

revisions remove the ability of kraft pulp mills that exceed their NO_x limits and caps to comply by purchasing or otherwise acquiring NO_x allowances from EPA's ozone season NO_x trading program by removing these provisions in COMAR 26.11.14 and 26.11.01. The removal of the provisions allowing purchase of additional allowances removes the potential for increased local NO_x emissions.

The May 15, 2018 Maryland SIP submittal does not result in increased NO_x emissions, and therefore has no impact on any requirements related to attainment, reasonable further progress, or any other NAAQS requirements under the CAA. The submittal therefore meets section 110(l) of the CAA.

III. Proposed Action

EPA's review of this material indicates that Maryland's May 18, 2018 SIP revision submittal (Maryland SIP Revision #18-03) is approvable in accordance with CAA section 110. For the reasons noted previously, EPA is proposing to approve the Maryland SIP revision submitted on May 15, 2018. EPA is soliciting public comments on the issues discussed in this document. These comments will be considered before taking final action.

IV. Incorporation by Reference

In this proposed action, 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 new Maryland regulation COMAR 26.11.40 and associated revisions to COMAR 26.11.01 and COMAR 26.11.14.07. EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials generally available through <http://www.regulations.gov> and at the EPA Region III Office (please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble for more information).

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 CAA and applicable federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this 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 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 action proposing approval of Maryland regulation COMAR 26.11.40 and associated revisions to other COMAR regulations does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the SIP is not approved to apply in Indian country located in the state, and EPA notes that it 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, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides.

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

Dated: July 24, 2018.

Cecil Rodrigues,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 2018-16778 Filed 8-7-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0711; FRL-9981-91—Region 9]

Approval of California Air Plan Revision, South Coast 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 South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) 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 emissions from architectural coatings 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 September 7, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0711 at <http://www.regulations.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. 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 action with the date that it was adopted

by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). On February 22, 2018, CARB requested the withdrawal from its earlier SIP submittal of one sentence from two definitions (“Bond Breakers” and “Form Release Compounds”), which exempted these materials from the rule, due to the adoption of a rule regulating these materials. Accordingly, our proposed approval of this rule does not include the two withdrawn sentences.

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Amended	Submitted
SCAQMD	1113	Architectural Coatings	2/5/2016	8/22/2016

On September 27, 2016, the EPA determined that the submittal for SCAQMD Rule 1113 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?

We approved an earlier version of SCAQMD Rule 1113 into the SIP on March 26, 2013 (78 FR 18244).

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

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 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. SCAQMD Rule 1113 controls VOC emissions by establishing VOC limits on architectural coatings. SCAQMD Rule 1113 was revised to increase stringency and reduce VOC emissions by updating VOC content limits, and restricting the small container exemption (less than 1 quart) for high-VOC coatings.

The EPA’s technical support document (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 as well as each major source of VOCs in ozone nonattainment areas classified as Moderate or above (see CAA section 182(b)(2)). The SCAQMD has been designated as Extreme nonattainment for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS (40 CFR 81.305). As addressed further in the EPA’s TSD for this rule, there are no relevant EPA CTG documents and architectural coatings are considered area sources. Therefore, architectural coating sources are not subject to RACT requirements.

Guidance and policy documents that we use to evaluate enforceability, revision/relaxation, and rule stringency 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 59.400,

Subpart D, Table 1, VOC Content Limits for Architectural Coatings.

B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?

We believe 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. 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 we believe it fulfills all relevant requirements. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal until September 7, 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 SCAQMD 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: July 24, 2018.

Michael Stoker,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2018-16795 Filed 8-7-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0215; FRL-9981-75—Region 3]

Air Plan Approval; District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia; Maryland and Virginia Redesignation Requests and District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia Maintenance Plan for the Washington, DC-MD-VA 2008 Ozone Standard Nonattainment Area

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve the requests from the State of Maryland (Maryland) and the Commonwealth of Virginia (Virginia) to redesignate to attainment their respective portions of the Washington, DC-MD-VA nonattainment area (hereafter "the Washington Area" or "the Area") for the 2008 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS or standard) (also referred to as the 2008 ozone NAAQS). EPA is not proposing to approve the redesignation request for the District of Columbia (the District) for its portion of the Area; EPA will address the District's redesignation request for its portion of the Area in a separate rulemaking action. EPA is also proposing to approve, as a revision to the District's, Maryland's, and Virginia's state implementation plans (SIPs), the joint maintenance plan submitted by the District, Maryland, and Virginia. The joint maintenance plan demonstrates maintenance of the 2008 ozone NAAQS through 2030 in the Washington Area. Approval of a maintenance plan is among the CAA criteria for redesignation to attainment, as

discussed in more detail in this notice. The Washington Area maintenance plan includes motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS for nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs), which are precursors to ozone. EPA has found the MVEBs adequate and is proposing to approve, as a SIP revision, these 2014, 2025, and 2030 NO_x and VOC MVEBs for the Washington Area.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before September 7, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0215 at <https://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to spielberger.susan@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 <https://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sara Calcinore, (215) 814-2043, or by email at calcinore.sara@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 actions EPA is proposing?
- II. What is the background for these proposed actions?
- III. What are the criteria for redesignation?
- IV. What is EPA's analysis of Maryland's and Virginia's redesignation requests for the Washington Area?
 - A. Has the Washington Area attained the 2008 ozone NAAQS?