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:
David Grounds, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3019, grounds.david@epa.gov.

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

   Table 1 lists the rule addressed by this proposal with the date that it was adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board.

   Table 1—Submitted Rule

<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>SJVUAPCD</td>
<td>4692</td>
<td>Commercial Charbroiling</td>
<td>09/17/09</td>
<td>05/17/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On June 8, 2010, EPA determined that the submittal for SJVUAPCD Rule 4692 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 this rule?

We approved an earlier version of Rule 4692 into the SIP on June 3, 2003 (68 FR 33005).

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

VOCs help produce ground-level ozone and smog, which harm human health and the environment. PM emissions also harm human health and the environment by causing, among other things, premature mortality, aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular disease, visibility impairment, and damage to vegetation and ecosystems. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires States to submit regulations that control VOC and PM emissions. SJVUAPCD Rule 4692, Commercial Charbroiling, is designed to limit VOC and PM emissions from commercial charbroiling. 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 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 ozone nonattainment areas classified as moderate or above (see sections 182(b)(2) and (f)), 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 (RACTM) as expeditiously as practicable in nonattainment areas. Because the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) area is designated nonattainment for the fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and designated and classified as extreme nonattainment for the ozone NAAQS (see 40 CFR 81.305), the RACT requirement in CAA section 172(c)(1) applies to this area. The specific ozone RACT requirement in CAA section 182(b)(2), however, does not apply to Rule 4692 because there are no CTG documents for this source category and no major sources of ozone precursors subject to this rule in the SJV area.

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


B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?

We believe this rule is consistent with the applicable CAA requirements and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP revisions. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. 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.

III. Proposed Action

Under section 110(k)(3) of the Act, we are proposing to fully approve Rule 4692 based on our conclusion that it satisfies all applicable CAA requirements. 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 this rule into the federally enforceable SIP.

IV. 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 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 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.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

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

Dated: June 9, 2011.

Jared Blumenfeld,
Regional Administrator, Region IX.
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