by the Captain of the Port, or his designated representative.

(2) Mariners requesting permission to transit through the safety zone may request authorization to do so from the Patrol Commander. The Patrol Commander may be contacted via VHF–FM channel 16.

(3) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port or the designated representative.

(4) Upon being hailed by U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel by siren, radio, flashing light, or other means, the operator of a vessel shall proceed as directed.

(5) The Coast Guard may be assisted by other Federal, State, or local agencies.

Dated: March 17, 2008.

#### C.V. Strangfeld,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port.

[FR Doc. E8–7937 Filed 4–14–08; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R03-OAR-2007-1139; FRL-8554-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Control of Volatile Organic Compound (VOCs) Emissions From the Kraft Foods Global, Inc.—Bakery Located in Henrico County, VA

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA). **ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia. This revision pertains to a federally enforceable State operating permit containing terms and conditions for the control of emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from the Kraft Foods Global, Inc.—Richmond Bakery located in Henrico County, Virginia. The submittal is for the purpose of meeting the requirements for reasonably available control technology (RACT) in order to implement the maintenance plan for the Richmond 8hour ozone maintenance area. EPA is approving the revision to the Virginia SIP in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* This final rule is effective on May 15, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID

Number EPA-R03-OAR-2007-1139. All documents in the docket are listed in the www.regulations.gov Web site. Although listed in the electronic docket, some information is not publicly available, i.e., confidential business information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically through www.regulations.gov or in hard copy for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Copies of the State submittal are available at the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia, 23219.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irene Shandruk, (215) 814–2166, or by e-mail at *shandruk.irene@epa.gov*.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Background

On January 31, 2008 (73 FR 5781), EPA published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPR) for the Commonwealth of Virginia. The NPR proposed approval of Virginia's SIP revision for the purpose of meeting RACT requirements in order to implement the maintenance plan for the Richmond 8-hour ozone maintenance area. The formal SIP revision was submitted by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality on October 29, 2007. Other specific requirements of RACT and the rationale for EPA's proposed action are explained in the NPR and will not be restated here. No comments were received on the NPR.

### II. Summary of SIP Revision

The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality is requesting that a revision to the Commonwealth's SIP concerning a federally enforceable State operating permit containing terms and conditions for the control of emissions of VOCs from the Kraft Foods Global, Inc.—Richmond Bakery located in Henrico County, Virginia be approved. The purpose of this revision is for meeting the requirements for RACT in order to implement the maintenance plan for the Richmond 8-hour ozone maintenance area.

### III. General Information Pertaining to SIP Submittals From the Commonwealth of Virgina

In 1995, Virginia adopted legislation that provides, subject to certain conditions, for an environmental assessment (audit) "privilege" for voluntary compliance evaluations performed by a regulated entity. The legislation further addresses the relative burden of proof for parties either asserting the privilege or seeking disclosure of documents for which the privilege is claimed. Virginia's legislation also provides, subject to certain conditions, for a penalty waiver for violations of environmental laws when a regulated entity discovers such violations pursuant to a voluntary compliance evaluation and voluntarily discloses such violations to the Commonwealth and takes prompt and appropriate measures to remedy the violations. Virginia's Voluntary Environmental Assessment Privilege Law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1–1198, provides a privilege that protects from disclosure documents and information about the content of those documents that are the product of a voluntary environmental assessment. The Privilege Law does not extend to documents or information (1) that are generated or developed before the commencement of a voluntary environmental assessment; (2) that are prepared independently of the assessment process; (3) that demonstrate a clear, imminent and substantial danger to the public health or environment; or (4) that are required by

On January 12, 1998, the Commonwealth of Virginia Office of the Attorney General provided a legal opinion that states that the Privilege law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1–1198, precludes granting a privilege to documents and information "required by law," including documents and information "required by Federal law to maintain program delegation, authorization or approval," since Virginia must "enforce Federally authorized environmental programs in a manner that is no less stringent than their Federal counterparts. \* \* \*" The opinion concludes that "[r]egarding  $\S 10.1-1198$ , therefore, documents or other information needed for civil or criminal enforcement under one of these programs could not be privileged because such documents and information are essential to pursuing enforcement in a manner required by Federal law to maintain program delegation, authorization or approval."

Virginia's Immunity law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1–1199, provides that "[t]o the

extent consistent with requirements imposed by Federal law,' any person making a voluntary disclosure of information to a state agency regarding a violation of an environmental statute, regulation, permit, or administrative order is granted immunity from administrative or civil penalty. The Attorney General's January 12, 1998 opinion states that the quoted language renders this statute inapplicable to enforcement of any Federally authorized programs, since "no immunity could be afforded from administrative, civil, or criminal penalties because granting such immunity would not be consistent with Federal law, which is one of the criteria for immunity."

Therefore, EPA has determined that Virginia's Privilege and Immunity statutes will not preclude the Commonwealth from enforcing its program consistent with the Federal requirements. In any event, because EPA has also determined that a state audit privilege and immunity law can affect only state enforcement and cannot have any impact on Federal enforcement authorities, EPA may at any time invoke its authority under the CAA, including, for example, sections 113, 167, 205, 211 or 213, to enforce the requirements or prohibitions of the state plan, independently of any state enforcement effort. In addition, citizen enforcement under section 304 of the Clean Air Act is likewise unaffected by this, or any, state audit privilege or immunity law.

Other specific requirements of the SIP revision and the rationale for EPA's proposed action are explained in the NPR and will not be restated here. No public comments were received on the NPR.

#### **IV. Final Action**

Virginia has met the requirements concerning a federally enforceable State operating permit containing terms and conditions for the control of emissions of VOCs from the Kraft Foods Global, Inc.—Richmond Bakery located in Henrico County, Virginia, and EPA is therefore approving Virginia's revision for the purpose of this revision is for meeting the requirements for RACT in order to implement the maintenance plan for the Richmond 8-hour ozone maintenance area.

# V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

## A. General Requirements

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 action merely approves 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 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 (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 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 rule 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.

# B. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small

**Business Regulatory Enforcement** Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the Federal Register. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 et seq., as added by the Small **Business Regulatory Enforcement** Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. Section 804, however, exempts from section 801 the following types of rules: rules of particular applicability; rules relating to agency management or personnel; and rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties. 5 U.S.C. 804(3). Because this is a rule of particular applicability, EPA is not required to submit a rule report regarding this action under section 801.

### C. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by June 16, 2008. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action.

This action approving Virginia's SIP revision pertaining to a federally enforceable State operating permit containing terms and conditions for the control of emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from the Kraft Foods Global, Inc.—Richmond Bakery located in Henrico County, Virginia may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: April 3, 2008.

#### William T. Wisniewski,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

■ 40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

#### PART 52—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for 40 CFR part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

#### Subpart VV—Virginia

■ 2. In § 52.2420, the table in paragraph (d) is amended by adding the entry for Kraft Food Global, Inc.—Richmond Bakery at the end of the table to read as follows:

#### § 52.2420 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \* \* (d) \* \* \*

#### **EPA-APPROVED SOURCE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS**

Source name		Permit/order or registration number		State effective date		EPA approval date		40 CFR part 52 citation
* Kraft Foods Global, Inc. mond Bakery.	* :.—Rich-	* Registration No. 50703	*	9/19/07	* 4/15/08	[Insert	* page number ument begins].	* 52.2420(d)(8)

[FR Doc. E8–7876 Filed 4–14–08; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R07-OAR-2008-0241; FRL-8553-1]

## Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving a revision to the Iowa State Implementation Plan submitted on January 16, 2008. The revision includes changes to the definition of "permitting authority" in each of Iowa's rules used for compliance with EPA's Clean Air Interstate Rule. Iowa's SIP revision is in response to EPA's request of Iowa to revise the definitions to ensure that all allowances issued in the EPA Budget Trading Programs can be traded and used for compliance with the allowance-holding requirement in any State in the program.

**DATES:** This direct final rule will be effective June 16, 2008, without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comment by May 15, 2008. If EPA receives adverse comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule in the **Federal Register** informing the public that the rule will not take effect.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2008-0241, by one of the following methods:

- 1. www.regulations.gov: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- 2. E-mail: jay.michael@epa.gov. 3. Mail: Michael Jay, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.
- 4. Hand Delivery or Courier: Deliver your comments to Michael Jay, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

*Instructions:* Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2008-0241. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit through www.regulations.gov or e-mail information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected. The www.regulations.gov Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through www.regulations.gov, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. If EPA

cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment.

Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

Docket: All documents in the docket are listed in the www.regulations.gov index. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. excluding Federal holidays. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the office at least 24 hours in advance.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Jay at (913) 551–7460, or by email at *jay.michael@epa.gov*.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document whenever "we," "us," or "our" is used, we mean EPA. This section provides additional information by addressing the following questions:

What is a SIP?

What is the Federal approval process for a SIP?

What does Federal approval of a state regulation mean to me? What is being addressed in this document?