold public hearings for the submittal?
- III. What is EPA’s analysis of the State’s submittal?
- IV. What action is EPA taking?
- V. Incorporation by Reference
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. What are the State rule revisions?

On February 2, 2017, MDEQ submitted a request to incorporate revisions to Michigan’s Air Pollution Control Rules in Chapter 336, Part 9—Emissions Limitations and Prohibitions—Miscellaneous (Part 9) in the Michigan SIP. Michigan’s submittal included revisions to three separate rules in Part 9: R 336.1902—“Adoption of standards by reference” (rule 902); R 336.1916—“Affirmative defense for excess emissions during start-up or shutdown” (rule 916); and R 336.1930—“Emission of carbon monoxide from ferrous cupola operations” (rule 930). This rule will only take action on rule 930, while the revisions to rule 902 and 916 will be addressed separately.

Michigan’s rule 930 specifies CO emission limits for large ferrous cupola operations with a melting capacity of 20 tons or more per hour. The version of rule 930 currently approved into the Michigan SIP only applies to ferrous cupola operations in Saginaw, Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne Counties in Michigan.¹ The rule is designed to require installation of afterburner control system, or equivalent, which reduces the CO emissions from the ferrous cupola by 90 percent.

¹ EPA approved rule 930 on May 6, 1980 (45 FR 29790).