PART 202—PREREGISTRATION AND REGISTRATION OF CLAIMS TO COPYRIGHT

4. The authority citation for part 202 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 17 U.S.C. 408(f), 702.

§ 202.3 Registration of copyright.

5. Amend § 202.3 as follows:

a. In paragraph (b)(11)(iii), remove the phrase “by that applicant; and” and add in its place “by that applicant.”

b. Remove paragraph (b)(11)(iv).

Dated: November 22, 2016.

Sarang V. Damle,
General Counsel and Associate Register of Copyrights.

[FR Doc. 2016–28701 Filed 11–30–16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 1410–30–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52


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) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and particulate matter (PM) from confined animal facilities (CAF). It is 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.


ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2016–0245 at http://www.regulations.gov, or via email to Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief at Steckel.Andrew@epa.gov. For comments submitted at Regulations.gov, follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be removed or edited from 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 FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Levin, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3848, levinnancy@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to the EPA.
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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 adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resourced Board (CARB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local agency</th>
<th>Rule No.</th>
<th>Rule title</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YSAQMD</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Confined Animal Facilities Permit Program</td>
<td>06/14/06</td>
<td>10/05/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On October 24, 2006, the EPA determined that the submittal for YSAQMD Rule 11.2 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?

There are no previous versions of Rule 11.2 in the SIP.

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule?

VOCs help produce ground-level ozone, smog and PM, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires States to submit regulations that control VOC emissions. PM, including PM equal to or less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM$_{2.5}$) and PM equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter (PM$_{10}$), contributes to effects that are harmful to human health and the environment, including premature mortality, aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular disease, decreased lung function, visibility impairment and damage to vegetation and ecosystems. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control PM emissions. This rule prohibits any person from operating a CAF without first obtaining a “CAF Permit” from the YSAQMD Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO). The rule defines a CAF as a “facility where animals are corralled, penned, or otherwise caused to remain in restricted areas for commercial purposes and primarily fed by means other than grazing.” The rule exempts a CAF from permit requirements if it does not meet the definition of a large CAF (LCAF). The rule defines a LCAF as a CAF that meets or exceeds a threshold of 1,000 milking cows per facility, 3,500 beef cattle per beef feedlot, 7,500 “other cattle” per facility, 100,000 turkeys per facility, 650,000 chickens per facility or 3,000 swine per facility. The permit application must contain an emissions mitigation plan that implements best available retrofit control technology (BARCT) for existing CAFs and best available control technology (BACT) for new facilities, as applicable. The rule does not include specific measures that the CAF may or must use to implement BARCT or BACT. 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).

Guidance and policy documents that we use to evaluate enforceability and revision/relaxation requirements for the applicable criteria pollutants include the following:


B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?

We believe this rule is consistent with CAA requirements and relevant guidance regarding enforceability and SIP revisions. The submitted rule strengthens the SIP by establishing a permit program for CAFs and by prohibiting any person from operating a CAF without first obtaining a CAF permit from the APCO. The CAF permit application must include an emissions mitigation plan. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

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, 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 Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- 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 (Public Law 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);
The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve two separate but related actions: (1) the Kentucky portion of the Campbell-Clermont, Kentucky-Ohio nonattainment area to attainment for the 2010 1-hour SO\(_2\) national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for the Kentucky portion of the Area; (2) to approve the Commonwealth’s RACM determination and incorporate it into the SIP; and to redesignate the Kentucky portion of the Area to attainment for the 2010 1-hour SO\(_2\) NAAQS.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before January 3, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2016–0361 at [http://www.regulations.gov](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](http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steven Scofield of the 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. Mr. Scofield may be reached by phone at (404) 562–9034 or via electronic mail at scofield.steve@epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

I. What are the actions EPA is proposing to take?

EPA is proposing to take the following five separate but related actions regarding Kentucky’s aforementioned requests and SIP submission: (1) To approve Kentucky’s RACM determination for the Kentucky portion of the Campbell-Clermont, KY-OH Area pursuant to Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) section 172(c)(1) and incorporate it into the SIP; (2) to approve the base year emissions inventory for the 2010 1-hour SO\(_2\) NAAQS for the Kentucky portion of the Area pursuant to CAA section 172(c)(3) and incorporate it into the SIP; (3) to approve the Commonwealth’s March 31, 2015, request for EPA to determine that the Area attained the 2010 1-hour SO\(_2\) NAAQS per EPA’s “Clean Data Policy;” (4) to approve Kentucky’s plan for maintaining the 2010 1-hour SO\(_2\) NAAQS (maintenance plan) in the Area and incorporate it into the SIP; and (5) to redesignate the Kentucky portion of the Campbell-Clermont, KY-OH Area to attainment for the 2010 1-hour SO\(_2\) NAAQS. The Campbell-Clermont, KY-OH Area consists of a portion of Campbell County in Kentucky and a portion of Clermont County in Ohio. These proposed actions are summarized below.

---

1. The Kentucky portion of the Area emits less than nine tons of total SO\(_2\) emissions per year, but it contains the SO\(_2\) monitor that violated the SO\(_2\) standard in 2011. The Ohio portion of the Area contains the Walter C. Beckjord power plant (Beckjord Facility) which shut down in 2014.