

administrative review, if the exporter or producer wishes the Department to use the weighted-average purchase price paid to the market economy supplier(s) to value all of the input (from all sources). Furthermore, the proposed rule will require that exporters or producers also establish on the administrative record that the market economy input at issue was produced in a market economy, rather than merely being sold through a market economy supplier. There will be no additional reporting or recordkeeping burdens on U.S. importers as a result of this rule.

Description of Any Significant Alternatives to the Proposed Rule That Accomplish the Stated Objectives of Applicable Statutes and That Minimize Any Significant Economic Impact of the Proposed Rule on Small Entities

As required by 5 U.S.C. 603(c), the Department's analysis considered significant alternatives. The alternatives which the Department considered are: (1) The preferred alternative of modifying 19 CFR 351.408(c)(1) to (a) establish that if substantially all of an input is purchased from market economy suppliers as a share of total purchases of that input from all sources during the investigation or review period, the Department will use the weighted-average purchase price paid to market economy suppliers to value all of the input and (b) require that the market economy input at issue actually be produced in one or more market economy countries, and not just be sold through market economy countries; (2) modify the regulation with respect to (1)(a), but not (1)(b); (3) modify the regulation with respect to (1)(b), but not (1)(a); or (4) maintain the *status quo* with respect to the valuation of inputs purchased from a market economy supplier and paid for in a market economy currency.

Factors of production for the subject merchandise will be assigned a value in the calculation of the weighted average dumping margin and antidumping duty assessment rate, whether the assigned value is a market economy purchase price, a surrogate value from a market economy country, or a combination of the two. Accordingly, the economic impact of providing information and argument to the Department in relation to the valuation of the factors of production for entities individually examined in the Department's antidumping proceedings is roughly equivalent under each of the above-noted alternatives.

In relation to the possible impact of the alternatives on the amount of antidumping duties to be paid by

importers of record of the subject merchandise, the value of a factor of production is one of numerous elements in the calculation of a weighted average margin of dumping. Whether a particular factor value will have any impact on the resulting weighted average dumping margin is not certain. To the extent that a small U.S. importer will be economically impacted by this rule, it will only be through an increase or decrease in the cash deposits and duties posted by that importer as a result in the change of a weighted average dumping margin. In those circumstances where a change in the value of an input as a result of this regulatory modification does have an impact on the weighted average dumping margin, the impact to the small U.S. importer will depend on whether the publicly sourced value is higher or lower than the market economy purchase price(s).

In this regard, the Department is required by 19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)(1)(b) to rely on the best information available for valuing the producer's factors of production. The proposed modification to the regulation addresses the Department's concerns that a market economy input price may not be the best available information when: (1) Market economy purchases of an input are insufficient in proportion to NME purchases for the Department to objectively conclude that the purchase price for the input would have been the same had the firm purchased solely from market economy suppliers and (2) the reported pricing of an NME-produced input purchased from a market economy supplier (or reseller) can be distorted by NME cost or supply factors. Accordingly, the Department considers that the first, preferred alternative is the only alternative that fully addresses the Department's policy concerns explained in the Background section of this Notice.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain a collection of information for purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, as amended (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*)

List of Subjects in 19 CFR Part 351

Administrative practice and procedure, Antidumping, Business and industry, Cheese, Confidential business information, Countervailing duties, Freedom of information, Investigations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: June 15, 2012.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

For the reasons stated, 19 CFR part 351 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 351—ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES

1. The authority citation for 19 CFR part 351 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 19 U.S.C. 1202 note; 19 U.S.C. 1303 note; 19 U.S.C. 1671 *et seq.*; and 19 U.S.C. 3538.

2. In § 351.408, revise paragraph (c)(1) to read as follows:

Information used to value factors. The Secretary normally will use publicly available information to value factors. However, where a factor is produced in one or more market economy countries, purchased from one or more market economy suppliers and paid for in market economy currency, the Secretary normally will use the price(s) paid to the market economy supplier(s) if substantially all of the total volume of the factor is purchased from the market economy supplier(s). For purposes of this provision, the Secretary defines the term "substantially all" to be 85 percent or more of the total purchase volume of the factor used in the production of subject merchandise. In those instances where less than substantially all of the total volume of the factor is produced in one or more market economy countries and purchased from one or more market economy suppliers, the Secretary normally will weight-average the actual price(s) paid for the market economy portion and the surrogate value for the nonmarket economy portion by their respective quantities.

[FR Doc. 2012–15436 Filed 6–27–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

22 CFR Parts 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, and 130

[Public Notice [7927]]

Export Control Reform Transition Plan Correction

In proposed rule document 2012–15070 appearing on pages 37346–37349 in the issue of Thursday, June 21, 2012 make the following correction:

On page 37346, in the third column, in the document's heading, the CFR parts affected should read "22 CFR Parts

120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, and 130".

[FR Doc. C1–2012–15070 Filed 6–27–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2012–0141; FRL–9694–1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revisions to the Nevada State Implementation Plan; Stationary Source Permits

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the applicable state implementation plan for the State of Nevada. The submitted revisions include new or amended State rules governing applications for, and issuance of, permits for stationary sources, but not including review and permitting of major sources and major modifications under parts C and D of title I of the Clean Air Act. EPA is proposing this action under the Clean Air Act obligation to take action on State submittals of revisions to state implementation plans. The intended effect of the limited approval and limited disapproval action is to update the applicable state implementation plan with current State rules with respect to permitting, and to set the stage for remedying deficiencies in the permitting rules with respect to certain new or revised national ambient air quality standards. If finalized as proposed, this limited disapproval action would not trigger sanctions under section 179 of the Clean Air Act but would trigger an obligation on EPA to promulgate a Federal Implementation Plan unless the State of Nevada corrects the deficiencies, and EPA approves the related plan revisions within two years of the final action.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before July 30, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2012–0141, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* www.regulations.gov. Follow the on-line instructions.

2. *Email:* R9airpermits@epa.gov.

3. *Mail or deliver:* Gerardo Rios (AIR–3), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

Instructions: All comments 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 Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through www.regulations.gov or email. www.regulations.gov is an “anonymous access” system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send email directly to EPA, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. 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.

Docket: The index to the docket for this action is available electronically at www.regulations.gov and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed in the index, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laura Yannayon, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street (AIR–3), San Francisco, CA 94105, phone number (415) 972–3534, fax number (415) 947–3579, or by email at yannayon.laura@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, the terms “we,” “us,” and “our” refer to EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. The State’s Submittals
 - A. Which rules did the state submit?
 - B. What is the regulatory history of the Nevada SIP?
 - C. What are the existing Nevada rules governing NSR in the Nevada SIP?
 - D. What is the purpose of this proposed rule?
- II. EPA’s Evaluation
 - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
 - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
- 1. Previous Deficiencies in Prior-Submitted NSR Rules

- 2. New Deficiencies in NSR Rules
- 3. Conclusion
- III. Public Comment and Proposed Action
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. The State’s Submittals

A. Which rules did the state submit?

On January 24, 2011, the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) submitted a revision to the Nevada State Implementation Plan (SIP) to EPA for approval or disapproval under section 110(k) of the Clean Air Act (CAA or “Act”). NDEP’s submittal includes certain new or amended State rules [i.e., certain sections of Nevada Administrative Code (NAC)] that govern applications for, and issuance of, permits for stationary sources [a process referred to herein as “New Source Review” (NSR) and rules referred to herein as “NSR rules”].¹ NDEP’s January 24, 2011 submittal also includes a rescission of one definition from the existing SIP (the definition of “special mobile equipment”). In addition to the NSR rules, NDEP’s January 24, 2011 submittal contains evidence of public notice and adoption of the rules, or amendments to the rules, since March 2006. Evidence of public notice and adoption of the NSR rules or amendments that predate March 2006 were previously submitted by NDEP in SIP revision submittals dated February 16, 2005 and January 12, 2006. By letter dated February 17, 2011, we found that the January 24, 2011 submittal fulfills the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V.

On November 9, 2011, NDEP replaced one of the NSR rules, that had been submitted on January 24, 2011 (NAC 445B.3457) and that had been submitted as a temporary regulation, with the version of the rule that had been adopted by the State Environmental Commission (SEC) as a permanent regulation, and enclosed the related evidence of public notice and adoption for the permanent regulation.

On May 21, 2012, NDEP submitted a small set of additional NSR-related rules [and one definition from the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS)] to supplement the NSR rules submitted on January 24, 2011 and November 9, 2011. NDEP’s May 21, 2012 submittal also includes certain clarifications concerning the previously-submitted NSR rules, and documentation supporting the selection

¹ We note that the stationary source permitting rules that are the subject of this proposed rule are not intended to satisfy the requirements for pre-construction review and permitting of major sources or major modifications under part C (“Prevention of Significant Deterioration of air quality”) or part D (“Plan requirements for nonattainment areas”) of title I of the Clean Air Act.