

some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Adrienne Borgia, EPA Region IX, (415) 972-3576, [borgia.adrienne@epa.gov](mailto:borgia.adrienne@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This proposal addresses the following local rules: SCAQMD Rule 1143, "Consumer Paint Thinner & Multi-Purpose Solvents" and SCAQMD Rule 1144, "Metal Working Fluids & Direct-Contact Lubricants." In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, we are approving these local rules in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe these SIP revisions are not controversial. If we receive adverse comments, however, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in subsequent action based on this proposed rule. Please note that if we receive adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, we may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, please see the direct final action.

Dated: June 23, 2011.

**Jared Blumenfeld,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 2011-17758 Filed 7-14-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0546; FRL-9438-9]

#### Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These

revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from the manufacture of polystyrene, polyethylene, and polypropylene products. We are proposing action on a local rule that regulates these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

**DATES:** Any comments must arrive by August 15, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0546, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions.

2. *E-mail:* [steckel.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:steckel.andrew@epa.gov).

3. *Mail or deliver:* Andrew Steckel (Air-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

*Instructions:* All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. <http://www.regulations.gov> is an "anonymous access" system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send e-mail directly to EPA, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. 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.

*Docket:* Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed at <http://www.regulations.gov>, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mae Wang, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-4124, [wang.mae@epa.gov](mailto:wang.mae@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to 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?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?
  - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. What are the rule deficiencies?
  - D. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rule.
  - E. Proposed Action and Public Comment.
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

### I. The State's Submittal

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

We are proposing a limited approval and limited disapproval of San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) Rule 4682, Polystyrene, Polyethylene, and Polypropylene Products Manufacturing, amended on September 20, 2007, and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) on March 7, 2008. On April 17, 2008, the submittal for SJVUAPCD Rule 4682 was found to meet 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 4682 into the SIP on June 13, 1995 (60 FR 31086).

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

VOCs help produce ground-level ozone and smog, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires States to submit regulations that control VOC emissions. Rule 4682 was designed to reduce emissions of VOCs from the manufacturing, processing, and storage of products composed of polystyrene, polyethylene, or polypropylene. EPA's technical support document (TSD) has more information about this rule.

### II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

#### A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see CAA section 110(a)), and must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for each category of sources covered by a Control Techniques Guidelines document as well as each major source in

nonattainment areas (see CAA sections 182(a)(2) and (b)(2)). The SJVUAPCD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so Rule 4682 must fulfill RACT.

Guidance and policy documents that we use to evaluate enforceability and RACT requirements consistently include the following:

1. "Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations," EPA, May 25, 1988 (the *Bluebook*).

2. "Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule Deficiencies," EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001 (the *Little Bluebook*).

3. "Control of VOC Emissions from Polystyrene Foam Manufacturing" (EPA-450/3-90-020, September 1990).

4. "Averaging Times for Compliance With VOC Emission Limits—SIP Revision Policy," memorandum from John R. O'Connor, OAQPS, dated January 20, 1984.

Additionally, SIP revisions must not interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment and reasonable further progress (RFP) or any other applicable requirement of the CAA (see CAA section 110(l)) or modify, in a nonattainment area, any SIP-approved control requirement in effect before November 15, 1990 (see CAA section 193).

#### *B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?*

Rule 4682 improves the SIP by clarifying language, adding definitions, and adding control requirements. This rule also improves the SIP by adding requirements for compliance plans, recordkeeping, and testing. The rule is generally clear and contains appropriate monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements to ensure the emission limits are adequately enforceable. The rule is largely consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT and SIP relaxations. We are proposing to determine that our approval of the submittal would comply with CAA section 110(l), because the proposed SIP revision would not interfere with the on-going process for ensuring that requirements for RFP and attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards are met, and the submitted SIP revision is at least as stringent as the rule previously approved into the SIP. Rule provisions which do not meet the evaluation criteria are summarized below and discussed further in the TSD.

#### *C. What are the rule deficiencies?*

Rule 4682 contains a monthly averaging provision that conflicts with CAA section 110 and part D, and prevents full approval of the SIP revision. Section 5.3.1 of Rule 4682 establishes an emission limit of 2.4 pounds of VOC per 100 pounds of total material processed, as averaged on a monthly basis. EPA generally cannot approve compliance periods exceeding 24 hours unless specific criteria are met, including a clear explanation of why the application of RACT is not economically or technically feasible on a daily basis. Rules for this source category in other districts contain similar limits without the monthly averaging. A more detailed discussion of this deficiency is contained in the TSD.

#### *D. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rule*

The TSD describes additional rule revisions that we recommend for the next time the local agency modifies the rule.

#### *E. Proposed Action and Public Comment*

As authorized in sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the CAA, EPA is proposing a limited approval of the submitted rule to improve the SIP. If finalized, this action would incorporate the submitted rule into the SIP, including those provisions identified as deficient. This approval is limited because EPA is simultaneously proposing a limited disapproval of the rule under CAA section 110(k)(3). If this disapproval is finalized, sanctions will be imposed under CAA section 179 unless EPA approves subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rule deficiencies within 18 months of the disapproval. These sanctions would be imposed according to 40 CFR 52.31. A final disapproval would also trigger the 2-year clock for the federal implementation plan requirement under section 110(c). Note that the submitted rule has been adopted by the SJVUAPCD, and EPA's final limited disapproval would not prevent the local agency from enforcing it. The limited disapproval also would not prevent any portion of the rule from being incorporated by reference into the federally enforceable SIP as discussed in a July 9, 1992, EPA memo found at: <http://www.epa.gov/nsr/ttnnsr01/gen/pdf/memo-s.pdf>.

We will accept comments from the public on the proposed limited approval and limited disapproval for the next 30 days.

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

#### *A. Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review*

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866, entitled "Regulatory Planning and Review."

#### *B. Paperwork Reduction Act*

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.3(b).

#### *C. Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Regulatory Flexibility Act generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals or disapprovals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the CAA do not create any new requirements but simply approve or disapprove requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the proposed Federal SIP limited approval/limited disapproval does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the CAA, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of State action. The CAA forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co., v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255-66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

#### *D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act*

Under sections 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome

alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the limited approval/limited disapproval action proposed does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action proposes to approve and disapprove pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

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

*Federalism* (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Orders 12612 (*Federalism*) and 12875 (*Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership*). Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure “meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications.” “Policies that have federalism implications” is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that 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.” Under Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This rule 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, as specified in Executive Order 13132, because it merely proposes to approve or

disapprove a State rule implementing a federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the CAA. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this rule.

#### *F. Executive Order 13175, Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments*

Executive Order 13175, entitled “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments” (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure “meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications.” This proposed rule does not have tribal implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175. It will not have substantial direct effects on tribal governments, on the relationship between the Federal government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Indian tribes. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule.

EPA specifically solicits additional comment on this proposed rule from tribal officials.

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

EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) as applying only to those regulatory actions that concern health or safety risks, such that the analysis required under section 5–501 of the Executive Order has the potential to influence the regulation. This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045, because it approves a State rule implementing a Federal standard.

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

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, “Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use” (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

#### *I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act*

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing a new regulation. To comply with NTTAA, EPA must consider and use “voluntary consensus standards” (VCS) if available

and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

The EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to this action. Today’s action does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

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

Executive Order (EO) 12898 (59 FR 7629 (Feb. 16, 1994)) establishes federal executive policy on environmental justice. Its main provision directs federal agencies, to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, to make environmental justice part of their mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States.

EPA lacks the discretionary authority to address environmental justice in this rulemaking.

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

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

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

Dated: June 29, 2011.

**Jared Blumenfeld,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 2011–17784 Filed 7–14–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

### **40 CFR Part 82**

**[EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0672; FRL–9439–3]**

**RIN 2060–AQ39**

### **Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Extension of Global Laboratory and Analytical Use Exemption for Essential Class I Ozone-Depleting Substances**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to extend the global laboratory and analytical use exemption for the production and import of Class I ozone-depleting substances through December 31, 2014, consistent with the recent actions by the