

Note: The text of Form 5 does not, and this amendment will not, appear in the Code of Federal Regulations.

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, DC 20549

FORM 5

* * * * *

General Instructions

* * * * *

10. Optional Rule 10b5-1(c) Transaction Indication

If a transaction was made pursuant to a contract, instruction or written plan for the purchase or sale of equity securities of the issuer that satisfies the conditions of Rule 10b5-1(c) under the Exchange Act [§ 240.10b5-1(c) of this chapter], a reporting person may elect to check the Rule 10b5-1 box appearing on this Form. Additional information, such as the date of a Rule 10b5-1 plan, may be provided at the filer's option in the "Explanation of Responses" portion of the Form.

* * * * *

Check this box to indicate that a transaction was made pursuant to Rule 10b5-1(c). See Instruction 10.

* * * * *

By the Commission.

Dated: December 22, 2020.

Vanessa A. Countryman,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2020-28790 Filed 1-15-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0523; FRL-10017-10-Region 9]

Air Plan Approval; California; Feather River Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a revision to the Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD or "District") portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from surface preparation and clean-up operations. We are proposing to approve a local rule to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the "Act"). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 18, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. is EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0523 at <https://www.regulations.gov>. For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). 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 <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>. If you need assistance in a language other than English or if you are a person with disabilities who needs a reasonable accommodation at no cost to you, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine Vineyard, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105. By phone: (415) 947-4125 or by email at vineyard.christine@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 rule did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revision?
- II. The EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is the EPA evaluating the rule?
 - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. The EPA's Recommendations to Further Improve the Rule
 - D. Public Comment and Proposed Action
- III. Incorporation by Reference
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. The State's Submittal

A. What rule did the State submit?

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

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Amended	Submitted
FRAQMD	3.14	Surface Preparation and Clean-up	08/01/16	01/24/17

On April 17, 2017, the EPA determined that the submittal for FRAQMD Rule 3.14 met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

B. Are there other versions of this rule?

We approved an earlier version of Rule 3.14 into the SIP on April 23, 2015 (80 FR 22646). The FRAQMD adopted revisions to the SIP-approved version on August 1, 2016, and CARB submitted them to us on January 24, 2017.

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

Emissions of VOCs contribute to the production of ground-level ozone, (or "smog") and particulate matter, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control VOC emissions. Rule 3.14 was

revised to be consistent with the CARB Suggested Control Measure (SCM) for Automotive Coatings and Components by simplifying coating categories, lowering VOC limits and modifying recordkeeping and labeling requirements. The EPA's technical support document (TSD) has more information about this rule.

II. The EPA's Evaluation and Action

A. How is the EPA evaluating the rule?

Rules in the SIP 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 section 182(b)(2)).

CAA 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); 57 FR 18070 (April 28, 1992).
2. "Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations," EPA, May 25, 1988 (the Bluebook, revised January 11, 1990).
3. "Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule Deficiencies," EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001 (the Little Bluebook).
4. "Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Solvent Metal Cleaning," EPA-450/2-77-022, November 1977 (<http://www.epa.gov/ozonepollution/SIPToolkit/ctgs.html>)
5. "Control Techniques Guidelines for Industrial Cleaning Solvents," EPA-453/R-06-001, September 2006 (<http://www.epa.gov/ozonepollution/SIPToolkit/ctgs.html>)

B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?

The FRAQMD regulates an ozone nonattainment area classified as Severe nonattainment. The District is a bi-county agency that administers local,

state, and federal air quality management programs for Yuba and Sutter Counties. Portions of the District have been designated as Moderate or above nonattainment for failure to meet the federal 8-hour ground-level ozone standard. The submitted SIP rule does not fully meet RACT because the rule contains an exemption for any solvent degreasing operations subject to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) requirements of 40 CFR part 63, subpart T—National Emission Standards for Halogenated Solvent Cleaning. However, EPA approved a negative declaration for this category in the FRAQMD's 2008 ozone standard RACT SIP. (80 FR 38959, July 8, 2015). Therefore, Rule 3.14 does not need to meet RACT requirements. Despite this, we believe it is helpful, for informational purposes, to compare Rule 3.14 to other RACT rules in effect in other California districts. This comparison is set forth in our TSD and we believe Rule 3.14 contains RACT-level control requirements, except for the NESHAP exemption, that will strengthen the SIP. In addition, the District has submitted a negative declaration for this source category in the FRAQMD's 2015 ozone standard RACT SIP. We will evaluate the FRAQMD's 2015 ozone standard RACT SIP in a future rulemaking.

C. The EPA's Recommendations to Further Improve the Rule

The TSD also includes recommendations for the next time the local agency modifies the rule.

D. Public Comment and Proposed Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, the EPA proposes to fully approve the submitted rule because it fulfills all relevant requirements. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal until February 18, 2021. If we take final action to approve the submitted rule, our final action will incorporate this rule into the federally enforceable SIP.

III. Incorporation by Reference

In this rule, the EPA is proposing to include in a final EPA rule regulatory text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is proposing to incorporate by reference the FRAQMD Rule described in Table 1 of this preamble. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials available through <https://www.regulations.gov> and at the EPA Region IX Office (please contact the

person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** 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 proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this proposed action:

- Is not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866;
- 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 disproportionate human health or environmental effects with practical, appropriate, and legally permissible

methods under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, 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).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

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

Dated: November 23, 2020.

John Busterud,

Regional Administrator, EPA Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2021-00358 Filed 1-15-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R07-OAR-2020-0711; FRL-10019-24-Region 7]

Air Plan Approval; Kansas; Removal of Kansas City, Kansas Reid Vapor Pressure Fuel Requirement

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing approval of revision to the Kansas State Implementation Plan (SIP), submitted by the Kansas Department of Health and the Environment (KDHE) on December 9, 2020. The proposed revision removes the Kansas City, Kansas seven pounds per square inch Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP) Fuel requirement which required gasoline sold in the Kansas City, Kansas area to have a seven pounds per square inch Reid Vapor Pressure from June 1 to September 15. The rest of the state is subject to the Clean Air Act (CAA) nine pounds per square inch Reid Vapor Pressure from June 1 to September 15. If approved the Kansas City, Kansas area would be subject to the Clean Air Act Reid Vapor Pressure Fuel requirement. In addition, EPA anticipates issuing a separate proposal for the Missouri side of the Kansas City metro area.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 18, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2020-0711 to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket ID No. for this rulemaking. Comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov/>, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on sending comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the "Written Comments" heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jed Wolkins, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 Office, Air Quality Planning Branch, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219; telephone number: (913) 551-7588; email address: wolkins.jed@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

- I. Written Comments
- II. What is being addressed in this document?
- III. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?
- IV. Background
- V. What is the EPA's analysis of Kansas' SIP request?
- VI. What action is the EPA taking?
- VII. Incorporation by Reference
- VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Written Comments

Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2020-0711, at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. 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, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on

making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

II. What is being addressed in this document?

The EPA is proposing to approve a revision to the Kansas SIP, submitted by the KDHE on December 9, 2020. The proposed revision removes the Kansas City, Kansas; Johnson and Wyandotte Counties; 7.0 Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP) Fuel requirement. The approved SIP, K.A.R. 28-19-719, requires gasoline sold in the two counties to have a RVP of seven pounds per square inch (psi) or less from June 1 through September 15.¹ If the SIP revision is approved, the Kansas City, Kansas area would be subject to the CAA RVP requirement of nine psi or less from June 1 through September 15.² Kansas has asked EPA to remove K.A.R. 28-19-719 Fuel Volatility from the SIP.

III. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?

The State submission has met the public notice requirements for SIP submissions in accordance with 40 CFR 51.102. The submission also satisfied the completeness criteria of 40 CFR part 51, appendix V. The State provided public notice on this SIP revision from August 27, 2020 to November 4, 2020 and received eight comments. Kansas adequately responded to all eight comments, as noted in the State submission included in the docket for this action, but did not make any changes to the removal based on the comments received.

In addition, as explained below, the revision meets the substantive SIP requirements of the CAA, including section 110 and implementing regulations.

IV. Background

The EPA established a 1-hour ozone NAAQS in 1971.³ 36 FR 8186 (April 30, 1971). On March 3, 1978, the EPA designated Johnson and Wyandotte counties (hereinafter referred to in this document as the "Kansas City area") in nonattainment of the 1971 1-hour ozone

¹ The Kansas rule allows an additional one psi for gasoline containing 9 to 10% ethanol.

² The CAA allows an additional one psi for gasoline containing up to 15% ethanol.

³ The 1-hour ozone NAAQS was originally promulgated as a photochemical oxidant standard. See 36 FR 8186 (April 30, 1971). In 1979, the EPA substituted the word "ozone" for "photochemical oxidant". See 44 FR 8202 (February 8, 1979). In doing so, the EPA stated that "(t)he intent of the standard (total-oxidant reduction), the control strategies, and the index of progress toward attainment (measured ozone levels) remain unchanged." *Id.* at 8203.