

75656 (March 16, 2012). Further, on May 1, 2012, the State of Tennessee provided a letter to EPA with clarification of the State's intent in light of EPA's March 12, 2012, proposed rulemaking. Specifically, in that letter, the State of Tennessee requested that EPA not approve the term "particulate matter emissions" (at rule 1200-03-09-.01(4)(b)47(vi)) as part of the definition for "regulated NSR pollutant" regarding the inclusion of condensable emissions in applicability determinations and in establishing emissions limitations for PM. Therefore given the State's request and EPA's intention to amend the definition of "regulated NSR pollutant," EPA is not proposing action to approve the terminology "particulate matter emissions" into the Tennessee SIP (at 1200-03-09-.01(4)(b)47(vi)) for the condensable provision in the definition of "regulated NSR pollutant." EPA is, however, proposing to approve into the Tennessee SIP at 1200-03-09-.01(4)(b)47(vi) the remaining condensable requirement at 40 CFR 51.166(b)(49)(vi), which requires that condensable emissions be accounted for in applicability determinations and in establishing emissions limitations for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀.

In addition to the adoption of the NSR PM_{2.5} Rule mentioned above, TDEC's July 29, 2011, SIP revision makes an administrative change to Chapter 1200-03-09 for PSD and NNSR. On June 13, 2007, EPA took final action to revise the 2002 NSR Reform Rules⁵ to remove from federal law all provisions pertaining to clean units and the pollution control projects exemption that were vacated by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Rule. *New York v. United States*, 413 F.3d 3 (D.C. Cir. 2005). See 72 FR 32526. EPA's efforts to remove the vacated provisions included removing the following language from the hybrid test applicability provision at 40 CFR 51.166(a)(7)(iv)(f), 51.165(f)(6) and 52.21(a)(2)(iv)(f): "For example, if a project involves both an existing emissions unit and a Clean Unit, the projected increase is determined by summing the values determined using the method specified in paragraph (a)(7)(iv)(c) of this section for the existing unit and determined using the method specified in paragraph

(a)(7)(iv)(e) of this section for the Clean Unit."

Tennessee's July 29, 2011, submission removes the above language from its hybrid test applicability provision at 1200-03-09-.01(4)(c)4(vi) and 1200-03-09-.01(5)(b)2(xvii) (PSD and NNSR regulations respectively) to be consistent with federal language amended in the June 13, 2007, final rulemaking regarding the vacated portions of the 2002 NSR Reform Rule. EPA is proposing to approve the NSR PM_{2.5} requirements and administrative changes mentioned above into the Tennessee SIP because EPA has made the preliminary determination that this change is consistent with federal regulations and the CAA.

IV. Proposed Action

EPA is proposing to approve Tennessee's July 29, 2011, SIP revision, which includes rules that modify Tennessee's PSD and NNSR programs to adopt federal regulations amended in the NSR PM_{2.5} Rule. EPA has made the preliminary determination that this SIP revision is approvable because it is in consistent with the CAA and EPA regulations regarding NSR permitting.

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, 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 CAA. Accordingly, this proposed 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 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 CAA; 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 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, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: May 31, 2012.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2012-14106 Filed 6-8-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0285; FRL-9684-3]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate National Ambient Air Quality Standards

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve in part, and conditionally approve in part, the State Implementation Plans (SIPs), submitted by the State of Tennessee, through the Tennessee

⁵ On December 31, 2002 (67 FR 80186), EPA published final rule changes to 40 CFR parts 51 and 52 regarding the CAA's PSD and NNSR programs. On November 7, 2003 (68 FR 63021), EPA published a notice of final action on the reconsideration of the December 31, 2002, final rule changes. The December 31, 2002, and the November 7, 2003, final actions are collectively referred to as the "2002 NSR Reform Rules."

Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) as demonstrating that the State meets the requirements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) of the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act) for the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour fine particulate (PM_{2.5}) national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). Section 110(a) of the CAA requires that each state adopt and submit a SIP for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of each NAAQS promulgated by the EPA, which is commonly referred to as an “infrastructure” SIP. Tennessee certified that the Tennessee SIP contains provisions that ensure the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS are implemented, enforced, and maintained in Tennessee (hereafter referred to as “infrastructure submission”). EPA is proposing to conditionally approve a portion of sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) of Tennessee’s December 14, 2007, and October 19, 2009, submissions because the current Tennessee SIP does not currently include provisions to comply with all the requirements of this sub-element, however, the State has committed to adding such provisions to the SIP within one year of EPA’s final action on the infrastructure submission. With the exception of a portion of sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), EPA is proposing to determine that Tennessee’s infrastructure submission, provided to EPA on December 14, 2007, addressed all the required infrastructure elements for the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS and that its October 19, 2009, submission addressed all the required infrastructure elements for the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before July 11, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0285, by one of the following methods:

1. *www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
2. *Email*: R4-RDS@epa.gov.
3. *Fax*: (404) 562–9019.
4. *Mail*: “EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0285,” Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960.
5. *Hand Delivery or Courier*: Lynorae Benjamin, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Such

deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office’s normal hours of operation. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding Federal holidays.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0285. EPA’s policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at *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 through *www.regulations.gov* or email, information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected. The *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 email comment directly to EPA without going through *www.regulations.gov*, your email 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. For additional information about EPA’s public docket visit the EPA Docket Center homepage at <http://www.epa.gov/epahome/dockets.htm>.

Docket: All documents in the electronic docket are listed in the *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 *www.regulations.gov* or in hard copy at the Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW.,

Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sean Lakeman, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. The telephone number is (404) 562–9043. Mr. Lakeman can be reached via electronic mail at lakeman.sean@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Background
- II. What elements are required under sections 110(a)(1) and (2)?
- III. Scope of Infrastructure SIPs
- IV. What is EPA’s analysis of how Tennessee addressed the elements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) “infrastructure” provisions?
- V. Proposed Action
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Background

On July 18, 1997 (62 FR 36852), EPA established an annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS at 15.0 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) based on a 3-year average of annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations. At that time, EPA also established a 24-hour NAAQS of 65 µg/m³. See 40 CFR 50.7. On October 17, 2006 (71 FR 61144), EPA retained the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS at 15.0 µg/m³ based on a 3-year average of annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations, and promulgated a new 24-hour NAAQS of 35 µg/m³ based on a 3-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hour concentrations. By statute, SIPs meeting the requirements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) are to be submitted by states within 3 years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS. Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) require states to address basic SIP requirements, including emissions inventories, monitoring, and modeling to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. States were required to submit such SIPs to EPA no later than July 2000 for the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS, no later than October 2009 for the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

On March 4, 2004, Earthjustice submitted a notice of intent to sue related to EPA’s failure to issue findings of failure to submit related to the “infrastructure” requirements for the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS. On March

10, 2005, EPA entered into a consent decree with Earthjustice which required EPA, among other things, to complete a **Federal Register** notice announcing EPA's determinations pursuant to section 110(k)(1)(B) as to whether each state had made complete submissions to meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2) for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS by October 5, 2008. In accordance with the consent decree, EPA made completeness findings for each state based upon what the Agency received from each state for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS as of October 3, 2008.

On October 22, 2008, EPA published a final rulemaking entitled, "Completeness Findings for Section 110(a) State Implementation Plans Pertaining to the Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) NAAQS" making a finding that each state had submitted or failed to submit a complete SIP that provided the basic program elements of section 110(a)(2) necessary to implement the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS (See 73 FR 62902). For those states that did receive findings, the findings of failure to submit for all or a portion of a state's implementation plan established a 24-month deadline for EPA to promulgate a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) to address the outstanding SIP elements unless, prior to that time, the affected states submitted, and EPA approved, the required SIPs.

The findings that all or portions of a state's submission are complete established a 12-month deadline for EPA to take action upon the complete SIP elements in accordance with section 110(k). Tennessee's infrastructure submissions were received by EPA on December 14, 2007, for the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS and on October 19, 2009 for the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. The submissions were determined to be complete on June 14, 2008, and April 19, 2010, respectively. Tennessee was among other states that did not receive findings of failure to submit for the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS infrastructure requirements because it had provided a complete submission to EPA to address the infrastructure elements for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS by October 3, 2008.

On July 6, 2011, WildEarth Guardians and Sierra Club filed an amended complaint related to EPA's failure to take action on the SIP submittal related to the "infrastructure" requirements for the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. On October 20, 2011, EPA entered into a consent decree with WildEarth Guardians and Sierra Club which required EPA, among other things, to complete a **Federal Register** notice of the Agency's final action either approving, disapproving, or approving

in part and disapproving in part the Tennessee 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS Infrastructure SIP submittal addressing the applicable requirements of sections 110(a)(2)(A)–(H), (J)–(M), except for section 110(a)(2)(C) the nonattainment area requirements and section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) interstate transport requirements, by September 30, 2012.

Today's action is proposing to approve in part, and conditionally approve in part, Tennessee's infrastructure submission for the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS for sections 110(a)(2)(A)–(H), (J)–(M), except for section 110(a)(2)(C) nonattainment area requirements and section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) interstate transport requirements. This action is not approving any specific rule, but rather proposing that Tennessee's already approved SIP, with the exception of the portion of section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) for which EPA is today proposing conditional approval, meets certain CAA requirements.

II. What elements are required under sections 110(a)(1) and (2)?

Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit SIPs to provide for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of a new or revised NAAQS within 3 years following the promulgation of such NAAQS, or within such shorter period as EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a) imposes the obligation upon states to make a SIP submission to EPA for a new or revised NAAQS, but the contents of that submission may vary depending upon the facts and circumstances. In particular, the data and analytical tools available at the time the state develops and submits the SIP for a new or revised NAAQS affects the content of the submission. The contents of such SIP submissions may also vary depending upon what provisions the state's existing SIP already contains. In the case of the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS, some states may need to adopt language specific to the PM_{2.5} NAAQS to ensure that they have adequate SIP provisions to implement the PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

More specifically, section 110(a)(1) provides the procedural and timing requirements for SIPs. Section 110(a)(2) lists specific elements that states must meet for "infrastructure" SIP requirements related to a newly established or revised NAAQS. As mentioned above, these requirements include SIP infrastructure elements such as modeling, monitoring, and emissions inventories that are designed to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. The requirements that are

the subject of this proposed rulemaking are listed below¹ and in EPA's October 2, 2007, memorandum entitled "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8–Hour Ozone and PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards" and September 25, 2009, memorandum entitled "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standards."

- 110(a)(2)(A): Emission limits and other control measures.
- 110(a)(2)(B): Ambient air quality monitoring/data system.
- 110(a)(2)(C): Program for enforcement of control measures.²
- 110(a)(2)(D): Interstate transport.³
- 110(a)(2)(E): Adequate resources.
- 110(a)(2)(F): Stationary source monitoring system.
- 110(a)(2)(G): Emergency power.
- 110(a)(2)(H): Future SIP revisions.
- 110(a)(2)(I): Areas designated nonattainment and meet the applicable requirements of part D.⁴

¹ Two elements identified in section 110(a)(2) are not governed by the three year submission deadline of section 110(a)(1) because SIPs incorporating necessary local nonattainment area controls are not due within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS, but rather due at the time the nonattainment area plan requirements are due pursuant to section 172. These requirements are: (1) Submissions required by section 110(a)(2)(C) to the extent that subsection refers to a permit program as required in part D Title I of the CAA, and (2) submissions required by section 110(a)(2)(I) which pertain to the nonattainment planning requirements of part D, Title I of the CAA. Today's proposed rulemaking does not address infrastructure elements related to section 110(a)(2)(I) but does provide detail on how Tennessee's SIP addresses 110(a)(2)(C).

² This rulemaking only addresses requirements for this element as they relate to attainment areas.

³ Today's proposed rule does not address element 110(a)(2)(D)(i) (Interstate Transport) for the 1997 and 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Interstate transport requirements were formerly addressed by Tennessee consistent with the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR). On December 23, 2008, CAIR was remanded by the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, without vacatur, back to EPA. See *North Carolina v. EPA*, 531 F.3d 896 (DC Cir. 2008). Prior to this remand, EPA took final action to approve Tennessee SIP revision, which was submitted to comply with CAIR. See 72 FR 46388 (August 20, 2007). In so doing, Tennessee CAIR SIP revision addressed the interstate transport provisions in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 1997 and 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. In response to the remand of CAIR, EPA has recently finalized a new rule to address the interstate transport of nitrogen oxides and sulfur oxides in the eastern United States. See 76 FR 48208 (August 8, 2011) ("the Transport Rule"). That rule was recently stayed by the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. EPA's action on element 110(a)(2)(D)(i) will be addressed in a separate action.

⁴ This requirement was inadvertently omitted from EPA's October 2, 2007, memorandum entitled "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards," and the September 25, 2009,

- 110(a)(2)(J): Consultation with government officials; public notification; and PSD and visibility protection.
- 110(a)(2)(K): Air quality modeling/data.
- 110(a)(2)(L): Permitting fees.
- 110(a)(2)(M): Consultation/participation by affected local entities.

III. Scope of Infrastructure SIPs

EPA is currently acting upon SIPs that address the infrastructure requirements of CAA section 110(a)(1) and (2) for ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS for various states across the country. Commenters on EPA's recent proposals for some states raised concerns about EPA statements that it was not addressing certain substantive issues in the context of acting on those infrastructure SIP submissions.⁵ Those Commenters specifically raised concerns involving provisions in existing SIPs and with EPA's statements in other proposals that it would address two issues separately and not as part of actions on the infrastructure SIP submissions: (i) Existing provisions related to excess emissions during periods of start-up, shutdown, or malfunction at sources (SSM), that may be contrary to the CAA and EPA's policies addressing such excess emissions; and (ii) existing provisions related to "director's variance" or "director's discretion" that purport to permit revisions to SIP approved emissions limits with limited public process or without requiring further approval by EPA, that may be contrary to the CAA ("director's discretion"). EPA notes that there are two other substantive issues for which EPA likewise stated in other proposals that it would address the issues separately: (i) Existing provisions for minor source new source review (NSR) programs that may be inconsistent with the requirements of the CAA and EPA's regulations that pertain to such programs ("minor source NSR"); and (ii) existing provisions for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) programs that may be inconsistent with current requirements of EPA's "Final NSR Improvement Rule," 67 FR 80186

(December 31, 2002), as amended by 72 FR 32526 (June 13, 2007) ("NSR Reform"). In light of the comments, EPA believes that its statements in various proposed actions on infrastructure SIPs with respect to these four individual issues should be explained in greater depth. It is important to emphasize that EPA is taking the same position with respect to these four substantive issues in this action on the infrastructure SIPs for the 1997 and 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS from Tennessee.

EPA intended the statements in the other proposals concerning these four issues merely to be informational and to provide general notice of the potential existence of provisions within the existing SIPs of some states that might require future corrective action. EPA did not want states, regulated entities, or members of the public to be under the misconception that the Agency's approval of the infrastructure SIP submission of a given state should be interpreted as a re-approval of certain types of provisions that might exist buried in the larger existing SIP for such state. Thus, for example, EPA explicitly noted that the Agency believes that some states may have existing SIP approved SSM provisions that are contrary to the CAA and EPA policy, but that "in this rulemaking, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing state provisions with regard to excess emissions during SSM of operations at facilities." EPA further explained, for informational purposes, that "EPA plans to address such State regulations in the future." EPA made similar statements, for similar reasons, with respect to the director's discretion, minor source NSR, and NSR Reform issues. EPA's objective was to make clear that approval of an infrastructure SIP for these ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS should not be construed as explicit or implicit re-approval of any existing provisions that relate to these four substantive issues. EPA is reiterating that position in this action on the infrastructure SIP for Tennessee.

Unfortunately, the Commenters and others evidently interpreted these statements to mean that EPA considered action upon the SSM provisions and the other three substantive issues to be integral parts of acting on an infrastructure SIP submission, and therefore that EPA was merely postponing taking final action on the issues in the context of the infrastructure SIPs. This was not EPA's intention. To the contrary, EPA only meant to convey its awareness of the potential for certain types of deficiencies in existing SIPs and to prevent any misunderstanding that it

was reapproving any such existing provisions. EPA's intention was to convey its position that the statute does not require that infrastructure SIPs address these specific substantive issues in existing SIPs and that these issues may be dealt with separately, outside the context of acting on the infrastructure SIP submission of a state. To be clear, EPA did not mean to imply that it was not taking a full final agency action on the infrastructure SIP submission with respect to any substantive issue that EPA considers to be a required part of acting on such submissions under section 110(k) or under section 110(c). Given the confusion evidently resulting from EPA's statements in those other proposals, however, we want to explain more fully the Agency's reasons for concluding that these four potential substantive issues in existing SIPs may be addressed separately from actions on infrastructure SIP submissions.

The requirement for the SIP submissions at issue arises out of CAA section 110(a)(1). That provision requires that states must make a SIP submission "within 3 years (or such shorter period as the Administrator may prescribe) after the promulgation of a national primary ambient air quality standard (or any revision thereof)" and that these SIPs are to provide for the "implementation, maintenance, and enforcement" of such NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) includes a list of specific elements that "[e]ach such plan" submission must meet. EPA has historically referred to these particular submissions that states must make after the promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS as "infrastructure SIPs." This specific term does not appear in the statute, but EPA uses the term to distinguish this particular type of SIP submission designed to address basic structural requirements of a SIP from other types of SIP submissions designed to address other different requirements, such as "nonattainment SIP" submissions required to address the nonattainment planning requirements of part D, "regional haze SIP" submissions required to address the visibility protection requirements of CAA section 169A, NSR permitting program submissions required to address the requirements of part D, and a host of other specific types of SIP submissions that address other specific matters.

Although section 110(a)(1) addresses the timing and general requirements for these infrastructure SIPs, and section 110(a)(2) provides more details concerning the required contents of these infrastructure SIPs, EPA believes that many of the specific statutory

memorandum entitled "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 2006 Fine Particle (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standards," but as mentioned above is not relevant to today's proposed rulemaking.

⁵ See Comments of Midwest Environmental Defense Center, dated May 31, 2011. Docket #EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1179 (adverse comments on proposals for three states in Region 5). EPA notes that these public comments on another proposal are not relevant to this rulemaking and do not have to be directly addressed in this rulemaking. EPA will respond to these comments in the appropriate rulemaking action to which they apply.

provisions are facially ambiguous. In particular, the list of required elements provided in section 110(a)(2) contains a wide variety of disparate provisions, some of which pertain to required legal authority, some of which pertain to required substantive provisions, and some of which pertain to requirements for both authority and substantive provisions.⁶ Some of the elements of section 110(a)(2) are relatively straightforward, but others clearly require interpretation by EPA through rulemaking, or recommendations through guidance, in order to give specific meaning for a particular NAAQS.⁷

Notwithstanding that section 110(a)(2) provides that “each” SIP submission must meet the list of requirements therein, EPA has long noted that this literal reading of the statute is internally inconsistent, insofar as section 110(a)(2)(I) pertains to nonattainment SIP requirements that could not be met on the schedule provided for these SIP submissions in section 110(a)(1).⁸ This illustrates that EPA must determine which provisions of section 110(a)(2) may be applicable for a given infrastructure SIP submission. Similarly, EPA has previously decided that it could take action on different parts of the larger, general “infrastructure SIP” for a given NAAQS without concurrent action on all subsections, such as section 110(a)(2)(D)(i), because the Agency bifurcated the action on these latter “interstate transport” provisions within section 110(a)(2) and worked with states to address each of the four prongs of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) with substantive administrative actions proceeding on different tracks with different

schedules.⁹ This illustrates that EPA may conclude that subdividing the applicable requirements of section 110(a)(2) into separate SIP actions may sometimes be appropriate for a given NAAQS where a specific substantive action is necessitated, beyond a mere submission addressing basic structural aspects of the state’s implementation plans. Finally, EPA notes that not every element of section 110(a)(2) would be relevant, or as relevant, or relevant in the same way, for each new or revised NAAQS and the attendant infrastructure SIP submission for that NAAQS. For example, the monitoring requirements that might be necessary for purposes of section 110(a)(2)(B) for one NAAQS could be very different than what might be necessary for a different pollutant. Thus, the content of an infrastructure SIP submission to meet this element from a state might be very different for an entirely new NAAQS, versus a minor revision to an existing NAAQS.¹⁰

Similarly, EPA notes that other types of SIP submissions required under the statute also must meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2), and this also demonstrates the need to identify the applicable elements for other SIP submissions. For example, nonattainment SIPs required by part D likewise have to meet the relevant subsections of section 110(a)(2) such as section 110(a)(2)(A) or (E). By contrast, it is clear that nonattainment SIPs would not need to meet the portion of section 110(a)(2)(C) that pertains to part C, i.e., the PSD requirements applicable in attainment areas. Nonattainment SIPs required by part D also would not need to address the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) with respect to emergency episodes, as such requirements would not be limited to nonattainment areas. As this example illustrates, each type of SIP submission may implicate some subsections of section 110(a)(2) and not others.

Given the potential for ambiguity of the statutory language of section 110(a)(1) and (2), EPA believes that it is appropriate for EPA to interpret that language in the context of acting on the

infrastructure SIPs for a given NAAQS. Because of the inherent ambiguity of the list of requirements in section 110(a)(2), EPA has adopted an approach in which it reviews infrastructure SIPs against this list of elements “as applicable.” In other words, EPA assumes that Congress could not have intended that each and every SIP submission, regardless of the purpose of the submission or the NAAQS in question, would meet each of the requirements, or meet each of them in the same way. EPA elected to use guidance to make recommendations for infrastructure SIPs for these ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

On October 2, 2007, EPA issued guidance making recommendations for the infrastructure SIP submissions for both the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS and the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.¹¹ Within this guidance document, EPA described the duty of states to make these submissions to meet what the Agency characterized as the “infrastructure” elements for SIPs, which it further described as the “basic SIP requirements, including emissions inventories, monitoring, and modeling to assure attainment and maintenance of the standards.”¹² As further identification of these basic structural SIP requirements, “attachment A” to the guidance document included a short description of the various elements of section 110(a)(2) and additional information about the types of issues that EPA considered germane in the context of such infrastructure SIPs. EPA emphasized that the description of the basic requirements listed on attachment A was not intended “to constitute an interpretation of” the requirements, and was merely a “brief description of the required elements.”¹³ EPA also stated its belief that with one exception, these requirements were “relatively self explanatory, and past experience with SIPs for other NAAQS should enable States to meet these requirements with assistance from EPA Regions.”¹⁴ However, for the one exception to that general assumption (i.e., how states

⁶ For example, section 110(a)(2)(E) provides that states must provide assurances that they have adequate legal authority under state and local law to carry out the SIP; section 110(a)(2)(C) provides that states must have a substantive program to address certain sources as required by part C of the CAA; section 110(a)(2)(G) provides that states must have both legal authority to address emergencies and substantive contingency plans in the event of such an emergency.

⁷ For example, section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) requires EPA to be sure that each state’s SIP contains adequate provisions to prevent significant contribution to nonattainment of the NAAQS in other states. This provision contains numerous terms that require substantial rulemaking by EPA in order to determine such basic points as what constitutes significant contribution. See “Rule To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone (Clean Air Interstate Rule); Revisions to Acid Rain Program; Revisions to the NO_x SIP Call; Final Rule,” 70 FR 25162 (May 12, 2005) (defining, among other things, the phrase “contribute significantly to nonattainment”).

⁸ See *Id.*, 70 FR 25162, at 63–65 (May 12, 2005) (explaining relationship between timing requirement of section 110(a)(2)(D) versus section 110(a)(2)(I)).

⁹ EPA issued separate guidance to states with respect to SIP submissions to meet section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 1997 ozone and 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. See “Guidance for State Implementation Plan (SIP) Submissions to Meet Current Outstanding Obligations Under Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 8-Hour Ozone and PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards,” from William T. Harnett, Director Air Quality Policy Division OAQPS, to Regional Air Division Directors, Regions I–X, dated August 15, 2006.

¹⁰ For example, implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS required the deployment of a system of new monitors to measure ambient levels of that new indicator species for the new NAAQS.

¹¹ See “Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8-hour Ozone and PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards,” from William T. Harnett, Director Air Quality Policy Division, to Air Division Directors, Regions I–X, dated October 2, 2007 (the “2007 Guidance”).

¹² *Id.*, at page 2.

¹³ *Id.*, at attachment A, page 1.

¹⁴ *Id.*, at page 4. In retrospect, the concerns raised by commenters with respect to EPA’s approach to some substantive issues indicates that the statute is not so “self explanatory,” and indeed is sufficiently ambiguous that EPA needs to interpret it in order to explain why these substantive issues do not need to be addressed in the context of infrastructure SIPs and may be addressed at other times and by other means.

should proceed with respect to the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, EPA gave much more specific recommendations. But for other infrastructure SIP submittals, and for certain elements of the submittals for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, EPA assumed that each state would work with its corresponding EPA regional office to refine the scope of a state's submittal based on an assessment of how the requirements of section 110(a)(2) should reasonably apply to the basic structure of the state's implementation plans for the NAAQS in question.

On September 25, 2009, EPA issued guidance to make recommendations to states with respect to the infrastructure SIPs for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.¹⁵ In the 2009 Guidance, EPA addressed a number of additional issues that were not germane to the infrastructure SIPs for the 1997 8-hour ozone and 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, but were germane to these SIP submissions for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS (e.g., the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) that EPA had bifurcated from the other infrastructure elements for those specific 1997 ozone and PM_{2.5} NAAQS). Significantly, neither the 2007 Guidance nor the 2009 Guidance explicitly referred to the SSM, director's discretion, minor source NSR, or NSR Reform issues as among specific substantive issues EPA expected states to address in the context of the infrastructure SIPs, nor did EPA give any more specific recommendations with respect to how states might address such issues even if they elected to do so. The SSM and director's discretion issues implicate section 110(a)(2)(A), and the minor source NSR and NSR Reform issues implicate section 110(a)(2)(C). In the 2007 Guidance and the 2009 Guidance, however, EPA did not indicate to states that it intended to interpret these provisions as requiring a substantive submission to address these specific issues in existing SIP provisions in the context of the infrastructure SIPs for these NAAQS. Instead, EPA's 2007 Guidance merely indicated its belief that the states should make submissions in which they established that they have the basic SIP structure necessary to implement, maintain, and enforce the NAAQS. EPA believes that states can establish that they have the basic SIP structure, notwithstanding that there may be potential deficiencies within the

existing SIP. Thus, EPA's proposals for other states mentioned these issues not because the Agency considers them issues that must be addressed in the context of an infrastructure SIP as required by section 110(a)(1) and (2), but rather because EPA wanted to be clear that it considers these potential existing SIP problems as separate from the pending infrastructure SIP actions. The same holds true for this action on the infrastructure SIPs for Tennessee.

EPA believes that this approach to the infrastructure SIP requirement is reasonable because it would not be feasible to read section 110(a)(1) and (2) to require a top to bottom, stem to stern, review of each and every provision of an existing SIP merely for purposes of assuring that the state in question has the basic structural elements for a functioning SIP for a new or revised NAAQS. Because SIPs have grown by accretion over the decades as statutory and regulatory requirements under the CAA have evolved, they may include some outmoded provisions and historical artifacts that, while not fully up to date, nevertheless may not pose a significant problem for the purposes of "implementation, maintenance, and enforcement" of a new or revised NAAQS when EPA considers the overall effectiveness of the SIP. To the contrary, EPA believes that a better approach is for EPA to determine which specific SIP elements from section 110(a)(2) are applicable to an infrastructure SIP for a given NAAQS, and to focus attention on those elements that are most likely to need a specific SIP revision in light of the new or revised NAAQS. Thus, for example, EPA's 2007 Guidance specifically directed states to focus on the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(G) for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS because of the absence of underlying EPA regulations for emergency episodes for this NAAQS and an anticipated absence of relevant provisions in existing SIPs.

Finally, EPA believes that its approach is a reasonable reading of section 110(a)(1) and (2) because the statute provides other avenues and mechanisms to address specific substantive deficiencies in existing SIPs. These other statutory tools allow the Agency to take appropriate tailored action, depending upon the nature and severity of the alleged SIP deficiency. Section 110(k)(5) authorizes EPA to issue a "SIP call" whenever the Agency determines that a state's SIP is substantially inadequate to attain or maintain the NAAQS, to mitigate interstate transport, or otherwise to

comply with the CAA.¹⁶ Section 110(k)(6) authorizes EPA to correct errors in past actions, such as past approvals of SIP submissions.¹⁷ Significantly, EPA's determination that an action on the infrastructure SIP is not the appropriate time and place to address all potential existing SIP problems does not preclude the Agency's subsequent reliance on provisions in section 110(a)(2) as part of the basis for action at a later time. For example, although it may not be appropriate to require a state to eliminate all existing inappropriate director's discretion provisions in the course of acting on the infrastructure SIP, EPA believes that section 110(a)(2)(A) may be among the statutory bases that the Agency cites in the course of addressing the issue in a subsequent action.¹⁸

IV. What is EPA's analysis of how Tennessee addressed the elements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) "infrastructure" provisions?

Tennessee's infrastructure submission addresses the provisions of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) as described below.

1. 110(a)(2)(A): *Emission limits and other control measures*: Tennessee's infrastructure submissions provide an overview of the provisions of the Tennessee's Air Pollution Control Requirements relevant to air quality control regulations. The regulations described below have been federally approved in the Tennessee SIP and include enforceable emission limitations and other control measures:

Chapter 1200–3–4, *Open Burning*.
Chapter 1200–3–5, *Visible Emission Regulations*.

¹⁶ EPA has recently issued a SIP call to rectify a specific SIP deficiency related to the SSM issue. See, "Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Utah State Implementation Plan Revision," 74 FR 21639 (April 18, 2011).

¹⁷ EPA has recently utilized this authority to correct errors in past actions on SIP submissions related to PSD programs. See "Limitation of Approval of Prevention of Significant Deterioration Provisions Concerning Greenhouse Gas Emitting-Sources in State Implementation Plans; Final Rule," 75 FR 82536 (December 30, 2010). EPA has previously used its authority under CAA 110(k)(6) to remove numerous other SIP provisions that the Agency determined it had approved in error. See 61 FR 38664 (July 25, 1996) and 62 FR 34641 (June 27, 1997) (corrections to American Samoa, Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada SIPs); 69 FR 67062 (November 16, 2004) (corrections to California SIP); and 74 FR 57051 (November 3, 2009) (corrections to Arizona and Nevada SIPs).

¹⁸ EPA has recently disapproved a SIP submission from Colorado on the grounds that it would have included a director's discretion provision inconsistent with CAA requirements, including section 110(a)(2)(A). See 75 FR 42342, 42344 (July 21, 2010) (proposed disapproval of director's discretion provisions); 76 FR 4540 (January 26, 2011) (final disapproval of such provisions).

¹⁵ See "Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)," from William T. Harnett, Director Air Quality Policy Division, to Regional Air Division Directors, Regions I–X, dated September 25, 2009 (the "2009 Guidance").

Chapter 1200–3–6, *Non-process Emission Standards*.

Chapter 1200–3–7, *Process Emissions Standards*.

Chapter 1200–3–9, *Construction and Operating Permits*.

Chapter 1200–3–21, *General Alternate Emission Standard*.

EPA has made the preliminary determination that the provisions contained in these chapters and Tennessee's practices are adequate to protect the PM_{2.5} annual and 24-hour NAAQS in the State.

In this action, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing state provisions with regard to excess emissions during SSM of operations at a facility. EPA believes that a number of states have SSM provisions which are contrary to the CAA and existing EPA guidance, "State Implementation Plans: Policy Regarding Excess Emissions During Malfunctions, Startup, and Shutdown" (September 20, 1999), and the Agency plans to address such state regulations in the future. In the meantime, EPA encourages any state having deficient SSM provisions to take steps to correct it as soon as possible.

Additionally, in this action, EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove any existing state rules with regard to director's discretion or variance provisions. EPA believes that a number of states have such provisions which are contrary to the CAA and existing EPA guidance (52 FR 45109 (November 24, 1987)), and the Agency plans to take action in the future to address such state regulations. In the meantime, EPA encourages any state having a director's discretion or variance provision which is contrary to the CAA and EPA guidance to take steps to correct the deficiency as soon as possible.

2. 110(a)(2)(B) *Ambient air quality monitoring/data system*: Tennessee's Air Pollution Control Requirements, Chapter 1200–3–12–.02, *Procedures for Ambient Sampling and Analysis*, along with the Tennessee Network Description and Ambient Air Monitoring Network Plan provides for an ambient air quality monitoring system in the State. Annually, EPA approves the ambient air monitoring network plan for the state agencies. On July 1, 2011, Tennessee submitted its plan to EPA. On October 24, 2011, EPA approved Tennessee's monitoring network plan. Tennessee's approved monitoring network plan can be accessed at www.regulations.gov using Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2012–0285. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are adequate for the ambient air quality monitoring and data systems

related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

3. 110(a)(2)(C) *Program for enforcement of control measures including review of proposed new sources*: Chapter 1200–3–9, *Construction and Operating Permits*, of Tennessee's SIP pertain to the construction or modification of any major stationary source in areas designated as attainment, nonattainment or unclassifiable. On July 29, 2011, TDEC submitted revisions to its PSD/NSR regulations for EPA approval. Tennessee's SIP revision makes changes to Chapter 1200–03–09–.01, *Construction Permits*, to adopt PSD and Nonattainment New Source Review requirements related to the implementation of the NSR PM_{2.5} Rule. The rule amendment adopts required Federal PSD and NNSR permitting provisions governing the implementation of the NSR program for PM_{2.5} as promulgated in the NSR PM_{2.5} Rule that address the infrastructure requirements (C) and (J). See 73 FR 28321 (May 16, 2008). EPA will propose approval of Tennessee's July 29, 2011, submission in a rulemaking separate from today's action. However, the July 29, 2011, proposed SIP revision addresses requisite requirements of infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(C), therefore, today's action to propose approval of infrastructure SIP element 110(a)(2)(C) is contingent upon EPA taking final action to approve the July 29, 2011, revision into the Tennessee SIP. Final action regarding today's proposed approval of infrastructure SIP element 110(a)(2)(C) will not occur prior to final approval of the July 29, 2011, SIP revision.

In this action, EPA is proposing to approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP for the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS with respect to the general requirement in section 110(a)(2)(C) to include a program in the SIP that regulates the modification and construction of any stationary source as necessary to assure that the NAAQS are achieved. EPA is not proposing to approve or disapprove the State's existing minor NSR program itself to the extent that it is inconsistent with EPA's regulations governing this program. EPA believes that a number of states may have minor NSR provisions that are contrary to the existing EPA regulations for this program. EPA intends to work with states to reconcile state minor NSR programs with EPA's regulatory provisions for the program. The statutory requirements of section 110(a)(2)(C) provide for considerable flexibility in designing minor NSR programs, and EPA believes it may be

time to revisit the regulatory requirements for this program to give the states an appropriate level of flexibility to design a program that meets their particular air quality concerns, while assuring reasonable consistency across the country in protecting the NAAQS with respect to new and modified minor sources.

EPA has made the preliminary determination that, following final approval of the Tennessee July 29, 2011, submitted revision discussed above, Tennessee's SIP and the State's practices are adequate for program enforcement of control measures including review of proposed new sources related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

4. 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) *Interstate and International transport provisions*: Chapter 1200–9–.01(5), *Growth Policy*, outlines how the State will notify neighboring states of potential impacts from new or modified sources. Tennessee does not have any pending obligation under sections 115 and 126 of the CAA. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are adequate for insuring compliance with the applicable requirements relating to interstate and international pollution abatement for the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

5. 110(a)(2)(E) *Adequate resources*: Section 110(a)(2)(E) requires that each implementation plan provide (i) necessary assurances that the State will have adequate personnel, funding, and authority under state law to carry out its implementation plan, (ii) that the State comply with the requirements respecting State Boards pursuant to section 128 of the Act, and (iii) necessary assurances that, where the State has relied on a local or regional government, agency, or instrumentality for the implementation of any plan provision, the State has responsibility for ensuring adequate implementation of such plan provisions. As with the remainder of the infrastructure elements addressed by this notice, EPA is proposing to approve Tennessee's SIP as meeting the requirements of sub-elements 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii). With respect to sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) (regarding state boards), EPA is proposing to approve in part, and conditionally approve in part, this sub-element. EPA's rationale for today's proposals respecting each sub-element is described in turn below.

In support of EPA's proposal to approve sub-elements 110(a)(2)(E)(i) and (iii), TDEC, through the Tennessee Air Pollution Control Board, is responsible for promulgating rules and regulations

for the NAAQS, emissions standards general policies, a system of permits, fee schedules for the review of plans, and other planning needs. As evidence of the adequacy of TDEC's resources with respect to sub-elements (i) and (iii), EPA submitted a letter to Tennessee on March 11, 2011, outlining 105 grant commitments and current status of these commitments for fiscal year 2010. The letter EPA submitted to Tennessee can be accessed at www.regulations.gov using Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0285. Annually, states update these grant commitments based on current SIP requirements, air quality planning, and applicable requirements related to the NAAQS. There were no outstanding issues in relation to the SIP for fiscal year 2010, therefore, Tennessee's grants were finalized and closed out. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee has adequate resources for implementation of the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

With respect to sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii), EPA is proposing to approve in part, and to conditionally approve in part, Tennessee's infrastructure SIP as to this requirement. Section 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) provides that infrastructure SIPs must require compliance with section 128 of CAA requirements respecting State boards. Section 128, in turn, provides at subsection (a)(1) that each SIP shall require that any board or body which approves permits or enforcement orders shall be subject to the described public interest and income restrictions therein. Subsection 128(a)(2) requires that any board or body, or the head of an executive agency with similar power to approve permits or enforcement orders under the CAA, shall also be subject to conflict of interest disclosure requirements. In this action, EPA is proposing to conditionally approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP for element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) with respect to the applicable section 128(a)(1) requirements, and to approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP for element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) with respect to the applicable section 128(a)(2) requirements.

EPA's proposed conditional approval of sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) respecting the 128(a)(1) requirements is based upon a TDEC letter to EPA, dated March 28, 2012, which outlined TDEC's commitment to adopt specific enforceable measures into its SIP within one year to address the applicable portions of section 128(a)(1). The March 28, 2012, letter from TDEC to EPA can be accessed at www.regulations.gov

using docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0285.

In Tennessee's March 28, 2012, commitment letter, TDEC committed to bring its SIP into conformity with section 128(a)(1) of the CAA by submitting SIP revisions that designate at least a majority of the positions on the State's Air Pollution Control Board¹⁹ as being subject to the "public interest" requirement. In addition, TDEC has committed to submitting SIP revisions establishing requirements to ensure that at least a majority of the members on the State's Air Pollution Control Board do not derive any significant portion of their income from persons subject to permits or enforcement orders. In the March 28, 2012, commitment letter, TDEC describes that its planned restrictions related to the "significant portion of income" requirements of section 128 will include an exclusion for the official salaries of mayors of counties and municipalities, and for faculty members at institutions of higher learning.

In accordance with section 110(k)(4) of the CAA, the commitment from Tennessee must provide that the State will adopt the specified enforceable provisions and submit a revision to EPA for approval within one year from EPA's final conditional approval action. In its March 28, 2012, letter, TDEC committed to adopt the above-specified enforceable provisions and submit them to EPA for incorporation into the SIP by no later than one year from the effective date of EPA's final conditional approval action for that requirement. Failure by the State to adopt these provisions and submit them to EPA for incorporation into the SIP within one year from the effective date of EPA's final conditional approval action would result in this proposed conditional approval being treated as a disapproval. Should that occur, EPA would provide the public with notice of such a disapproval in the **Federal Register**.²⁰

As a result of Tennessee's formal commitment to correct deficiencies contained in the Tennessee SIP pertaining to section 128, EPA intends to move forward with finalizing the conditional approval of 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) with respect to the section 128(a)(1) requirements consistent with section 110(k)(4) of the Act. With respect to the

remaining sub-elements of 110(a)(2)(E), EPA is proposing to approve these portions of Tennessee's infrastructure SIP. As such, EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee has adequate resources for implementation of the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

6. 110(a)(2)(F) *Stationary source monitoring system*: Tennessee's infrastructure submission describes how to establish requirements for compliance testing by emissions sampling and analysis, and for emissions and operation monitoring to ensure the quality of data in the State. TDEC uses these data to track progress towards maintaining the NAAQS, develop control and maintenance strategies, identify sources and general emission levels, and determine compliance with emission regulations and additional EPA requirements. These requirements are provided in Chapter 1200-3-10, *Required Sampling, Recording and Reporting*, of the Tennessee Air Pollution Control Requirements.

Additionally, Tennessee is required to submit emissions data to EPA for purposes of the National Emissions Inventory (NEI). The NEI is EPA's central repository for air emissions data. EPA published the Air Emissions Reporting Rule (AERR) on December 5, 2008, which modified the requirements for collecting and reporting air emissions data (73 FR 76539). The AERR shortened the time states had to report emissions data from 17 to 12 months, giving states one calendar year to submit emissions data. All states are required to submit a comprehensive emissions inventory every 3 years and report emissions for certain larger sources annually through EPA's online Emissions Inventory System (EIS). States report emissions data for the six criteria pollutants and the precursors that form them—nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, ammonia, lead, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and volatile organic compounds. Many states also voluntarily report emissions of hazardous air pollutants. Tennessee made its latest update to the NEI on December 31, 2011. EPA compiles the emissions data, supplementing it where necessary, and releases it to the general public through the Web site <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chieff/eiinformation.html>. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are adequate for the stationary source monitoring systems related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

7. 110(a)(2)(G) *Emergency power*: Chapter 1200-3-15, *Emergency Episode*

¹⁹ The composition of Tennessee's Air Pollution Control Board is statutorily prescribed at Tennessee Code Annotated 68-201-104.

²⁰ EPA notes that pursuant to section 110(k)(4), a conditional approval is treated as a disapproval in the event that a State fails to comply with its commitment. Notification of this disapproval action in the **Federal Register** is not subject to public notice and comment.

Requirements, of the Tennessee SIP identifies air pollution emergency episodes and preplanned abatement strategies. These criteria have previously been approved by EPA. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices are adequate for emergency powers related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

8. 110(a)(2)(H) Future SIP revisions: As previously discussed, TDEC is responsible for adopting air quality rules and revising SIPs as needed to attain or maintain the NAAQS. Tennessee has the ability and authority to respond to calls for SIP revisions, and has provided a number of SIP revisions during the course of its NAAQS implementation. Specific to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS, Tennessee has provided the following submissions, including:

- April 4, 2008, Knoxville PM_{2.5} Attainment Demonstration;
- October 15, 2009, TN Portion of Chattanooga 1997 PM_{2.5} Attainment Demonstration; and,
- July 29, 2011, PM_{2.5} NSR/PSD.

EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate a commitment to provide future SIP revisions related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS when necessary.

9. 110(a)(2)(J) (121 consultation) Consultation with government officials: Chapter 1200-3-9 Construction and Operating Permits, as well as the Regional Haze Implementation Plan (which allows for consultation between appropriate state, local, and tribal air pollution control agencies as well as the corresponding Federal Land Managers), provide for consultation with government officials whose jurisdictions might be affected by SIP development activities. More specifically, Tennessee adopted state-wide consultation procedures for the implementation of transportation conformity, which includes the consideration of the development of mobile inventories for SIP development. Required partners covered by Tennessee's consultation procedures include Federal, state, and local transportation and air quality agency officials. EPA approved Tennessee's consultation procedures on May 16, 2003 (68 FR 26492). EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with government officials related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS when necessary.

10. 110(a)(2)(J) (127 public notification) Public notification: TDEC

has public notice mechanisms in place to notify the public of PM and other pollutant forecasting, including an air quality monitoring Web site with detailed maps of the PM forecast areas and specific information about each monitor, <http://tn.gov/environment/apc/>. As discussed above, Chapter 1200-3-15, *Emergency Episode Requirements*, requires that TDEC notify the public of any air pollution episode or NAAQS violation. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to provide public notification related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS when necessary.

11. 110(a)(2)(J) (PSD) PSD and visibility protection: Tennessee demonstrates its authority to regulate new and modified sources of PM to assist in the protection of air quality in Chapter 1200-3-9, Construction and Operating Permits. As with infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(C), infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(J) also requires compliance with applicable provisions of the PSD program described in part C of the Act. Accordingly, the pending EPA action on the July 29, 2011, SIP revision, is a prerequisite to today's proposed action to approve the State's infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(J). See the discussion for element 110(a)(2)(C) above for a description of the pending revision to the Tennessee SIP. The July 29, 2011, SIP revision, addresses requisite requirements of infrastructure element 110(a)(2)(J) (PSD and visibility protection), therefore, today's action to propose approval of infrastructure SIP element 110(a)(2)(J) (PSD and visibility protection) is contingent upon EPA first taking final action to approve the July 29, 2011, SIP revision, into the Tennessee SIP. Final action regarding today's proposed approval of infrastructure SIP element 110(a)(2)(J) (PSD and visibility protection) will not occur prior to final approval of the July 29, 2011, SIP revision.

With regard to the applicable requirements for visibility protection, EPA recognizes that states are subject to visibility and regional haze program requirements under part C of the Act (which includes sections 169A and 169B). In the event of the establishment of a new NAAQS, however, the visibility and regional haze program requirements under part C do not change. Thus, EPA finds that there is no new visibility obligation "triggered" under section 110(a)(2)(J) when a new NAAQS becomes effective. This would be the case even in the event a secondary PM_{2.5} NAAQS for visibility is

established, because this NAAQS would not affect visibility requirements under part C. Tennessee has submitted SIP revisions for approval to satisfy the requirements of the CAA Section 169A and the regional haze and best available retrofit technology rules contained in 40 CFR 51.308. The majority of Tennessee's regional haze program was approved on April 24, 2012 (77 FR 24392); the remaining portions are currently undergoing review. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to implement PSD programs and to provide for visibility protection related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS when necessary.

12. 110(a)(2)(K) Air quality and modeling/data: Chapter 1200-3-9-.01(4)(k), *Air Quality Models*, specify that required air modeling be conducted in accordance with 40 CFR part 51 Appendix W "Guideline on Air Quality Models," as incorporated into the Tennessee SIP. Tennessee's air quality regulations demonstrate that TDEC has the authority to provide relevant data for the purpose of predicting the effect on ambient air quality of the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate the State's ability to provide for air quality and modeling, along with analysis of the associated data, related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS when necessary.

13. 110(a)(2)(L) Permitting fees: As discussed above, Tennessee's SIP provides for the review of construction permits. Permitting fees in Tennessee are collected through the State's federally-approved title V fees program, which has been federally approved and according to State regulation Chapter 1200-03-26-.02, *Permit-Related Fees*. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately provide for permitting fees related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS when necessary.

14. 110(a)(2)(M) Consultation/participation by affected local entities: Chapter 1200-3-9-.01(4)(k), *Public Participation*, of the Tennessee SIP requires that TDEC notify the public of an application, preliminary determination, the activity or activities involved in the permit action, any emissions change associated with any permit modification, and the opportunity for comment prior to making a final permitting decision. TDEC has worked closely with local political subdivisions during the

development of its Transportation Conformity SIP and Regional Haze Implementation Plan. EPA has made the preliminary determination that Tennessee's SIP and practices adequately demonstrate consultation with, and participation by, affected local entities related to the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS when necessary.

V. Proposed Action

As described above, with the exception of sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) respecting CAA section 128(a)(1) requirements, EPA is proposing to determine that Tennessee's infrastructure submissions, provided to EPA on December 14, 2007 and October 19, 2009, addressed the required infrastructure elements for the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. EPA is proposing to approve in part and conditionally approve in part, Tennessee's SIP submission consistent with section 110(k)(3) of the CAA.

As described above, with the exception of sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) respecting CAA section 128(a)(1) requirements, and contingent upon final action by EPA to approve TDEC's July 29, 2011, SIP submission regarding the State's PSD/NSR regulations, TDEC will have addressed the requisite elements of the CAA 110(a)(1) and (2) SIP requirements pursuant to EPA's October 2, 2007 and September 25, 2009, guidance to ensure that the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS are implemented, enforced, and maintained in Tennessee. With respect to 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) (referencing section 128 of the CAA), EPA is proposing to conditionally approve Tennessee's infrastructure SIP.

Based on a March 28, 2012, commitment that TDEC will adopt specific enforceable measures into its SIP and submit these revisions to EPA within one year of EPA's final rulemaking to address the applicable portions of section 128, EPA is today proposing to conditionally approve Tennessee's infrastructure submission for the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS for sub-element 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) respecting the requirements of CAA section 128(a)(1). EPA is also proposing to approve Tennessee's infrastructure submissions for the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS because its December 14, 2007, and October 19, 2009, submissions are consistent with section 110 of the CAA. This proposed approval with respect to element 110(a)(2)(C) is contingent upon EPA first taking final action to approve TDEC's July 29, 2011,

SIP submission regarding the State's PSD/NSR regulations,

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, 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 CAA. Accordingly, this proposed 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 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 CAA; 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 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

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

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

Dated: May 31, 2012.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2012-14096 Filed 6-8-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 122, 123, 124, and 125

[EPA-HQ-OW-2008-0667, FRL-9681-4]

RIN 2040-AE95

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System—Proposed Regulations to Establish Requirements for Cooling Water Intake Structures at Existing Facilities; Notice of Data Availability Related to Impingement Mortality Control Requirements

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of Data Availability.

SUMMARY: On April 20, 2011, EPA published proposed standards for cooling water intake structures at all existing power generating facilities and existing manufacturing and industrial facilities as part of implementing section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act (CWA). As a result of that notice, EPA received extensive comments on its proposal. These comments included a substantial amount of new information accompanied by reports, studies and other documents often supplemented with the substantiating data. In some cases, the materials may not have included the underlying data supporting the documents' conclusions. Consequently, in many circumstances, EPA contacted the commenters to obtain the raw data underlying the documents for EPA's use in further assessing its proposal. This notice presents a summary of the significant new information and data EPA has received since proposal and a discussion of possible revisions to the final rule that EPA is considering that were suggested by the data and comments. EPA solicits public comment on the data and possible revisions presented in this