

§ 52.2020 Identification of plan. (c) \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* \* \* (2) \* \* \*

Article XX or XXI citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation/ § 52.2063 citation
<b>Part E—Source Emission and Operating Standards</b>				
<b>Subpart 1—VOC Sources</b>				
1205.14	Gasoline Dispensing Facilities—Stage II Control.	7/10/05	1/17/08	[Insert page number where the document begins].

\* \* \* \* \*  
 [FR Doc. E8–583 Filed 1–16–08; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA–R09–OAR–2007–1075; FRL–8506–2]

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Kern 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 Kern County Air Pollution Control District (KCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern particulate matter (PM–10) emissions from ambient dust, propellant testing, and rocket testing. We are approving local rules under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on March 17, 2008 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by February 19, 2008. 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–2007–1075, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). Follow the on-line instructions.
- *E-mail:* [steckel.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:steckel.andrew@epa.gov).
- *Mail or deliver:* Andrew Steckel (Air-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

*Instructions:* All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at [www.regulations.gov](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 [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or e-mail. [www.regulations.gov](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:* The index to the docket for this action is available electronically at [www.regulations.gov](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 in the index, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material), 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:** Al Petersen, EPA Region IX, (415) 947–4118, [petersen.alfred@epa.gov](mailto:petersen.alfred@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 are the purposes of the new rule and rule revisions?
- II. EPA’s Evaluation and Action
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
  - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. 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 we are approving with the dates that the rules were adopted or amended by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule #	Rule title	Amended	Submitted
KCAPCD .....	404.1	Particulate Matter Concentration .....	01/24/07	08/24/07
KCAPCD .....	431	Propellant Combustion and Rocket Testing .....	03/08/07	08/24/07

On September 17, 2007, the submittal of KCAPCD Rules 404.1 and 431 was determined to meet 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?*

A version of KCAPCD Rule 404.1 was approved into the SIP on September 22, 1972, 37 FR 19812). There are no versions of Rule 431 in the SIP.

*C. What are the purposes of the new rule and rule revisions?*

Section 110(a) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) requires states to submit regulations that control volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, and other air pollutants which harm human health and the environment. These rules were developed as part of local air districts' programs to control these pollutants.

The purposes of the submitted KCAPCD Rule 404.1 revisions relative to the SIP rule are as follows:

- 404.1.II: Exemptions are added to the rule for (a) equipment that combusts only liquid fuels, gaseous fuels, or waste gases and only emits combustion contaminants, (b) rocket test stand operation with less than 75 pounds of propellant, and (c) fires set in accordance with Rule 416.

- 404.1.III: The particulate emission standard for existing sources is deleted and the standard for new sources of 0.1 grains per cubic foot is extended to include all sources.

- 404.1.IV: Test methods are added to the rule.

The purposes of new KCAPCD Rule 431 are as follows:

- 431.I.II: The rule applicability and definitions are provided.

- 431.III: Exemptions to the rule are provided for (a) rocket test stand operation with less than 75 pounds of propellant, (b) emergency disposal by a qualified bomb squad, (c) combustion for fire training, (d) rocket propulsion systems that do not require propellant, and (e) rocket propellants composed primarily of liquid fuels.

- 431.IV: A rocket test plan is required for the combustion of rocket propellants at a permitted test stand unless (a) a rocket motor contains less than 500 pounds of propellant or a rocket engine contains less than 1000 pounds of propellant and (b) CARB has designated the day of the test a permissible burn day.

- 431.V: The requirements are provided for a test plan that include a toxic risk analysis and identification of those meteorological conditions under

which propellant testing will cause insignificant risk to the nearest receptor.

- 431.VI,VII: The recordkeeping requirements and compliance schedule are provided.

EPA's technical support document (TSD) has 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 CAA) and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). SIP rules in moderate PM-10 nonattainment areas must require for significant sources reasonably available control measures (RACM), including reasonably available control technology (RACT) (see section 189(b)). KCAPCD regulates a PM-10 attainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so KCAPCD Rules 404.1 and 431 need not fulfill the requirements of RACM/RACT.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to help evaluate rules consistently include the following:

- *Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans*, U.S. EPA, 40 CFR part 51.

- *PM-10 Guideline Document* (EPA-452/R-93-008).

### B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?

We believe that KCAPCD Rules 404.1 and 431 are consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACM/RACT, and SIP relaxations and should be given full approval. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

### C. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the CAA, 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 rule. If we receive adverse comments by February 19, 2008, 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 March 17, 2008. This will incorporate the rule into the federally enforceable SIP.

Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment 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 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). This action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.). Because this rule approves pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it 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).

This rule 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 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. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997),

because it approves a state rule implementing a Federal standard.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission; to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

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).

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 *March 17, 2008*. 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, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 23, 2007.

**Alexis Strauss,**

*Acting 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)(351)(i)(D) to read as follows:

#### § 52.220 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(351) \* \* \*

(i) \* \* \*

(D) Kern County Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 404.1, adopted on April 18, 1972 and amended on January 24, 2007.

(i) Resolution No. 2007-001-01, Reference No. *Item 5*, Adoption of Amendments to Rules and Regulations of the Kern County Air Pollution Control District; to Wit: Rule 404.1.

(2) Rule 431, adopted on January 24, 2007 and amended on March 8, 2007.

(i) Resolution No. 2007-003-03, Reference No. *Item 3*, Amendments to Rules and Regulations of the Kern County Air Pollution Control District; To Wit: Rule 431 (Propellant Combustion and Rocket Testing).

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. E8-161 Filed 1-16-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 62

[EPA-R07-OAR-2007-0943; FRL-8517-7]

#### Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Missouri; Clean Air Mercury Rule

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking final action to approve the State Plan submitted by Missouri on May 18, 2007, and revisions submitted on September 6, 2007. The plan addresses the requirements of EPA's Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR), promulgated on May 18, 2005, and subsequently revised on June 9, 2006.

EPA has determined that the submitted State Plan fully meets the CAMR requirements for Missouri.

CAMR requires States to regulate emissions of mercury (Hg) from large coal-fired electric generating units (EGUs). CAMR establishes State budgets for annual EGU Hg emissions and requires States to submit State Plans to ensure that annual EGU Hg emissions will not exceed the applicable State budget. States have the flexibility to choose which control measures to adopt to achieve the budgets, including participating in the EPA-administered CAMR cap-and-trade program. In the State Plan that EPA is approving today, Missouri has met the CAMR requirements by electing to participate in the EPA trading program.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on February 19, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2007-0943. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., 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 either electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8 to 4:30 excluding Federal holidays. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the office at least 24 hours in advance.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael Jay at (913) 551-7460 or by e-mail at [jay.michael@epa.gov](mailto:jay.michael@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Table of Contents

- I. What Action Is EPA Taking?
- II. What Is the Regulatory History of CAMR?
- III. What Are the General Requirements of CAMR State Plans?
- IV. How Can States Comply With CAMR?
- V. Analysis of Missouri's CAMR State Plan Submittal
  - A. State Budgets
  - B. CAMR State Plan
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. What Action Is EPA Taking?

EPA is taking final action to approve Missouri's State Plan, submitted on May