PART 369—VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

§ 369.4 What definitions apply to these programs?

Reservation means a Federal or State Indian reservation; public domain Indian allotment; former Indian reservation in Oklahoma; land held by incorporated Native groups, regional corporations, and village corporations under the provisions of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; or a defined area of land recognized by a State or the Federal Government where there is a concentration of tribal members and on which the tribal government is providing structured activities and services.

(Authority: Sections 12(c) and 121(e) of the Act; 29 U.S.C. 709(c) and 741(e))

PART 371—VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES PROJECTS FOR AMERICAN INDIANS WITH DISABILITIES

§ 371.4 What definitions apply to this program?

Reservation means a Federal or State Indian reservation; public domain Indian allotment; former Indian reservation in Oklahoma; land held by incorporated Native groups, regional corporations, and village corporations under the provisions of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; or a defined area of land recognized by a State or the Federal Government where there is a concentration of tribal members and on which the tribal government is providing structured activities and services.

(Authority: Sections 12(c) and 121(e) of the Act; 29 U.S.C. 709(c) and 741(e))

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52


Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Inspection and Maintenance Program Updates

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.
I. This Action

EPA is taking final action to approve SIP revisions submitted on January 31, 2008, May 24, 2010, October 11, 2013, and February 11, 2014, related to changes to North Carolina’s I/M regulations. On November 20, 2014, EPA published a direct final rulemaking to approve these changes into the SIP and published an accompanying proposed approval to the direct final rule in the event that EPA received adverse comment and withdrew the direct final rulemaking. See 79 FR 69051. In the direct final rule, EPA stated that if adverse comments were received by December 22, 2014, the rule would be withdrawn and not take effect, and an additional public comment period would not be instituted.

On December 17, 2014, and December 19, 2014, EPA received comments identified with the docket number for the aforementioned rulemaking actions. EPA withdrew the direct final rule on January 20, 2015 (80 FR 2612) and is now taking final action to approve the SIP revisions identified above. EPA has reviewed the changes included in these revisions and has determined that they are consistent with federal regulations and the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act).

II. Background

The North Carolina I/M program began in 1982 in Mecklenburg County utilizing a “tail-pipe” emissions test. From 1986 through 1991 the program expanded to include eight additional counties (Wake, Forsyth, Guilford, Durham, Gaston, Cabarrus, Orange and Union County). In 1999, the North Carolina General Assembly passed legislation to expand the coverage area for the I/M program in order to gain additional emission reductions to achieve the 1997 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standards in the State. This legislation expanded the I/M program from nine counties to 48 counties subject to continued tail-pipe testing of MY 1995 and older vehicles. EPA approved these changes to North Carolina’s I/M program into the SIP on October 30, 2002. See 67 FR 66056. Since that time, North Carolina has submitted additional changes to its program, which EPA is now acting upon. Specifically, North Carolina submitted SIP revisions related to the State’s I/M program on January 31, 2008, May 24, 2010, October 11, 2013, and February 11, 2014. EPA’s response to comments received on EPA’s November 20, 2014 rulemaking is provided in Section III of this rulemaking. EPA’s detailed analysis of these SIP revisions is provided in EPA’s direct final rulemaking published on November 20, 2014, and incorporated herein by reference. See 79 FR 69051.

III. Response to Comments

On December 19, 2014, EPA received comments on the proposed SIP revisions from an anonymous commenter and withdrew the direct final rule. EPA also received comments from the United States Department of Defense (DOD) on December 17, 2014. These comments are addressed below.

Comment: EPA received a comment from DOD expressing concern regarding the language in 15A North Carolina Administrative Code (NCAC) 02D.1002(a)(3) applying the I/M program to federal facilities. DOD believes that EPA should rescind its prior approval of section .1002(a)(3) into the SIP, disapprove North Carolina’s “proposed revisions thereto,” and identify section .1002(a)(3) “as no longer approved as part of the SIP.”

Response: These comments are not relevant to this rulemaking because EPA approved 15A NCAC 02D.1002(a)(3) into the SIP in 1995 (60 FR 28720 (June 2, 1995)) and North Carolina did not propose any substantive changes to section .1002(a)(3) as part of its January 31, 2008, May 24, 2010, October 11, 2013, and February 11, 2014 SIP submissions. The changes to 15A NCAC 02D.1002(a)(3) are merely typographical due to a reorganization of section .1002 and do not impact its scope or effect any substantive change in the regulations.

Comment: EPA received a comment from an anonymous commenter who does not believe that EPA can approve the state implementation plan (SIP) revisions because “North Carolina used the wrong modeling approach when determining whether the proposed revisions to the inspection program negatively affect the attainment and maintenance of NAAQS.” The Commenter contends that North Carolina used an inappropriate modeling approach is therefore inconsistent with EPA’s guidance on performance standard modeling and the use of MOVES to model changes to states’ I/M programs. According to the Commenter, proper modeling would show that “simply expanding the required model years that are subject to inspection would not have gained the necessary emission reductions required to offset the loss of reductions from dropping tailpipe testing.” The Commenter also believes that “expanding the [I/M] program to the rest of the state cannot be included as a way to offset the reductions from the tailpipe testing” and that North Carolina “must show that for each nonattainment/maintenance area, (1) dropping the tailpipe test still meets the applicable performance standard, and (2) the emission reductions provided in the past by the tailpipe test are offset by some other way since expanding the model years of new vehicles has typically not provided the requisite emissions reductions as tailpipe testing for older (more polluting) vehicles has done.”

Response: EPA disagrees with the Commenter. North Carolina’s January 31, 2008 SIP submission asks EPA to remove the State’s regulation governing tailpipe testing, 15A NCAC 02D.1004, from the SIP. As the State noted in its 2008 submission, 15A NCAC 02D.1004 is obsolete because the tailpipe testing requirements of that section expired on January 1, 2006, pursuant to subsection .1004(e). EPA approved the addition of 15A NCAC 02D.1004(e) into the SIP in 2002. See 67 FR 66056 (Oct. 30, 2002). Therefore, the SIP revision only eliminates inoperative regulatory text and does not “drop” tailpipe testing. The tailpipe testing requirement expired in 2006 pursuant to the terms of the regulation which EPA approved in 2002. Therefore, this comment is not relevant to the SIP revisions EPA is acting on today.

The removal of 15A NCAC 02D.1004 from the SIP will not interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment or any other applicable requirement of the CAA because its removal has no impact on emissions. Tailpipe testing ended in North Carolina on January 1, 2006, and 15 NCAC 02D.1004(e) had already been approved into the SIP at the time of the State’s 2008 submission. Therefore, no modeling or other technical analysis is required to satisfy CAA Section 110(l). Moreover, the Commenter’s claim that North Carolina used an inappropriate
application of MOVES to demonstrate that the revisions to the I/M program will not interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment is based solely on the fact that the modeling did not consider removal of the tailpipe emissions testing provision. As explained above, the tailpipe emissions testing program expired pursuant to a previously-approved SIP revision, and therefore is not at issue in today’s action.

IV. Final Action

EPA is approving North Carolina’s January 31, 2008, May 24, 2010, October 11, 2013, and February 11, 2014, SIP revisions pertaining to state rule changes to the State’s I/M program. EPA has determined that these SIP revisions are approvable because they are consistent with section 110 of the CAA.

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 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);
- 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, the SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where 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 Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. If a rule report is submitted, the rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published 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).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by April 6, 2015. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. See section 307(b)(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: January 26, 2015.

V. Anne Heard,
Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

§ 52.1770 Identification of plan.

(a) Table 1, in paragraph (c) is amended by revising the entries for “Sect .1002,” “Sect .1003,” “Sect .1004,” and “Sect .1005”;
(b) In paragraph (e), the table is amended by adding a new entry “Non-Interference Demonstration for the North Carolina Inspection and Maintenance Program” at the end of the table.

The revisions and addition read as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1—EPA Approved North Carolina Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter 2D Air Pollution Control Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 52.1770 Identification of plan.
### TABLE 1—EPA APPROVED NORTH CAROLINA REGULATIONS—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State citation</th>
<th>Title/subject</th>
<th>State effective date</th>
<th>EPA approval date</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sect .1000 ...... Motor Vehicle Emissions Control Standard</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sect .1002 ....... Applicability</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>2/5/2015</td>
<td>[Insert Federal Register citation].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sect .1003 ....... Definitions</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
<td>2/1/2014</td>
<td>2/5/2015</td>
<td>[Insert Federal Register citation].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sect .1005 ....... On-Board Diagnostic Standards</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>2/5/2015</td>
<td>[Insert Federal Register citation].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) \* \* \* \* \*  

---

### EPA APPROVED NORTH CAROLINA NON-REGULATORY PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>State effective date</th>
<th>EPA approval date</th>
<th>Federal Register citation</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interference Demonstration for the North Carolina Inspection and Maintenance Program.</td>
<td>10/11/2013</td>
<td>2/5/2015</td>
<td>[Insert Federal Register citation].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[FR Doc. 2015–02071 Filed 2–4–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300


National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan National Priorities List: Deletion of the Midvale Slag Superfund Site

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 8 is publishing a direct final Notice of Deletion of the Midvale Slag Superfund Site (Site), located in Salt Lake County, Utah, from the National Priorities List (NPL). The NPL, promulgated pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended, is an appendix of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP). This direct final deletion is being published by EPA with the concurrence of the State of Utah, through the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ), because EPA has determined that all appropriate response actions under CERCLA, other than operation, maintenance and five-year reviews of the Site, have been completed. However, this deletion does not preclude future actions under Superfund.

DATES: This direct final deletion is effective April 6, 2015 unless EPA receives adverse comments by March 9, 2015. If adverse comments are received, EPA will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final deletion in the Federal Register informing the public that the deletion will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID no. EPA–HQ–SFUND–1991–0006, by one of the following methods: (1) http://www.regulations.gov; Follow on-line instructions for submitting comments. (2) Email: waterman.erna@epa.gov (3) Fax: 303–312–7151 (4) Mail: Erna Waterman, Remedial Project Manager, U.S. EPA, Region 8, Mail Code 8EPR–SR, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, CO 80202–1129 (5) Hand delivery: US EPA, Region 8, 1595 Wynkoop Street, EPR–SR, Denver, CO 80202–1129. Such deliveries are only accepted during EPA’s normal hours of operation (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.), and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID no. EPA–HQ–SFUND–1991–0006. EPA’s policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through http://www.regulations.gov or email. The http://www.regulations.gov Web site is an “anonymous access” system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an email comment directly to EPA without going through http://www.regulations.gov, your email...