

used by EPA to determine compliance with the standards.

*Form numbers:* None.

*Respondents/affected entities:*

Commercial and industrial solid waste incineration units.

*Respondent's obligation to respond:* Mandatory (40 CFR part 60, subpart CCCC).

*Estimated number of respondents:* 8 (total).

*Frequency of response:* Initially, occasionally, semiannually and annually.

*Total estimated burden:* 1,450 hours (per year). Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.3(b).

*Total estimated cost:* \$779,000 (per year), includes \$630,000 annualized capital or operation & maintenance costs.

*Changes in the estimates:* There is an adjustment increase in the total estimated burden, labor costs and capital and O&M costs as currently identified in the OMB Inventory of Approved Burdens. This increase is not due to any program changes. The change in the burden and cost estimates occurred because the respondent universe has increased since the most recently approved ICR.

**Courtney Kerwin,**

*Director, Regulatory Support Division.*

[FR Doc. 2017-13591 Filed 6-28-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0345; FRL-9964-02-Region 9]

**Adequacy Status of Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets in Submitted Ozone Attainment Plan for San Joaquin Valley, California**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Adequacy.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is notifying the public that the Agency has found that the motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEBs or "budgets") for ozone for the years 2018, 2021, 2024, 2027, 2030, and 2031 in the San Joaquin Valley 2016 Plan for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard ("2016 Ozone Plan") are adequate for transportation conformity purposes for the 2008 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) submitted the 2016 Ozone Plan to the EPA on August 24, 2016, as a revision to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). Upon the effective date of this notice of adequacy, the previously-approved budgets for the 1997 8-hour ozone standards will no longer be applicable for transportation conformity purposes, and the metropolitan planning organizations in the San Joaquin Valley and the U.S. Department of Transportation must use these budgets for future transportation conformity determinations.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on July 14, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** The EPA has established a docket for this action, identified by Docket ID Number EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0345. The index to the docket is available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the EPA Region IX office, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed in the index, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., confidential business information). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed below.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Anita Lee, (415) 972-3958, or by email at [lee.anita@epa.gov](mailto:lee.anita@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document whenever "we," "us," or "our" is used, we mean the EPA.

This notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. On June 13, 2017, the Region IX office of the EPA sent a letter to CARB stating that the MVEBs in the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District's 2016 Ozone Plan for the reasonable further progress milestone years of 2018, 2021, 2024, 2027, and 2030, and the attainment year of 2031, are adequate.<sup>1</sup>

We announced the availability of the budgets on the EPA's adequacy review Web page from February 23, 2017, through March 27, 2017.<sup>2</sup> We did not receive any comments on the budgets. The MVEBs are provided in the following table:

**ADEQUATE MVEBS IN THE 2016 PLAN FOR THE 2008 8-HOUR OZONE STANDARD<sup>a</sup>**

[Tons per summer planning day]

County	2018		2021		2024		2027		2030		2031	
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>
Fresno	8.0	27.7	6.4	22.2	5.4	14.1	4.9	13.2	4.5	12.6	4.3	12.5
Kern <sup>b</sup> ...	6.6	25.4	5.5	20.4	4.8	12.6	4.5	11.7	4.2	10.9	4.1	10.8
Kings ...	1.3	5.1	1.1	4.2	0.9	2.6	0.9	2.5	0.8	2.3	0.8	2.3
Madera	1.9	5.1	1.5	4.1	1.2	2.6	1.1	2.3	0.9	2.0	0.9	2.0
Merced	2.5	9.4	2.0	7.8	1.6	4.8	1.5	4.4	1.3	4.2	1.3	4.1
San Joaquin ..	5.9	13.0	4.9	10.3	4.2	6.9	3.8	6.2	3.5	5.7	3.3	5.5
Stanislaus .....	3.8	10.5	3.0	8.3	2.6	5.6	2.3	5.1	2.1	4.7	2.0	4.7
Tulare ..	3.7	9.5	2.9	7.2	2.4	4.7	2.2	4.1	1.9	3.8	1.9	3.7

<sup>a</sup> CARB calculated the MVEBs by taking each county's emissions results from EMFAC2014 (short for EMISSION FACTOR 2014 version) and then rounding each county's emissions up to the nearest tenth of a ton. The EPA approved EMFAC2014 for use in SIP revisions and transportation conformity at 80 FR 77337 (December 14, 2015).

<sup>b</sup> San Joaquin Valley portion.

<sup>1</sup> See letter from Richard Corey, CARB, to Alexis Strauss, EPA, dated August 24, 2016, and letter

from Elizabeth Adams, EPA, to Richard Corey, CARB dated June 13, 2017.

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.epa.gov/state-and-local-transportation/state-implementation-plans-sip-submissions-currently-under-epa#Sanjoaquin2017>.

Transportation conformity is required by Clean Air Act section 176(c). The EPA's conformity rule requires that transportation plans, transportation improvement programs, and projects conform to SIPs and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they conform. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS.

The criteria by which we determine whether a SIP's MVEBs are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4), which was promulgated on August 15, 1997.<sup>3</sup> We have further described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP MVEBs in our final rule dated July 1, 2004, and we used the information in these resources in making our adequacy determination.<sup>4</sup> Please note that an adequacy review is separate from the EPA's completeness review and should not be used to prejudice EPA's ultimate action on the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 93.104(e), within 2 years of the effective date of this notice, the metropolitan planning organizations in the San Joaquin Valley and the U.S. Department of Transportation will need to demonstrate conformity to the new MVEBs if the demonstration has not already been made.<sup>5</sup> For demonstrating conformity to the MVEBs in this plan, the motor vehicle emissions from implementation of the transportation plan should be projected consistently with the budgets in this plan, *i.e.*, by taking each county's emissions results from EMFAC2014 and then rounding each county's emissions up to the nearest tenth of a ton.

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

Dated: June 13, 2017.

**Deborah Jordan,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 2017-13658 Filed 6-28-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0478; FRL-9962-14-OAR]

### Proposed Information Collection Request; Comment Request; Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Gasoline Volatility

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is planning to submit an information collection request (ICR), Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Gasoline Volatility (EPA ICR No. 1367.11, OMB control No. 2060-0178), to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA). Before doing so, EPA is soliciting public comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection. This is a proposed extension of the ICR, which is currently approved through August 31, 2017. An Agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before August 28, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, referencing Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0478, online using <https://www.regulations.gov> (our preferred method), by email to [a-and-r-docket@epa.gov](mailto:a-and-r-docket@epa.gov), or by mail to: EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460.

EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes profanity, threats, information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James W. Caldwell, Compliance Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Mail Code 6405A, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 343-9303; fax number: (202) 343-2802; email address: [caldwell.jim@epa.gov](mailto:caldwell.jim@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Supporting documents which explain in detail the information that the EPA will be collecting are available in the

public docket for this ICR. The docket can be viewed online at <https://www.regulations.gov> or in person at the EPA Docket Center, WJC West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The telephone number for the Docket Center is 202-566-1744. For additional information about EPA's public docket, visit <http://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

Pursuant to section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, EPA specifically solicits comments and information to enable it to: (i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (ii) evaluate the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (iii) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses. EPA will consider the comments received and amend the ICR as appropriate. The final ICR package will then be submitted to OMB for review and approval. At that time, EPA will issue another **Federal Register** notice to announce the submission of the ICR to OMB and the opportunity to submit additional comments to OMB.

**Abstract:** Gasoline volatility, as measured by Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP) in pounds per square inch (psi), is controlled during the summer ozone season (June 1 to September 15) in order to minimize evaporative hydrocarbon emissions from motor vehicles. RVP is subject to a federal standard of 7.8 psi or 9.0 psi, depending on location. The addition of ethanol to gasoline increases the RVP by about 1 psi. Gasoline that contains between nine and 10 volume percent ethanol is provided a 1.0 psi waiver such that the RVP may be up to 8.8 psi or 10.0 psi for a federal standard of 7.8 psi or 9.0 psi respectively. As an aid to industry compliance and EPA enforcement, the product transfer document (PTD), which is prepared by the gasoline producer or importer and which accompanies a shipment of gasoline containing ethanol, is required by regulation to contain a legible and conspicuous statement that the gasoline contains ethanol and the percentage concentration of ethanol. This is intended to deter the mixing within the

<sup>3</sup> See 62 FR 43780 (August 15, 1997).

<sup>4</sup> See 69 FR 40004 (July 1, 2004).

<sup>5</sup> See 73 FR 4419 (January 24, 2008).