ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from surface coating of metal parts and products. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on July 25, 2011 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by June 23, 2011. If we receive such comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the Federal Register to notify the public that this direct final rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2011–0355, by one of the following methods:
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. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Throughout this document, “we,” “us,” and “our” refer to EPA.
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I. The State’s Submittal
A. What rules did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rules we are approving with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).
On February 4, 2010, EPA determined that both submittals 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 are no previous versions of PCAPCD Rule 245 in the SIP.

We approved an earlier version of VCAPCD Rule 74.12 into the SIP on 10/25/2005 (70 FR 15616).

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rules?

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. Both PCAPCD Rule 245 and VCAPCD Rule 74.12 limit emissions of VOC from the application of coatings, coating removers (strippers), surface preparation materials, and cleanup materials in metal parts and products coating operations. EPA’s technical support documents (TSD) 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)), and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). PCAPCD and VCAPCD regulate an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so PCAPCD Rule 245 and VCAPCD Rule 74.12 must fulfill RACT.

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


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 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.

D. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving the submitted rules because we believe they fulfill all relevant requirements. We do not think anyone will object to this approval, so we are finalizing it without proposing it in advance. However, in the Proposed Rules section of this Federal Register, we are simultaneously proposing approval of the same submitted rules. If we receive adverse comments by June 23, 2011, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the Federal Register to notify the public that the direct final approval will not take effect and we will address the comments in a subsequent final action based on the proposal. If we do not receive timely adverse comments, the direct final approval will be effective without further notice on July 25, 2011. This will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP.

Please note that if EPA receives adverse comments on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

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 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 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 26355, 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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local agency</th>
<th>Rule No.</th>
<th>Rule title</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCAPCD ...........</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Surface Coating of Metal Parts and Products</td>
<td>8/20/09</td>
<td>1/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCAPCD ...........</td>
<td>74.12</td>
<td>Surface Coating of Metal Parts and Products</td>
<td>4/8/08</td>
<td>1/10/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULES
costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

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 rules, 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 related
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).

Parties with objections to this
direct final rule are encouraged to file a
comment in response to the parallel
notice of proposed rulemaking for this
action published in the Proposed Rules
section of today’s Federal Register,
rather than file an immediate petition
for judicial review of this direct final rule, so that EPA can withdraw
this direct final rule and address the
comment in the proposed rulemaking.
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, Reporting and recordkeeping
requirements, Volatile organic
compounds.

Dated: April 25, 2011.

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 paragraphs (c)(378)(i)(B) and (C)
to read as follows:

§52.220 Identification of plan.

(c) * * * * * * * 

(378) * * * *

(ii) * * * *

(B) Placer County Air Pollution
Control District.

(1) Rule 245, “Surface Coating of
Metal Parts and Products,” amended on
August 20, 2009.

(C) Ventura County Air Pollution
Control District.

(1) Rule 74.12, “Surface Coating of
Metal Parts and Products,” adopted on
April 8, 2008.

* * * * * * *

[FR Doc. 2011–12611 Filed 5–23–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY

40 CFR Part 268


Land Disposal Restrictions: Site-
Specific Treatment Variance for
Hazardous Selenium-Bearing Waste
Treated by U.S. Ecology Nevada in
Beatty, NV and Withdrawal of Site-
Specific Treatment Variance for
Hazardous Selenium-Bearing Waste
Treatment Issued to Chemical Waste
Management, Inc. in Kettleman Hills, CA

AGENCY: Environmental Protection
Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule.

SUMMARY: Because EPA received adverse
comment, we are withdrawing the
Direct Final rule that granted a site-
specific treatment variance to U.S.
Ecology Nevada in Beatty, Nevada and
withdrew an existing site-specific
treatment variance issued to Chemical
Waste Management, Inc. in Kettleman
Hills, California. The Direct Final rule
pertain[s] to the treatment of a hazardous
waste generated by the Ownes-
Brockway Glass Container Company in
Vernon, California that is unable to meet the
concentrations-based treatment
standard for selenium established under the
Land Disposal Restrictions program.
EPA also issued a parallel proposal to be
used as the basis for the final action in the
event that EPA received any adverse
comments on the Direct Final rule.

DATES: Effective May 24, 2011, EPA
withdraws the Direct Final rule
published at 76 FR 18921 on April 6,
2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For
more information, contact Jesse Miller,
Materials Recovery and Waste
Management Division, Office of
Resource Conservation and Recovery
(MC 5304 P), U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania
Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460;
telephone (703) 308–1180; fax (703)
308–0522; or miller.jesse@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: Because
EPA received adverse comment, we are
withdrawing the Direct Final rule that
amended the Land Disposal Restrictions
treatment standards (40 CFR part
268.44(o)) by granting a site-specific
treatment variance to U.S. Ecology
Nevada in Beatty, Nevada and
withdrawing an existing site-specific
treatment variance issued to Chemical
Waste Management, Inc. in Kettleman
Hills, California, published on April 6,
2011 at 76 FR 18921. We stated in that
Direct Final rule that if we received
adverse comment by May 6, 2011, the
Direct Final rule would not take effect
and we would publish a timely
withdrawal in the Federal Register. We
subsequently received adverse comment
on that Direct Final rule. We will
address those comments in any
subsequent final action, which will be
based on the parallel proposed rule also
published on April 6, 2011 at 76 FR
18921. As stated in the Direct Final rule
and the parallel proposed rule, we will
not institute a second comment period
on this action.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 268

Environmental protection, Hazardous
waste, and Variances.

Dated: May 17, 2011.

Mathy Stanislaus,
Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste
and Emergency Response.

Accordingly, the amendments to the
rule published on April 6, 2011 (76 FR
18921) are withdrawn as of May 24,
2011.

[FR Doc. 2011–12783 Filed 5–23–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300


National Oil and Hazardous Substance
Pollution Contingency Plan; National
Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection
Agency.

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection
Agency (EPA) Region 8 is publishing a
direct final Notice of Partial Deletion of
the remaining portions of Operable Unit
9 (OU9), the Residential Populated
Areas, of the California Gulch
Superfund Site (Site), located in Lake
County, Colorado, from the National
Priorities List (NPL). The NPL,
promulgated pursuant to section 105 of
the Comprehensive Environmental
Response, Compensation, and Liability