

- Does the format of the proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions (grouping and order of sections, use of headings, paragraphing, etc.) aid or reduce their clarity?

- Would the proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions be easier to understand if we divided them into more (but shorter) sections?

- Could the description of the proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this preamble be more helpful in making the proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions easier to understand? If so, how?

- What else could we do to make the proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions easier to understand?

To send any comments that concern how the Department could make these proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions easier to understand, see the instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section.

Intergovernmental Review: This program is subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. One of the objectives of the Executive order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism. The Executive order relies on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

This document provides early notification of our specific plans and actions for this program.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

The Secretary certifies that these proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The small entities that this proposed regulatory action would affect are institutions that meet the eligibility requirements described in 316 through 320 of part A of title III, part B of title III, or title V of the HEA. The Secretary believes that the costs imposed on applicants by the proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions would be limited to paperwork burden related to preparing an application and that the benefits would outweigh any costs incurred by applicants.

Participation in this program is voluntary. For this reason, the proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions would impose no burden on small entities unless they applied for funding under the program. We expect that in determining whether to apply for RDI grant program funds, an eligible applicant would evaluate the requirements of preparing an application and any associated costs

and weigh them against the benefits likely to be achieved by receiving an RDI program grant. Eligible applicants most likely would apply only if they determine that the likely benefits exceed the costs of preparing an application. The likely benefits include the potential receipt of a grant as well as other benefits that may accrue to an entity through its development of an application, such as the use of that application to seek funding from other sources to address the institution's research and development infrastructure needs.

This proposed regulatory action would not have a significant economic impact on a small entity once it receives a grant because it would be able to meet the costs of compliance using the funds provided under this program. We invite comments from eligible small entities as to whether they believe this proposed regulatory action would have a significant economic impact on them and, if so, request evidence to support that belief.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

These proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions do not contain any information collection requirements.

Accessible Format: On request to the program contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, individuals with disabilities can obtain this document in an accessible format. The Department will provide the requestor with an accessible format that may include Rich Text Format (RTF) or text format (txt), a thumb drive, an MP3 file, braille, large print, audiotope, or compact disc, or other accessible format.

Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. You may access the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations at www.govinfo.gov. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit

your search to documents published by the Department.

Nasser Paydar,
Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education.

[FR Doc. 2024–10870 Filed 5–16–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R04–OAR–2023–0518; FRL–11955–01–R4]

Air Plan Approval; GA; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan Gasoline Transport Vehicles and Vapor Collection System Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GA DNR) Environmental Protection Division (EPD) on September 28, 2023, for the purpose of clarifying requirements for gasoline transport vehicles and making minor administrative changes. EPA is proposing to approve Georgia's September 28, 2023, SIP revision pursuant to the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 17, 2024.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2023–0518 at regulations.gov. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from Regulations.gov. EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general

guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Weston Freund, Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air and Radiation Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. The telephone number is (404) 562-8773. Mr. Freund can also be reached via electronic mail at staff email freund.weston@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. EPA's Analysis of Georgia's Submittal

EPA is proposing to approve a SIP revision submitted by the Georgia EPD on September 28, 2023, amending Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss), "Gasoline Transport Vehicles and Vapor Collection Systems"¹ to clarify requirements for tank labeling and increase consistency with other rules. The SIP revision makes the following changes: replaces "paragraph" with "subparagraph" in Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss)1.; adds "(month and year)" to Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss)1.(ii) to clarify that "date" means month and year; changes the first letter of "subparagraph" to lower case in Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss)2.(ii), and replaces "section" with "paragraph" in Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss)3. to be consistent with the rest of the rule. EPA is proposing to approve these changes because they are administrative in nature and would therefore not interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment and reasonable further progress or any other applicable requirement of the CAA.²

II. Incorporation by Reference

In this document, EPA is proposing to include in a final EPA rule regulatory text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, and as discussed in Section I of this preamble, EPA is proposing to incorporate by reference Georgia Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss), "Gasoline Transport Vehicles and Vapor Collection Systems", which changes "paragraph" to "subparagraph"

in Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss)1., adds "(month and year)" to Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss)1.(ii), changes "subparagraph" to lower case in Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss)2.(ii), and changes "section" to "paragraph" in Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss)3., state effective on September 17, 2023. EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials generally available through www.regulations.gov and at the EPA Region 4 office (please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble for more information).

III. Proposed Action

EPA is proposing to approve the aforementioned Georgia SIP revision consisting of administrative changes to Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss), "Gasoline Transport Vehicles and Vapor Collection Systems" for the reasons discussed above.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the CAA 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 proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this proposed action:

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 14094 (88 FR 21879, April 11, 2023);
- 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 subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) because it approves a state program;

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001); and

- 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.

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).

Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 59 FR 7629, Feb. 16, 1994) directs Federal agencies to identify and address "disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects" of their actions on minority populations and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. EPA defines environmental justice (EJ) as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies." EPA further defines the term fair treatment to mean that "no group of people should bear a disproportionate burden of environmental harms and risks, including those resulting from the negative environmental consequences of industrial, governmental, and commercial operations or programs and policies."

GA EPD did not evaluate EJ considerations as part of its SIP submittal; the CAA and applicable implementing regulations neither prohibit nor require such an evaluation. EPA did not perform an EJ analysis and did not consider EJ in this proposed action. Due to the nature of the action being proposed here, this proposed action is expected to have a neutral to positive impact on the air quality of the affected area. Consideration of EJ is not required as part of this proposed action, and there is no information in the record inconsistent with the stated goal of E.O. 12898 of achieving EJ for people of color, low-income populations, and Indigenous people.

¹ Table 1 to Paragraph (c)—EPA-Approved Georgia Regulations at 40 CFR 52.570(c) incorrectly refers to Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss) as "Gasoline Transport Systems and Vapor Collection Systems" rather than "Gasoline Transport Vehicles and Vapor Collection Systems" as approved October 13, 1992. See 57 FR 46780. In addition to the revisions described herein, EPA is proposing to correct the title of Rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(ss) in 40 CFR 52.570(c) to accurately reflect the title as approved on October 13, 1992.

² See CAA section 110(l).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

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

Dated: May 10, 2024.

Jeananne Gettle,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2024–10713 Filed 5–16–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R03–OAR–2019–0562; FRL–11960–01–R3]

Air Plan Approval and Disapproval; Pennsylvania; Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) Under the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to revise its December 14, 2020 action that fully approved two state implementation plan (SIP) revisions, both submitted to EPA on August 13, 2018 by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, through the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP). Those SIP revisions addressed reasonably available control technology (RACT) requirements for the 2008 ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS), including those related to control technique guidelines (CTGs) for volatile organic compounds (VOC) and the addition of regulations controlling VOC emissions from industrial cleaning solvents. The SIP revisions also included certain clarifying amendments to Pennsylvania code related to major source RACT regulations. Upon reconsideration, EPA is proposing to revise its prior action to partially approve and partially disapprove the August 13, 2018 submittals. Specifically, EPA is proposing approval of certain clarifying amendments as well as a negative declaration submitted by PADEP. EPA is proposing disapproval of the remainder of both SIP submittals related to CTGs and control of VOC emissions from industrial cleaning

solvents. This action is being taken under the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before June 17, 2024.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R03–OAR–2019–0562 at www.regulations.gov, or via email to goold.megan@epa.gov. For comments submitted at Regulations.gov, follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from Regulations.gov. For either manner of submission, EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be confidential business information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.* on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Ellen Schmitt, Planning & Implementation Branch (3AD30), Air & Radiation Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1600 John F Kennedy Boulevard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. The telephone number is (215) 814–5787. Ms. Schmitt can also be reached via electronic mail at schmitt.ellen@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 13, 2018, PADEP submitted to EPA two SIP revisions to satisfy certain RACT requirements for sources of VOC emissions required by sections 182(b)(2) and 184(b)(1)(B) of the CAA and the implementing regulations for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS (80 FR 12264, March 6, 2015; 40 CFR part 51, subpart AA). Additionally, these two submittals are related to another PADEP SIP submission addressing RACT for major stationary sources of VOC and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) that was conditionally approved by EPA on May 9, 2019. See section II.B.2 of this proposed rulemaking.

I. Background

A. Ozone NAAQS and RACT Requirements

On July 18, 1997 (62 FR 38856), EPA promulgated a revised standard for ground level ozone based on 8-hour average concentrations. The 8-hour averaging period replaced the previous 1-hour averaging period adopted in 1979, and the level of the NAAQS was changed from 0.12 parts per million (ppm) to 0.08 ppm. On March 27, 2008 (73 FR 16436), EPA further strengthened the 8-hour ozone standards from 0.08 ppm to 0.075 ppm (2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS). On October 26, 2015, (80 FR 65292) EPA adopted another revision to the ozone standard (2015 ozone NAAQS), but the 2008 ozone standard remains in place. This action concerns RACT requirements under the 2008 8-hour NAAQS.

The CAA regulates emissions of NO_x and VOC to prevent photochemical reactions that result in ozone formation. Section 182(b)(2) of the CAA requires states with ozone nonattainment areas classified as moderate or higher to submit a SIP revision requiring implementation of RACT. EPA has consistently defined “RACT” as the lowest emission limit that a particular source is capable of meeting by the application of the control technology that is reasonably available considering technological and economic feasibility.

The CAA requires RACT revisions for three specific categories of sources for the ozone NAAQS. First, section 182(b)(2)(A) requires RACT for each category of VOC sources in the nonattainment area covered by a CTG document issued by EPA between November 15, 1990 and the date of attainment.¹ Second, section 182(b)(2)(B) requires RACT for all VOC sources in the area covered by any CTG issued before November 15, 1990. Third, section 182(b)(2)(C) requires RACT for all other major stationary sources of VOC located in the nonattainment area. In addition, section 182(f) subjects major stationary sources of NO_x to the same RACT requirements applicable to major stationary sources of VOC.² EPA has not issued any CTGs for categories of NO_x sources, so the effect of section 182(f) is to require that SIPs also require

¹ EPA provides states with guidance concerning what types of controls could constitute RACT for a given source category through the issuance of CTG and alternative control technique (ACT) documents.

² A “major source” is defined based on the source’s potential to emit NO_x or VOC, and the applicable ton per year emission thresholds defining a “major” source differ based on the classification of the nonattainment area in which the source is located. See sections 182(c)–(f) and 302 of the CAA.