

## EPA-APPROVED NORTH CAROLINA REGULATIONS

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
<b>Subchapter 2D Air Pollution Control Requirements</b>				
*	*	*	*	*
<b>Section .0500 Emission Control Standards</b>				
*	*	*	*	*
Section .0530.	Prevention of Significant Deterioration.	9/1/2017	9/16/2020, [Insert citation of publication].	
Section .0531.	Sources in Non-attainment Areas.	9/1/2013	9/14/2016, 81 FR 63107.	The version of Section .0531 in the SIP does not incorporate by reference the provisions amended in the Ethanol Rule (published in the <b>Federal Register</b> on May 1, 2007) that excludes facilities that produce ethanol through a natural fermentation process from the definition of "chemical process plants" at § 52.21(b)(1)(i)(a) and (b)(1)(iii)(t).
*	*	*	*	*

\* \* \* \* \*

"Standard No. 7" under "Regulation No. (c) \* \* \*

62.5" to read as follows:

**Subpart PP—South Carolina**

■ 7. In § 52.2120 amend the table in paragraph (c) by revising the entry for

**§ 52.2120 Identification of plan.**

\* \* \* \* \*

## EPA-APPROVED SOUTH CAROLINA REGULATIONS

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
*	*	*	*	*
Regulation No. 62.5.	Air Pollution Control Standards..	.....	.....	
*	*	*	*	*
Standard No. 7.	Prevention of Significant Deterioration.	8/25/2017	9/16/2020, [Insert citation of publication].	Except Standard No. 7, paragraphs (b)(30)(v) and (b)(34)(iii)(d), which the state withdrew from EPA's consideration for approval on December 20, 2016. Except Standard No. 7, paragraph (b)(34)(iii)(c), approved conditionally on June 2, 2008, and approved fully on June 23, 2011, with a state effective date of June 25, 2005.
*	*	*	*	*

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2020–19341 Filed 9–15–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

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

[EPA–R09–OAR–2020–0180; FRL–10012–89–Region 9]

**Air Plan Approval; California; Feather River Air Quality Management District**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to approve a revision to the Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from vehicle and mobile equipment coating operations. We are approving a local rule that regulates these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule will be effective on October 16, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2020–0180. All documents in the docket are listed on the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. 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 through <https://www.regulations.gov>, or please contact

the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section for additional availability information.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christine Vineyard, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105. By phone: (415) 947-4125 or by email at [vineyard.christine@epa.gov](mailto:vineyard.christine@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to the EPA.

#### Table of Contents

- I. Proposed Action
- II. Public Comments and EPA Responses
- III. EPA Action

IV. Incorporation by Reference

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. Proposed Action

On May 8, 2020 (85 FR 27344), the EPA proposed to approve the following rule into the California SIP.

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule Title	Amended	Submitted
FRAQMD .....	3.19 .....	Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Coating Operations .....	08/01/2016	01/24/2017

We proposed to approve this rule because we determined that it complies with the relevant CAA requirements. Our proposed action contains more information on the rule and our evaluation.

#### II. Public Comments and EPA Responses

The EPA’s proposed action provided a 30-day public comment period. During this period, we received one comment from Mr. Evan Stull, New Jersey:

Comment: Mr. Stull believes VOC levels in paint can be forcibly cut down under the EPA’s authority. Further, he believes that the contamination of the air under the Clean Air Act is grounds to expand the EPA’s role in the spread of VOCs and their toxic fumes.

Response: EPA appreciates the comment, but believes it is not germane to our action.

#### III. EPA Action

No comments were submitted that change our assessment of the rule as described in our proposed action. Therefore, as authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, the EPA is fully approving this rule into the California SIP.

#### IV. Incorporation by Reference

In this rule, the EPA is finalizing regulatory text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is finalizing the incorporation by reference of the FRAQMD rules described in the amendments to 40 CFR part 52 set forth below. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these documents available through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) and at the EPA Region IX Office (please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble for more information).

#### V. 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, the 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 Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 3, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866;
- 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 the 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, the SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where the EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

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. The 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).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

Dated: August 17, 2020.

**John Busterud,**  
Regional Administrator, Region IX.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the EPA amends 40 CFR part 52 as follows:

## PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 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)(442)(i)(E)(5) and (c)(497)(i)(E) to read as follows:

#### § 52.220 Identification of plan-in part.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*  
(442) \* \* \*  
(i) \* \* \*  
(E) \* \* \*

(5) Previously approved on June 11, 2015 in paragraph (c)(442)(i)(E)(4) of this section and now deleted with replacement in (c)(497)(i)(E)(1), Rule 3.19, “Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Coating Operations,” amended on August 1, 2016.

\* \* \* \* \*

(497) \* \* \*  
(i) \* \* \*

(E) Feather River Air Quality Management District

(1) Rule 3.19, “Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Coating Operations,” amended on August 1, 2016.

(2) [Reserved]

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2020–18407 Filed 9–15–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2019–0241; FRL–10014–24–Region 9]

### Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Coachella Valley; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to approve portions of two state implementation plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of California to meet Clean Air Act requirements for the 2008 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS or “standards”) in the Coachella Valley ozone nonattainment area (“Coachella Valley”). The two SIP revisions include the portions of the “Final 2016 Air

Quality Management Plan” and the “2018 Updates to the California State Implementation Plan” that address ozone in the Coachella Valley. These submittals address the nonattainment area requirements for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS, including the requirements for an emissions inventory, emissions statements, attainment demonstration, reasonable further progress, reasonably available control measures, contingency measures, and motor vehicle emissions budgets. The EPA is taking final action to approve these submittals as meeting all the applicable ozone nonattainment area requirements except for the contingency measure requirements, for which the EPA is deferring action.

**DATES:** This rule will be effective on October 16, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2019–0241. All documents in the docket are listed on the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. 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 through <https://www.regulations.gov>, or please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section for additional availability information. If you need assistance in a language other than English or if you are a person with disabilities who needs a reasonable accommodation at no cost to you, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Ungvarsky, Air Planning Office (AIR–2), EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 972–3963 or [ungvarsky.john@epa.gov](mailto:ungvarsky.john@epa.gov).

### Table of Contents

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

### I. Summary of the Proposed Action

On January 17, 2020 (85 FR 2949), the EPA proposed to approve, under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 110(k)(3), and to conditionally approve, under CAA section 110(k)(4), portions of submittals from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD or “District”) as revisions to the California

SIP for the Coachella Valley ozone nonattainment area.<sup>1</sup> The relevant SIP revisions include the SCAQMD’s Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (“2016 AQMP”) and CARB’s 2018 Updates to the California State Implementation Plan (“2018 SIP Update”). Collectively, we refer to the relevant portions of the two SIP revisions as the “2016 Coachella Valley Ozone SIP,” and we refer to our January 17, 2020 proposed rule as the “proposed rule.”

In our proposed rule, we provided background information on the ozone standards,<sup>2</sup> area designations, and related SIP revision requirements under the CAA, and the EPA’s implementing regulations for the 2008 ozone standards, referred to as the 2008 Ozone SIP Requirements Rule (“2008 Ozone SRR”). To summarize, the Coachella Valley ozone nonattainment area is classified as Severe for the 2008 ozone standards, and the 2016 Coachella Valley Ozone SIP was developed to address the requirements for this Severe nonattainment area for the 2008 ozone NAAQS.

In our proposed rule, we also discussed a decision issued by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in *South Coast Air Quality Management Dist. v. EPA* (“*South Coast II*”)<sup>3</sup> that vacated certain portions of the EPA’s 2008 Ozone SRR. The only aspect of the *South Coast II* decision that affects this action is the vacatur of the provision in the 2008 Ozone SRR that allowed states to use an alternative baseline year for demonstrating reasonable further progress (RFP). To address this, in the 2018 SIP Update, CARB submitted an updated RFP demonstration that relied

<sup>1</sup> The Coachella Valley is located within Riverside County, and its boundaries generally align with the Riverside County portion of the Salton Sea Air Basin. For a precise description of the geographic boundaries of the Coachella Valley, see 40 CFR 81.305.

<sup>2</sup> Ground-level ozone pollution is formed from the reaction of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) in the presence of sunlight. The 1-hour ozone NAAQS is 0.12 parts per million (ppm) (one-hour average), the 1997 ozone NAAQS is 0.08 ppm (eight-hour average), and the 2008 ozone NAAQS is 0.075 ppm (eight-hour average). CARB refers to reactive organic gases (ROG) in some of its ozone-related submittals. The CAA and the EPA’s regulations refer to VOC, rather than ROG, but both terms cover essentially the same set of gases. In this final rule, we use the term (VOC) to refer to this set of gases.

<sup>3</sup> *South Coast Air Quality Management Dist. v. EPA*, 882 F.3d 1138 (D.C. Cir. 2018). The term “*South Coast II*” is used in reference to the 2018 court decision to distinguish it from a decision published in 2006 also referred to as “*South Coast*.” The earlier decision involved a challenge to the EPA’s Phase 1 implementation rule for the 1997 ozone standard. *South Coast Air Quality Management Dist. v. EPA*, 472 F.3d 882 (D.C. Cir. 2006).