

because these aspects of the submission are consistent with section 110 of the CAA. EPA will address those portions of North Carolina's infrastructure SIP submission not acted upon through this notice in a separate action.

## VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

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

- Is not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);
- does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and
- does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, the North Carolina SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area

where EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor will it impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, and Recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: November 7, 2014.

**V. Anne Heard,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

[FR Doc. 2014-27504 Filed 11-19-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0772; FRL-9919-09-Region 4]

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Inspection and Maintenance Program Updates

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of North Carolina, through the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources on January 31, 2008, May 24, 2010, October 11, 2013, and February 11, 2014, pertaining to rules for changes for the North Carolina Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) program. Specifically, these SIP revisions update the North Carolina I/M program as well as repeal one rule from the federally-approved SIP.

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

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0772, by one of the following methods:

1. [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov): Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
2. Email: [R4-RDS@epa.gov](mailto:R4-RDS@epa.gov).
3. Fax: (404) 562-9019.
4. Mail: "EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0772," 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-2013-0772. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at [www.regulations.gov](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 [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or email, information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected. The [www.regulations.gov](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 [www.regulations.gov](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 [www.regulations.gov](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 [www.regulations.gov](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 Ward, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. The telephone number is (404) 562–9140. Ms. Ward can be reached via electronic mail at [ward.nacosta@epa.gov](mailto:ward.nacosta@epa.gov). For information regarding the I/M program, contact Ms. Amanetta Somerville, Air Quality Modeling and Transportation Section, at the same address above. Telephone number: (404) 562–9025; email address: [somerville.amanetta@epa.gov](mailto:somerville.amanetta@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information see the associated direct final rule which is published in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this rule by December 22, 2014, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments by December 22, 2014, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all relevant adverse comments received during the public comment period will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this document must do so by December 22, 2014.

Dated: October 23, 2014.

**V. Anne Heard,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.*  
[FR Doc. 2014–27027 Filed 11–19–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 54

[WC Docket No. 10–90; DA 14–1499]

### Proposed Methodology for Connect America High-Cost Universal Service Support Recipients To Measure and Report Speed and Latency Performance to Fixed Locations

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Wireline Competition Bureau, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, and the Office of Engineering and Technology seek to further develop the record on how compliance with speed obligations should be determined for recipients of high-cost support that deploy broadband networks to serve fixed locations.

**DATES:** Comments due December 22, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested parties may file comments on or before December 22, 2014. All pleadings are to reference WC Docket No. 10–90. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies, by any of the following methods:

- Electronic Filers: Comments may be filed electronically using the Internet by accessing the ECFS: <http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs2/>.
- Paper Filers: Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing.
- People with Disabilities: To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov) or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (tty).

For detailed instructions for submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alexander Minard, Wireline Competition Bureau at (202) 418–7400 or TTY (202) 418–0484.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Wireline Competition Bureau's Public Notice (Notice) in WC Docket No. 10–90; DA 14–1499, released October 16, 2014. The complete text of this document is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference

Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554. The document may also be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc., 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone (800) 378–3160 or (202) 863–2893, facsimile (202) 863–2898, or via Internet at <http://www.bcpweb.com>.

## I. Introduction

1. In this document, the Wireline Competition Bureau, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, and the Office of Engineering and Technology (together, the Bureaus) seek to further develop the record on how compliance with speed (also referred to as bandwidth) obligations should be determined for recipients of high-cost support that deploy broadband networks to serve fixed locations. In addition, the Bureaus seek comment on whether the same testing methodologies adopted for price cap carriers accepting model-based Phase II support should be applied to other recipients of support to serve fixed locations, such as rate-of-return providers and those that are awarded Connect America support through a competitive bidding process. Finally, the Bureaus seek comment on the circumstances that would trigger an audit of the speed and latency metrics.

## II. Measuring Compliance With Service Obligations

### A. Speed Performance Measurement

2. The record received in response to the 2011 *USF/ICC Transformation Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 76 FR 73830, November 29, 2011 and 76 FR 78384, December 16, 2011, on the methodology to be implemented for testing compliance with service obligations was not well developed. The Bureaus now seek to refresh the record on the methodology to be used for demonstrating compliance with the speed obligation for ETCs that receive high cost support to deploy broadband networks to fixed locations. Should internal network management system (NMS) tools be used to measure speed performance? Alternatively, should external measurement tools such as Speedtest/Ookla or Network Diagnostic Tests (NDT) by M-Labs? Are there better and more reliable methods of measuring speed?

3. Internal NMS tools vary among providers. How can the Commission ensure that internal NMS tool measurements are valid? Will such tools account for multiple transmission