

March 11, 2011–1; revisions submitted March 11, 2011–2; the revisions proposed February 22, 2012, for parallel processing; and the letter from TCEQ to EPA dated May 3, 2012, which clarifies TCEQ's interpretation of 30 TAC 116.12.

- Revisions to 30 TAC 116.115—General and Special Conditions—submitted March 11, 2011–2.

- New 30 TAC 116.127—Actual to Projected Actual and Emission Exclusion Test for Emissions—submitted February 1, 2006 (as 30 TAC 116.121) and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2 (as redesignated to 30 TAC 116.127).

- Revisions to 30 TAC 116.150—New Major Source or Major Modification in Ozone Nonattainment Area—submitted June 10, 2005, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–1; February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–1; revisions submitted March 11, 2011–1; and the revisions proposed February 22, 2012, for parallel processing.

- Revisions to 30 TAC 116.151—New Major Source or Major Modification in Nonattainment Areas Other Than Ozone—submitted February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2 (without further revision); and the revisions proposed February 22, 2012, for parallel processing.

- New 30 TAC 116.180—Applicability—submitted February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2; revisions submitted March 11, 2011–2; and the revisions proposed February 22, 2012, for parallel processing.

- New 30 TAC 116.182—Plant-Wide Applicability Permit—Submitted February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2; and revisions submitted March 11, 2011–2.

- New 30 TAC 116.184—Application Review Schedule—Submitted February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2 (without further revision).

- New 30 TAC 116.186—General and Specific Conditions—Submitted February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2; revisions submitted March 11, 2011–2; the revisions proposed February 22, 2012, for parallel processing; and the letter from TCEQ to EPA dated May 3, 2012, which clarifies TCEQ's interpretation of 30 TAC 116.12.

- New 30 TAC 116.188—Plant-Wide Applicability Limit—Submitted February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2; and revisions submitted March 11, 2011–2.

- New 30 TAC 116.190—Federal Nonattainment and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Review—Submitted February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2; and revisions submitted March 11, 2011–2.

- New 30 TAC 116.192—Amendments and Alterations—Submitted February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2; and revisions submitted March 11, 2011–2.

- New 30 TAC 116.196—Renewal of a Plant-Wide Applicability Limit Permit—Submitted February 1, 2006; and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2 (without further revision).

- New 30 TAC 116.198—Expiration or Voidance—Submitted February 1, 2006, and resubmitted March 11, 2011–2 (without further revision).

VIII. 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. See 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 notice 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, 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.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Carbon monoxide, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: June 7, 2012.

Samuel Coleman,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 2012–15049 Filed 6–19–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 20

[Docket No. FWS–R9–MB–2012–0028; FF09M21200–123–FXMB1231099BPP0L2]

RIN 1018–AY61

Migratory Bird Hunting; Application for Approval of Copper-Clad Iron Shot as Nontoxic for Waterfowl Hunting

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of application for nontoxic shot approval.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce that Environ-Metal, Inc., of Sweet Home, Oregon, has applied for our approval of shot composed of copper and iron as nontoxic for waterfowl hunting in the United States. The shot contains a maximum of 44.1 percent copper by weight, with iron composing the rest of the shot. We have initiated review of the shot under the criteria we have set out in our nontoxic shot approval procedures in our regulations.

DATES: This notice announces the initiation of our review of a Tier 1 application submitted in accordance with 50 CFR 20.134. We will complete

the review of the application by August 20, 2012.

ADDRESSES: You may view the application by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Search for Docket No. FWS-R9-MB-2012-0028.

- Request a copy by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Allen, at 703-358-1825.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (Act) (16 U.S.C. 703-712 and 16 U.S.C. 742 a-j) implements migratory bird treaties between the United States and Great Britain for Canada (1916 and 1996 as amended), Mexico (1936 and 1972 as amended), Japan (1972 and 1974 as amended), and Russia (then the Soviet Union, 1978). These treaties protect most migratory bird species from take, except as permitted under the Act, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to regulate take of migratory birds in the United States. Under this

authority, we control the hunting of migratory game birds through regulations in 50 CFR part 20. We prohibit the use of shot types other than those listed in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 50 CFR 20.21(j) for hunting waterfowl and coots and any species that make up aggregate bag limits.

Since the mid-1970s, we have sought to identify types of shot for waterfowl hunting that are not toxic to migratory birds or other wildlife when ingested. We have approved nontoxic shot types and added them to the migratory bird hunting regulations in 50 CFR 20.21(j). We will continue to review all shot types submitted for approval as nontoxic.

Current Application

Environ-Metal has submitted its application to us with the counsel that it contained all of the specified information required by 50 CFR 20.134 for a complete Tier 1 submittal, and has requested unconditional approval pursuant to the Tier 1 timeframe. Having determined that the application is complete, we have initiated a comprehensive review of the Tier 1

information under 50 CFR 21.134. After review, we will either publish a notice of review to inform the public that the Tier 1 test results are inconclusive, or we will publish a proposed rule to approve the candidate shot.

If the Tier 1 tests are inconclusive, the notice of review will indicate what other tests we will require before we will again consider approval of the shot as nontoxic. If the Tier 1 data review results in a preliminary determination that the candidate material does not pose a significant toxicity hazard to migratory birds, other wildlife, or their habitats, the Service will commence with a rulemaking proposing to approve the candidate shot and add it to our list at 50 CFR 20.21(j).

Authority: We publish this notice under the authority of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703-712 and 16 U.S.C. 742 a-j) and in accordance with the regulations at 50 CFR 134(b)(2)(i)(D)(3).

Dated: June 12, 2012.

Rachel Jacobson,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

[FR Doc. 2012-14956 Filed 6-19-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P