

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0089; FRL-9737-2]

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is finalizing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This action was proposed in the **Federal Register** on February 28, 2012 and concerns oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions from stationary gas turbines. Under authority of the Clean Air Act

(CAA or the Act), this action simultaneously approves a local rule that regulates these emission sources and directs California to correct rule deficiencies.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on November 26, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0089 for this action. Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> or 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, multi-volume reports), and some may not be available in either location (e.g., confidential business information (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:** Idalia Pérez, EPA Region IX, (415) 972-2348, [perez.idalia@epa.gov](mailto:perez.idalia@epa.gov).

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

**Table of Contents**

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

**I. Proposed Action**

On February 28, 2012 (77 FR 11992), EPA proposed a limited approval and limited disapproval of the following rule that was submitted for incorporation into the California SIP.

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Amended	Submitted
MDAQMD .....	1159 .....	Stationary Gas Turbines .....	09/28/09	05/17/10

We proposed a limited approval because we determined that this rule improves the SIP and is largely consistent with the relevant CAA requirements. We simultaneously proposed a limited disapproval because the following provision conflicts with section 110 and part D of the Act and prevents full approval of the SIP revision. Section D.3 exempts the Southern California Gas Company General Electric Model Frame 3 turbine located in Kelso, California from testing requirements. This undermines enforceability of the rule which contradicts CAA requirements for enforceability.

Our proposed action contains more information on the basis for this rulemaking and on our evaluation of the submittal.

**II. Public Comments and EPA Responses**

EPA's proposed action provided a 30-day public comment period. During this period, we received no comments.

**III. EPA Action**

No comments were submitted that change our assessment of the rule as described in our proposed action. Therefore, as authorized in sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the Act, EPA is finalizing a limited approval of the submitted rule. This action incorporates the submitted rule into the California SIP, including those provisions

identified as deficient. As authorized under section 110(k)(3), EPA is simultaneously finalizing a limited disapproval of the rule. Neither sanctions nor a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) will be imposed following this final limited disapproval as explained in our proposed action.

Note that the submitted rule has been adopted by the MDAQMD, and EPA's final limited disapproval does not prevent the local agency from enforcing it. The limited disapproval also does 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>.

**IV. 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 (RFA) 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 and limited approvals/limited disapprovals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because this limited approval/limited disapproval action 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 Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of State action. The Clean Air Act 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 (“Unfunded Mandates Act”), 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 promulgated 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 approves 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 approves a State rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. 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 final 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.

*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 Population*

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.

*K. Congressional Review Act*

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. section 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 rule 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. section 804(2). This rule will be effective on November 26, 2012.

#### *L. Petitions for Judicial Review*

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 December 24, 2012. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule 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, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: September 5, 2012.

**Jared Blumenfeld,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

Part 52, Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

#### **PART 52—[AMENDED]**

- 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 paragraph (c)(379)(i)(E) to read as follows:

##### **§ 52.220 Identification of plan.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(379) \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(E) Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.

(I) Rule 1159, “Stationary Gas Turbines,” amended on September 28, 2009.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2012–26212 Filed 10–24–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

### **40 CFR Part 63**

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2008–0334; FRL–9746–4]

**RIN 2060–AQ89**

### **National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Manufacturing Area Sources**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule; stay.

**SUMMARY:** On January 30, 2012, the EPA published in the **Federal Register** a proposed rule reconsidering certain provisions in the final National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Manufacturing Area Sources (CMAS) that was promulgated on October 29, 2009. The compliance date for the final CMAS rule is October 29, 2012. However, the EPA is still in the process of finalizing the reconsideration action. For this reason, a short stay of the final CMAS rule pending completion of the reconsideration action is warranted. Pursuant to the Clean Air Act, the EPA is staying until December 24, 2012 the final CMAS rule.

**DATES:** Effective October 25, 2012, 40 CFR part 63, subpart VVVVVV, is stayed until December 24, 2012.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Nick Parsons, Sector Policies and Programs Division (E143–01), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number: (919) 541–5372; fax number: (919) 541–0246; email address: [parsons.nick@epa.gov](mailto:parsons.nick@epa.gov).

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **I. Background**

On October 29, 2009 (74 FR 56008), the EPA issued the final CMAS rule. On February 12, 2010, the American Chemistry Council and the Society of Chemical Manufacturers and Affiliates (collectively referred to as “Petitioners”) sought reconsideration of certain provisions in the final rule. On June 15, 2010, the EPA notified Petitioners that the EPA intended to initiate the reconsideration process.

On January 30, 2012 (77 FR 4522), the EPA published a proposed rule reconsidering certain aspects of the final CMAS rule, including provisions that, if finalized, would revise the applicability of the final rule. The compliance date for the final CMAS rule is October 29, 2012, and it was EPA’s expectation that the reconsideration would be finalized

in advance of that date. However, the EPA is still in the process of finalizing the reconsideration action. For this reason, a short stay of the final rule is appropriate to allow the EPA the time necessary to complete the reconsideration action.

Pursuant to Clean Air Act section 307(d)(7)(B), the EPA is staying for 60 days the provisions of 40 CFR part 63, subpart VVVVVV.

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

### *A. General Requirements*

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a “significant regulatory action” and, therefore, is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, “Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use” (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4), or require prior consultation with state officials as specified by Executive Order 12875 (58 FR 58093, October 28, 1993), or involve special consideration of environmental justice related issues as required by Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). Because this action is not subject to notice-and-comment requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute, it is not subject to the regulatory flexibility provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*). This action also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, 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, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have federalism implications because it does 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 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 “Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks” (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). The requirements of section 12(d) of the