

For purposes of judicial review, the two of the these determinations approved by today's action are severable from one another.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: September 1, 2011.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2011–23527 Filed 9–13–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2011–0735; FRL–9464–2]

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 to approve revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from confined animal facilities (CAFs) and biosolids, animal manure, and poultry litter operations. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as

amended in 1990 (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 October 14, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2011–0735, 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.

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>

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:

Sona Chilingaryan, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3368, chilingaryan.sona@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to 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. EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is 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. 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 proposal with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board.

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULES

| Local agency | Rule No. | Rule title | Adopted | Submitted |
|----------------|----------|---|----------|-----------|
| SJVUAPCD | 4570 | Confined Animal Facilities | 10/21/10 | 4/5/11 |
| SJVUAPCD | 4565 | Biosolids, Animal Manure, and Poultry Litter Operations | 3/15/07 | 8/24/07 |

On September 17, 2007, EPA determined that the submittal for SJVUAPCD Rule 4565 met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51 appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review. On May 6, 2011, EPA determined that the submittal for SJVUAPCD Rule 4570 met the completeness criteria.

B. Are there other versions of these rules?

There are no previous versions of Rule 4565. On January 14, 2010, EPA finalized a limited approval of an earlier

version of Rule 4570 into the SIP. Simultaneously, EPA finalized a limited disapproval of the rule for exempting major source poultry operations and for an inadequate RACT analysis for swine and poultry (75 FR 2079). The SJVUAPCD adopted revisions to Rule 4570 on October 21, 2010, partly to address these issues, and we are proposing action on that version of the rule.

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

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 4570 requires management practices to reduce VOCs from dairies, beef feedlots, poultry houses, and other confined animal facilities. Rule 4565 requires management practices to reduce VOC emissions from land-application of

biosolids and disposal at landfills and small and medium sized composting/co-composting operations. Rule 4565 also requires add-on controls at large composting/co-composting operations. EPA's technical support documents (TSDs) have more information about these rules.

II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the Act), 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 in nonattainment areas (see sections 182(a)(2) and (b)(2)), must not interfere with any applicable requirements concerning attainment and reasonable further progress (RFP), and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). Section 172(c)(1) of the Act also requires implementation of all reasonably available control measures (RACM) as expeditiously as practicable in nonattainment areas. The SJVUAPCD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so Rules 4565 and 4570 must fulfill RACT. Additionally, the RACM requirement in CAA section 172(c)(1) applies to this area. In this proposal, we are only evaluating RACT. In a separate rulemaking, EPA will take action on the State's RACM demonstrations for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS based on an evaluation of the control measures submitted as a whole and their overall potential to advance the applicable attainment date in the San Joaquin Valley. See 40 CFR 51.912(d) and 51.1010.

Guidance and policy documents that we use to evaluate enforceability and RACT and RACM 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. Portions of the proposed post-1987 ozone and carbon monoxide policy that concern RACT, 52 FR 45044, November 24, 1987.
4. "State Implementation Plans, General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Amendments of 1990," 57 FR 13498, April 16, 1992.
5. "Preamble, Final Rule to Implement the 8-hour Ozone National

Ambient Air Quality Standard," 70 FR 71612, Nov. 29, 2005.

6. Letter from William T. Hartnett to Regional Air Division Directors, "RACT Qs & As—Reasonable Available Control Technology (RACT) Questions and Answers," May 18, 2006.

B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?

We believe these rules are consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. The revisions to Rule 4570 address the deficiencies we noted in our January 14, 2010 limited disapproval action, and include lowering the rule applicability threshold for poultry facilities to include all major sources and an adequate RACT analysis for swine and poultry facilities. 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 are not currently the basis for rule disapproval.

D. Public Comment and Final Action

Because EPA believes the submitted rules fulfill all relevant requirements, we are proposing to fully approve them as described in section 110(k)(3) of the Act. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal for the next 30 days. Unless we receive convincing new information during the comment period, we intend to publish a final approval action that will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP. If finalized as proposed, approval of Rule 4570 would terminate all CAA sanction and FIP implications associated with EPA's 2010 limited disapproval of a previous version of this rule.

III. 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, 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 Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);

- 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 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, this proposed action 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, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: August 31, 2011.

Jared Blumenfeld,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2011-23550 Filed 9-13-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P