Name of non-regulatory SIP revision	Applicable geographic area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation		
* Section 110(a)(2) Infra- structure Requirements for the 2012 Particulate Matter NAAQS.	* Statewide	* 7/16/15	6/16/16, [Insert <b>Federal Register</b> citation].	lowing 110(a)(2	* 015–0838. This action CAA elements, or )(A), (B), (C), (D)(i)(I (H), (J), (K), (L), and	portions thereof: I)(PSD), (D)(ii), (E),

[FR Doc. 2016–14181 Filed 6–15–16; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0124; FRL-9946-38-Region 9]

Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District

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

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) and Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District (EKAPCD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern, respectively, the definition of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and emissions of VOCs from the surface coating operations of wood products. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on August 15, 2016 without further notice, unless the EPA receives adverse comments by July 18, 2016. If we receive such comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this direct final rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0124 at http:// www.regulations.gov, or via email to Steckel. Andrew@epa.gov. For comments submitted at Regulations.gov, follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from Regulations.gov. For either manner of submission, the EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (i.e. on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the FOR

**FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <a href="http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets/">http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets</a>.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Arnold Lazarus, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3024, lazarus.arnold@epa.gov.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, "we," "us," and "our" refer to the EPA.

#### **Table of Contents**

- I. The State's Submittal
  - A. What rules did the State submit?
  - B. Are there other versions of these rules?
  - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule and rule revision?
- II. The EPA's Evaluation and Action
  - A. How is the EPA evaluating the rules?
  - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules
- D. Public Comment and Final Action III. Incorporation by Reference
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. The State's Submittal

#### A. What rules did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rules addressed by this action with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted/ amended/ revised	Submitted
EKAPCD YSAQMD		Wood Products Surface Coating Operations General Provisions and Definitions	3/13/2014 7/08/2015	7/25/2014 11/13/2015

On September 11, 2014, and January 19, 2016, the EPA determined that the submittals for EKAPCD Rule 410.9 and YSAQMD Rule 1.1 respectively 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 these rules?

There are no previous versions of Rule 410.9 in the SIP. We approved an earlier version of Rule 1.1 into the SIP on April 28, 2015 (80 FR 23449).

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule and rule revision?

VOCs help produce ground-level ozone, smog and PM, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires States to submit regulations that control VOC emissions. Rule 410.9 limits and controls VOC emission from surface coating operations of wood products. The revisions to Rule 1.1 do not have a direct effect on air pollution emissions; they amend the definition of VOC that is used in other YSAQMD rules to exempt certain substances that have been determined to have negligible photochemical reactivity and which are excluded from the definition applied by the EPA. The EPA's technical support documents (TSDs) have more information about these rules.

#### II. The EPA's Evaluation and Action

A. How is the EPA evaluating the rules?

SIP rules must be enforceable (see CAA section 110(a)(2)), must not interfere with applicable requirements concerning attainment and reasonable further progress or other CAA requirements (see CAA section 110(l)), and must not modify certain SIP control requirements in nonattainment areas without ensuring equivalent or greater emissions reductions (see CAA section 193).

Generally, SIP rules 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 of VOCs in ozone nonattainment areas classified as moderate or above (see CAA sections 182(b)(2)). The EKAPCD and the YSAQMD regulate ozone areas classified as Marginal Nonattainment and Severe Nonattainment respectively for the federal 8-hour 2008 Ozone Standard. 40 CFR 81.305. The TSDs have more information about these requirements as they relate to the submitted rules.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to evaluate enforceability, revision/relaxation and rule stringency requirements for the applicable criteria pollutants include the following:

- 1. "State Implementation Plans; General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990," (57 FR 13498, April 16, 1992 and 57 FR 18070, April 28, 1992).
- 2. "Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations" ("the Bluebook," U.S. EPA, May 25, 1988; revised January 11, 1990).
- 3. "Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule Deficiencies" ("the Little Bluebook", EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001).
- 4. Control Techniques Guidelines, "Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Wood Furniture

Manufacturing Operations' (EPA-453/R-96-007, April 1996).

- 5. Control Techniques Guidelines, "Control Techniques Guidelines for Flat Wood Paneling Coatings" (EPA-453/R-06-004, September 2006).
- 6. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Chapter C, Part 51, Subpart F, Section 51.100, "Definitions" (40 CFR 51.100).

# B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?

We believe these rules are consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, stringency and SIP relaxations. The TSDs have more information on our evaluation.

# C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules

The TSDs describe additional rule revisions that we recommend for the next time the local agency modifies the rules but which are not currently the basis for rule disapproval.

#### D. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, the EPA is fully approving the submitted rules because we believe they fulfill all relevant requirements. We do not think anyone will object to this approval, so we are finalizing it without proposing it in advance. However, in the Proposed Rules section of this issue of the Federal Register, we are simultaneously proposing approval of the same submitted rules. If we receive adverse comments by July 18, 2016, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the Federal Register to notify the public that the direct final approval will not take effect and we will address the comments in a subsequent final action based on the proposal. If we do not receive timely adverse comments, the direct final approval will be effective without further notice on August 15, 2016. This will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP.

Please note that if the EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, the EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

#### III. Incorporation by Reference

In this rule, the EPA is finalizing regulatory text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is finalizing the incorporation by reference of the EKAPCD and YSAQMD rules described in the amendments to 40 CFR part 52 set

forth below. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these documents available electronically through www.regulations.gov and in hard copy at the appropriate EPA office (see the ADDRESSES section of this preamble for more information).

## IV. 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, the EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- 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 the 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 SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where the 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 and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 et seq., as added by the Small **Business Regulatory Enforcement** Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. The EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the Federal **Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the Federal Register. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by August 15, 2016. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. Parties with objections to this direct final rule are encouraged to file a comment in response to the parallel notice of proposed rulemaking for this action published in the Proposed Rules section of today's Federal Register, rather than file an immediate petition for judicial review of this direct final rule, so that the EPA can withdraw this direct final rule and address the comment in the proposed rulemaking. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (see section 307(b)(2)).

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

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

Dated: May 3, 2016.

#### Jared Blumenfeld,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

#### PART 52—[AMENDED]

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

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

#### Subpart F—California

■ 2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraphs (c)(442)(i)(F)(3), (c)(447)(i)(D)(4), and (c)(472) to read as follows:

#### § 52.220 Identification of plan.

(c) \* \* \*

(442) \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(F) \* \* \*

(3) Previously approved on April 28, 2015 in paragraph (442)(i)(F)(1) of this section and now deleted with replacement in (472)(i)(A)(1), Rule 1.1, "General Provisions and Definitions," revised on May 8, 2013.

\* \* (447) \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(D) \* \* \*

(4) Rule 410.9, "Wood Products Surface Coating Operations," adopted on March 13, 2014.

(472) New and amended regulations were submitted on November 13, 2015, by the Governor's designee.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District.

(1) Rule 1.1, General Provisions and Definitions, revised July 8, 2015.

[FR Doc. 2016-14098 Filed 6-15-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

#### **National Oceanic and Atmospheric** Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 660

RIN 0648-XD344

#### Pacific Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean; Response to Petition for Rulemaking

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

**ACTION:** Notice of decision on petition.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS announces its decision on a petition for rulemaking submitted by the Center for Biological Diversity (CBD). In their petition, CBD requested that NMFS implement additional domestic regulations to address the relative impacts of the U.S. fleet on the Pacific bluefin tuna (PBF) stock, which is overfished and subject to overfishing. Outside of the scope of their petition for rulemaking, CBD also requested that NMFS develop recommendations for international fishery management organizations to take actions to end overfishing of PBF. In light of public comments, NMFS is responding to each element of the petition but referring the specific requests for rulemaking under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) to the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Pacific Council) for further consideration. The decision was made on June 9, 2016.

**DATES:** June 16, 2016.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Heidi Taylor, NMFS, 562-980-4039.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NMFS received a letter from CBD, an environmental non-governmental organization, on April 9, 2014. In the letter, CBD asserted that PBF (Thunnus orientalis) are not adequately protected under the Fishery Management Plan for U.S. West Coast Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species (HMS FMP) and that the Pacific Council failed to meet its statutory duty to develop recommendations for domestic regulations in response to NMFS' determination that the PBF stock is overfished and subject to overfishing (78 FR 41033, July 9, 2013). Specifically, CBD petitioned NMFS to amend the HMS FMP or initiate a rulemaking under the authority of the MSA, 16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq., to include PBF as a prohibited species until the stock is rebuilt, thereby placing a moratorium on retention of PBF by U.S. fishing vessels. As an alternative, CBD proposed that NMFS establish annual catch limits and a permanent minimum size requirement to protect PBF of age classes 1 and 2 and that NMFS amend the HMS FMP to establish specific reference points for PBF to guide science-based management of the stock. Outside of the scope of the petition for rulemaking, CBD requested that NMFS develop recommendations to the Secretary of State and Congress to end PBF overfishing at the international level.

## **Public Input on the Petition**

NMFS published a Federal Register document on July 24, 2014 (79 FR