

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

**§ 71.1 [Amended]**

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of FAA Order 7400.9V, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 9, 2011, and effective September 15, 2011, is amended as follows:

*Paragraph 6005 Class E Airspace Areas Extending Upward From 700 Feet or More Above the Surface of the Earth.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**ACE IA E5 Boone, IA [Amended]**

Boone Municipal Airport, IA  
(Lat. 42°02'58" N., long. 93°50'51" W.)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6.5-mile radius of Boone Municipal Airport.

Issued in Fort Worth, TX on August 1, 2012.

**David P. Medina,**

*Manager, Operations Support Group, ATO Central Service Center.*

[FR Doc. 2012–20658 Filed 8–21–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4901–13–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

**[EPA–R01–OAR–2012–0620; A–1–FRL–9719–2]**

**Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Hot Mix Asphalt Plants**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve in part a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of New Hampshire on January 28, 2005. Specifically, EPA is proposing to approve amendments to the New Hampshire Hot Mix Asphalt Plant Rule at Env-A 2703.02(a). This rule establishes and requires limitations on visible emissions from all hot mix asphalt plants. This revision is consistent with the maintenance of all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in New Hampshire. This action is being taken under the Clean Air Act.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before September 21, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R01–OAR–2012–0620 by one of the following methods:

1. *www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

2. *Email:* [arnold.anne@epa.gov](mailto:arnold.anne@epa.gov).

3. *Fax:* (617) 918–0047.

4. *Mail:* “EPA–R01–OAR–2012–0620”, Anne Arnold, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA New England Regional Office, 5 Post Office Square—Suite 100, (Mail code OEP05–2), Boston, MA 02109–3912.

5. *Hand Delivery or Courier.* Deliver your comments to: Anne Arnold, Manager, Air Quality Planning Unit, Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA New England Regional Office, 5 Post Office Square—Suite 100, (Mail code OEP05–2), Boston, MA 02109–3912. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office’s normal hours of operation. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding legal holidays.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Alison C. Simcox, Air Quality Planning Unit, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA New England Regional Office, Office of Ecosystem Protection, 5 Post Office Square—Suite 100, Mail Code OEP05–2, Boston, MA 02109–3912, telephone number (617) 918–1684, fax number (617) 908–0684, email [simcox.alison@epa.gov](mailto:simcox.alison@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State’s SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this action rule, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 7, 2012.

**H. Curtis Spalding,**

*Regional Administrator, EPA New England.*

[FR Doc. 2012–20498 Filed 8–21–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

**[EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0237; FRL– 9718–5]**

**Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve in part, and conditionally approve in part, the State Implementation Plan (SIP) submission, submitted by the State of Tennessee, through the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC), to demonstrate that the State meets the requirements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) for the 2008 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). Section 110(a) of the CAA requires that each state adopt and submit a SIP for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of each NAAQS promulgated by EPA, which is commonly referred to as an “infrastructure” SIP. TDEC certified that the Tennessee SIP contains provisions that ensure the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS are implemented, enforced, and maintained in Tennessee (hereafter referred to as “infrastructure submission”). EPA is proposing to conditionally approve sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) of Tennessee’s October 19, 2009, submission because the current Tennessee SIP does not include provisions to comply with the requirements of this sub-element. With the exception of sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), EPA is proposing to determine that Tennessee’s infrastructure submission, provided to EPA on October 19, 2009, addressed all the required infrastructure elements for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before September 21, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0237, by one of the following methods:

1. *www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
2. *Email*: R4–RDS@epa.gov.
3. *Fax*: (404) 562–9019.
4. *Mail*: “EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0237,” Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960.

5. *Hand Delivery or Courier*: Lynora Benjamin, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office’s normal hours of operation. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding federal holidays.

*Instructions*: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0237. 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 email, 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 email comment directly to EPA without going through *www.regulations.gov*, your email 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. For additional information about EPA’s public docket visit the EPA Docket Center homepage at <http://www.epa.gov/epahome/dockets.htm>.

*Docket*: All documents in the electronic 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, is not placed on the Internet and 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 Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Nacosta C. Ward, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. The telephone number is (404) 562–9140. Ms. Ward can be reached via electronic mail at [ward.nacosta@epa.gov](mailto:ward.nacosta@epa.gov).

**Table of Contents**

- II. What elements are required under sections 110(a)(1) and (2)?
- III. Scope of Infrastructure SIPs
- IV. What is EPA’s analysis of how Tennessee addressed the elements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) “Infrastructure” provisions?
- V. Proposed Action
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. Background**

On March 27, 2008, EPA promulgated a new NAAQS for ozone based on 8-hour average concentrations. EPA revised the level of the 8-hour standard to 0.075 parts per million (ppm). See 73 FR 16436. Pursuant to section 110(a)(1) of the CAA, states are required to submit SIPs meeting the requirements of section 110(a)(2) within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) requires states to address basic SIP requirements, including emissions inventories, monitoring, and modeling to assure

attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. States were required to submit such SIPs for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS to EPA no later than March 2011.

Midwest Environmental Defense and Sierra Club submitted a complaint on November 20, 2011, related to EPA’s failure to issue findings of failure to submit related to the infrastructure requirements for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. On December 13, 2011, and March 6, 2012, Midwest Environmental Defense and Sierra Club submitted amended complaints for failure to promulgate prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) regulations within two years and failure to approve or disapprove SIP submittals, and to remove claims regarding states that have submitted SIPs for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS, respectively. Tennessee was among the states named in the November 2011 complaint, and the December 2011 and March 2012 amended complaints. Specifically, the plaintiffs claim that EPA has failed to perform its mandatory duty by not approving in full, disapproving in full, or approving in part and disapproving in part Tennessee’s 2008 ozone infrastructure SIP addressing section 110(a)(2)(A)–(H) and (J)–(M) by no later than April 19, 2011.

Tennessee’s infrastructure submission was received by EPA on October 19, 2009, for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. The submission was determined to be complete on April 19, 2010. On July 3, 2012, Tennessee submitted a letter to EPA withdrawing the portion of its October 19, 2009, SIP revision purported to address the requirements related to section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) interstate transport. Today’s action is proposing to approve in part, and conditionally approve in part, Tennessee’s infrastructure submission for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS for sections 110(a)(2)(A)–(H) and (J)–(M), except for section 110(a)(2)(C) nonattainment area requirements and, section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) interstate transport. This action is not approving any specific rule, but rather proposing that Tennessee’s already approved SIP meets certain CAA requirements.

**II. What elements are required under sections 110(a)(1) and (2)?**

Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit SIPs to provide for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of a new or revised NAAQS within three years following the promulgation of such NAAQS, or within such shorter period as EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a) imposes the

obligation upon states to make a SIP submission to EPA for a new or revised NAAQS, but the contents of that submission may vary depending upon the facts and circumstances. In particular, the data and analytical tools available at the time the state develops and submits the SIP for a new or revised NAAQS affects the content of the submission. The contents of such SIP submissions may also vary depending upon what provisions the state's existing SIP already contains. In the case of the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS, states typically have met the basic program elements required in section 110(a)(2) through earlier SIP submissions in connection with the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

More specifically, section 110(a)(1) provides the procedural and timing requirements for SIPs. Section 110(a)(2) lists specific elements that states must meet for "infrastructure" SIP requirements related to a newly established or revised NAAQS. As mentioned above, these requirements include SIP infrastructure elements such as modeling, monitoring, and emissions inventories that are designed to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. The requirements that are the subject of this proposed rulemaking are listed below.<sup>1</sup>

- 110(a)(2)(A): Emission limits and other control measures.
- 110(a)(2)(B): Ambient air quality monitoring/data system.
- 110(a)(2)(C): Program for enforcement of control measures.<sup>2</sup>
- 110(a)(2)(D): Interstate transport.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Two elements identified in section 110(a)(2) are not governed by the three year submission deadline of section 110(a)(1) because SIPs incorporating necessary local nonattainment area controls are not due within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS, but rather due at the time the nonattainment area plan requirements are due pursuant to section 172. These requirements are: (1) submissions required by section 110(a)(2)(C) to the extent that subsection refers to a permit program as required in part D Title I of the CAA; and (2) submissions required by section 110(a)(2)(I) which pertain to the nonattainment planning requirements of part D, Title I of the CAA. Today's proposed rulemaking does not address infrastructure elements related to section 110(a)(2)(I) or the nonattainment planning requirements of 110(a)(2)(C).

<sup>2</sup> This rulemaking only addresses requirements for this element as they relate to attainment areas.

<sup>3</sup> Today's proposed rulemaking does not address element 110(a)(2)(D)(i) (Interstate Transport) for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Interstate transport requirements were formerly addressed by Tennessee consistent with the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. On December 23, 2008, CAIR was remanded by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, without vacatur, back to EPA. See *North Carolina v. EPA*, 531 F.3d 896 (D.C. Cir. 2008). Prior to this remand, EPA took final action to approve Tennessee's SIP revision, which was submitted to comply with CAIR. See 72 FR 46388 (August 20, 2007). In so doing, Tennessee's

- 110(a)(2)(E): Adequate resources.
- 110(a)(2)(F): Stationary source monitoring system.
- 110(a)(2)(G): Emergency power.
- 110(a)(2)(H): Future SIP revisions.
- 110(a)(2)(I): Areas designated nonattainment and meet the applicable requirements of part D.<sup>4</sup>
- 110(a)(2)(J): Consultation with government officials; public notification; and PSD and visibility protection.
- 110(a)(2)(K): Air quality modeling/data.
- 110(a)(2)(L): Permitting fees.
- 110(a)(2)(M): Consultation/participation by affected local entities.

### III. Scope of Infrastructure SIPs

EPA is currently acting upon SIPs that address the infrastructure requirements of CAA sections 110(a)(1) and (2) for ozone and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) NAAQS for various states across the country. Commenters on EPA's recent proposals for some states raised concerns about EPA's statements that it was not addressing certain substantive issues in the context of acting on those infrastructure SIP submissions.<sup>5</sup> Those Commenters specifically raised concerns involving provisions in existing SIPs and with EPA's statements in other proposals that it would address two issues separately and not as part of actions on the infrastructure SIP submissions: (i) Existing provisions related to excess emissions during periods of start-up, shutdown, or malfunction (SSM) at sources, that may be contrary to the CAA and EPA's policies addressing such excess emissions; and (ii) existing provisions related to "director's variance" or

CAIR SIP revision addressed the interstate transport provisions in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. In response to the remand of CAIR, EPA has promulgated a new rule to address interstate transport. See 76 FR 48208 (August 8, 2011) ("the Transport Rule"). That rule was recently stayed by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. As a result of both the remand of CAIR and stay of the Transport Rule, Tennessee has not yet made a submission to address interstate transport. EPA's action on element 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS will be addressed in a separate action.

<sup>4</sup> This requirement was inadvertently omitted from EPA's October 2, 2007, memorandum entitled "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards," but as mentioned above is not relevant to today's proposed rulemaking.

<sup>5</sup> See Comments of Midwest Environmental Defense Center, dated May 31, 2011. Docket # EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1179 (adverse comments on proposals for three states in Region 5). EPA notes that these public comments on another proposal are not relevant to this rulemaking and do not have to be directly addressed in this rulemaking. EPA will respond to these comments in the appropriate rulemaking action to which they apply.

"director's discretion" that purport to permit revisions to SIP approved emissions limits with limited public process or without requiring further approval by EPA, that may be contrary to the CAA (director's discretion). EPA notes that there are two other substantive issues for which EPA likewise stated in other proposals that it would address the issues separately: (i) Existing provisions for minor source new source review (NSR) programs that may be inconsistent with the requirements of the CAA and EPA's regulations that pertain to such programs (minor source NSR); and (ii) existing provisions for PSD programs that may be inconsistent with current requirements of EPA's "Final NSR Improvement Rule," 67 FR 80186 (December 31, 2002), as amended by 72 FR 32526 (June 13, 2007) (NSR Reform). In light of the comments, EPA believes that its statements in various proposed actions on infrastructure SIPs with respect to these four individual issues should be explained in greater depth. It is important to emphasize that EPA is taking the same position with respect to these four substantive issues in this action on the infrastructure SIPs for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS from Tennessee.

EPA intended the statements in the other proposals concerning these four issues merely to be informational, and to provide general notice of the potential existence of provisions within the existing SIPs of some states that might require future corrective action. EPA did not want states, regulated entities, or members of the public to be under the misconception that the Agency's approval of the infrastructure SIP submission of a given state should be interpreted as a re-approval of certain types of provisions that might exist buried in the larger existing SIP for such state. Thus, for example, EPA explicitly noted that the Agency believes that some states may have existing SIP approved SSM provisions that are contrary to the CAA and EPA policy, but that "in this rulemaking, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing state provisions with regard to excess emissions during SSM of operations at facilities." EPA further explained, for informational purposes, that "EPA plans to address such State regulations in the future." EPA made similar statements, for similar reasons, with respect to the director's discretion, minor source NSR, and NSR Reform issues. EPA's objective was to make clear that approval of an infrastructure SIP for these ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS should not be construed as explicit or

implicit re-approval of any existing provisions that relate to these four substantive issues. EPA is reiterating that position in this action on the infrastructure SIP for Tennessee.

Unfortunately, the Commenters and others evidently interpreted these statements to mean that EPA considered action upon the SSM provisions and the other three substantive issues to be integral parts of acting on an infrastructure SIP submission, and therefore that EPA was merely postponing taking final action on the issues in the context of the infrastructure SIPs. This was not EPA's intention. To the contrary, EPA only meant to convey its awareness of the potential for certain types of deficiencies in existing SIPs, and to prevent any misunderstanding that it was reapproving any such existing provisions. EPA's intention was to convey its position that the statute does not require that infrastructure SIPs address these specific substantive issues in existing SIPs and that these issues may be dealt with separately, outside the context of acting on the infrastructure SIP submission of a state. To be clear, EPA did not mean to imply that it was not taking a full final Agency action on the infrastructure SIP submission with respect to any substantive issue that EPA considers to be a required part of acting on such submissions under section 110(k) or under section 110(c). Given the confusion evidently resulting from EPA's statements in those other proposals, however, we want to explain more fully the Agency's reasons for concluding that these four potential substantive issues in existing SIPs may be addressed separately from actions on infrastructure SIP submissions.

The requirement for the SIP submissions at issue arises out of CAA section 110(a)(1). That provision requires that states must make a SIP submission "within 3 years (or such shorter period as the Administrator may prescribe) after the promulgation of a national primary ambient air quality standard (or any revision thereof)" and that these SIPs are to provide for the "implementation, maintenance, and enforcement" of such NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) includes a list of specific elements that "[e]ach such plan" submission must meet. EPA has historically referred to these particular submissions that states must make after the promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS as "infrastructure SIPs." This specific term does not appear in the statute, but EPA uses the term to distinguish this particular type of SIP submission designed to address basic

structural requirements of a SIP from other types of SIP submissions designed to address other different requirements, such as "nonattainment SIP" submissions required to address the nonattainment planning requirements of part D, "regional haze SIP" submissions required to address the visibility protection requirements of CAA section 169A, NSR permitting program submissions required to address the requirements of part D, and a host of other specific types of SIP submissions that address other specific matters.

Although section 110(a)(1) addresses the timing and general requirements for these infrastructure SIPs, and section 110(a)(2) provides more details concerning the required contents of these infrastructure SIPs, EPA believes that many of the specific statutory provisions are facially ambiguous. In particular, the list of required elements provided in section 110(a)(2) contains a wide variety of disparate provisions, some of which pertain to required legal authority, some of which pertain to required substantive provisions, and some of which pertain to requirements for both authority and substantive provisions.<sup>6</sup> Some of the elements of section 110(a)(2) are relatively straightforward, but others clearly require interpretation by EPA through rulemaking, or recommendations through guidance, in order to give specific meaning for a particular NAAQS.<sup>7</sup>

Notwithstanding that section 110(a)(2) provides that "each" SIP submission must meet the list of requirements therein, EPA has long noted that this literal reading of the statute is internally inconsistent, insofar as section 110(a)(2)(I) pertains to nonattainment SIP requirements that could not be met on the schedule provided for these SIP

<sup>6</sup> For example, section 110(a)(2)(E) provides that states must provide assurances that they have adequate legal authority under state and local law to carry out the SIP; section 110(a)(2)(C) provides that states must have a substantive program to address certain sources as required by part C of the CAA; section 110(a)(2)(G) provides that states must have both legal authority to address emergencies and substantive contingency plans in the event of such an emergency.

<sup>7</sup> For example, section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) requires EPA to be sure that each state's SIP contains adequate provisions to prevent significant contribution to nonattainment of the NAAQS in other states. This provision contains numerous terms that require substantial rulemaking by EPA in order to determine such basic points as what constitutes significant contribution. See "Rule To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone (Clean Air Interstate Rule); Revisions to Acid Rain Program; Revisions to the NO<sub>x</sub> SIP Call; Final Rule," 70 FR 25162 (May 12, 2005) (defining, among other things, the phrase "contribute significantly to nonattainment").

submissions in section 110(a)(1).<sup>8</sup> This illustrates that EPA must determine which provisions of section 110(a)(2) may be applicable for a given infrastructure SIP submission. Similarly, EPA has previously decided that it could take action on different parts of the larger, general "infrastructure SIP" for a given NAAQS without concurrent action on all subsections, such as section 110(a)(2)(D)(i), because the Agency bifurcated the action on these latter "interstate transport" provisions within section 110(a)(2) and worked with states to address each of the four prongs of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) with substantive administrative actions proceeding on different tracks with different schedules.<sup>9</sup> This illustrates that EPA may conclude that subdividing the applicable requirements of section 110(a)(2) into separate SIP actions may sometimes be appropriate for a given NAAQS where a specific substantive action is necessitated, beyond a mere submission addressing basic structural aspects of the state's implementation plans. Finally, EPA notes that not every element of section 110(a)(2) would be relevant, or as relevant, or relevant in the same way, for each new or revised NAAQS and the attendant infrastructure SIP submission for that NAAQS. For example, the monitoring requirements that might be necessary for purposes of section 110(a)(2)(B) for one NAAQS could be very different than what might be necessary for a different pollutant. Thus, the content of an infrastructure SIP submission to meet this element from a state might be very different for an entirely new NAAQS, versus a minor revision to an existing NAAQS.<sup>10</sup>

Similarly, EPA notes that other types of SIP submissions required under the statute also must meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2), and this also demonstrates the need to identify the applicable elements for other SIP submissions. For example, nonattainment SIPs required by part D

<sup>8</sup> See *Id.*, 70 FR 25162, at 63–65 (May 12, 2005) (explaining relationship between timing requirement of section 110(a)(2)(D) versus section 110(a)(2)(I)).

<sup>9</sup> EPA issued separate guidance to states with respect to SIP submissions to meet section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 1997 ozone and 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. See "Guidance for State Implementation Plan (SIP) Submissions to Meet Current Outstanding Obligations Under Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 8-Hour Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards," from William T. Harnett, Director Air Quality Policy Division OAQPS, to Regional Air Division Director, Regions I–X, dated August 15, 2006.

<sup>10</sup> For example, implementation of the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS required the deployment of a system of new monitors to measure ambient levels of that new indicator species for the new NAAQS.

likewise have to meet the relevant subsections of section 110(a)(2) such as section 110(a)(2)(A) or (E). By contrast, it is clear that nonattainment SIPs would not need to meet the portion of section 110(a)(2)(C) that pertains to part C, *i.e.*, the PSD requirements applicable in attainment areas. Nonattainment SIPs required by part D also would not need to address the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) with respect to emergency episodes, as such requirements would not be limited to nonattainment areas. As this example illustrates, each type of SIP submission may implicate some subsections of section 110(a)(2) and not others.

Given the potential for ambiguity of the statutory language of section 110(a)(1) and (2), EPA believes that it is appropriate for EPA to interpret that language in the context of acting on the infrastructure SIPs for a given NAAQS. Because of the inherent ambiguity of the list of requirements in section 110(a)(2), EPA has adopted an approach in which it reviews infrastructure SIPs against this list of elements “as applicable.” In other words, EPA assumes that Congress could not have intended that each and every SIP submission, regardless of the purpose of the submission or the NAAQS in question, would meet each of the requirements, or meet each of them in the same way. EPA elected to use guidance to make recommendations for infrastructure SIPs for these ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.

On October 2, 2007, EPA issued guidance making recommendations for the infrastructure SIP submissions for both the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS and the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.<sup>11</sup> Within this guidance document, EPA described the duty of states to make these submissions to meet what the Agency characterized as the “infrastructure” elements for SIPs, which it further described as the “basic SIP requirements, including emissions inventories, monitoring, and modeling to assure attainment and maintenance of the standards.”<sup>12</sup> As further identification of these basic structural SIP requirements, “attachment A” to the guidance document included a short description of the various elements of section 110(a)(2) and additional information about the types of issues that EPA considered germane in the context of such infrastructure SIPs. EPA

emphasized that the description of the basic requirements listed on attachment A was not intended “to constitute an interpretation of” the requirements, and was merely a “brief description of the required elements.”<sup>13</sup> EPA also stated its belief that, with one exception, these requirements were “relatively self explanatory, and past experience with SIPs for other NAAQS should enable States to meet these requirements with assistance from EPA Regions.”<sup>14</sup> However, for the one exception to that general assumption (*i.e.*, how states should proceed with respect to the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS), EPA gave much more specific recommendations. But for other infrastructure SIP submittals, and for certain elements of the submittals for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, EPA assumed that each state would work with its corresponding EPA regional office to refine the scope of a state’s submittal based on an assessment of how the requirements of section 110(a)(2) should reasonably apply to the basic structure of the state’s implementation plans for the NAAQS in question.

On September 25, 2009, EPA issued guidance to make recommendations to states with respect to the infrastructure SIPs for the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.<sup>15</sup> In the 2009 Guidance, EPA addressed a number of additional issues that were not germane to the infrastructure SIPs for the 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, but were germane to these SIP submissions for the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS (e.g., the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) that EPA had bifurcated from the other infrastructure elements for those specific 1997 ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS). Significantly, neither the 2007 Guidance nor the 2009 Guidance explicitly referred to the SSM, director’s discretion, minor source NSR, or NSR Reform issues as among specific substantive issues EPA expected states to address in the context of the infrastructure SIPs, nor did EPA give any more specific recommendations with respect to how states might address

such issues even if they elected to do so. The SSM and director’s discretion issues implicate section 110(a)(2)(A), and the minor source NSR and NSR Reform issues implicate section 110(a)(2)(C). In the 2007 Guidance and the 2009 Guidance, however, EPA did not indicate to states that it intended to interpret these provisions as requiring a substantive submission to address these specific issues in existing SIP provisions in the context of the infrastructure SIPs for these NAAQS. Instead, EPA’s 2007 Guidance merely indicated its belief that the states should make submissions in which they established that they have the basic SIP structure necessary to implement, maintain, and enforce the NAAQS. EPA believes that states can establish that they have the basic SIP structure, notwithstanding that there may be potential deficiencies within the existing SIP. Thus, EPA’s proposals for other states mentioned these issues not because the Agency considers them issues that must be addressed in the context of an infrastructure SIP as required by section 110(a)(1) and (2), but rather because EPA wanted to be clear that it considers these potential existing SIP problems as separate from the pending infrastructure SIP actions. The same holds true for this action on the infrastructure SIPs for Tennessee.

EPA believes that this approach to the infrastructure SIP requirement is reasonable because it would not be feasible to read section 110(a)(1) and (2) to require a top to bottom, stem to stern, review of each and every provision of an existing SIP merely for purposes of assuring that the state in question has the basic structural elements for a functioning SIP for a new or revised NAAQS. Because SIPs have grown by accretion over the decades as statutory and regulatory requirements under the CAA have evolved, they may include some outmoded provisions and historical artifacts that, while not fully up to date, nevertheless may not pose a significant problem for the purposes of “implementation, maintenance, and enforcement” of a new or revised NAAQS when EPA considers the overall effectiveness of the SIP. To the contrary, EPA believes that a better approach is for EPA to determine which specific SIP elements from section 110(a)(2) are applicable to an infrastructure SIP for a given NAAQS, and to focus attention on those elements that are most likely to need a specific SIP revision in light of the new or revised NAAQS. Thus, for example, EPA’s 2007 Guidance specifically directed states to focus on the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS because of

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*, at attachment A, page 1.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*, at page 4. In retrospect, the concerns raised by the Commenters with respect to EPA’s approach to some substantive issues indicates that the statute is not so “self explanatory,” and indeed is sufficiently ambiguous that EPA needs to interpret it in order to explain why these substantive issues do not need to be addressed in the context of infrastructure SIPs and may be addressed at other times and by other means.

<sup>15</sup> See “Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS),” from William T. Harnett, Director Air Quality Policy Division, to Regional Air Division Directors, Regions I–X, dated September 25, 2009 (the “2009 Guidance”).

<sup>11</sup> See “Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8-hour Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards,” from William T. Harnett, Director Air Quality Policy Division, to Air Division Directors, Regions I–X, dated October 2, 2007 (the “2007 Guidance”).

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*, at page 2.

the absence of underlying EPA regulations for emergency episodes for this NAAQS and an anticipated absence of relevant provisions in existing SIPs.

Finally, EPA believes that its approach is a reasonable reading of section 110(a)(1) and (2) because the statute provides other avenues and mechanisms to address specific substantive deficiencies in existing SIPs. These other statutory tools allow the Agency to take appropriate tailored action, depending upon the nature and severity of the alleged SIP deficiency. Section 110(k)(5) authorizes EPA to issue a "SIP call" whenever the Agency determines that a state's SIP is substantially inadequate to attain or maintain the NAAQS, to mitigate interstate transport, or otherwise to comply with the CAA.<sup>16</sup> Section 110(k)(6) authorizes EPA to correct errors in past actions, such as past approvals of SIP submissions.<sup>17</sup> Significantly, EPA's determination that an action on the infrastructure SIP is not the appropriate time and place to address all potential existing SIP problems does not preclude the Agency's subsequent reliance on provisions in section 110(a)(2) as part of the basis for action at a later time. For example, although it may not be appropriate to require a state to eliminate all existing inappropriate director's discretion provisions in the course of acting on the infrastructure SIP, EPA believes that section 110(a)(2)(A) may be among the statutory bases that the Agency cites in the course of addressing the issue in a subsequent action.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup>EPA has recently issued a SIP call to rectify a specific SIP deficiency related to the SSM issue. See "Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Utah State Implementation Plan Revision," 76 FR 21639 (April 18, 2011).

<sup>17</sup>EPA has recently utilized this authority to correct errors in past actions on SIP submissions related to PSD programs. See "Limitation of Approval of Prevention of Significant Deterioration Provisions Concerning Greenhouse Gas Emitting-Sources in State Implementation Plans; Final Rule," 75 FR 82536 (December 30, 2010). EPA has previously used its authority under CAA 110(k)(6) to remove numerous other SIP provisions that the Agency determined it had approved in error. See 61 FR 38664 (July 25, 1996) and 62 FR 34641 (June 27, 1997) (corrections to American Samoa, Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada SIPs); 69 FR 67062 (November 16, 2004) (corrections to California SIP); and 74 FR 57051 (November 3, 2009) (corrections to Arizona and Nevada SIPs).

<sup>18</sup>EPA has recently disapproved a SIP submission from Colorado on the grounds that it would have included a director's discretion provision inconsistent with CAA requirements, including section 110(a)(2)(A). See 75 FR 42342, 42344 (July 21, 2010) (proposed disapproval of director's discretion provisions); 76 FR 4540 (January 26, 2011) (final disapproval of such provisions).

#### IV. What is EPA's analysis of how Tennessee addressed the elements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) "infrastructure" provisions?

The Tennessee infrastructure submission addresses the provisions of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) as described below.

1. *110(a)(2)(A): Emission limits and other control measures:* Tennessee's SIP contains several Air Pollution Control Regulations relevant to air quality control regulations. The regulations described below have been federally approved into the Tennessee SIP and include enforceable emission limitations and other control measures. Chapters 1200-3-1, *General Provisions*; 1200-3-3, *Air Quality Standards*; 1200-3-4, *Open Burning*; 1200-3-18, *Volatile Organic Compounds*; and 1200-3-27, *Nitrogen Oxides*, of the Tennessee SIP establish emission limits for ozone and address the required control measures, means, and techniques for compliance with the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA has made the preliminary determination that the provisions contained in these chapters and Tennessee's practices are adequate to protect the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS in the State.

In this action, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing State provisions with regard to excess emissions during SSM of operations at a facility. EPA believes that a number of states have SSM provisions which are contrary to the CAA and existing EPA guidance, "State Implementation Plans: Policy Regarding Excess Emissions During Malfunctions, Startup, and Shutdown" (September 20, 1999), and the Agency plans to address such state regulations in the future. In the meantime, EPA encourages any state having a deficient SSM provision to take steps to correct it as soon as possible.

Additionally, in this action, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing State rules with regard to director's discretion or variance provisions. EPA believes that a number of states have such provisions which are contrary to the CAA and existing EPA guidance (52 FR 45109 (November 24, 1987)), and the Agency plans to take action in the future to address such state regulations. In the meantime, EPA encourages any state having a director's discretion or variance provision which is contrary to the CAA and EPA guidance to take steps to correct the deficiency as soon as possible.

2. *110(a)(2)(B) Ambient air quality monitoring/data system:* Tennessee's Air Pollution Control Regulations, Chapter 1200-3-12, *Procedures for*

*Ambient Sampling and Analysis*, of the Tennessee SIP, along with the Tennessee Network Description and Ambient Air Monitoring Network Plan, provide for an ambient air quality monitoring system in the State. Annually, EPA approves the ambient air monitoring network plan for the state agencies. On July 1, 2011, Tennessee submitted its plan to EPA. On October 24, 2011, EPA approved Tennessee's monitoring network plan. Tennessee's approved monitoring network plan can be accessed at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) using Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0237. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are adequate for the ambient air quality monitoring and data system related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

3. *110(a)(2)(C) Program for enforcement of control measures including review of proposed new sources.* In this action, EPA is proposing to approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS with respect to the general requirement in section 110(a)(2)(C) to include a program in the SIP that regulates the modification and construction of any stationary source as necessary to assure that the NAAQS are achieved. Chapter 1200-3-9, *Construction and Operating Permits*, of Tennessee's SIP pertains to the construction of any new major stationary source or any project at an existing major stationary source in an area designated as nonattainment, attainment or unclassifiable. There are three revisions to the Tennessee SIP that are necessary to meet the requirements of infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(C). These three revisions are related to the Ozone Implementation NSR Update (November 29, 2005, 70 FR 71612), the "Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule" (June 3, 2010, 75 FR 31514), and the NSR PM<sub>2.5</sub> Rule (May 16, 2008, 73 FR 28321).

The first revision to the Tennessee SIP (Ozone Implementation NSR Update revisions) was submitted by TDEC on May 28, 2009. This revision modifies provisions of the State's SIP at Chapter 1200-3-9, *Construction and Operating Permits*. In addition to meeting the requirements of the Ozone Implementation NSR Update, these revisions are also necessary to address portions of the infrastructure SIP requirements described at element 110(a)(2)(C) and to include nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) as a precursor to ozone. EPA approved this revision on February 7, 2012. See 77 FR 6016.

The second revision pertains to revisions to the PSD program

promulgated in the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Tailoring Rule, submitted to EPA on January 11, 2012. This revision establishes appropriate emission thresholds for determining which new stationary sources and modification projects become subject to Tennessee's PSD permitting requirements for their GHG emissions, and thereby addresses the thresholds for GHG permitting applicability in Tennessee. EPA approved this revision on February 28, 2012. See 77 FR 11744. In the January 2012 revision, Tennessee also amended its PSD regulations to add automatic rescission provisions. EPA finalized approval of these provisions on March 1, 2012.

The third revision pertains to the adoption of PSD and Nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR) requirements related to the implementation of the NSR PM<sub>2.5</sub> Rule. On July 29, 2011, TDEC submitted revisions to its PSD/NSR regulations for EPA approval to revise the Tennessee SIP in Chapter 1200-03-09-.01, *Construction Permits*. The rule amendment adopts required federal PSD and NNSR permitting provisions governing the implementation of the NSR program for PM<sub>2.5</sub> as promulgated in the NSR PM<sub>2.5</sub> Rule that address the infrastructure requirements (C) and (J). See 73 FR 28321 (May 16, 2008). EPA finalized approval of Tennessee's July 29, 2011, submittal on July 30, 2012. See 77 FR 44481. These SIP revisions<sup>19</sup> address requisite requirements of infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(C), today's action to propose approval of infrastructure SIP element 110(a)(2)(C). EPA also notes that today's action is not proposing to approve or disapprove the State's existing minor NSR program itself to the extent that it is inconsistent with EPA's regulations governing this program. EPA believes that a number of states may have minor NSR provisions that are contrary to the existing EPA regulations for this program. EPA intends to work with states to reconcile state minor NSR programs with EPA's regulatory provisions for the program. The statutory requirements of section 110(a)(2)(C) provide for considerable flexibility in designing minor NSR programs, and EPA believes it may be time to revisit the regulatory requirements for this program to give the states an appropriate level of flexibility to design a program that

meets their particular air quality concerns, while assuring reasonable consistency across the country in protecting the NAAQS with respect to new and modified minor sources.

EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are adequate for program enforcement of control measures including review of proposed new sources related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

4. *110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) Interstate Transport*. EPA is proposing to approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS with respect to the general requirement in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) to include a program in the SIP that provides for meeting the applicable PSD and visibility requirements of part C of the Act.

*PSD Requirements*: In this action, EPA is proposing to approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS with respect to the general requirement in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) related to PSD to include a program in the SIP that regulates the modification and construction of any stationary source as necessary to assure that the NAAQS are achieved. Chapter 1200-3-9, *Construction and Operating Permits*, of Tennessee's SIP pertains to the construction of any new major stationary source or any project at an existing major stationary source in an area designated as nonattainment, attainment or unclassifiable. There are three revisions to the Tennessee SIP that are necessary to meet the requirements of infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(C). These three revisions are related to the Ozone Implementation NSR Update, the "Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule", and the NSR PM<sub>2.5</sub> Rule. For more detail on these rules, see item 3 above. These three rules demonstrate that Tennessee has a comprehensive PSD program approved in the state, thus EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are adequate for insuring compliance with the applicable PSD requirements relating to interstate transport pollution for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

*Visibility Requirements*: EPA recognizes that states are subject to visibility and regional haze program requirements under part C of the Act (which includes sections 169A and 169B). In the event of the establishment of a new NAAQS, however, the visibility and regional haze program requirements under part C do not change. Thus, EPA finds that there is no new visibility obligation "triggered"

under section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) when a new NAAQS becomes effective. This would be the case even in the event a secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS for visibility is established, because this NAAQS would not affect visibility requirements under part C. Tennessee has submitted SIP revisions for approval to satisfy the requirements of the CAA Section 169A and 169B, and the regional haze and best available retrofit technology rules contained in 40 CFR 51.308. On April 24, 2012, EPA published a final rulemaking regarding Tennessee's regional haze program. See 77 FR 24392. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to implement and provide for visibility protection relating to interstate transport pollution for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS as necessary.

5. *110(a)(2)(D)(ii) Interstate and International transport provisions*: Chapter 1200-9-.01(5) *Growth Policy*, of the Tennessee SIP outlines how the State will notify neighboring states of potential impacts from new or modified sources. Tennessee does not have any pending obligation under sections 115 and 126 of the CAA. Additionally, Tennessee has federally approved regulations in its SIP that satisfy the requirements for the NO<sub>x</sub> SIP Call. See 70 FR 76408 (December 27, 2005). EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are adequate for insuring compliance with the applicable requirements relating to interstate and international pollution abatement for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

6. *110(a)(2)(E) Adequate resources*: EPA is proposing two separate actions with respect to the sub-elements required pursuant to section 110(a)(2)(E). Section 110(a)(2)(E) requires that each implementation plan provide (i) necessary assurances that the State will have adequate personnel, funding, and authority under state law to carry out its implementation plan, (ii) that the State comply with the requirements respecting State Boards pursuant to section 128 of the Act, and (iii) necessary assurances that, where the State has relied on a local or regional government, agency, or instrumentality for the implementation of any plan provision, the State has responsibility for ensuring adequate implementation of such plan provisions. As with the remainder of the infrastructure elements addressed by this notice, EPA is proposing to approve Tennessee's SIP as meeting the requirements of sub-elements 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii). With respect to

<sup>19</sup> (1) EPA's approval of Tennessee's PSD/NSR regulations which address the Ozone Implementation NSR Update requirements, (2) EPA's approval of Tennessee's PSD GHG Tailoring Rule revisions which addresses the thresholds for GHG permitting applicability in Tennessee, and (3) EPA's approval of Tennessee's NSR PM<sub>2.5</sub> Rule.

sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) (regarding state boards), EPA is proposing to approve in part, and conditionally approve in part, this sub-element. EPA's rationale for today's proposals respecting each sub-element is described in turn below.

In support of EPA's proposal to approve sub-elements 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii), EPA notes that TDEC, through the Tennessee Air Pollution Control Board, is responsible for promulgating rules and regulations for the NAAQS, emissions standards general policies, a system of permits, fee schedules for the review of plans, and other planning needs. As evidence of the adequacy of TDEC's resources with respect to sub-elements (i) and (iii), EPA submitted a letter to Tennessee on April 24, 2012, outlining 105 grant commitments and current status of these commitments for fiscal year 2011. The letter EPA submitted to Tennessee can be accessed at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) using Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0237. Annually, states update these grant commitments based on current SIP requirements, air quality planning, and applicable requirements related to the NAAQS. There were no outstanding issues for fiscal year 2011, therefore, Tennessee's grants were finalized and closed out. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee has adequate resources for implementation of the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

With respect to sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), EPA is proposing to approve in part, and to conditionally approve in part, Tennessee's infrastructure SIP as to this requirement. Section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) provides that infrastructure SIPs must require compliance with section 128 of CAA requirements respecting State boards. Section 128, in turn, provides at subsection (a)(1) that each SIP shall require that any board or body which approves permits or enforcement orders shall be subject to the described public interest and income restrictions therein. Subsection 128(a)(2) provides that each SIP shall require any board or body, or the head of an executive agency with similar power to approve permits or enforcement orders under the CAA, shall also be subject to conflict of interest disclosure requirements. In this action, EPA is proposing to conditionally approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP for element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) with respect to the applicable section 128(a)(1) requirements, and to approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP for element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) with respect to

the applicable section 128(a)(2) requirements.

Today's proposed conditional approval of this sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) regarding section 128(a)(1) requirements is based upon a commitment made by Tennessee to adopt specific enforceable measures into its SIP within one year to address the applicable portions of section 128(a)(1). Tennessee's commitment letter to EPA, dated March 28, 2012, can be accessed at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) using docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0353. Based upon that commitment, on July 23, 2012, EPA took final action to conditionally approve infrastructure sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) regarding section 128(a)(1) for purposes of the 1997 8-hour Ozone NAAQS. See 77 FR 42997. In accordance with section 110(k)(4) of the CAA, the commitment from Tennessee provided that the State will adopt the specified enforceable provisions and submit a revision to EPA for approval within one year from EPA's final conditional approval action. In its March 28, 2012, letter, TDEC committed to adopt the above-specified enforceable provisions and submit them to EPA for incorporation into the SIP by no later than July 23, 2012.<sup>20</sup> Failure by the State to adopt these provisions and submit them to EPA for incorporation into the SIP by July 23, 2013, would result in today's conditional approval being treated as a disapproval. Should that occur, EPA would provide the public with notice of such a disapproval in the **Federal Register**.<sup>21</sup>

Because the 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) obligations to incorporate provisions into the Tennessee SIP to meet the requirements of section 128(a)(1) have not changed for purposes of the 2008 8-hour Ozone NAAQS, EPA is today proposing to rely upon Tennessee's earlier commitment to adopt specific enforceable measures into its SIP within one year as the basis for a condition of this sub-element as it relates to the section 128(a)(1) requirements. With respect to the remaining sub-elements of 110(a)(2)(E), EPA is proposing to approve these portions of Tennessee's infrastructure SIP. As such, EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee has adequate resources

<sup>20</sup> July 23, 2012, is one year from the approval date of EPA's final rulemaking to conditionally approve sub-section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) regarding section 128(a)(1) for purposes of the 1997 8-hour Ozone NAAQS.

<sup>21</sup> EPA notes that pursuant to section 110(k)(4), a conditional approval is treated as a disapproval in the event that a state fails to comply with its commitment. Notification of this disapproval action in the **Federal Register** is not subject to public notice and comment.

for implementation of the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

7. *110(a)(2)(F) Stationary source monitoring system*: Tennessee's infrastructure submission describes how to establish requirements for compliance testing by emissions sampling and analysis, and for emissions and operation monitoring to ensure the quality of data in the State. TDEC uses these data to track progress towards maintaining the NAAQS, develop control and maintenance strategies, identify sources and general emission levels, and determine compliance with emission regulations and additional EPA requirements. These requirements are provided in Chapter 1200-3-10, *Required Sampling, Recording and Reporting*, of the Tennessee SIP.

Additionally, Tennessee is required to submit emissions data to EPA for purposes of the National Emissions Inventory (NEI). The NEI is EPA's central repository for air emissions data. EPA published the Air Emissions Reporting Rule (AERR) on December 5, 2008, which modified the requirements for collecting and reporting air emissions data (73 FR 76539). The AERR shortened the time states had to report emissions data from 17 to 12 months, giving states one calendar year to submit emissions data. All states are required to submit a comprehensive emissions inventory every three years and report emissions for certain larger sources annually through EPA's online Emissions Inventory System (EIS). States report emissions data for the six criteria pollutants and their associated precursors—NO<sub>x</sub>, sulfur dioxide, ammonia, lead, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Many states also voluntarily report emissions of hazardous air pollutants. Tennessee made its latest update to the NEI on December 31, 2011. EPA compiles the emissions data, supplementing it where necessary, and releases it to the general public through the Web site <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chieff/einformation.html>. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are adequate for the stationary source monitoring systems related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

8. *110(a)(2)(G) Emergency power*: Chapter 1200-3-15, *Emergency Episode Requirements*, of the Tennessee SIP identifies air pollution emergency episodes and preplanned abatement strategies. These criteria have previously been approved by EPA. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are



adequate for emergency powers related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

*9. 110(a)(2)(H) Future SIP revisions:*

As previously discussed, TDEC is responsible for adopting air quality rules and revising SIPs as needed to attain or maintain the NAAQS. Tennessee has the ability and authority to respond to calls for SIP revisions, and has provided a number of SIP revisions over the years for implementation of the NAAQS.

Tennessee has two areas, Knoxville, TN and Memphis, TN-MS-AR, that are designated as nonattainment for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. These two areas are classified as marginal nonattainment areas and therefore no attainment demonstration SIPs are required. Section 182(a) of the CAA does require that, for marginal areas, states must submit Base Year Emissions Inventory SIPs, Periodic Emission Inventory SIPs, Emission Statement SIPs and possible SIP updates to their NSR program. While the CAA requires these types of SIPs for marginal areas, the specific requirements and compliance dates for these SIPs, as they relate to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS, are not yet established but are expected to be addressed in the upcoming Implementation Rule for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS SIP Requirements. Tennessee has provided SIP revisions for both the 1-hour ozone and 8-hour ozone standards. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate a commitment to provide future SIP revisions related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

*10. 110(a)(2)(I). EPA is proposing to approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS with respect to the general requirement in section 110(a)(2)(I) to include a program in the SIP that provides for meeting the applicable consultation requirements of section 121, the public notification requirements of section 127, and the PSD and visibility protection requirements of part C of the Act.*

*110(a)(2)(I) (121 consultation)*

*Consultation with government officials:* Chapter 1200-3-9 *Construction and Operating Permits*, as well as the Regional Haze Implementation Plan (which allows for consultation between appropriate state, local, and tribal air pollution control agencies as well as the corresponding Federal Land Managers), provide for consultation with government officials whose jurisdictions might be affected by SIP development activities. Tennessee adopted state-wide consultation procedures for the implementation of transportation

conformity. These consultation procedures include considerations associated with the development of mobile inventories for SIPs. Implementation of transportation conformity, as outlined in the consultation procedures, requires TDEC to consult with federal, state and local transportation and air quality agency officials on the development of motor vehicle emissions budgets. EPA approved Tennessee's consultation procedures on May 16, 2003 (68 FR 26492). EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with government officials related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

*110(a)(2)(J) (127 public notification)*

*Public notification:* TDEC has public notice mechanisms in place to notify the public of ozone and other pollutant forecasting, including an air quality monitoring Web site with ground level ozone alerts, <http://tn.gov/environment/apc/ozone/>. Chapter 1200-3-15, *Emergency Episode Requirements*, requires that TDEC notify the public of any air pollution episode or NAAQS violation. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to provide public notification related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

*110(a)(2)(J) (Part C) PSD and visibility protection:* Tennessee demonstrates its authority to regulate new and modified sources of ozone precursors, VOCs, and NO<sub>x</sub> to assist in the protection of air quality in Chapter 1200-3-9, *Construction and Operating Permits*. As with infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(C), infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(J) also requires compliance with applicable provisions of the PSD program described in part C of the Act. Accordingly, this portion of element (J) also requires compliance with the Ozone Implementation NSR Update, the "Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule", and the NSR PM<sub>2.5</sub> Rule. These SIP revisions<sup>22</sup> have been approved into the Tennessee SIP and address requisite requirements of infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(J) (PSD and visibility protection).

With regard to the applicable requirements for visibility protection,

<sup>22</sup> (1) EPA's approval of Tennessee's PSD/NSR regulations which address the Ozone Implementation NSR Update requirements, (2) EPA's approval of Tennessee's PSD GHG Tailoring Rule revisions which addresses the thresholds for GHG permitting applicability in Tennessee and (3) EPA's approval of Tennessee's NSR PM<sub>2.5</sub> Rule.

EPA recognizes that states are subject to visibility and regional haze program requirements under part C of the Act (which includes sections 169A and 169B). In the event of the establishment of a new NAAQS, however, the visibility and regional haze program requirements under part C do not change. Thus, EPA finds that there is no new visibility obligation "triggered" under section 110(a)(2)(J) when a new NAAQS becomes effective. This would be the case even in the event a secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS for visibility is established, because this NAAQS would not affect visibility requirements under part C. Tennessee has submitted SIP revisions for approval to satisfy the requirements of the CAA Section 169A and 169B, and the regional haze and best available retrofit technology rules contained in 40 CFR 51.308. On April 24, 2012, EPA published a final rulemaking regarding Tennessee's regional haze program. See 77 FR 24392. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to implement PSD programs and to provide for visibility protection related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

*11. 110(a)(2)(K) Air quality and modeling/data:* Chapter 1200-3-9-.01(4)(k), *Air Quality Models*, of the Tennessee SIP specifies that required air modeling be conducted in accordance with 40 CFR part 51, Appendix W "Guideline on Air Quality Models," as incorporated into the Tennessee SIP. This demonstrates that Tennessee has the authority to provide relevant data for the purpose of predicting the effect on ambient air quality of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Additionally, Tennessee supports a regional effort to coordinate the development of emissions inventories and conduct regional modeling for several NAAQS, including the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS, for the southeastern states. Taken as a whole, Tennessee's air quality regulations and practices demonstrate that TDEC has the authority to provide relevant data for the purpose of predicting the effect on ambient air quality of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to provide for air quality and modeling, along with analysis of the associated data, related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

*12. 110(a)(2)(L) Permitting fees:* As discussed above, Tennessee's SIP provides for the review of construction permits. Permitting fees in Tennessee are collected through the State's federally-approved title V fees program

and consistent with Chapter 1200–03–26–.02, *Permit-Related Fees*, of the Tennessee Code. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately provide for permitting fees related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

13. 110(a)(2)(M) *Consultation/participation by affected local entities*: Chapter 1200–3–9–.01(4)(k), *Public Participation*, of the Tennessee SIP requires that TDEC notify the public of an application, preliminary determination, the activity or activities involved in the permit action, any emissions change associated with any permit modification, and the opportunity for comment prior to making a final permitting decision. By way of example, TDEC has recently worked closely with local political subdivisions during the development of its Transportation Conformity SIP, Regional Haze Implementation Plan, and Early Action Compacts. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with affected local entities related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary.

#### V. Proposed Action

As described above, with the exception of sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), EPA is proposing to determine that Tennessee's infrastructure submission, provided to EPA on October 19, 2009, addressed the required infrastructure elements for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA is proposing to approve in part and conditionally approve in part, Tennessee's SIP submission consistent with section 110(k)(3) of the CAA.

As described above, with the exception of sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) (as it relates to section 128(a)(1)), TDEC has addressed the elements of the CAA 110(a)(1) and (2) SIP requirements pursuant to section 110 of the CAA to ensure that the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS are implemented, enforced, and maintained in Tennessee. With respect to 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) (referencing section 128 of the CAA), EPA is proposing to conditionally approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP based on a March 28, 2012, commitment that TDEC will adopt specific enforceable measures into its SIP and submit these revisions to EPA July 23, 2013, to address the applicable portions of section 128. EPA is also proposing to approve Tennessee's infrastructure submission for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS, with the exception of sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), because its October 19,

2009, submission is consistent with section 110 of the CAA.

#### VI. 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. See 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 CAA. Accordingly, this proposed 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 proposed 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 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 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.

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

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: August 8, 2012.

**A. Stanley Meiburg,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

[FR Doc. 2012–20668 Filed 8–21–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2012–0566; FRL–9719–7]

#### Limited Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nevada; Clark County; Stationary Source Permits; Extension of Comment Period

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is extending the comment period on a proposed limited approval and limited disapproval published on July 24, 2012, concerning permit regulations for stationary sources in Clark County, Nevada.

**DATES:** Any comments on this proposal must arrive by September 7, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by Docket ID Number EPA–R09–OAR–2012–0566, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). Follow the on-line instructions.

2. *Email:* [R9airpermits@epa.gov](mailto:R9airpermits@epa.gov).

3. *Mail or deliver:* Gerardo Rios (AIR–3), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901. Deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office's normal hours of operation.

*Instructions:* All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected