On September 27, 2016, the EPA determined that the submittals for SDCAPCD Rules 67.12 and 67.12.1 met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51 Appendix V, which must be met before formal review by the EPA.

A. What rules did the State submit?

There are no previous versions of Rule 67.12.1 in the SIP. We approved Rule 67.12 on March 27, 1997 (62 FR 14639).

B. Are there other versions of these rules?

There are no previous versions of Rule 67.12.1 in the SIP. We approved Rule 67.12 on March 27, 1997 (62 FR 14639).

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule and rule rescission?

VOCs help produce 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. Rule 67.12.1, and the rescinded Rule 67.12, control VOCs emitted from polyester resin

### Table 1—Submitted Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local agency</th>
<th>Rule No.</th>
<th>Rule title</th>
<th>Adopted/ amended</th>
<th>Repealed/ rescinded</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDCAPCD</td>
<td>67.12.1</td>
<td>Polyester Resin Operations</td>
<td>5/11/2016</td>
<td>8/22/16</td>
<td>8/22/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional Information

### FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT

For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI and 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:

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.
operations. The EPA’s technical support document (TSD) has more information about these rules.

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 SDCAPCD regulates an ozone nonattainment area classified as “Moderate” for the 2008 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) (40 CFR 81.305). Rule 67.12.1 regulates activities covered by the CTG titled “Control Techniques Guidelines for Fiberglass Boat Manufacturing Materials,” EPA–453/R–08–004, September 2008. However, none of the sources regulated by Rule 67.12.1 meet the applicability threshold for the Fiberglass Boat Manufacturing CTG. Guideline and policy documents that we use to evaluate enforceability, revision/relaxation and rule stringency requirements for the applicable criteria pollutants include the following:


B. Do the rule and rule rescission meet the evaluation criteria?

This rule and rule rescission are consistent with the CAA requirements and relevant guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. Based on information provided by the SDCAPCD, the District does not appear to have facilities that are subject to the fiberglass boat manufacturing CTG and therefore the District’s RACT analysis for Rule 67.12.1 is not required to address the presumptive RACT limits included in the CTG.1 The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. The EPA’s Recommendations to Further Improve the Rule

The TSD describes additional rule revisions that we recommend for the next time the local agency modifies the rule.

We recommend the SDCAPCD consider adopting a negative declaration for the fiberglass boat manufacturing operations CTG since the District’s data indicate it does not have facilities meeting the CTG’s applicability threshold of 15 lb/day or 2.7 tpy.

D. Public Comment and Proposed Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, the EPA proposes to fully approve the submitted rule and rule rescission because they fulfill all relevant requirements. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal until January 19, 2018. If we take final action to approve the submitted rule and rule rescission, our final action will incorporate the rule and rule rescission 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 SDCAPCD 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);

Email dated July 12, 2017, from Angela Ortega (SDCAPCD) to Arnold Lazarus (USEPA), RE: “REE: Response to EPA regarding Rule 67.12.1 06.30.17 revised.docx” with attachment. See Table 1. “Summary of Total Emission Reduction.”

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
List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Volatile organic compounds, Particulate matter.

Dated: December 5, 2017.
Alexis Strauss,
Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2017–27432 Filed 12–19–17; 8:45 am]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission’s Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM), FCC 17–158, adopted on November 16, 2017 and released on November 20, 2017. The full text of this document is available electronically via the FCC’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) website at http://fnfios.fcc.gov/edocs_public/ or via the FCC’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) website at http://fnfios.fcc.gov/ecfs2/. (Documents will be available electronically in ASCII, Microsoft Word, and/or Adobe Acrobat.) This document is also available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, which is located in Room CY–A257 at FCC Headquarters, 445 12th Street SW, Washington, DC 20554. The Reference Information Center is open to the public Monday through Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. The complete text may be purchased from the Commission’s copy contractor, 445 12th Street SW, Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554. Alternative formats are available for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), by sending an email to fcc504@fcc.gov or calling the Commission’s Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

Synopsis
I. Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

A. Introduction

1. In this Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, we seek further comment on three topics related to the rules adopted in the companion Report and Order. First, we seek further comment on issues related to exceptions to and waivers of the local simulcasting requirement. Second, we seek comment on whether we should let full power broadcasters use channels in the television broadcast band that are vacant to facilitate the transition to 3.0. Finally, we tentatively conclude that local simulcasting should not change the significantly viewed status of a Next Gen TV station.

B. Discussion

1. Local Simulcasting Waivers and Exceptions

2. Simulcast Waivers

The Commission may waive its rules if good cause is shown. See 47 CFR 1.3. We explain in the Report and Order that we are not inclined to consider favorably requests to change community of license solely to enable simulcasting.