

Register on December 16, 2009 (DIN: 20091216-IR-326090221ACA).

(O) Corrections to Indiana Administrative Code Title 326: Air Pollution Control Board, Article 8: Volatile Organic Compound Rules, Rule 18: Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry Air Oxidation, Distillation, and Reactor Processes, filed with the Publisher of the Indiana Register on November 19, 2009, and became effective on January 3, 2010. Published in the Indiana Register on December 16, 2009 (DIN: 20091216-IR-326090222ACA).

(P) Corrections to Indiana Administrative Code Title 326: Air Pollution Control Board, Article 8: Volatile Organic Compound Rules, Rule 19: Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Process Vents in Batch Operations, filed with the Publisher of the Indiana Register on November 19, 2009, and became effective on January 3, 2010. Published in the Indiana Register on December 16, 2009 (DIN: 20091216-IR-326090222ACA).

(Q) Corrections to Indiana Administrative Code Title 326: Air Pollution Control Board, Article 8: Volatile Organic Compound Rules, Rule 20: Industrial Wastewater, filed with the Publisher of the Indiana Register on November 19, 2009, and became effective on January 3, 2010. Published in the Indiana Register on December 16, 2009 (DIN: 20091216-IR-326090222ACA).

(R) Corrections to Indiana Administrative Code Title 326: Air Pollution Control Board, Article 8: Volatile Organic Compound Rules, Rule 21: Aerospace Manufacturing and Rework Operations, filed with the Publisher of the Indiana Register on November 19, 2009, and became effective on January 3, 2009. Published in the Indiana Register on December 16, 2009 (DIN: 20091216-IR-326090222ACA).

(S) Corrections to Indiana Administrative Code Title 326: Air Pollution Control Board, Article 8: Volatile Organic Compound Rules, Rule 22: Miscellaneous Industrial Adhesives, filed with the Publisher of the Indiana Register on November 18, 2009, and became effective on January 2, 2010. Published in the Indiana Register on December 16, 2009 (DIN: 20091216-IR-326090221ACA).

[FR Doc. 2010-3523 Filed 2-23-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0009; FRL-9115-9]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Opacity Source Surveillance Methods

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Commonwealth of Virginia State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revisions update methods for determining compliance with opacity standards for existing, new and modified stationary sources. EPA is approving these revisions in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: This rule is effective on April 26, 2010 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse written comment by March 26, 2010. If EPA receives such comments, it will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule in the **Federal Register** and inform the public that the rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID Number EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0009 by one of the following methods:

A. <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

B. *E-mail:* fernandez.cristina@epa.gov.

C. *Mail:* EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0009, Cristina Fernandez, Associate Director, Office of Air Program Planning, Mailcode 3AP30, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103.

D. *Hand Delivery:* At the previously-listed EPA Region III address. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Docket's normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0009. EPA's policy is that all comments received 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 information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you

consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. The <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through <http://www.regulations.gov>, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. 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.

Docket: All documents in the electronic docket are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index. 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 in <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Copies of the State submittal are available at the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maria A. Pino, (215) 814-2181, or by e-mail at pino.maria@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, whenever "we," "us," or "our" is used, we mean EPA.

I. Background

On August 25, 2008, the Commonwealth of Virginia submitted a formal revision to its SIP. The SIP revision consists of amendments to Title 9 of the Virginia Administrative Code (VAC) to update methods for determining compliance with opacity standards for existing, new, and modified stationary sources.

Amendments to regulations 9VAC5–40–20 and 9VAC5–50–20 allow the use of continuous opacity monitoring system (COMS) data to determine compliance with opacity standards. The amendments also allow the use of other methods approved by EPA.

II. Summary of SIP Revision

These revisions update regulations 9VAC5–40–20 and 9VAC5–50–20 to allow the use of data from a “continuous monitoring by transmissometer” or COMS, provided that the device meets Performance Standard 1—Specifications and Test Procedures for Continuous Opacity Monitoring Systems in Stationary Sources in Appendix B to 40 CFR part 60. The revisions also require that the device be properly maintained and prohibit any alteration of the resulting data. Previously, compliance with opacity standards was determined by EPA Method 9, which requires a certified smoke reader to observe the emissions leaving the stack during daylight hours. EPA Method 9 had been the only Federally acceptable method to determine compliance with opacity standards and visibility requirements. However, on February 24, 1997, EPA promulgated its Credible Evidence Revisions, which clarified that non-reference test data, *i.e.*, any creditable evidence, can be used in enforcement actions and for compliance determinations under the Clean Air Act (62 FR 8314). Thus, Method 9 is not the exclusive means to determining compliance with opacity standards, and the use of data from COMS is deemed acceptable. This change strengthens the Virginia SIP by allowing the use of COMS data to determine compliance with opacity standards, which will make compliance determinations easier.

The revisions also limit the use of alternative compliance methods to only methods which EPA has approved. These changes strengthen the Virginia SIP, which had previously allowed alternative methods, but did not specify that those methods must be approved by EPA.

Virginia made these revisions to make regulations 9VAC5–40–20 and 9VAC5–50–20 consistent with § 10.1–1307.3.B of the Code of Virginia, which reads as follows:

“The Executive Director or his duly authorized representative may pursue enforcement action for a violation of opacity requirements or limits based on (i) visual observations conducted pursuant to methods approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, (ii) data from certified continuous opacity monitors, or (iii) other methods approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.”

III. General Information Pertaining to SIP Submittals From the Commonwealth of Virginia

In 1995, Virginia adopted legislation that provides, subject to certain conditions, for an environmental assessment (audit) “privilege” for voluntary compliance evaluations performed by a regulated entity. The legislation further addresses the relative burden of proof for parties either asserting the privilege or seeking disclosure of documents for which the privilege is claimed. Virginia’s legislation also provides, subject to certain conditions, for a penalty waiver for violations of environmental laws when a regulated entity discovers such violations pursuant to a voluntary compliance evaluation and voluntarily discloses such violations to the Commonwealth and takes prompt and appropriate measures to remedy the violations. Virginia’s Voluntary Environmental Assessment Privilege Law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1–1198, provides a privilege that protects from disclosure documents and information about the content of those documents that are the product of a voluntary environmental assessment. The Privilege Law does not extend to documents or information (1) that are generated or developed before the commencement of a voluntary environmental assessment; (2) that are prepared independently of the assessment process; (3) that demonstrate a clear, imminent and substantial danger to the public health or environment; or (4) that are required by law.

On January 12, 1998, the Commonwealth of Virginia Office of the Attorney General provided a legal opinion that states that the Privilege Law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1–1198, precludes granting a privilege to documents and information “required by law,” including documents and information “required by Federal law to maintain program delegation, authorization or approval,” since Virginia must “enforce Federally authorized environmental programs in a manner that is no less stringent than their Federal counterparts.” * * * The opinion concludes that “[r]egarding § 10.1–1198, therefore, documents or other information needed for civil or criminal enforcement under one of these programs could not be privileged because such documents and information are essential to pursuing enforcement in a manner required by Federal law to maintain program delegation, authorization or approval.”

Virginia’s Immunity law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1–1199, provides that “[t]o the

extent consistent with requirements imposed by Federal law,” any person making a voluntary disclosure of information to a State agency regarding a violation of an environmental statute, regulation, permit, or administrative order is granted immunity from administrative or civil penalty. The Attorney General’s January 12, 1998 opinion states that the quoted language renders this statute inapplicable to enforcement of any Federally authorized programs, since “no immunity could be afforded from administrative, civil, or criminal penalties because granting such immunity would not be consistent with Federal law, which is one of the criteria for immunity.”

Therefore, EPA has determined that Virginia’s Privilege and Immunity statutes will not preclude the Commonwealth from enforcing its program consistent with the Federal requirements. In any event, because EPA has also determined that a State audit privilege and immunity law can affect only State enforcement and cannot have any impact on Federal enforcement authorities, EPA may at any time invoke its authority under the CAA, including, for example, sections 113, 167, 205, 211 or 213, to enforce the requirements or prohibitions of the State plan, independently of any State enforcement effort. In addition, citizen enforcement under section 304 of the CAA is likewise unaffected by this, or any, State audit privilege or immunity law.

IV. Final Action

EPA is approving revisions to the Virginia SIP that amend regulations 9VAC5–40–20 and 9VAC5–50–20 to update methods for determining compliance with opacity standards for existing, new, and modified stationary sources. The amendments allow the use of data from COMS or other EPA-approved methods to determine compliance with opacity standards.

EPA is publishing this rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comment. However, in the “Proposed Rules” section of today’s **Federal Register**, EPA is publishing a separate document that will serve as the proposal to approve the SIP revision if adverse comments are filed. This rule will be effective on April 26, 2010 without further notice unless EPA receives adverse comment by March 26, 2010. If EPA receives adverse comment, EPA will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public that the rule will not take effect. EPA will address all public comments in a

subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. 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.

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

A. General Requirements

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 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, 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 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 April 26, 2010. 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. 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, which revises the Virginia SIP to update methods for determining compliance with opacity standards for existing, new and modified stationary sources, 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, Nitrogen dioxide, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides.

Dated: February 1, 2010.

W.C. Early,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

■ 40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for 40 CFR part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart VV—Virginia

■ 2. In § 52.2420, the table in paragraph (c) is amended by revising the entries for Chapter 40, Section 5-40-20 and Chapter 50, Section 5-50-20 to read as follows:

§ 52.2420 Identification of plan.

*	*	*	*	*
(c)	*	*	*	*

EPA-APPROVED VIRGINIA REGULATIONS AND STATUTES

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation (former SIP citation)
*	*	*	*	*

EPA-APPROVED VIRGINIA REGULATIONS AND STATUTES—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation (former SIP citation)
*	*	*	*	*
Part I Special Provisions				
5–40–20	Compliance	12/12/07	02/24/10 [Insert page number where the document begins].	Revisions to paragraph A.3.
*	*	*	*	*
9 VAC 5 Chapter 50 New and Modified Stationary Sources				
*	*	*	*	*
Part I Special Provisions				
5–50–20	Compliance	12/12/07	02/24/10 [Insert page number where the document begins].	Revisions to paragraph A.3.
*	*	*	*	*

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2010–3512 Filed 2–23–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2008–0529; FRL–8812–1]

Laminarin; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of laminarin in or on all food commodities when applied preharvest as a biochemical pesticide to stimulate natural defense mechanisms in plants. Laboratoires Goëmar SA c/o SciReg, Inc. submitted a petition to EPA under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), requesting an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. This regulation eliminates the need to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of laminarin.

DATES: This regulation is effective February 24, 2010. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before April 26, 2010, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part

178 (see also Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2008–0529. All documents in the docket are listed in the docket index available at <http://www.regulations.gov>. 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 in the electronic docket at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or, if only available in hard copy, at the OPP Regulatory Public Docket in Rm. S–4400, One Potomac Yard (South Bldg.), 2777 S. Crystal Dr., Arlington, VA. The Docket Facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The Docket Facility telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chris Pfeifer, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division (7511P), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (703) 308–0031; e-mail address: pfeifer.chris@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected entities may include, but are not limited to:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in this unit could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether this action might apply to certain entities. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

B. How Can I Get Electronic Access to Other Related Information?

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/ecfr>.