

**Subpart F—California**

■ 2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraphs (c)(231)(i)(B) (9) and (c)(447)(i)(D)(5) to read as follows:

**§ 52.220 Identification of plan.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*  
(231) \* \* \*  
(i) \* \* \*  
(B) \* \* \*

(9) Previously approved on November 13, 1998 in paragraph (c)(231)(i)(B)(4) and now deleted with replacement in (c)(447)(i)(D)(5) Rule 410.4A amended on March 7, 1996.

\* \* \* \* \*

(447) \* \* \*  
(i) \* \* \*  
(D) \* \* \*

(5) Rule 410.4A, “Motor Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Refinishing Operations,” amended on March 13, 2014.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2016–17192 Filed 7–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2016–0347; FRL–9949–42–OAR]

**Extension of Deadline for Action on the Section 126 Petition From Connecticut**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** In this action, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is determining that 60 days is insufficient time to complete the technical and other analyses and public notice-and-comment process required for our review of a petition submitted by the state of Connecticut pursuant to section 126 of the Clean Air Act (CAA). The petition requests that the EPA make a finding that the Brunner Island Steam Electric Station located in York County, Pennsylvania, emits air pollution that significantly contributes to nonattainment and interferes with maintenance of the 2008 ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) in Connecticut. Under section 307(d)(10) of CAA, the EPA is authorized to grant a time extension for responding to the petition if the EPA determines that the extension is necessary to afford the public, and the agency, adequate opportunity to carry

out the purposes of the section 307(d)'s notice-and-comment rulemaking requirements. By this action, the EPA is making that determination. The EPA is therefore extending the deadline for acting on the petition to no later than January 25, 2017.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective on July 25, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2016–0347. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information 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 electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Gobeail McKinley, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (C504–04), U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709, telephone number (919) 541–5246, email: [mckinley.gobeail@epa.gov](mailto:mckinley.gobeail@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Background and Legal Requirements for Interstate Air Pollution**

This is a procedural action to extend the deadline for the EPA to respond to a petition from the state of Connecticut filed pursuant to CAA section 126(b). The EPA received the petition on June 1, 2016. The petition requests that the EPA make a finding under section 126(b) of the CAA that the Brunner Island Steam Electric Station located in York County, Pennsylvania is operating in a manner that emits air pollutants in violation of the provisions of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) of the CAA with respect to the 2008 ozone NAAQS.

Section 126(b) of the CAA authorizes states to petition the EPA to find that a major source or group of stationary sources in upwind states emits or would emit any air pollutant in violation of the prohibition of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)<sup>1</sup> by contributing significantly to nonattainment or maintenance problems in downwind states. Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) of the

<sup>1</sup> The text of CAA section 126 codified in the United States Code cross references CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) instead of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i). The courts have confirmed that this is a scrivener's error and the correct cross reference is to CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i). See *Appalachian Power Co. v. EPA*, 249 F.3d 1032, 1040–44 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

CAA prohibits emissions of any air pollutant in amounts which will contribute significantly to nonattainment in, or interfere with maintenance by, any other state with respect to any NAAQS. The petition asserts that emissions from Brunner Island's three major boiler units are linked to downwind nonattainment and maintenance ozone receptor sites in Connecticut for the 2008 ozone NAAQS and that this impact would be mitigated by regulation of nitrogen oxide emissions at the plant or shutting down the plant.

Pursuant to CAA section 126(b), the EPA must make the finding requested in the petition, or must deny the petition, within 60 days of its receipt. Under CAA section 126(c), any existing sources for which the EPA makes the requested finding must cease operations within 3 months of the finding, except that the source may continue to operate if it complies with emission limitations and compliance schedules (containing increments of progress) that the EPA may provide to bring about compliance with the applicable requirements as expeditiously as practical but no later than 3 years from the date of the finding.

CAA section 126(b) further provides that the EPA must hold a public hearing on the petition. The EPA's action under section 126 is also subject to the procedural requirements of CAA section 307(d). See CAA section 307(d)(1)(N). One of these requirements is notice-and-comment rulemaking, under section 307(d)(3)–(6).

In addition, CAA section 307(d)(10) provides for a time extension, under certain circumstances, for a rulemaking subject to CAA section 307(d). Specifically, CAA section 307(d)(10) provides:

Each statutory deadline for promulgation of rules to which this subsection applies which requires promulgation less than six months after date of proposal may be extended to not more than six months after date of proposal by the Administrator upon a determination that such extension is necessary to afford the public, and the agency, adequate opportunity to carry out the purposes of the subsection.

CAA section 307(d)(10) may be applied to section 126 rulemakings because the 60-day time limit under CAA section 126(b) necessarily limits the period for promulgation of a final rule after proposal to less than 6 months.

**II. Final Rule****A. Rule**

In accordance with CAA section 307(d)(10), the EPA is determining that

the 60-day period afforded by CAA section 126(b) for responding to the petition from the state of Connecticut is not adequate to allow the public and the agency the opportunity to carry out the purposes of CAA section 307(d). Specifically, the 60-day period is insufficient for the EPA to complete the necessary technical review, develop an adequate proposal, and allow time for notice and comment, including an opportunity for public hearing, on a proposed finding regarding whether the Brunner Island Steam Electric Station identified in the CAA section 126 petition contributes significantly to nonattainment or interferes with maintenance of the 2008 ozone NAAQS in Connecticut. Moreover, the 60-day period is insufficient for the EPA to review and develop response to any public comments on a proposed finding, or testimony supplied at a public hearing, and to develop and promulgate a final finding in response to the petition. The EPA is in the process of determining an appropriate schedule for action on the CAA section 126 petition. This schedule must afford the EPA adequate time to prepare a proposal that clearly elucidates the issues to facilitate public comment, and must provide adequate time for the public to comment and for the EPA to review and develop responses to those comments prior to issuing the final rule. As a result of this extension, the deadline for the EPA to act on the petition is January 25, 2017.

#### *B. Notice and Comment Under the Administrative Procedures Act (APA)*

This document is a final agency action, but may not be subject to the notice-and-comment requirements of the APA, 5 U.S.C. 553(b). The EPA believes that, because of the limited time provided to make a determination, the deadline for action on the CAA section 126 petition should be extended pursuant to section 307(d)(10) of CAA. Congress may not have intended a CAA section 307(d)(10) extension determination to be subject to notice-and-comment rulemaking. However, to the extent that this extension determination otherwise would require notice and opportunity for public comment, there is good cause within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B) not to apply those requirements here. Providing for notice and comment of this extension determination under section 307(d)(10) of CAA would be impracticable because of the limited time provided for making this determination, and would be contrary to the public interest because it would divert agency resources from the

substantive review of the CAA section 126 petition.

#### *C. Effective Date Under the APA*

This action is effective on July 25, 2016. Under the APA, 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), agency rulemaking may take effect before 30 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** if the agency has good cause to mandate an earlier effective date. This action—a deadline extension—must take effect immediately because its purpose is to extend by 6 months the deadline for action on the petition. As discussed earlier, the EPA intends to use the 6-month extension period to develop a proposal on the petition and provide time for public comment before issuing the final rule. It would not be possible for the EPA to complete the required notice and comment and public hearing process within the original 60-day period noted in the statute. These reasons support an immediate effective date.

### **III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

#### *A. Executive Orders 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory*

This action is exempt from review by the Office of Management and Budget because it simply extends the date for the EPA to take action on a petition.

#### *B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)*

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the PRA. This good cause final action simply extends the date for the EPA to take action on a petition and does not impose any new obligations or enforceable duties on any state, local or tribal governments or the private sector. It does not contain any recordkeeping or reporting requirements.

#### *C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)*

This action is not subject to the RFA. The RFA applies only to rules subject to notice-and-comment rulemaking requirements under the APA, 5 U.S.C. 553, or any other statute. This rule is not subject to notice-and-comment requirements because the agency has invoked the APA “good cause” exemption under 5 U.S.C. 553(b).

#### *D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)*

This action does not contain any unfunded mandate of \$100 million or more as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The action imposes no enforceable duty on

any state, local or tribal governments or the private sector.

#### *E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism*

This action does not have federalism implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

#### *F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments*

This action does not have tribal implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175. This good cause final action simply extends the date for the EPA to take action on a petition. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule.

#### *G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks*

The EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that concern environmental health or safety risks that the EPA has reason to believe may disproportionately affect children, per the definition of “covered regulatory action” in section 2–202 of the Executive Order. This action is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not concern an environmental health risk or safety risk.

#### *H. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use*

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211, because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

#### *I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)*

This rulemaking does not involve technical standards.

#### *J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*

The EPA believes that this action is not subject to Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994) because it does not establish an environmental health or safety standard. This good cause final action simply extends the date for the EPA to take action on a petition and does not have any impact on human health or the environment.

#### *K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)*

This action is subject to the CRA, and the EPA will submit a rule report to

each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. The CRA allows the issuing agency to make a rule effective sooner than otherwise provided by the CRA if the agency makes a good cause finding that notice-and-comment rulemaking procedures are impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest (5 U.S.C. 808(2)). The EPA has made a good cause finding for this rule as discussed in Section II.B of this document, including the basis for that finding.

#### IV. Statutory Authority

The statutory authority for this action is provided by sections 110, 126 and 307 of the CAA as amended (42 U.S.C. 7410, 7426 and 7607).

#### V. Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, judicial review of this final rule is available only by the filing of a petition for review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by September 23, 2016. Under section 307(b)(2) of the CAA, the requirements that are the subject of this final rule may not be challenged later in civil or criminal proceedings brought by us to enforce these requirements.

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

Environmental protection, Administrative practices and procedures, Air pollution control, Electric utilities, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Sulfur dioxide.

Dated: July 14, 2016.

**Gina McCarthy,**  
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2016-17412 Filed 7-22-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0708; FRL-9949-47-Region 9]

#### Clean Data Determination for 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standards; California—South Coast; Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to determine that the South Coast air quality planning area in California has attained the 1997 annual and 24-hour

fine particle (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standards. This determination is based upon complete (or otherwise validated), quality-assured and certified ambient air monitoring data showing that the area has monitored attainment of the 1997 annual and 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS based on the 2011–2013 monitoring period, and that all complete data available since that time period indicate that the area continues to attain. Based on the above determination, the requirements for this area to submit certain state implementation plan (SIP) revisions related to attainment shall be suspended for so long as the area continues to attain the 1997 annual and 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on August 24, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0708. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., confidential business information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted materials, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available through <http://www.regulations.gov>, or please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section for additional availability information.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Wienke Tax, (415) 947-4192, or by email at [tax.wienke@epa.gov](mailto:tax.wienke@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, wherever “we”, “us” or “our” are used, we mean the EPA.

#### Table of Contents

- I. Summary of Proposed Action
- II. Evaluation of 2014 and 2015 Data
- III. Public Comments and the EPA’s Responses
- IV. Final Action
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. Summary of Proposed Action

On December 9, 2014 (79 FR 72999), the EPA proposed to determine that the Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin (“South Coast”) nonattainment area had attained the 1997 annual and 24-hour national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS or “standards”) for fine particles (generally referring to particles less than or equal to 2.5 micrometers in diameter, PM<sub>2.5</sub>) (“1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub>

NAAQS”).<sup>1</sup> Herein, we refer to our December 9, 2014 proposed rule as the “proposed rule.”

In our proposed rule, we explained that in making an attainment determination, the EPA generally relies on complete, quality-assured and certified data gathered at State and Local Air Monitoring Stations (SLAMS) and entered into the EPA’s Air Quality System (AQS) database.<sup>2</sup> Under 40 CFR 50.7 (“National primary and secondary ambient air quality standards for PM<sub>2.5</sub>”) and appendix N to 40 CFR part 50 (“Interpretation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for PM<sub>2.5</sub>”), the 1997 annual and 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS is met when each monitoring site in the area has a design value at or below the standard.<sup>3 4</sup>

The EPA proposed the determination of attainment for the South Coast area based upon a review of the monitoring network operated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the data collected at the monitoring sites operating during the most recent three-year period from which data was available at the time of the proposed rule (*i.e.*, 2011 to 2013). Based on this review, the EPA found that complete (or otherwise validated), quality-assured and certified data for the South Coast showed that the annual and 24-hour design values for the 2011–2013 period were equal to or less than 15 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m<sup>3</sup>) and 65 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, respectively, at all monitoring sites and that, therefore, the South Coast had attained the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. See the data summary tables on pages 73003 and 73004 of our proposed rule.

In conjunction with and based upon our proposed determination that the South Coast had attained the standard,

<sup>1</sup> The South Coast includes Orange County, the southwestern two-thirds of Los Angeles County, southwestern San Bernardino County, and western Riverside County (see 40 CFR 81.305).

<sup>2</sup> AQS is EPA’s repository for ambient air quality data. Data completeness requirements for a given year are met when at least 75 percent of the scheduled sampling days for each quarter have valid data.

<sup>3</sup> The annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard design value is the 3-year average of annual mean concentration, and the 1997 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS is met when the annual standard design value at each eligible monitoring site is less than or equal to 15.0 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. In 2012, we established a more stringent annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS of 12.0 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, 78 FR 3086 (January 15, 2013) (“2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS”), but the 1997 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS remains in effect.

<sup>4</sup> The 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard design value is the 3-year average of annual 98th percentile 24-hour average values recorded at each eligible monitoring site, and the 1997 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS is met when the 24-hour standard design value at each monitoring site is less than or equal to 65 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. In 2006, we established a more stringent 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS of 35 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, 71 FR 61144 (October 17, 2006) (“2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS”), but the 1997 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS remains in effect.