

such immunity would not be consistent with Federal law, which is one of the criteria for immunity.”

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

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 CAA 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 CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this 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, which satisfies certain infrastructure requirements of Section 110(a)(2) of the CAA for the 2010 SO₂ NAAQS for the Commonwealth of Virginia, 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, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides.

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

Dated: August 5, 2014.

William C. Early,

Acting, Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 2014–20032 Filed 8–21–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0694; FRL–9915–64–Region 4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve the July 17, 2012, State Implementation Plan (SIP) submission, provided by the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SC DHEC) for inclusion into the South Carolina SIP. This proposal pertains to the Clean

Air Act (CAA or the Act) infrastructure requirements for the 2008 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). 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. SC DHEC certified that the South Carolina SIP contains provisions that ensure the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS is implemented, enforced, and maintained in South Carolina (hereafter referred to as an “infrastructure SIP submission”). With the exception of provisions pertaining to prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) permitting, interstate transport, and visibility protection requirements, EPA is proposing to determine that South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission, provided to EPA on July 17, 2012, addresses the required infrastructure elements for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before September 22, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0694, by one of the following methods:

1. <http://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–2012–0694,” 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:* Lynorae Benjamin, Chief, 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 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. excluding Federal holidays.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0694. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://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 <http://www.regulations.gov> or email, information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected. The <http://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 <http://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 <http://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 <http://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 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Background and Overview
- II. What elements are required under sections 110(a)(1) and (2)?
- III. What is EPA’s approach to the review of infrastructure SIP submissions?
- IV. What is EPA’s analysis of how South Carolina addressed the elements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) “infrastructure” provisions?
- V. Proposed Action
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Background and Overview

On March 27, 2008, EPA promulgated a revised NAAQS for ozone based on 8-hour average concentrations. EPA revised the level of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS to 0.075 parts per million. See 77 FR 16436. Pursuant to section 110(a)(1) of the CAA, states are required to submit SIPs meeting the applicable requirements of section 110(a)(2) within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS or within such shorter period as EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a)(2) requires states to address basic SIP elements such as requirements for monitoring, basic program requirements and legal authority that are designed 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 2011.¹

Today’s action is proposing to approve South Carolina’s infrastructure SIP submission for the applicable requirements of the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS, with the exception of the PSD permitting requirements for major sources of section 110(a)(2)(C) and (J), the interstate transport requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and (II) (prongs 1 through 4), and the visibility requirements of 110(a)(2)(J). With respect to South Carolina’s infrastructure SIP submission related to the provisions pertaining to the PSD

¹ In these infrastructure SIP submissions States generally certify evidence of compliance with sections 110(a)(1) and (2) of the CAA through a combination of state regulations and statutes, some of which have been incorporated into the federally-approved SIP. In addition, certain federally-approved, non-SIP regulations may also be appropriate for demonstrating compliance with sections 110(a)(1) and (2). Throughout this rulemaking, unless otherwise indicated, the term “Regulation” indicates that the cited regulation has been approved into South Carolina’s federally-approved SIP. The term “S.C. Code Ann.” indicates cited South Carolina state statutes, which are not a part of the SIP unless otherwise indicated.

permitting requirements for major sources of section 110(a)(2)(C) and (J), the interstate transport requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and (II), and the visibility requirements of 110(a)(2)(J), EPA is not proposing any action today regarding these requirements. EPA will act on these portions of the submission in a separate action. Further, this action is not approving any specific rule, but rather proposing that South Carolina’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 the “infrastructure” SIP requirements related to a newly established or revised NAAQS. As mentioned above, these requirements include basic SIP elements such as requirements for monitoring, basic program requirements and legal authority that are designed to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. The requirements that are the subject of this proposed rulemaking are summarized below and in EPA’s September 13, 2013, memorandum entitled “Guidance on Infrastructure State Implementation Plan (SIP) Elements under Clean Air Act Sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2).”²

² 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

- 110(a)(2)(A): Emission Limits and Other Control Measures
- 110(a)(2)(B): Ambient Air Quality Monitoring/Data System
- 110(a)(2)(C): Programs for Enforcement of Control Measures and for Construction or Modification of Stationary Sources³
- 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and (II): Interstate Pollution Transport
- 110(a)(2)(D)(ii): Interstate Pollution Abatement and International Air Pollution
- 110(a)(2)(E): Adequate Resources and Authority, Conflict of Interest, and Oversight of Local Governments and Regional Agencies
- 110(a)(2)(F): Stationary Source Monitoring and Reporting
- 110(a)(2)(G): Emergency Powers
- 110(a)(2)(H): SIP revisions
- 110(a)(2)(I): Plan Revisions for Nonattainment Areas⁴
- 110(a)(2)(J): Consultation with Government Officials, Public Notification, and Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Visibility Protection
- 110(a)(2)(K): Air Quality Modeling and Submission of Modeling Data
- 110(a)(2)(L): Permitting fees
- 110(a)(2)(M): Consultation and Participation by Affected Local Entities

III. What is EPA's approach to the review of infrastructure SIP submissions?

EPA is acting upon the SIP submission from South Carolina that addresses the infrastructure requirements of CAA sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. The requirement for states to make a SIP submission of this type arises out of CAA section 110(a)(1). Pursuant to section 110(a)(1), states must make SIP submissions “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 these SIP

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).

³ This rulemaking only addresses requirements for this element as they relate to attainment areas.

⁴ As mentioned above, this element is not relevant to today's proposed rulemaking.

submissions are to provide for the “implementation, maintenance, and enforcement” of such NAAQS. The statute directly imposes on states the duty to make these SIP submissions, and the requirement to make the submissions is not conditioned upon EPA's taking any action other than promulgating a new or revised NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) includes a list of specific elements that “[e]ach such plan” submission must address.

EPA has historically referred to these SIP submissions made for the purpose of satisfying the requirements of CAA sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) as “infrastructure SIP” submissions. Although the term “infrastructure SIP” does not appear in the CAA, EPA uses the term to distinguish this particular type of SIP submission from submissions that are intended to satisfy other SIP requirements under the CAA, such as “nonattainment SIP” or “attainment plan SIP” submissions to address the nonattainment planning requirements of part D of title I of the CAA, “regional haze SIP” submissions required by EPA rule to address the visibility protection requirements of CAA section 169A, and nonattainment new source review permit program submissions to address the permit requirements of CAA, title I, part D.

Section 110(a)(1) addresses the timing and general requirements for infrastructure SIP submissions, and section 110(a)(2) provides more details concerning the required contents of these submissions. 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 program provisions, and some of which pertain to requirements for both authority and substantive program provisions.⁵ EPA therefore believes that while the timing requirement in section 110(a)(1) is unambiguous, some of the other statutory provisions are ambiguous. In particular, EPA believes that the list of required elements for infrastructure SIP submissions provided in section 110(a)(2) contains ambiguities concerning what is required for inclusion in an infrastructure SIP submission.

⁵ For example: Section 110(a)(2)(E)(i) 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 SIP-approved program to address certain sources as required by part C of title I of the CAA; and section 110(a)(2)(G) provides that states must have legal authority to address emergencies as well as contingency plans that are triggered in the event of such emergencies.

The following examples of ambiguities illustrate the need for EPA to interpret some section 110(a)(1) and section 110(a)(2) requirements with respect to infrastructure SIP submissions for a given new or revised NAAQS. One example of ambiguity is that section 110(a)(2) requires that “each” SIP submission must meet the list of requirements therein, while EPA has long noted that this literal reading of the statute is internally inconsistent and would create a conflict with the nonattainment provisions in part D of title I of the Act, which specifically address nonattainment SIP requirements.⁶ Section 110(a)(2)(I) pertains to nonattainment SIP requirements and part D addresses when attainment plan SIP submissions to address nonattainment area requirements are due. For example, section 172(b) requires EPA to establish a schedule for submission of such plans for certain pollutants when the Administrator promulgates the designation of an area as nonattainment, and section 107(d)(1)(B) allows up to two years, or in some cases three years, for such designations to be promulgated.⁷ This ambiguity illustrates that rather than apply all the stated requirements of section 110(a)(2) in a strict literal sense, EPA must determine which provisions of section 110(a)(2) are applicable for a particular infrastructure SIP submission.

Another example of ambiguity within sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) with respect to infrastructure SIPs pertains to whether states must meet all of the infrastructure SIP requirements in a single SIP submission, and whether EPA must act upon such SIP submission in a single action. Although section 110(a)(1) directs states to submit “a plan” to meet these requirements, EPA interprets the CAA to allow states to make multiple SIP submissions separately addressing infrastructure SIP elements for the same NAAQS. If states elect to make such multiple SIP submissions to meet the infrastructure SIP requirements, EPA can elect to act

⁶ See, e.g., “Rule To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone (Clean Air Interstate Rule); Revisions to Acid Rain Program; Revisions to the NOx SIP Call; Final Rule,” 70 FR 25162, at 25163–65 (May 12, 2005) (explaining relationship between timing requirement of section 110(a)(2)(D) versus section 110(a)(2)(I)).

⁷ EPA notes that this ambiguity within section 110(a)(2) is heightened by the fact that various subparts of part D set specific dates for submission of certain types of SIP submissions in designated nonattainment areas for various pollutants. Note, e.g., that section 182(a)(1) provides specific dates for submission of emissions inventories for the ozone NAAQS. Some of these specific dates are necessarily later than three years after promulgation of the new or revised NAAQS.

on such submissions either individually or in a larger combined action.⁸ Similarly, EPA interprets the CAA to allow it to take action on the individual parts of one larger, comprehensive infrastructure SIP submission for a given NAAQS without concurrent action on the entire submission. For example, EPA has sometimes elected to act at different times on various elements and sub-elements of the same infrastructure SIP submission.⁹

Ambiguities within sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) may also arise with respect to infrastructure SIP submission requirements for different NAAQS. Thus, 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. The states' attendant infrastructure SIP submissions for each NAAQS therefore could be different. For example, the monitoring requirements that a state might need to meet in its infrastructure SIP submission for purposes of section 110(a)(2)(B) could be very different for different pollutants because the content and scope of a state's infrastructure SIP submission to meet this element might be very different for an entirely new NAAQS than for a minor revision to an existing NAAQS.¹⁰

EPA notes that interpretation of section 110(a)(2) is also necessary when EPA reviews other types of SIP submissions required under the CAA. Therefore, as with infrastructure SIP submissions, EPA also has to identify and interpret the relevant elements of section 110(a)(2) that logically apply to

these other types of SIP submissions. For example, section 172(c)(7) requires that attainment plan SIP submissions required by part D have to meet the "applicable requirements" of section 110(a)(2). Thus, for example, attainment plan SIP submissions must meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(A) regarding enforceable emission limits and control measures and section 110(a)(2)(E)(i) regarding air agency resources and authority. By contrast, it is clear that attainment plan SIP submissions required by part D would not need to meet the portion of section 110(a)(2)(C) that pertains to the PSD program required in part C of title I of the CAA, because PSD does not apply to a pollutant for which an area is designated nonattainment and thus subject to part D planning requirements. As this example illustrates, each type of SIP submission may implicate some elements of section 110(a)(2) but not others.

Given the potential for ambiguity in some of the statutory language of section 110(a)(1) and section 110(a)(2), EPA believes that it is appropriate to interpret the ambiguous portions of section 110(a)(1) and section 110(a)(2) in the context of acting on a particular SIP submission. In other words, EPA assumes that Congress could not have intended that each and every SIP submission, regardless of the NAAQS in question or the history of SIP development for the relevant pollutant, would meet each of the requirements, or meet each of them in the same way. Therefore, EPA has adopted an approach under which it reviews infrastructure SIP submissions against the list of elements in section 110(a)(2), but only to the extent each element applies for that particular NAAQS.

Historically, EPA has elected to use guidance documents to make recommendations to states for infrastructure SIPs, in some cases conveying needed interpretations on newly arising issues and in some cases conveying interpretations that have already been developed and applied to individual SIP submissions for particular elements.¹¹ EPA most recently issued guidance for infrastructure SIPs on September 13, 2013 (2013 Guidance).¹² EPA developed

this document to provide states with up-to-date guidance for infrastructure SIPs for any new or revised NAAQS. Within this guidance, EPA describes the duty of states to make infrastructure SIP submissions to meet basic structural SIP requirements within three years of promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS. EPA also made recommendations about many specific subsections of section 110(a)(2) that are relevant in the context of infrastructure SIP submissions.¹³ The guidance also discusses the substantively important issues that are germane to certain subsections of section 110(a)(2). Significantly, EPA interprets sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) such that infrastructure SIP submissions need to address certain issues and need not address others. Accordingly, EPA reviews each infrastructure SIP submission for compliance with the applicable statutory provisions of section 110(a)(2), as appropriate.

As an example, section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) is a required element of section 110(a)(2) for infrastructure SIP submissions. Under this element, a state must meet the substantive requirements of section 128, which pertain to state boards that approve permits or enforcement orders and heads of executive agencies with similar powers. Thus, EPA reviews infrastructure SIP submissions to ensure that the state's implementation plan appropriately addresses the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) and section 128. The 2013 Guidance explains EPA's interpretation that there may be a variety of ways by which states can appropriately address these substantive statutory requirements, depending on the structure of an individual state's permitting or enforcement program (e.g., whether permits and enforcement orders are approved by a multi-member board or by a head of an executive agency). However they are addressed by the state, the substantive requirements of section 128 are necessarily included in EPA's evaluation of infrastructure SIP

Air Act Sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2)," Memorandum from Stephen D. Page, September 13, 2013.

¹³ EPA's September 13, 2013, guidance did not make recommendations with respect to infrastructure SIP submissions to address section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I). EPA issued the guidance shortly after the U.S. Supreme Court agreed to review the DC Circuit decision in *EME Homer City*, 696 F.3d7 (D.C. Cir. 2012) which had interpreted the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I). In light of the uncertainty created by ongoing litigation, EPA elected not to provide additional guidance on the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) at that time. As the guidance is neither binding nor required by statute, whether EPA elects to provide guidance on a particular section has no impact on a state's CAA obligations.

⁸ See, e.g., "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Revisions to the New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR) Permitting," 78 FR 4339 (January 22, 2013) (EPA's final action approving the structural PSD elements of the New Mexico SIP submitted by the State separately to meet the requirements of EPA's 2008 PM_{2.5} NSR rule), and "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Infrastructure and Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS," (78 FR 4337) (January 22, 2013) (EPA's final action on the infrastructure SIP for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS).

⁹ On December 14, 2007, the State of Tennessee, through the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, made a SIP revision to EPA demonstrating that the State meets the requirements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2). EPA proposed action for infrastructure SIP elements (C) and (J) on January 23, 2012 (77 FR 3213) and took final action on March 14, 2012 (77 FR 14976). On April 16, 2012 (77 FR 22533) and July 23, 2012 (77 FR 42997), EPA took separate proposed and final actions on all other section 110(a)(2) infrastructure SIP elements of Tennessee's December 14, 2007 submittal.

¹⁰ For example, implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS required the deployment of a system of new monitors to measure ambient levels of that new indicator species for the new NAAQS.

¹¹ EPA notes, however, that nothing in the CAA requires EPA to provide guidance or to promulgate regulations for infrastructure SIP submissions. The CAA directly applies to states and requires the submission of infrastructure SIP submissions, regardless of whether or not EPA provides guidance or regulations pertaining to such submissions. EPA elects to issue such guidance in order to assist states, as appropriate.

¹² "Guidance on Infrastructure State Implementation Plan (SIP) Elements under Clean

submissions because section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) explicitly requires that the state satisfy the provisions of section 128.

As another example, EPA's review of infrastructure SIP submissions with respect to the PSD program requirements in sections 110(a)(2)(C), (D)(i)(II), and (J) focuses upon the structural PSD program requirements contained in part C and EPA's PSD regulations. Structural PSD program requirements include provisions necessary for the PSD program to address all regulated sources and new source review (NSR) pollutants, including greenhouse gas (GHGs). By contrast, structural PSD program requirements do not include provisions that are not required under EPA's regulations at 40 CFR 51.166 but are merely available as an option for the state, such as the option to provide grandfathering of complete permit applications with respect to the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Accordingly, the latter optional provisions are types of provisions EPA considers irrelevant in the context of an infrastructure SIP action.

For other section 110(a)(2) elements, however, EPA's review of a state's infrastructure SIP submission focuses on assuring that the state's SIP meets basic structural requirements. For example, section 110(a)(2)(C) includes, among other things, the requirement that states have a program to regulate minor new sources. Thus, EPA evaluates whether the state has an EPA-approved minor new source review program and whether the program addresses the pollutants relevant to that NAAQS. In the context of acting on an infrastructure SIP submission, however, EPA does not think it is necessary to conduct a review of each and every provision of a state's existing minor source program (*i.e.*, already in the existing SIP) for compliance with the requirements of the CAA and EPA's regulations that pertain to such programs.

With respect to certain other issues, EPA does not believe that an action on a state's infrastructure SIP submission is necessarily the appropriate type of action in which to address possible deficiencies in a state's existing SIP. These issues include: (i) existing provisions related to excess emissions from sources during periods of startup, shutdown, or malfunction that may be contrary to the CAA and EPA's policies addressing such excess emissions ("SSM"); (ii) existing provisions related to "director's variance" or "director's discretion" that may be contrary to the CAA because they purport to allow

revisions to SIP-approved emissions limits while limiting public process or not requiring further approval by EPA; and (iii) 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"). Thus, EPA believes it may approve an infrastructure SIP submission without scrutinizing the totality of the existing SIP for such potentially deficient provisions and may approve the submission even if it is aware of such existing provisions.¹⁴ It is important to note that EPA's approval of a state's infrastructure SIP submission should not be construed as explicit or implicit re-approval of any existing potentially deficient provisions that relate to the three specific issues just described.

EPA's approach to review of infrastructure SIP submissions is to identify the CAA requirements that are logically applicable to that submission. EPA believes that this approach to the review of a particular infrastructure SIP submission is appropriate, because it would not be reasonable to read the general requirements of section 110(a)(1) and the list of elements in 110(a)(2) as requiring review of each and every provision of a state's existing SIP against all requirements in the CAA and EPA regulations 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. These provisions, 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 evaluates adequacy of the infrastructure SIP submission. EPA believes that a better approach is for states and EPA to focus attention on those elements of section 110(a)(2) of the CAA most likely to warrant a specific SIP revision due to the promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS or other factors.

For example, EPA's 2013 Guidance gives simpler recommendations with

¹⁴ By contrast, EPA notes that if a state were to include a new provision in an infrastructure SIP submission that contained a legal deficiency, such as a new exemption for excess emissions during SSM events, then EPA would need to evaluate that provision for compliance against the rubric of applicable CAA requirements in the context of the action on the infrastructure SIP.

respect to carbon monoxide than other NAAQS pollutants to meet the visibility requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II), because carbon monoxide does not affect visibility. As a result, an infrastructure SIP submission for any future new or revised NAAQS for carbon monoxide need only state this fact in order to address the visibility prong of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II).

Finally, EPA believes that its approach with respect to infrastructure SIP requirements is based on a reasonable reading of sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) because the CAA provides other avenues and mechanisms to address specific substantive deficiencies in existing SIPs. These other statutory tools allow EPA to take appropriately 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 implementation plan is substantially inadequate to attain or maintain the NAAQS, to mitigate interstate transport, or to otherwise comply with the CAA.¹⁵ Section 110(k)(6) authorizes EPA to correct errors in past actions, such as past approvals of SIP submissions.¹⁶ Significantly, EPA's determination that an action on a state's infrastructure SIP submission is not the appropriate time and place to address all potential existing SIP deficiencies does not preclude EPA's subsequent reliance on provisions in section 110(a)(2) as part of the basis for action to correct those deficiencies 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 an infrastructure SIP submission, EPA believes that section 110(a)(2)(A) may be among the statutory bases that EPA relies upon in the course of addressing

¹⁵ For example, EPA issued a SIP call to Utah to address specific existing SIP deficiencies related to the treatment of excess emissions during SSM events. See "Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Utah State Implementation Plan Revisions," 74 FR 21639 (April 18, 2011).

¹⁶ EPA has used 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 section 110(k)(6) to remove numerous other SIP provisions that the Agency determined it had approved in error. See, e.g., 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).

such deficiency in a subsequent action.¹⁷

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

The South Carolina infrastructure SIP 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*: Several regulations within South Carolina's SIP are relevant to air quality control regulations. The regulations described below have been federally approved in the South Carolina SIP and include enforceable emission limitations and other control measures. Regulation 61–62.5, Standard No. 2, *Ambient Air Quality Standards* and Regulation 61–62.1, *Definitions and General Requirements*, provide enforceable emission limits and other control measures, means, and techniques. Section 48–1–50(23) of the 1976 South Carolina Code of Laws, as amended, ("S.C. Code Ann.") provides the SC DHEC with the authority to "[a]dopt emission and effluent control regulations standards and limitations that are applicable to the entire State, that are applicable only within specified areas or zones of the State, or that are applicable only when a specified class of pollutant is present." EPA has made the preliminary determination that the provisions contained in these regulations and South Carolina'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 a separate action.¹⁸ 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*: South Carolina's Air Pollution Control Regulations, Regulation 61–62.5, Standard No. 7, *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, along with the *South Carolina Network Description and Ambient Air Network Monitoring Plan*, provide for an ambient air quality monitoring system in the State. S.C. Code Ann. § 48–1–50(14) provides the Department with the necessary authority to "[c]ollect and disseminate information on air and water control." Annually, States develop and submit to EPA for approval statewide ambient monitoring network plans consistent with the requirements of 40 CFR Parts 50, 53, and 58. The annual network plan involves an evaluation of any proposed changes to the monitoring network, includes the annual ambient monitoring network design plan and a certified evaluation of the agency's ambient monitors and auxiliary support equipment.¹⁹ On July 3, 2013, South Carolina submitted its plan to EPA. On November 6, 2013, EPA approved South Carolina's monitoring network plan. South Carolina's approved monitoring network plan can be accessed at www.regulations.gov using Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0694. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina'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) *Programs for enforcement of control measures and for construction or modification of stationary sources*: In this action, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina'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 new and modified sources of emissions that contribute to ozone concentrations and the enforcement of nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) emission limits to assist in the protection of air quality in nonattainment, attainment or unclassifiable areas. Regulation 61–62.5, Standard No. 7, *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, and Regulation 61–62.5, Standard No. 7.1, *Nonattainment New Source Review*, of South Carolina's SIP pertains to the construction of any new major stationary source or any modification at an existing major stationary source in an area designated as nonattainment, attainment or unclassifiable.

Enforcement: SC DHEC's above-described, SIP-approved regulations provide for enforcement of VOC and NO_x emission limits and control measures and construction permitting for new or modified stationary sources.

Preconstruction PSD permitting for major sources: With respect to South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission related to the preconstruction PSD permitting requirements for major sources of section 110(a)(2)(C), EPA is not proposing any action today regarding these requirements and instead will act on this portion of the submission in a separate action.

Regulation of minor sources and modifications: Section 110(a)(2)(C) also requires the SIP to include provisions that govern the minor source preconstruction program that regulates emissions of the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Regulation 61–62.1, Section II, *Permit Requirements* governs the preconstruction permitting of modifications and construction of minor stationary sources.

EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices are adequate for program enforcement of control measures and regulation of minor sources and modifications related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

4. 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and (II) *Interstate pollution transport*: Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) has two components; 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II). Each of these components have two subparts resulting in four distinct components, commonly referred to as "prongs," that must be addressed in infrastructure SIP submissions. The first two prongs, which are codified in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), are provisions that prohibit any source or other type of emissions activity in one state from contributing significantly to

¹⁷ See, e.g., EPA's disapproval of 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, e.g., 75 FR 42342 at 42344 (July 21, 2010) (proposed disapproval of director's discretion provisions); 76 FR 4540 (Jan. 26, 2011) (final disapproval of such provisions).

¹⁸ On February 22, 2013, EPA published a proposed action in the *Federal Register* entitled, "State Implementation Plans: Response to Petition for Rulemaking; Findings of Substantial Inadequacy; and SIP Calls to Amend Provisions Applying to Excess Emissions During Periods of Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction; Proposed Rule."

¹⁹ On occasion, proposed changes to the monitoring network are evaluated outside of the network plan approval process in accordance with 40 CFR Part 58.

nonattainment of the NAAQS in another state (“prong 1”), and interfering with maintenance of the NAAQS in another state (“prong 2”). The third and fourth prongs, which are codified in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II), are provisions that prohibit emissions activity in one state interfering with measures required to prevent significant deterioration of air quality in another state (“prong 3”), or to protect visibility in another state (“prong 4”). With respect to South Carolina’s infrastructure SIP submission related to the interstate transport requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prongs 1 through 4), EPA is not proposing any action today regarding these requirements and instead will act on these portions of the submission in a separate action.

5. 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) *Interstate pollution abatement and international air pollution*: Section 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) requires SIPs to include provisions insuring compliance with sections 115 and 126 of the Act, relating to interstate and international pollution abatement. With regard to the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(ii), South Carolina does not have any pending obligation under sections 115 and 126 of the CAA. Additionally, Regulation 61–62.5, Standards 7 and 7.1 (q)(2)(iv), *Public Participation*, requires SC DHEC to notify air agencies “whose lands may be affected by emissions” from each new or modified major source if such emissions may significantly contribute to levels of pollution in excess of a NAAQS in any air quality control region outside of the South Carolina. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina’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 personnel, funding, and authority*: 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. EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina’s SIP as meeting the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(E). EPA’s rationale for

today’s proposal respecting each requirement of section 110(a)(2)(E) is described in turn below.

With respect to section 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii), SC DHEC develops, implements and enforces EPA-approved SIP provisions in the State. S.C. Code Ann. Section 48, Title 1, as referenced in SC DHEC’s infrastructure SIP submission, provides the Department’s general legal authority to establish a SIP and implement related plans. Specifically, S.C. Code Ann. § 48–1–50(12) grants SC DHEC the statutory authority to “[a]ccept, receive and administer grants or other funds or gifts for the purpose of carrying out any of the purposes of this chapter; [and to] accept, receive and receipt for Federal money given by the Federal government under any Federal law to the State of South Carolina for air or water control activities, surveys or programs.” S.C. Code Ann. Section 48, Title 2 grants SC DHEC statutory authority to establish environmental protection funds, which provide resources for SC DHEC to carry out its obligations under the CAA. Additionally, Regulation 61–30, *Environmental Protection Fees*, provides SC DHEC with the ability to access fees for environmental permitting programs. SC DHEC implements the SIP in accordance with the provisions of S.C. Code Ann § 1–23–40 (the Administrative Procedures Act) and S.C. Code Ann. Section 48, Title 1.

The requirements of 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii) are further confirmed when EPA performs a completeness determination for each SIP submittal. This provides additional assurances that each submittal provides evidence that adequate personnel, funding, and legal authority under State Law has been used to carry out the State’s implementation plan and related issues. This information is included in all prehearings and final SIP submittal packages for approval by EPA.

EPA also notes that annually, states update grant commitments based on current SIP requirements, air quality planning, and applicable requirements related to the NAAQS, including the ozone NAAQS. On March 11, 2014, EPA submitted a letter to South Carolina outlining 105 grant commitments and current status of these commitments for fiscal year 2013. The letter EPA submitted to South Carolina can be accessed at www.regulations.gov using Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0694. There were no outstanding issues, therefore South Carolina’s grants were finalized and closed out.

With respect to 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), South Carolina satisfies the requirements of CAA section 128(a)(1) for the SC Board

of Health and Environmental Control, which is the “board or body which approves permits and enforcement orders” under the CAA in South Carolina, through S.C. Code Ann. Section 8–13–730. S.C. Code Ann. Section 8–13–730 provides that “[u]nless otherwise provided by law, no person may serve as a member of a governmental regulatory agency that regulates business with which that person is associated,” and S.C. Code Ann. Section 8–13–700(A) which provides in part that “[n]o public official, public member, or public employee may knowingly use his official office, membership, or employment to obtain an economic interest for himself, a member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated.” S.C. Code Ann. Section 8–13–700(B)(1)–(5) provides for disclosure of any conflicts of interest by public official, public member or public employee, which meets the requirement of CAA Section 128(a)(2) that “any potential conflicts of interest . . . be adequately disclosed.” These state statutes—S.C. Code Ann. Sections 8–13–730, 8–13–700(A), and 8–13–700(B)(1)–(5)—have been approved into the South Carolina SIP as required by CAA section 128. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina has adequate resources for implementation of the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

7. 110(a)(2)(F) *Stationary source monitoring system*: SC DHEC’s infrastructure SIP submission describes the establishment of requirements for compliance testing by emissions sampling and analysis, and for emissions and operation monitoring to ensure the quality of data in the State. SC DHEC 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 SIP requirements are codified at Regulation 61–62.1, Definitions and General Requirements, which provides for an emission inventory plan that establishes reporting requirements of the South Carolina SIP. SC DHEC’s SIP requires owners or operators of stationary sources to monitor emissions, submit periodic reports of such emissions and maintain records as specified by various regulations and permits, and to evaluate reports and records for consistency with the applicable emission limitation or standard on a continuing basis over

time. The monitoring data collected and records of operations serve as the basis for a source to certify compliance, and can be used by SC DHEC as direct evidence of an enforceable violation of the underlying emission limitation or standard. Accordingly, EPA is unaware of any provision preventing the use of credible evidence in the South Carolina SIP.

Additionally, South Carolina 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. States report emissions data for the six criteria pollutants and their associated precursors—NO_x, sulfur dioxide, ammonia, lead, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and VOC. Many states also voluntarily report emissions of hazardous air pollutants. South Carolina made its latest update to the 2011 NEI on April 8, 2014. 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/chief/einformation.html>. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices are adequate for the stationary source monitoring systems related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(F).

8. 110(a)(2)(G) *Emergency powers:* This section requires that states demonstrate authority comparable with section 303 of the CAA and adequate contingency plans to implement such authority. Regulation 61–62.3, Air Pollution Episodes, provides for contingency measures when an air pollution episode or exceedance may lead to a substantial threat to the health or persons in the state or region. S.C. Code Ann. Section 48–1–290 provides SC DHEC, with concurrent notice to the Governor, the authority to issue an order recognizing the existence of an emergency requiring immediate action as deemed necessary by SC DHEC to

protect the public health or property. Any person subject to this order is required to comply immediately. Additionally, S.C. Code Ann. Section 1–23–130 provides the Department with the authority to establish emergency regulations. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP, state laws and practices are adequate for emergency powers related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(G).

9. 110(a)(2)(H) *Future SIP revisions:* As previously discussed, SC DHEC is responsible for adopting air quality rules and revising SIPs as needed to attain or maintain the NAAQS. South Carolina 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. Additionally, S.C. Code Ann. Section 48, Title 1, provides SC DHEC with the necessary authority to revise the SIP to accommodate changes in the NAAQS and thus revise the SIP as appropriate. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina adequately demonstrates a commitment to provide future SIP revisions related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(H).

10. 110(a)(2)(J) *Consultation with government officials, public notification, and PSD and visibility protection:* EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS with respect to the general requirement in section 110(a)(2)(J) 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. With respect to South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission related to the preconstruction PSD permitting and visibility protection requirements, EPA is not proposing any action today regarding these requirements and instead will act on these portions of the submission in a separate action. EPA's rationale for applicable consultation requirements of section 121 and the public notification requirements of section 127 is described below.

110(a)(2)(J) (121 consultation) *Consultation with government officials:* Regulation 61–62.5, Standard No. 7, *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, as well as the State's 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. South Carolina adopted state-wide consultation procedures for the implementation of transportation conformity. These consultation procedures were developed in coordination with the transportation partners in the State and are consistent with the approaches used for development of mobile inventories for SIPs. Implementation of transportation conformity as outlined in the consultation procedures requires SC DHEC to consult with federal, state and local transportation and air quality agency officials on the development of motor vehicle emissions budgets. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with government officials related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(J) consultation with government officials.

110(a)(2)(J) (127 public notification) *Public notification:* 61–62.3, *Air Pollution Episodes*, requires that SC DHEC notify the public of any air pollution episode or NAAQS violation. Regulation 61–62.5, Standard 7.1 (q), *Public Participation*, notifies the public by advertisement in a newspaper of general circulation in each region in which a proposed plant or modifications will be constructed of the degree of increment consumption that is expected from the plant or modification, and the opportunity for comment at a public hearing as well as written public comment. An opportunity for a public hearing for interested persons to appear and submit written or oral comments on the air quality impact of the plant or modification, alternatives to the plant or modification, the control technology required, and other appropriate considerations is also offered.

EPA also notes that SC DHEC maintains a Web site that provides the public with notice of the health hazards associated with ozone NAAQS exceedances, measures the public can take to help prevent such exceedances, and the ways in which the public can participate in the regulatory process. See <http://www.scdhec.gov/HomeAndEnvironment/Air/MostCommonPollutants/Ozone/>. EPA has made the preliminary determination

that South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to provide public notification related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS when necessary. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(J) public notification.

11. 110(a)(2)(K) *Air quality and modeling/data*: Regulations 61–62.5, Standards No. 2, *Ambient Air Quality Standards*, and Regulation 61–62.5, Standard No. 7, *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, of the South Carolina SIP specify that required air modeling be conducted in accordance with 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W “Guideline on Air Quality Models,” as incorporated into the South Carolina SIP. These standards demonstrate that South Carolina has the authority to provide relevant data for the purpose of predicting the effect on ambient air quality of the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Additionally, South Carolina 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, South Carolina's air quality regulations and practices demonstrate that SC DHEC has the authority to provide relevant data for the purpose of predicting the effect on ambient air quality of any emissions of any pollutant for which a NAAQS had been promulgated, and to provide such information to the EPA Administrator upon request. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina'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. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(K).

12. 110(a)(2)(L) *Permitting fees*: This section requires the SIP to direct the owner or operator of each major stationary source to pay to the permitting authority, as a condition of any permit required under the CAA, a fee sufficient to cover (i) the reasonable costs of reviewing and acting upon any application for such a permit, and (ii) if the owner or operator receives a permit for such source, the reasonable costs of implementing and enforcing the terms and conditions of any such permit (not including any court costs or other costs associated with any enforcement action), until such fee requirement is superseded with respect to such sources

by the Administrator's approval of a fee program under title V.

Section 48–2–50 of the South Carolina Code prescribes that SC DHEC charge fees for environmental programs it administers pursuant to federal and state law and regulations including those that govern the costs to review, implement and enforce PSD and NNSR permits. Regulation 61–30, *Environmental Protection Fees*²⁰ prescribes fees applicable to applicants and holders of permits, licenses, certificates, certifications, and registrations, establishes procedures for the payment of fees, provides for the assessment of penalties for nonpayment, and establishes an appeals process for refunding fees. This regulation may be amended as needed to meet the funding requirements of the state's permitting program. Additionally, South Carolina has a federally-approved title V program, Regulation 61–62.70, *Title V Operating Permit Program*²¹, which implements and enforces the requirements of PSD and nonattainment NSR for facilities once they begin operating. EPA has made the preliminary determination that South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately provide for permitting fees related to the 2008 8-hour NAAQS when necessary. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(L).

13. 110(a)(2)(M) *Consultation/participation by affected local entities*: Regulation 61–62.5, Standard No. 7, *Prevention of Significant Deterioration*, of the South Carolina SIP requires that SC DHEC 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, SC DHEC 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 South Carolina's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with affected local entities related to the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Accordingly, EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's

infrastructure SIP submission with respect to section 110(a)(2)(M).

V. Proposed Action

As described above, with the exception of the PSD permitting requirements for major sources of section 110(a)(2)(C) and (J), the interstate transport requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and (II) (prongs 1 through 4), and the visibility requirements of 110(a)(2)(J), EPA is proposing to approve South Carolina's July 12, 2012, SIP submission to incorporate provisions into the South Carolina SIP to address infrastructure requirements for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA is proposing to approve these portions of South Carolina's infrastructure submission for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS because this 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);

²⁰ This regulation has not been incorporated into the federally-approved SIP.

²¹ Title V program regulations are federally-approved but not incorporated into the federally-approved SIP.

- 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 action for the state of South Carolina does not have Tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). The Catawba Indian Nation Reservation is located within the State of South Carolina. Pursuant to the Catawba Indian Claims Settlement Act, S.C. Code Ann. 27–16–120, “all state and local environmental laws and regulations apply to the [Catawba Indian Nation] and Reservation and are fully enforceable by all relevant state and local agencies and authorities.” However, EPA has determined that because this proposed rule does not have substantial direct effects on an Indian Tribe because, as noted above, this action is not approving any specific rule, but rather proposing that South Carolina’s already approved SIP meets certain CAA requirements. EPA notes today’s action 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, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: August 11, 2014.

Heather McTeer Toney,

Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2014–20039 Filed 8–21–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 300

[Docket No. 130703588–4658–01]

RIN 0648–BD44

International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Restrictions regarding the Oceanic Whitetip Shark, the Whale Shark, and the Silky Shark

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS proposes regulations under authority of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act (WCPFC Implementation Act) to implement decisions of the Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (Commission or WCPFC) on fishing restrictions related to the oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*), the whale shark (*Rhincodon typus*), and the silky shark (*Carcharhinus falciformis*). The regulations would apply to owners and operators of U.S. fishing vessels used for commercial fishing for highly migratory species (HMS) in the area of application of the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (Convention). The regulations for oceanic whitetip sharks and silky sharks would prohibit the retention, transshipment, storage, or landing of oceanic whitetip sharks or silky sharks and would require the release of any oceanic whitetip shark or silky shark as soon as possible after it is caught, with as little harm to the shark as possible. The regulations for whale sharks would prohibit setting a purse seine on a whale shark and would specify certain measures to be taken and reporting requirements in the event a whale shark is encircled in a purse seine net. This action is necessary for the United States to satisfy its obligations under the Convention, to which it is a Contracting Party.

DATES: Comments must be submitted in writing by October 6, 2014.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on this proposed rule, identified by

NOAA–NMFS–2014–0086, and the regulatory impact review (RIR) prepared for this proposed rule, by either of the following methods:

- **Electronic Submission:** Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2014-0086, click the “Comment Now!” icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.

- **Mail:** Submit written comments to Michael D. Tosatto, Regional Administrator, Pacific Islands Regional Office, NOAA Inouye Regional Center, 1845 Wasp Blvd., Building 176, Honolulu, HI 96818.

Instructions: Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, might not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on www.regulations.gov without change. All personal identifying information (e.g., name and address), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter “N/A” in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous). Attachments to electronic comments will be accepted in Microsoft Word, Excel, or Adobe PDF file formats only.

An initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA) prepared under authority of the Regulatory Flexibility Act is included in the Classification section of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this proposed rule.

Copies of the RIR and the Environmental Assessment (EA) are available at www.regulations.gov or may be obtained from Michael D. Tosatto, NMFS PIRO (see address above).

Written comments regarding the burden-hour estimates or other aspects of the collection-of-information requirements contained in this proposed rule may be submitted to Michael D. Tosatto, Regional Administrator, NMFS PIRO (see address above) and by email to OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov or fax to 202–395–7285.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rini Ghosh, NMFS PIRO, 808–725–5033.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background on the Convention

A map showing the boundaries of the area of application of the Convention (Convention Area), which comprises the majority of the western and central