

III. EPA's Proposed Action

The EPA is proposing to approve and incorporate by reference the following provision into the Alaska SIP at 40 CFR 52.70(c), EPA Approved Regulations and Statutes:

- 18 AAC 50.075(e) Solid Fuel-fired Heating Device Visible Emission Standards, State effective January 12, 2018.

The EPA is proposing to approve, but not incorporate by reference, the following revised sections of the Alaska State Air Quality Control Plan:

- Volume II, Section III.D.5.11 Fairbanks Emergency Episode Plan, State effective January 12, 2018; and
- Pages 68 through 84 of Volume III, Appendix III.D.5.12: Appendix to Volume II. Analysis of Problems, Control Actions; Section III. Area-wide Pollutant Control Program; D. Particulate Matter; 5. Fairbanks North Star Borough PM_{2.5} Control Plan, State effective January 12, 2018.

These proposed revisions to the SIP primarily apply to the Fairbanks PM_{2.5} nonattainment area. As described above, the EPA is proposing to approve the rules, Emergency Episode Plan, reflecting the State-adopted Fairbanks North Star Borough Ordinances as part of state rule in 18 AAC 50.030, as SIP strengthening. These revisions support the state's ability to reduce and manage emissions in the Fairbanks PM_{2.5} nonattainment area. This action does not alter our prior approval of the plan as meeting Moderate area requirements; and we are not making any findings with respect to the serious plan requirements triggered upon reclassification (82 FR 21711).

IV. Incorporation by Reference

In this document, the EPA is proposing to include regulatory text in an EPA final rule that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is proposing to incorporate by reference the regulations described in section III. *Regulations to Approve and Incorporate by Reference into the SIP*. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials generally available through www.regulations.gov and at the EPA Region 10 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

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 this action does not involve technical standards; and

- Does not provide the 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 does not 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 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, Carbon monoxide, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: March 1, 2019.

Chris Hladick,

Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 2019-04906 Filed 3-21-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0056; FRL-9991-27-Region 9]

Approval of California Air Plan Revisions; Imperial County Air Pollution Control District; Stationary Source Permits

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a revision to the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD or District) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns the District's New Source Review (NSR) permitting program for new and modified sources of air pollution. We are proposing action on a local rule under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (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 April 22, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0056 at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to T. Khoi Nguyen, at nguyen.thien@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

<https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: T. Khoi Nguyen, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-4120, nguyen.thien@epa.gov. EPA Region IX is located at 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

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?

- 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 proposal with the dates that it was amended by the ICAPCD and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), which is the governor’s designee for California SIP submittals.

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULE

| Local agency | Rule No. | Rule title | Amended | Submitted |
|--------------|----------|---|---------|-----------|
| ICAPCD | 207 | New and Modified Stationary Source Review | 9/11/18 | 10/5/18 |

On February 22, 2019, the EPA determined that the submittal for ICAPCD Rule 207 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 September 5, 2017, the EPA finalized a conditional approval of Rule 207, as amended October 22, 2013, into the California SIP. 82 FR 41895.

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule?

Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that include a pre-construction permit program for certain new or modified stationary sources of pollutants, including a permit program as required by Part D of Title I of the CAA.

The purpose of District Rule 207 is to implement a federal preconstruction permit program for new and modified minor sources of regulated NSR pollutants, and new and modified major sources of regulated NSR pollutants for which the area is designated nonattainment. Imperial County is currently designated as a marginal nonattainment area for the 2015 8-hr ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) and a moderate nonattainment area for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. Portions of the county are designated as a serious nonattainment area for the 1987 24-hr PM₁₀ NAAQS, as a moderate nonattainment area for the 2006 24-hr PM_{2.5} NAAQS, and as a moderate nonattainment area for the 2012 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS. 40 CFR 81.305. In addition, Imperial County was designated nonattainment for two

revoked NAAQS: the 1979 1-hour ozone (moderate) and 1997 8-hour ozone (moderate) NAAQS.

The rule revision corrects a deficiency for which the EPA previously finalized a conditional approval. 82 FR 41895. In that action, we explained our finding that the rule did not fully satisfy 40 CFR 51.165(a)(13)’s requirements for regulation of PM_{2.5} precursors as they pertain to ammonia. Our conditional approval of Rule 217 was based on a commitment by CARB and the ICAPCD to submit a revised Rule 207 that includes ammonia as a PM_{2.5} precursor within twelve months of the effective date of our action (*i.e.*, by October 5, 2018). To fulfill the commitment, the ICAPCD amended Rule 207 on September 11, 2018 and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) submitted revised Rule 207 to the EPA on October 5, 2018.

We present our evaluation of revised Rule 207, as identified in Table 1, in general terms below. Our technical support document (TSD), which is available in the docket for the proposed rulemaking, contains a more detailed analysis for today’s proposed action.

II. The EPA’s Evaluation and Action

A. How is the EPA evaluating the rule?

The submitted rule must meet the CAA’s general requirements for SIPs and SIP revisions in CAA sections 110(a)(2), 110(l), and 193 as well as the applicable requirements contained in part D of title I of the Act (sections 172 and 173) for a nonattainment NSR permit program. In addition, the submitted rule must contain the

applicable regulatory provisions of 40 CFR 51.160–51.165 and 40 CFR 51.307.

Among other things, section 110 of the Act requires that SIP rules be enforceable and provides that the EPA may not approve a SIP revision if it would interfere with any applicable requirements concerning attainment and reasonable further progress or any other requirement of the CAA. In addition, section 110(a)(2) and section 110(l) of the Act require that each SIP or revision to a SIP submitted by a state must be adopted after reasonable notice and public hearing.

Section 110(a)(2)(c) of the Act requires each SIP to include a permit program to regulate the modification and construction of any stationary source within the areas covered by the SIP as necessary to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. The EPA’s regulations at 40 CFR 51.160–51.164 provide general programmatic requirements to implement this statutory mandate commonly referred to as the “minor NSR” or “general NSR” permit program. These NSR program regulations impose requirements for SIP approval of state and local programs that are more general in nature as compared to the specific statutory and regulatory requirements for nonattainment NSR permitting programs under Part D of title I of the Act.

Part D of title I of the Act contains the general requirements for areas designated nonattainment for a NAAQS (section 172), including preconstruction permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications proposing to construct in nonattainment areas (section 173).

Additionally, 40 CFR 51.165 sets forth the EPA's regulatory requirements for SIP-approval of a nonattainment NSR-permit program.

The protection of visibility requirements that apply to New Source Review programs are contained in 40 CFR 51.307. This provision requires that certain actions be taken in consultation with the local Federal Land Manager if a new major source or major modification may have an impact on visibility in any mandatory Class I Federal Area.

Section 110(l) of the Act prohibits the EPA from approving any SIP revisions that would interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment and reasonable further progress (RFP) or any other applicable requirement of the CAA. Section 193 of the Act, which only applies in nonattainment areas, prohibits the modification of a SIP-approved control requirement in effect before November 15, 1990, in any manner unless the modification insures equivalent or greater emission reductions of such air pollutant.

The EPA has reviewed the submitted rule in accordance with the rule evaluation criteria described above. With respect to procedures, based on our review of the public process documentation included in the October 5, 2018 submittal, we are proposing to approve the submitted rule in part because we have determined that the ICAPCD has provided sufficient evidence of public notice and opportunity for comment and public hearings prior to adoption and submittal of this rule, in accordance with the requirements of CAA sections 110(a)(2) and 110(l). The amendment of Rule 207 now also includes ammonia as a potential precursor to PM_{2.5}, thus resolving the conditional approval issue from the September 2017 action. Specifically, the revised Rule 207 updated definitions of "emission increase", "major stationary source", "precursors", and "significant" to be consistent with local and federal regulations and added language to specify when best available control technology requirements apply to ammonia emissions. Our TSD, which can be found in the docket for this rule, contains a more detailed discussion of the approval criteria.

B. 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 April 22, 2019. 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 ICAPCD 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 action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- 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 EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

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

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by May 21, 2019. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, New Source Review, Particulate matter.

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

Dated: March 13, 2018.

Michael Stoker,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2019-05416 Filed 3-21-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration****50 CFR Part 648**

[Docket No. 151006928-9089-02]

RIN 0648-BF43

Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Jonah Crab Fishery; Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Jonah Crab

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Based on Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission recommendations, we, the National Marine Fisheries Service, are proposing to implement regulations for the Jonah crab fishery in Federal waters. This action is necessary to enact measures that provide stock protections to a previously unmanaged fishery. The action is intended to ensure compatibility between state and Federal Jonah crab management measures, consistent with the Commission's Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Jonah Crab and the intent of the Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act.

DATES: Public comments must be received by April 22, 2019.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on this document, identified by NOAA-NMFS-2015-0127, by either of the following methods:

- *Electronic Submission:* Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2015-0127, click the "Comment Now!" icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.

- *Mail:* Submit written comments to Michael Pentony, Regional

Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930-2276. Mark the outside of the envelope: "Comments on Jonah Crab Proposed Rule."

Instructions: Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on www.regulations.gov without change. All personal identifying information (e.g., name, address, etc.), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter "N/A" in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous). Attachments to electronic comments will be accepted in Microsoft Word, Excel, or Adobe PDF file formats only.

You may request copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), including the Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) and the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA), prepared for this action at the mailing address specified above or by calling (978) 281-9225. The document is also available online at <https://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/nr/2018/May/jonahcrabDEIS.html>.

You may submit written comments regarding the burden-hour estimates or other aspects of the collection-of-information requirements contained in this proposed rule to the mailing address listed above and by email to OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Allison Murphy, Fishery Policy Analyst, (978) 281-9122.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

Under its process for managing species that are managed by both the states and NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission decides upon a management strategy, and then recommends that the states and Federal government enact regulations to complement these measures when appropriate. The Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act (16 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) directs the Federal government to support the management efforts of the Commission and, to the extent the Federal government seeks to regulate a Commission species, to develop regulations that are compatible with the

Commission's Interstate Fishery Management Plan and consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act's National Standards.

Historically, Jonah crabs (*Cancer borealis*) have been harvested as an incidental catch in the American lobster trap fishery. That is, traditionally, lobster harvesters did not target Jonah crabs, but sometimes kept and brought them to market if they caught some while lobster fishing. Eventually, the Jonah crab market expanded, and lobster harvesters began making legal modifications to their lobster traps and setting traps for the specific purpose of catching Jonah crabs. Landings have dramatically increased from nearly 3 million lb (1360.78 mt) in 1994 to a high of over 17 million lb (7711.07 mt) in 2017.

The rapid increase in Jonah crab landings concerned fishery managers. Little is known about the species within U.S. waters other than the fact that fishing pressure has significantly increased. There has been no scientific stock assessment, so we do not know whether the stock is overfished or whether overfishing is occurring. The Jonah crab fishery has been wholly unregulated in Federal waters; anybody could fish for any amount of crabs. Minimal and inconsistent regulations had been issued by some states. Some states tied the harvest of Jonah crabs to their state lobster license, while others did not. The market did provide limited stock protection: Harvest was tempered at times by a low demand, and Jonah crabs with a carapace width smaller than 5 inches (12.7 cm) were considered less marketable. In recent years, targeted fishing pressure has increased, likely due to the decline of the Southern New England lobster stock and the growing market demand for crab.

The Commission initiated management of Jonah crab out of concern for its future sustainability. Given the linkage between the lobster and Jonah crab fisheries, the Jonah crab fishery is managed by the Commission's American Lobster Management Board. The Commission approved an Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Jonah Crab in August 2015, following its public process for review and approval of management actions. The goal of the Commission's Jonah Crab Plan is, "to promote conservation, reduce the possibility of recruitment failure, and allow the full utilization of the resource by the industry." In general, the plan aimed to capture the fishery within the parameters that existed prior to approval of the plan in 2015. For example, this involved establishing a