

These comments will be considered before taking final action.

IV. Incorporation by Reference

In this document, 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, EPA is proposing to incorporate by reference certain subsections of 25 Pa. Code Chapters 121 (General Provisions) and 127 (Construction, Modification, Reactivation and Operation of Sources) as identified and discussed in Section II of this preamble.

EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials generally available through <https://www.regulations.gov> and at the EPA Region III Office (please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble for more information).

V. 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 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 it is not a significant regulatory action 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 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 rulemaking, pertaining to Pennsylvania's NNSR requirements under the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, 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, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: March 3, 2021.

Diana Esher,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 2021-04824 Filed 3-8-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0543; FRL-10020-96-Region 9]

Air Plan Approval; California; El Dorado County Air Quality Management District; South Coast Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve revisions to the El Dorado County Air

Quality Management District (EDCAQMD) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) from architectural coatings and a rule that provides definitions for certain terms that are necessary for the implementation of local rules that regulate sources of air pollution. We are proposing to approve the rules 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: Any comments must arrive by April 8, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0543 at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to Arnold Lazarus, at lazarus.arnold@epa.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). 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 <http://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Arnold Lazarus, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105. By phone: (415) 972-3024 or by email at 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 rules?
- 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 Proposed Action

- III. Incorporation by Reference
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

I. The State's Submittal

A. What rules did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rules addressed by this proposal with the dates that they

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Revised/ amended	Submitted
EDCAQMD	215	Architectural Coatings	08/25/2020	09/21/2020
SCAQMD	102	Definition of Terms	01/10/2020	09/16/2020

On November 9, 2020, the EPA determined that the submittals for EDCAQMD Rule 215 and SCAQMD Rule 102 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 is a previous version of EDCAQMD Rule 215 in the SIP, which was adopted on September 27, 1994, submitted to EPA by CARB on November 30, 1994, and approved into the SIP on January 1, 1996 (61 FR 37390).

There is a previous version of SCAQMD Rule 102 in the SIP, which was amended on December 3, 2004, submitted to EPA by CARB on June 16, 2006, and approved into the SIP on January 8, 2007 (72 FR 656).

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rules?

VOCs contribute to the production of ground-level ozone, 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. Architectural coatings are coatings that are applied to stationary structures and their accessories. They include house paints, stains, industrial maintenance coatings, traffic coatings, and many other products. VOCs are emitted from the coatings during application and curing, and from the associated solvents used for thinning and clean-up.

The EDCAQMD Rule 215 controls VOC emissions from architectural coatings by establishing VOC limits on architectural coatings supplied, sold, offered for sale, manufactured, blended, or repackaged for use within the EDCAQMD, as well as architectural coatings applied or solicited for application within the District. The revisions to Rule 215 include aligning

the rule with CARB's "Suggested Control Measure for Architectural Coatings," approved in 2007, and lowering many of the rule's VOC limits. The technical support document (TSD) has more information about this rule.

The purpose of the submitted rule revisions for SCAQMD Rule 102 is to clarify and update definitions in the rule. The revisions, submitted on September 16, 2020, add the following five compounds to the list of exempt compounds:

- Methyl formate
- propylene carbonate
- 1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane (HFC-227ea)
- trans-1,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene (HFO-1234ze)
- trans-1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene (HFO-1233zd)¹

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 section 182(b)(2)). The EDCAQMD has been designated as Severe nonattainment for

¹ The Environmental Protection Agency lists this compound as *trans* 1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoroprop-1-ene. See 40 CFR 51.100(s)(1). It is identical to the version that SCAQMD lists. They both have the same Chemical Abstract Services registry number of 102687-65-0 and molecular formula of C₃H₂ClF₃.

the 1997 and the 2008 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and Moderate for the 2015 8-hour ozone NAAQS (40 CFR 81.305). Because there is no relevant EPA CTG document for architectural coatings and because there are no major architectural coating sources within the EDCAQMD, architectural coatings are not subject to RACT requirements. However, architectural coatings are subject to other VOC content limits and control measures described in the TSD. The SCAQMD regulates an ozone nonattainment area classified as Extreme for the 1997, 2008 and 2015 8-hour ozone NAAQS (40 CFR 81.305). However, the revisions to the SCAQMD definitions rule do not have a direct effect on air pollution emissions and are intended to improve clarity and enforceability of other SCAQMD rules, and thus are not subject to RACT requirements.

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. National Volatile Organic Compound Emission Standards for Architectural Coatings, 40 CFR 59, Subpart D.
5. CARB "Suggested Control Measure for Architectural Coatings," Approved 2007.
6. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Chapter C, Part 51, Subpart F, § Section 51.100 (s) (1), "Definitions" (40 CFR 51.100).

B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?

These rules are consistent with CAA requirements and relevant guidance regarding enforceability, stringency, and SIP revisions. The TSDs have more information on our evaluation.

C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules

The TSD for Rule 215 describes a suggested rule revision that we recommend 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 rules because they fulfill all relevant requirements. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal until April 8, 2021. If we take final action to approve the submitted rules, our final action will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP.

III. Incorporation by Reference

In these rules, 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 EDCAQMD Rule 215 and the SCAQMD Rule 102 described in Table 1 of this preamble. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials available through 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);

- 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, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: February 26, 2021.

Deborah Jordan,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2021-04585 Filed 3-8-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 21-50; RM-11875; DA 21-159; FR ID 17524]

Television Broadcasting Cape Girardeau, Missouri

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed Rule.

SUMMARY: The Video Division has before it a petition for rulemaking filed November 27, 2020 (Petition) by Gray Television Licensee, LLC (Petitioner), the licensee of KFVS-TV (CBS), channel 11 (KFVS or Station), Cape Girardeau, Missouri. The Petitioner requests the substitution of channel 32 for channel 11 at Cape Girardeau, Missouri in the DTV Table of Allotments. In support of its channel substitution request, the Petitioner states that the Commission has recognized that VHF channels have certain propagation characteristics which may cause reception issues for some viewers, and also that the "reception of VHF signals require larger antennas . . . relative to UHF channels." According to the Petitioner, "many of its viewers experience significant difficulty receiving KFVS-TV's signal" and its channel substitution proposal will allow KFVS "to deliver a more reliable over-the-air signal to viewers." The Petitioner further states that operation on channel 32 will not result in any predicted loss of service and would result in a substantial increase in signal receivability for KFVS viewers. We believe that the Petitioner's channel substitution proposal warrants consideration. Channel 32 can be substituted for channel 11 at Cape Girardeau, Missouri as proposed, in compliance with the principal community coverage requirements of the Commission's rules at coordinates 37-27-46.0 N and 89-30-14.0 W. In addition, we find that this channel change meets the technical requirements set forth in our regulations. We believe that the Petitioner's channel substitution proposal warrants consideration. Channel 32 can be substituted for channel 11 at Cape Girardeau, Missouri as proposed, in compliance with the principal community coverage requirements of the Commission's rules at coordinates 37-27-46.0 N and 89-30-14.0 W. In addition, we find that this channel change meets the technical requirements set forth in our regulations.