than needed to both ensure the public's awareness of the new agency's purview and to provide it the clearest understanding of the means to initiate and participate in the rulemaking process. However unnecessary it may seem at today's point in the digital age, directly providing interested persons a truncated version of the applicable operating rules so that they may exercise their rights to participate in the rulemaking process and hold their regulators accountable was laudable. Eager to effectuate its mandate and build its regulatory footprint, the Commission clearly understood the value in ensuring the barriers to participation were few.

I am pleased today that the Commission has chosen to publish the Proposal for public comment. The removal of the part 13 regulations viewed as duplicative of the APA's statutorily prescribed procedures for agency rulemakings and adjudications—which is almost part 13 in its entirety—could be accomplished without engaging the public in notice-and-comment on grounds that such regulations are strictly technical and administrative in nature. However, the Commission has recognized the importance of ensuring that as we move forward in improving the efficacy of our regulations, they remain current and reflective of our statutory mandate, which includes adhering to process and providing transparency. Whereas here we are preparing to remove the rules setting forth the Commission's interpretation as to the application of the requirements of the APA with regard to information rulemaking [2]—with the intent to rely exclusively and unambiguously on the APA, it will be useful to hear from the public as to whether there remain matters of importance that ought to be considered before we move forward.

This Proposal is consistent with the Department of Treasury's October 2017 Report on Capital Markets in which it encouraged the CFTC to make full use of its ability to solicit public comment in order to better signal to the public what information may be relevant.[3] To say that the various provisions of part 13 are unnecessary does not mean they are useless. To the extent part 13 may in some instances accord more elaborate procedures than the APA sets as the minimum, I hope that the Commission is alerted thereto.

While I have some concerns about the guidance and plainly written information to be lost upon the almost wholesale elimination of part 13, I am pleased that the Chairman and the Commission staff will be publishing a primer on the Commission's rulemaking process to ensure that our governing procedures remain accessible to all interested persons.

[FR Doc. 2019–20361 Filed 9–19–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–P

[2] *See* 5 U.S.C. 553.

[3] U.S. Department of the Treasury, *A Financial System That Creates Economic Opportunities: Capital Markets* at 218 (Oct 2017), *https://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Documents/A-Financial-System-Capital-Markets-FINAL-FINAL.pdf.*

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

**[EPA–R09–OAR–2019–0272; FRL–9997–15–Region 9]**

### Air Plan Approval; California; South Coast Air Quality Management 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 South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD or ''the District'') portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns a rule used to issue permits for stationary sources, including review and permitting of major sources and major modifications under part D of title I of the Clean Air Act (CAA or ''the Act''). Specifically, the revision pertains to SCAQMD Rule 1325 ''Federal $PM_{2.5}$ New Source Review Program.''

**DATES:** Any comments on this proposal must arrive by October 21, 2019.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2019–0272 at *https://www.regulations.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.* 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:** Laura Yannayon, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105. By phone: (415) 972–3534 or by email at *yannayon.laura@epa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, ''we,'' ''us'' and ''our'' refer to the EPA. This proposal addresses the following local rule: SCAQMD Rule 1325 ''Federal $PM_{2.5}$ New Source Review Program.'' In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, we are approving this local rule in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe this SIP revision is not controversial. If we receive one or more adverse comments, however, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comment(s) in subsequent action based on this proposed rule.

We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, please see the direct final action.

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

Dated: July 16, 2019.

**Deborah Jordan,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 2019–20000 Filed 9–19–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

**[EPA–R05–OAR–2019–0394; FRL–9999–96–Region 5]**

### Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Ohio; Redesignation of the Ohio Portion of the Steubenville Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Clean Air Act (CAA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to redesignate the Ohio portion of the Steubenville Ohio-West Virginia interstate sulfur dioxide ($SO_2$) nonattainment area (Steubenville nonattainment area) from nonattainment to attainment. EPA is also proposing to approve Ohio's maintenance plan. Emissions of $SO_2$ in the area have been reduced and the air quality in the nonattainment area is currently well below the $SO_2$ national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS).

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before October 21, 2019.