

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 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, this proposed rule, addressing West Virginia’s regional haze requirements and visibility protection for the 2010 SO₂ and 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS and the withdrawal of the West Virginia regional haze regional FIP, does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the SIP is not approved to apply in Indian country located in the state, and EPA notes that it will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law. In addition, pursuant to CAA section 307(d)(1)(B), EPA proposes to determine that this action is subject to the provisions of section 307(d). Section 307(d) establishes procedural requirements specific to certain rulemaking actions under the CAA. Furthermore, section 307(d)(1)(V) of the CAA provides that the provisions of section 307(d) apply to “such other actions as the Administrator may determine.” EPA proposes that the provisions of 307(d) apply to EPA’s action on the West Virginia SIP revision. The withdrawal of the provisions of the West Virginia regional haze regional FIP is subject to the requirements of CAA section 307(d), as it constitutes a revision to a FIP under section 110(c) of the CAA.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides.

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

Dated: May 30, 2018.

Cosmo Servidio,

Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 2018–12812 Filed 6–13–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2018–0282; FRL–9979–34—Region 9]

Approval of Air Plan Revisions; Approvals and Promulgations: California; Placer County Air Pollution Control 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 Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns the District’s Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permitting program for new and modified sources of air pollution. We are proposing action on a local rule under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by July 16, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2018–0282 at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to Laura Yannayon, at yannayon.laura@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 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, (415) 972–3534, yannayon.laura@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to the EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. The State’s Submittal
 - A. What rule did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule?
- II. The EPA’s Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is the EPA evaluating the rule?
 - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. The EPA’s Proposed Action and Public Comment
- III. Incorporation by Reference
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

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 amended by the PCAPCD and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), which is the governor’s designee for California SIP submittals.

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULE

Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted or amended	Submitted
518	Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permit Program	10/13/16	1/24/17

On April 17, 2017, the EPA determined that CARB’s January 24,

2017, SIP submittal package conformed to 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?

The current SIP-approved version of Rule 518—*Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permit Program* was approved by EPA on December 10, 2012. 77 FR 73316.

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule?

Section 110(a)(2)(C) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that include a preconstruction permit program for certain new or modified stationary sources of pollutants, including a permit program as required by part C of title I of the CAA. This part, and the EPA's implementing regulations at 40 CFR 51.166, provide requirements for the prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) program, which applies to new and modified major sources of regulated New Source Review pollutants located in areas that are designated attainment or unclassifiable for those pollutants.

Rule 518 implements the federal PSD permit program for Placer County. The submitted rule has been revised to update and clarify the rule. See our technical support document (TSD), which can be found in the docket for this rule, for additional information about the rule and rule revisions.

II. The EPA's Evaluation and Action*A. How is the EPA evaluating the rule?*

The submitted rule must meet the CAA's general requirements for SIPs and SIP revisions in CAA sections 110(a)(2) and 110(l) as well as the applicable requirements for a PSD permit program contained in part C of title I of the Act and 40 CFR 51.166.

Section 110(a)(2)(A) of the Act requires that SIP rules be enforceable. Section 110(l) provides that the EPA may not approve a SIP revision if it would interfere with any applicable requirements concerning attainment and reasonable further progress or any other applicable requirement of the CAA. In addition, section 110(a)(2) and section 110(l) of the Act require that each SIP or revision to a SIP submitted by a state must be adopted after reasonable notice and public hearing.

Part C of title I of the Act contains the general permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications proposing to construct in attainment areas. Additionally, 40 CFR 51.166 sets forth the EPA's regulatory requirements for SIP approval of a PSD permit program.

B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?

The EPA has reviewed the submitted rule in accordance with the rule evaluation criteria described above. With respect to the procedural requirements at CAA sections 110(a)(2) and 110(l), we are proposing to approve the submitted rule because we have determined, based on our review of the public process documentation included in the January 24, 2017 submittal, that the PCAPCD has provided sufficient evidence of public notice and opportunity for comment and public hearing prior to adoption and submittal of this rule.

With respect to the rest of the evaluation criteria, we are proposing to approve the submitted rule because we have determined that the rule satisfies the substantive statutory and regulatory requirements for a PSD permit program as set forth in the applicable provisions of part C of title I of the Act and in 40 CFR 51.166. This determination is based on our review of Rule 518 and clarifying information provided by the District in a letter dated May 22, 2018 (available in the docket for this action). Our TSD for this action contains a more detailed discussion of our evaluation.

C. The EPA's Proposed Action and Public Comment

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, the EPA proposes to fully approve the submitted rule because it fulfills all relevant requirements. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal until July 16, 2018. If we take final action to approve the submitted rule, our final action will incorporate this rule into the Placer County portion of the California 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 PCAPCD 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); 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

specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Environmental protection, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, New source review, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: June 4, 2018.

Michael Stoker,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2018–12711 Filed 6–13–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 80

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0172; FRL–9979–33–OAR]

RIN 2060–AT91

Relaxation of the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP) Gasoline Volatility Standard for Baton Rouge, Louisiana

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a request from Louisiana for EPA to relax the federal Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP) standard applicable to gasoline introduced into commerce from June 1 to September 15 of each year for the Louisiana parishes of East Baton Rouge, West Baton Rouge, Livingston, Ascension, and Iberville (the Baton Rouge area). Specifically, EPA is proposing to amend the regulations to allow the RVP standard for the Baton Rouge area to change from 7.8 pounds per square inch (psi) to 9.0 psi for gasoline. EPA has preliminarily determined that this change to the federal RVP regulation is consistent with the applicable provisions of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before July 16, 2018 unless a public hearing is requested by June 29, 2018. If EPA receives such a request, we will publish information related to the timing and location of the hearing and a new deadline for public comment.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0172, to the *Federal eRulemaking Portal*: <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or withdrawn. 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 disclosure of which is restricted by statute. If you need to include CBI as part of your comment, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets> for instructions. 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.

For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Dave Sosnowski, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Environmental Protection Agency, 2000 Traverwood Drive, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48105; telephone number: (734) 214–4823; fax number: (734) 214–4052; email address: sosnowski.dave@epa.gov. You may also contact Rudolph Kapichak at the same address; telephone number: (734) 214–4574; fax number: (734) 214–4052; email address: kapichak.rudolph@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The contents of this preamble are listed in the following outline:

- I. General Information
- II. Public Participation
- III. Background and Proposal
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
- V. Legal Authority

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

Entities potentially affected by this proposed rule are fuel producers and distributors involved in the supplying of gasoline to the Baton Rouge area.

Examples of potentially regulated entities	NAICS ¹ codes
Petroleum Refineries	324110
Gasoline Marketers and Distributors	424710 424720
Gasoline Retail Stations	447110
Gasoline Transporters	484220 484230

¹North American Industry Classification System.

The above table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be

regulated by this action. The table lists the types of entities of which EPA is aware that potentially could be affected by this proposed rule. Other types of entities not listed on the table could also be affected. To determine whether your organization could be affected by this proposed rule, you should carefully examine the regulations in 40 CFR 80.27. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, call the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble.

B. What is the Agency's authority for taking this action?

The statutory authority for this action is granted to EPA by sections 211(h) and 301(a) of the CAA, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 7545(h) and 7601(a).

II. Public Participation

EPA will not hold a public hearing on this matter unless a request is received by the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble by June 29, 2018. If EPA receives such a request, we will publish information related to the timing and location of the hearing and a new deadline for public comment.

III. Background and Proposal

A. Summary of the Proposal

EPA is proposing to approve a request from Louisiana to change the summertime federal RVP standard for the parishes of East Baton Rouge, West Baton Rouge, Livingston, Ascension, and Iberville (henceforth “the Baton Rouge area”) from 7.8 psi to 9.0 psi by amending EPA’s regulations at 40 CFR 80.27(a)(2). On April 10, 2017, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ or State) requested a relaxation of the federal RVP requirements. Before EPA could act on LDEQ’s request, the State needed to revise its approved section 175A maintenance plan and demonstrate that relaxing the federal RVP requirement from 7.8 psi to 9.0 psi for gasoline sold from June 1 to September 15 of each year in the Baton Rouge area would not interfere with maintenance of any NAAQS, including the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS, or any other applicable CAA requirement, under CAA section 110(l). This demonstration was performed and a revised maintenance plan was submitted to EPA for approval on January 31, 2018. On April 13, 2018, EPA proposed approval of Louisiana’s maintenance revision and non-interference demonstration for the 2008 ozone NAAQS (83 FR 16017); EPA