

• 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 rule 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.

B. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this action and other

required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

C. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by September 10, 2018. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action, addressing Delaware’s interstate transport for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Particulate matter.

Dated: June 19, 2018.

Cosmo Servidio,

Regional Administrator, Region III.

40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart I—Delaware

■ 2. In § 52.420, the table in paragraph (e) is amended by adding a second entry for Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS after the first entry. The revised text reads as follows:

§ 52.470 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

Name of non-regulatory SIP revision	Applicable geographic area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 PM _{2.5} NAAQS.	Statewide	12/14/2015	7/12/2018, [Insert Federal Register citation].	Docket 2017–0152. This action addresses the infrastructure element of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I).
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *

[FR Doc. 2018–14838 Filed 7–11–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2018–0104; FRL–9980–43—Region 9]

Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to approve a revision to the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD or “District”) portion of the California State Implementation Plan

(SIP). This revision concerns emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from architectural coatings. We are approving a local rule that regulates these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on August 13, 2018.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2018–0104. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> website. 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 material, 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: Arnold Lazarus, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3024, Lazarus.Arnold@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

- I. Proposed Action
- II. Public Comments and EPA Responses
- III. EPA Action
- IV. Incorporation by Reference
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Proposed Action

On May 3, 2018 (83 FR 19495), the EPA proposed to approve the following rule into the California SIP.

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Revised	Submitted
YSAQMD	2.14	Architectural Coatings	10/12/2016	01/24/2017

We proposed to approve this rule because we determined that it complies with the relevant CAA requirements. Our proposed action contains more information on the rule and our evaluation.

II. Public Comments and EPA Responses

The EPA's proposed action provided a 30-day public comment period. During this period, we received one comment in support of regulating VOC emissions, and another that was not germane to this rule.

III. EPA Action

No comments were submitted that change our assessment of the rule as described in our proposed action. Therefore, as authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, the EPA is fully approving this rule into the California SIP.

IV. Incorporation by Reference

In this rule, the EPA is finalizing regulatory text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is finalizing the incorporation by reference of the YSAQMD rule described in the amendments to 40 CFR part 52 set forth below. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these documents 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).

V. 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 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 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, 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, 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).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a

copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. The EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by September 10, 2018. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

Dated: June 22, 2018.

Deborah Jordan,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart F—California

■ 2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraphs (c)(293)(i)(B)(2) and (c)(497)(i)(D)(2) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan-in part.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(293) * * *

(i) * * *
(B) * * *

(2) Previously approved on January 2, 2004 in paragraph (c)(293)(i)(B)(1) of this section and now deleted with replacement in (c)(497)(i)(D)(2), Rule 2.14, adopted on November 14, 2001.

* * * * *

(497) * * *

(i) * * *

(D) * * *

(2) Rule 2.14, “Architectural Coatings,” revised on October 12, 2016.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2018–14946 Filed 7–11–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2014–0741; FRL–9980–84–OAR]

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semichemical Pulp Mills

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notification of final action denying petition for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is providing notice that it has responded to a petition for reconsideration of the final National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semichemical Pulp Mills published in the **Federal Register** on October 11, 2017. The Acting Administrator denied the petition in a separate letter to the petitioners. The letter, which provides a full explanation of the agency’s rationale for the denial, is in the rulemaking docket.

DATES: July 12, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Kelley Spence, Sector Policies and Programs Division (E143–03), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number: (919) 541–3158; fax number: (919) 541–0516; email address: spence.kelley@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. How can I get copies of this document and other related information?

This **Federal Register** document, the petition for reconsideration, and the

letter denying the petition for reconsideration are available in the docket the EPA established under Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2014–0741. All documents in the docket are listed on the www.regulations.gov website. Although listed, 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 either electronically through www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), Room 3334, EPA WJC West Building, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744 and the telephone number for the Air Docket is (202) 566–1742.

II. Judicial Review

Section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) indicates which Federal Courts of Appeals have venue for petitions for review of final EPA actions. This section provides, in part, that the petitions for review must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit if: (1) The agency action consists of “nationally applicable regulations promulgated, or final action taken, by the Administrator,” or (2) such actions are locally or regionally applicable, if “such action is based on a determination of nationwide scope or effect and if in taking such action the Administrator finds and publishes that such action is based on such a determination.”

The EPA has determined that its action denying the petition for reconsideration is nationally applicable for purposes of CAA section 307(b)(1) because the action directly affects the NESHAP for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semichemical Pulp Mills, which are nationally applicable CAA section 112 standards. Any petitions for review of the letter denying the petition for reconsideration must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by September 10, 2018.

III. Description of Action

On October 11, 2017, pursuant to sections 112(d)(6) and (f)(2) of the CAA, the EPA published the final residual risk and technology review (RTR) of the

“National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semichemical Pulp Mills.” 82 FR 47328. Following publication of the final RTR amendments, the Administrator received a petition for reconsideration of two aspects of the final RTR pursuant to CAA section 307(d)(7)(B). The petitioners, Earthjustice on behalf of Crossett Concerned Citizens for Environmental Justice, Louisiana Environmental Action Network, PT AirWatchers, and Sierra Club, claimed: (1) It was impracticable to object to the EPA’s rationale for not setting additional standards for uncontrolled emissions when the EPA was conducting the review required by CAA section 112(d)(6), and their objections on this issue are of central relevance to the outcome of the rule; and (2) it was impracticable to object during the comment period to the EPA’s use of census block centroids to account for the residual risk to the most exposed individual, and their objections on this issue are of central relevance to the outcome of the rule.

CAA section 307(d)(7)(B) requires the EPA to convene a proceeding for reconsideration of a rule if a party raising an objection to the rule “can demonstrate to the Administrator that it was impracticable to raise such objection within [the public comment period] or if the grounds for such objection arose after the period for public comment (but within the time specified for judicial review) and if such objection is of central relevance to the outcome of the rule.” The requirement to convene a proceeding to reconsider a rule is, thus, based on the petitioner demonstrating to the EPA both: (1) That it was impracticable to raise the objection during the comment period, or that the grounds for such objection arose after the comment period, but within the time specified for judicial review (i.e., within 60 days after publication of the final rulemaking in the **Federal Register**, see CAA section 307(b)(1)); and (2) that the objection is of central relevance to the outcome of the rule.

The EPA carefully reviewed the petition for reconsideration and evaluated the issues raised to determine if they meet the CAA section 307(d)(7)(B) criteria for reconsideration. In a separate letter to the petitioners, the EPA Acting Administrator, Andrew R. Wheeler, denied the petition for reconsideration. The letter is available in the docket for this action.