

that this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This proposed rule simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. This rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2-1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction.

Under figure 2-1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, an environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are not required for this rule. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of significant environmental impact from the proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 33 CFR 1.05-1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Revise § 117.993 paragraph (c) and remove paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 117.993 Lake Champlain.

* * * * *

(c) The draw of the New England Central Railroad Bridge across Missiquoi Bay, mile 105.6, at Swanton, Vermont, shall operate as follows:

(1) From June 15 through September 15, the draw shall remain in the full open position at all times and shall only be closed for the passage of rail traffic or the performance of maintenance authorized in accordance with subpart A of this part.

(2) From September 16 through June 14, the draw may remain in the closed position and shall be opened on signal for the passage of vessel traffic after at least a twenty four hour notice is given by calling the number posted at the bridge.

(3) The draw may be operated either remotely by the New England Central Railroad train dispatcher located at St. Albans, Vermont or manually by a draw tender located at the bridge.

(4) A sufficient number of infrared cameras shall be maintained in good working order at all times with a clear unobstructed view of the channel under the bridge, and the up and down stream approaches to the bridge. A signal horn and message boards located both up and down stream, necessary to warn marine

traffic that the bridge will be closing, shall also be maintained in good working order at all times. In the event that any of the cameras, navigation lights, horn, or message board become disabled, personnel shall be deployed to the bridge to be on scene within two hours from the known time of the equipment failure.

(5) The draw may operate remotely as follows: Once it is determined that the draw must be opened or closed, the train dispatcher shall observe the waterway both up and down stream via the infrared cameras to verify that the channel is clear of all approaching vessel traffic. All approaching vessel traffic shall be allowed to pass before the bridge may closed. Once it is determined that no vessel traffic is approaching the dispatcher shall sound the warning horn and activate the up and down stream message boards indicating that the bridge will be closing. After at least a one minute delay the draw may then be closed and the swing span navigation lights shall display as red to indicate the bridge is in the closed position. Once the train clears the bridge the draw shall be returned to the full open position and the swing span lights shall display as green to indicate the draw is in the full open position.

(6) In the event that the dispatcher cannot verify that the channel is clear of all vessel traffic and the bridge cannot be safely closed, an on-scene train crewmember shall observe the waterway for any vessel traffic and then communicate with the train dispatch office either by radio or telephone to request the bridge be safely closed. Personnel shall then be deployed to the bridge to arrive within two hours to inspect and repair the bridge remote operation equipment. The bridge shall be operated manually from the tender's house located at the bridge until all necessary repairs are completed to the remote operation equipment.

* * * * *

Dated: October 16, 2012.
Daniel B. Abel,
*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander,
First Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 2012-27369 Filed 11-8-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0790; FRL-9750-2]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions from biomass boilers. We are approving a local rule that regulates these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by December 10, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0790, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* www.regulations.gov. Follow the on-line instructions.

2. *Email:* steckel.andrew@epa.gov.

3. *Mail or deliver:* Andrew Steckel (Air-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Instructions: All comments 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 Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through www.regulations.gov or email. www.regulations.gov is an "anonymous access" system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send email directly to EPA, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. 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.

Docket: Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at www.regulations.gov

and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed at www.regulations.gov, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Idalia Pérez, EPA Region IX, (415) 972-3248, perez.idalia@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

- I. The State’s Submittal
 - A. What rule did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule?
- II. EPA’s Evaluation and Action.
 - A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?

- B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rule
 - D. Public Comment and Final Action
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. The State’s Submittal

A. What rule did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rule addressed by this proposal with the dates that it was adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board.

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Amended	Submitted
PCAPCD	233	Biomass Boilers	06/14/12	09/21/12

On October 11, 2012, EPA determined that the submittal for PCAPCD Rule 233 met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR Part 51 Appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

B. Are there other versions of this rule?

We finalized a limited approval and limited disapproval of an earlier version of Rule 233 on January 19, 2012 (77 FR 2643). That action incorporated Rule 233 into the California SIP, including those provisions identified as deficient.

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule?

NO_x helps produce ground-level ozone, smog and particulate matter, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires States to submit regulations that control NO_x emissions. Rule 233 limits NO_x emissions from biomass boilers. EPA’s technical support document (TSD) has more information about this rule.

II. EPA’s Evaluation and Action

A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the Act), must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for each category of sources covered by a Control Techniques Guidelines (CTG) document as well as each major source in nonattainment areas (see sections 182(b)(2) and 182(f)), and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). The PCAPCD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so Rule 233 must fulfill RACT.

Guidance and policy documents that we use to evaluate enforceability and

RACT requirements consistently include the following:

1. “State Implementation Plans; Nitrogen Oxides Supplement to the General Preamble; Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 Implementation of Title I; Proposed Rule,” (the NO_x Supplement), 57 FR 55620, November 25, 1992.
2. “Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations,” EPA, May 25, 1988 (the Bluebook).
3. “Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule Deficiencies,” EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001 (the Little Bluebook).
4. “Determination of Reasonably Available Control Technology and Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters,” CARB, July 18, 1991.
5. “Alternative Control Techniques Document—NO_x Emissions from Industrial/Commercial/Institutional (ICI) Boilers,” U.S. EPA 453/R-94-022, March 1994.
6. “Alternative Control Techniques Document—NO_x Emissions from Utility Boilers,” US EPA 452/R-93-008, March 1994.

B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?

We believe this rule is consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rule

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

rule but are not currently the basis for rule disapproval.

D. Public Comment and Final Action

Because EPA believes the submitted rule fulfills all relevant requirements, we are proposing to fully approve it as described in section 110(k)(3) of the Act. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal for the next 30 days. Unless we receive convincing new information during the comment period, we intend to publish a final approval action that will incorporate this rule into the federally enforceable SIP. Final approval of Rule 233 would satisfy California’s obligation to implement RACT under CAA section 182 for this source category and thereby terminate both the sanctions clocks and the Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) clock associated with limited approval and limited disapproval of this rule which we finalized on January 19, 2012 (77 FR 2643).

III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA’s role is to approve State choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Accordingly, this proposed action merely proposes to approve State law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by State law. For that reason, this proposed action:

- Is not a “significant regulatory action” subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under

Executive 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 disproportionate human health or environmental effects with practical, appropriate, and legally permissible methods under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, this proposed action 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, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: October 30, 2012.

Jared Blumenfeld,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2012-27324 Filed 11-8-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

44 CFR Part 67

[Docket ID FEMA-2011-0002; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1233]

Proposed Flood Elevation Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: On November 29, 2011 FEMA published in the **Federal Register** a proposed rule that contained an erroneous table. This document provides corrections to that table, to be used in lieu of the information published at 76 FR 73537. The table provided here represents the flooding sources, location of referenced elevations, effective and modified elevations, and communities affected for Sullivan County, Pennsylvania (All Jurisdictions). Specifically, it addresses the flooding sources Big Run, Little Loyalsock Creek, Loyalsock Creek, and Muncy Creek.

DATES: Comments are to be submitted on or before February 7, 2013.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. FEMA-B-1233, to Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-4064 or (email) *Luis.Rodriguez3@fema.dhs.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal

Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-4064 or (email) *Luis.Rodriguez3@fema.dhs.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes proposed determinations of Base (1% annual-chance) Flood Elevations (BFEs) and modified BFEs for communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), in accordance with section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and 44 CFR 67.4(a).

These proposed BFEs and modified BFEs, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are minimum requirements. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities. These proposed elevations are used to meet the floodplain management requirements of the NFIP and also are used to calculate the appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings built after these elevations are made final, and for the contents in those buildings.

Correction

In the proposed rule published at 76 FR 73537, in the November 29, 2011, issue of the **Federal Register**, FEMA published a table under the authority of 44 CFR 67.4. The table, entitled "Sullivan County, Pennsylvania (All Jurisdictions)" addressed the flooding sources Big Run, Little Loyalsock Creek, Loyalsock Creek, and Muncy Creek. That table contained inaccurate information as to the location of referenced elevation, effective and modified elevation in feet, and/or communities affected for Loyalsock Creek. In this document, FEMA is publishing a table containing the accurate information, to address these prior errors. The information provided below should be used in lieu of that previously published.