involves a safety zone lasting for one hour that would prohibit entry portions of the Delaware River to promote public and maritime safety during a fireworks display. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60(a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 01. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places, or vessels.

V. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking, and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at http://www.regulations.gov. If your material cannot be submitted using http://www.regulations.gov, contact the person in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, visit http://www.regulations.gov/privacyNotice.

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at http://www.regulations.gov and can be viewed by following that website’s instructions. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:


2. Add § 165.T05–0373 to read as follows:

§ 165.T05–0373 Safety Zone; Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA.

(a) Location. The following area is a safety zone: all navigable waters of Delaware River, adjacent to Penns Landing, Philadelphia, PA, bounded from shoreline to shoreline, bounded on the south by a line running east to west from points along the shoreline commencing at latitude 39°56′31.2″ N, longitude 075°08′28.1″ W; thence westward to latitude 39°56′29.1″ N, longitude 075°07′56.5″ W, and bounded on the north by the Benjamin Franklin Bridge where it crosses the Delaware River.

(b) Definitions. As used in this section, designated representative means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard petty officer, warrant or commissioned officer on board a Coast Guard vessel or on board a federal, state, or local law enforcement vessel assisting the Captain of the Port, Delaware Bay in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(c) Regulations.

(1) Under the general safety zone regulations in subpart C of this part, you may not enter the safety zone described in paragraph (a) of this section unless authorized by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

(2) To request permission to enter the safety zone, contact the COTP or the COTP’s representative on marine band radio VHF–FM channel 16 (156.8 MHz) or 215–271–4807. All persons and vessels in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

(d) Enforcement period. This section will be enforced from 9:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. on June 13, 2018.
The EPA has addressed the interstate transport requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) with respect to PM$_{2.5}$ in several past regulatory actions. In 2011, we promulgated the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR, 76 FR 48208, August 8, 2011) in order to address the obligations of states—and of the EPA when states have not met their obligations—under CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) to prohibit air pollution contributing significantly to nonattainment in, or interfering with maintenance by, any other state with regard to several NAAQS, including the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. In that rule, we considered states linked to downwind nonattainment or maintenance receptors if they were projected by air quality modeling to contribute more than the threshold amount (1% of the standard) of PM$_{2.5}$ pollution for the 1997 and 2006 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS (76 FR 48208, 48239–43). The EPA has not established a threshold amount for the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. In 2016 we provided an informational memorandum (the memo) about the steps states should follow as they develop and review SIPs that address this provision of the CAA for the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS.1

**B. Oklahoma SIP Submittal Pertaining to the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS and Interstate Transport of Air Pollution**

On December 19, 2016, Oklahoma submitted a SIP revision to address the requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) for the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. In the submittal Oklahoma used a weight of evidence analysis to assess interstate transport of Oklahoma emissions to locations projected in the 2016 EPA memo as receptors of concern. In their analysis Oklahoma concluded that emissions from Oklahoma did not significantly contribute to interference with attainment or maintenance of the 1997 annual PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS or the 2006 24-hour PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS in another state. A copy of the Oklahoma SIP submittal is available in the electronic docket for this action.

We propose to approve the December 19, 2016 SIP revision submittal intended to ensure that the SIP met the requirements of the CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) for the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS.

**II. The EPA’s Evaluation**

As stated above, Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) requires SIPs to include adequate provisions prohibiting any source or other type of emissions activity in one state that will (I) contribute significantly to nonattainment, or interfere with maintenance of the NAAQs in another state, and (II) interfering with measures required to prevent significant deterioration of air quality, or to protective visibility in another state. This action address only CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I).

The 2016 EPA memo outlined the four-step framework EPA has historically used to evaluate interstate transport under section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), including the EPA’s CSAPR:

1. Identification of potential downwind nonattainment and maintenance receptors;
2. Identification of upwind states contributing to downwind nonattainment and maintenance receptors;
3. For states identified as contributing to downwind air quality problem, identification of upwind emissions reductions necessary to prevent upwind states from significantly contributing to nonattainment or interfering with maintenance of receptors, and;
4. For states that are found to have emissions that significantly contribute to non-attainment or interfere with maintenance downwind, reducing the identified upwind emissions through adoption of permanent and enforceable measures.

We will be following the framework outlined in the memo for our evaluation. Based on this approach, the potential receptors are outlined in Table 1 in the memo. Most of the potential receptors are in California, located in the San Joaquin Valley or South Coast nonattainment areas. However, there is also one potential receptor in Shoshone County, Idaho, and one potential receptor in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

The memo did note that because of data quality problems nonattainment and maintenance projections were not completed for all or portions of Florida, Illinois, Idaho, Tennessee and Kentucky. After issuance of the memo, data quality problems were resolved for Idaho, Tennessee, Kentucky and most of Florida, identifying no additional potential receptors, with those areas
having design values (DV) below the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS and expected to maintain the NAAQS due to downward emission trends for NO$_x$ and SO$_2$ (www.epa.gov/air-trends/air-quality-design-values and www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/air-pollutant-emissions-trends-data). Florida certified its 2017 PM$_{2.5}$ ambient air data for the counties in Florida with 2009–2013 data gaps in March, 2018 allowing us to develop 2015–2017 preliminary design values. The highest preliminary design value in Florida is 8 µg/m$^3$ and the highest monitored value in Florida is 7.5 µg/m$^3$, well below the NAAQS. For these reasons, we find that none of the counties in Florida with monitoring gaps between 2009–2013 should be considered either nonattainment or maintenance receptors for the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. Therefore, as of April, 2018, only Illinois still has data quality issues preventing projections of nonattainment and maintenance receptors. Illinois will be evaluated to determine if they have potential nonattainment or maintenance receptors for 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. Therefore, for “Step 1” of this evaluation, the areas identified as “potential downwind nonattainment and maintenance receptors” are:

- Seventeen potential receptors in California, located in the San Joaquin Valley or South Coast nonattainment areas;
- Shoshone County, Idaho;
- Allegheny County, Pennsylvania; and,
- All of Illinois

As stated above, “Step 2” is the identification of states contributing to downwind nonattainment and maintenance receptors, such that further analysis is required to identify necessary upwind reductions. For this step, we will be specifically determining if Oklahoma emissions contribute to downwind nonattainment and maintenance receptors.

Each of the potential receptors is discussed below, with a more in depth discussion provided in the Technical Support Document (TSD) for this notice. For additional information, links to the documents relied upon for this analysis can be found throughout the document, more information is available in the TSD and the documents can be found in the docket for this action.

**California**

As described in our TSD, our analysis shows that Oklahoma’s PM$_{2.5}$ emissions and/or PM$_{2.5}$ precursors do not significantly impact the California potential receptors identified in the memo. In our analysis we found specifically that the majority of the emissions impacting PM$_{2.5}$ levels in California are directly emitted PM$_{2.5}$ and/or PM$_{2.5}$ precursors from within the state, and that meteorological and topographic conditions serve as barriers to transport from Oklahoma. We note that air quality designations are not relevant to our evaluation of interstate transport, however, the analysis developed for the 2012 annual PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS designations process provides an in depth evaluation of factors critical in evaluating transport of PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ precursors, including evaluation of local emissions, wind speed and direction, topographical and meteorological conditions and seasonal variations recorded at the monitors, which all support the conclusion that Oklahoma’s PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ precursors do not significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the California potential receptors. Furthermore, Oklahoma is more than 800 miles to the east and generally downwind of the California receptors. For these reasons, we propose to find that Oklahoma does not significantly contribute to nonattainment, nor will it interfere with maintenance of the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS for California.

**Shoshone County, Idaho**

As discussed in the TSD, our analysis shows that Oklahoma’s PM$_{2.5}$ emissions and/or PM$_{2.5}$ precursors do not significantly impact the Idaho potential receptor identified in the memo. In our analysis, we found specifically that the majority of the emissions impacting PM$_{2.5}$ levels, came during the winter time and could be attributed to residential wood combustion. We note that air quality designations are not relevant to our evaluation of interstate transport; however, the analysis developed for the 2012 annual PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS designations process provide an in depth evaluation of factors critical in evaluating transport of PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ precursors, including evaluation of local emissions, wind speed and direction, topographical and meteorological conditions and seasonal variations recorded at the monitors, which all support the conclusion that Oklahoma PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ precursors do not significantly contribute to nonattainment nor interfere with maintenance of the Idaho potential receptor. Furthermore, Oklahoma is more than 1,000 miles to the southeast and downwind of this receptor.

For these reasons, we propose to find that Oklahoma does not significantly contribute to nonattainment, nor will it interfere with maintenance of the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS for Shoshone, Idaho.

**Allegheny County, Pennsylvania**

As discussed in the TSD, our analysis shows that Oklahoma’s PM$_{2.5}$ emissions and/or PM$_{2.5}$ precursors do not significantly impact the Allegheny County, Pennsylvania (Liberty monitor) potential receptor identified in the memo. In our analysis, we found that there were strong local influences throughout Allegheny County and contributions from nearby states that contributed to its nonattainment for both the 1997 and 2006 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. Contributors to the Liberty monitor in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania in recent years, have taken steps to improve air quality which will likely bring the monitor into compliance with the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ annual NAAQS by the 2021 attainment date.

Another compelling fact is that in previous modeling, Oklahoma emissions were not linked to Allegheny County. For these reasons, we propose to find that Oklahoma does not significantly contribute to nonattainment, nor will it interfere with maintenance of the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS for Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

**Illinois**

Due to ambient monitoring data gaps in the 2009–2013 data that should have been used to identify potential PM$_{2.5}$ nonattainment and maintenance receptors in Illinois and the modeling analysis of potential receptors could not be completed for the state, therefore the entire state is considered unclassifiable. Illinois did have a nonattainment receptor identified through the CSAPR modeling analysis for the 1997 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. The receptor was in Madison, Illinois, located near St. Louis, Missouri. As stated above, Colorado was included in the CSAPR modeling analysis for the 1997 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. The modeling did not show a linkage for nonattainment or maintenance between Oklahoma and Illinois. Recent DV for the monitors in Madison, Illinois have shown downward trends. There are

---


*Idaho: West Silver Valley Nonattainment Area-2012 Primary Annual PM$_{2.5}$ National Ambient Air Quality Standard Technical Support Document, Prepared by EPA Region 10.*

*Air Quality Modeling for 2011 Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) (76 FR 48207, August 8, 2011).*
three active monitors in Madison. The DVs for the monitors are shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171191007</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171192009</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171193007</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these reasons, we propose that Oklahoma will not significantly contribute to nonattainment, nor will it interfere with maintenance of the 2012 PM2.5 NAAQS in Illinois.

Since we determined that Oklahoma’s SIP includes provisions prohibiting any source or other type of emissions activity from contributing significantly to nonattainment in, or interfering with maintenance of the NAAQS, in another state, steps 3 and 4 of this evaluation are not necessary.

In conclusion, based on our review of the potential receptors presented in the March 17, 2016 informational memo, an evaluation identifying likely emission sources affecting these potential receptors, and the 2014 base case modeling in CSAPR final rule, we propose to determine that emissions from Oklahoma sources will not contribute significantly to nonattainment in, nor interfere with maintenance by, any other state with regard to the 2012 annual PM2.5 NAAQS.

III. Proposed Action

For the reasons discussed above and in the TSD, we are proposing to approve the December 19, 2016 Oklahoma SIP submittal concluding that emissions from Oklahoma will not significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the 2012 PM2.5 NAAQS in any other state.

IV. 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 28335, 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 CAA; 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 proposed 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).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control. Incorporation by reference, Particulate matter.

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


Anne Idsal,
Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 2018–10599 Filed 5–17–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180


Receipt of Several Pesticide Petitions Filed for Residues of Pesticide Chemicals in or on Various Commodities

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of filing of petitions and request for comment.

SUMMARY: This document announces the Agency’s receipt of several initial filings of pesticide petitions requesting the establishment or modification of regulations for residues of pesticide chemicals in or on various commodities.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 20, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by docket identification (ID) number and the pesticide petition number (PP) of interest as shown in the body of this document, by one of the following methods:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

• Mail: OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001.

• Hand Delivery: To make special arrangements for hand delivery or