

* * * * *

■ 5. Section 52.144 is amended by adding paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 52.144 Significant deterioration of air quality.

* * * * *

(c) The requirements of sections 160 through 165 of the Clean Air Act are met as they apply to stationary sources under the jurisdiction of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), except with respect to emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) (as defined in § 52.21(b)(49)(i)). Therefore, the provisions of § 52.21, except paragraph (a)(1) of this section, for GHGs are hereby made a part of the plan for stationary sources under the jurisdiction of ADEQ as it applies to the stationary sources described in § 52.21(b)(49)(iv).

[FR Doc. 2018-09205 Filed 5-3-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0315; FRL-9977-49-Region 4]

Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Regional Haze Plan and Prong 4 (Visibility) for the 2012 PM_{2.5}, 2010 NO₂, 2010 SO₂, and 2008 Ozone NAAQS

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving the portion of Georgia's July 26, 2017, State Implementation Plan (SIP) submittal changing reliance from the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) to the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) for certain regional haze requirements. EPA is also converting the previous limited approval/limited disapproval of Georgia's regional haze plan to a full approval and is removing the Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for Georgia which replaced reliance on CAIR with reliance on CSAPR. Finally, EPA is converting the conditional approvals to full approvals for the visibility prong of Georgia's infrastructure SIP submittals for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}), 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂), and 2008 8-hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

DATES: This rule will be effective June 4, 2018.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket

Identification No. EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0315. All documents in the docket are listed on the www.regulations.gov website. Although listed in the index, some information may not be publicly available, *i.e.*, Confidential Business Information 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 through www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation 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 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michele Notarianni, Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Ms. Notarianni can be reached by telephone at (404) 562-9031 or via electronic mail at notarianni.michele@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

A. Regional Haze Plans and Their Relationship With CAIR and CSAPR

Section 169A(b)(2)(A) of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) requires states to submit regional haze plans that contain such measures as may be necessary to make reasonable progress towards the natural visibility goal, including a requirement that certain categories of existing major stationary sources built between 1962 and 1977 procure, install, and operate Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) as determined by the state. Under the Regional Haze Rule (RHR), states are directed to conduct BART determinations for such "BART-eligible" sources that may be anticipated to cause or contribute to any visibility impairment in a Class I area. Rather than requiring source-specific BART controls, states also have the flexibility to adopt an emissions trading program or other alternative program as long as the alternative provides greater reasonable progress towards improving

visibility than BART. *See* 40 CFR 51.308(e)(2). EPA provided states with this flexibility in the RHR, adopted in 1999, and further refined the criteria for assessing whether an alternative program provides for greater reasonable progress in two subsequent rulemakings. *See* 64 FR 35714 (July 1, 1999); 70 FR 39104 (July 6, 2005); 71 FR 60612 (October 13, 2006).

EPA demonstrated that CAIR would achieve greater reasonable progress than BART in revisions to the regional haze program made in 2005.¹ *See* 70 FR 39104 (July 6, 2005). In those revisions, EPA amended its regulations to provide that states participating in the CAIR cap-and-trade programs pursuant to an EPA-approved CAIR SIP or states that remain subject to a CAIR FIP need not require affected BART-eligible electric generating units (EGUs) to install, operate, and maintain BART for emissions of SO₂ and nitrogen oxides (NO_x). As a result of EPA's determination that CAIR was "better-than-BART," a number of states in the CAIR region, including Georgia, relied on the CAIR cap-and-trade programs as an alternative to BART for EGU emissions of SO₂ and NO_x in designing their regional haze plans. These states also relied on CAIR as an element of a long-term strategy (LTS) for achieving their reasonable progress goals (RPGs) for their regional haze programs. However, in 2008, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (D.C. Circuit) remanded CAIR to EPA without vacatur to preserve the environmental benefits provided by CAIR. *North Carolina v. EPA*, 550 F.3d 1176, 1178 (D.C. Cir. 2008). On August 8, 2011 (76 FR 48208), acting on the D.C. Circuit's remand, EPA promulgated CSAPR to replace CAIR and issued FIPs to implement the rule in CSAPR-subject states.² Implementation of CSAPR was scheduled to begin on January 1, 2012,

¹ CAIR created regional cap-and-trade programs to reduce SO₂ and NO_x emissions in 27 eastern states (and the District of Columbia), including Georgia, that contributed to downwind nonattainment or interfered with maintenance of the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS or the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

² CSAPR requires 28 eastern states to limit their statewide emissions of SO₂ and/or NO_x in order to mitigate transported air pollution unlawfully impacting other states' ability to attain or maintain four NAAQS: the 1997 ozone NAAQS, the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS, the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS, and the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. The CSAPR emissions limitations are defined in terms of maximum statewide "budgets" for emissions of annual SO₂, annual NO_x, and/or ozone-season NO_x by each covered state's large EGUs. The CSAPR state budgets are implemented in two phases of generally increasing stringency, with the Phase 1 budgets applying to emissions in 2015 and 2016 and the Phase 2 budgets applying to emissions in 2017 and later years.

when CSAPR would have superseded the CAIR program.

Due to the D.C. Circuit's 2008 ruling that CAIR was "fatally flawed" and its resulting status as a temporary measure following that ruling, EPA could not fully approve regional haze plans to the extent that they relied on CAIR to satisfy the BART requirement and the requirement for a LTS sufficient to achieve the state-adopted RPGs. On these grounds, EPA finalized a limited disapproval of Georgia's regional haze plan on June 7, 2012 (77 FR 33642), and in the same action, promulgated a FIP to replace reliance on CAIR with reliance on CSAPR to address the deficiencies in Georgia's regional haze plan. EPA finalized a limited approval of Georgia's regional haze plan on June 28, 2012 (77 FR 38501), as meeting the remaining applicable regional haze requirements set forth in the CAA and the RHR.

In the June 7, 2012, limited disapproval action, EPA also amended the RHR to provide that participation by a state's EGUs in a CSAPR trading program for a given pollutant—either a CSAPR federal trading program implemented through a CSAPR FIP or an integrated CSAPR state trading program implemented through an approved CSAPR SIP revision—qualifies as a BART alternative for those EGUs for that pollutant. See 40 CFR 51.308(e)(4). Since EPA promulgated this amendment, numerous states covered by CSAPR have come to rely on the provision through either SIPs or FIPs.³

Numerous parties filed petitions for review of CSAPR in the D.C. Circuit, and on August 21, 2012, the court issued its ruling, vacating and remanding CSAPR to EPA and ordering continued implementation of CAIR. *EME Homer City Generation, L.P. v. EPA*, 696 F.3d 7, 38 (D.C. Cir. 2012). The D.C. Circuit's vacatur of CSAPR was reversed by the United States Supreme Court on April 29, 2014, and the case was remanded to the D.C. Circuit to resolve remaining issues in accordance with the high court's ruling. *EPA v. EME Homer City Generation, L.P.*, 134 S. Ct. 1584 (2014). On remand, the D.C. Circuit affirmed CSAPR in most respects, but invalidated without

vacating some of the CSAPR budgets as to a number of states. *EME Homer City Generation, L.P. v. EPA*, 795 F.3d 118 (D.C. Cir. 2015). The remanded budgets include the Phase 2 SO₂ emissions budgets for Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and Texas and the Phase 2 ozone-season NO_x budgets for 11 states. This litigation ultimately delayed implementation of CSAPR for three years, from January 1, 2012, when CSAPR's cap-and-trade programs were originally scheduled to replace the CAIR cap-and-trade programs, to January 1, 2015. Thus, the rule's Phase 2 budgets that were originally promulgated to begin on January 1, 2014, began on January 1, 2017.

On September 29, 2017 (82 FR 45481), EPA issued a final rule affirming the continued validity of the Agency's 2012 determination that participation in CSAPR meets the RHR's criteria for an alternative to the application of source-specific BART.⁴ EPA has determined that changes to CSAPR's geographic scope resulting from the actions EPA has taken or expects to take in response to the D.C. Circuit's budget remand do not affect the continued validity of participation in CSAPR as a BART alternative, because the changes in geographic scope would not have adversely affected the results of the air quality modeling analysis upon which the EPA based the 2012 determination. EPA's September 29, 2017, determination was based, in part, on EPA's final action approving a SIP revision from Alabama (81 FR 59869 (August 31, 2016)) adopting Phase 2 annual NO_x and SO₂ budgets equivalent to the federally-developed budgets and on SIP revisions submitted by Georgia and South Carolina to also adopt Phase 2 annual NO_x and SO₂ budgets equivalent to the federally-developed budgets.⁵ Since that time, EPA has approved the SIP revisions from Georgia and South Carolina. See 82 FR 47930 (October 13, 2017) and 82 FR 47936 (October 13, 2017), respectively.

A portion of Georgia's July 26, 2017, SIP submittal seeks to correct the deficiencies identified in the June 7, 2012, limited disapproval of its regional haze plan submitted on February 11, 2010, and supplemented on November 19, 2010, by replacing reliance on CAIR with reliance on CSAPR.⁶ Specifically,

Georgia requests that EPA amend the State's regional haze plan by replacing its reliance on CAIR with CSAPR to satisfy SO₂ and NO_x BART requirements and first implementation period SO₂ reasonable progress requirements for EGUs formerly subject to CAIR,⁷ and to support the RPGs for the Class I areas in Georgia for the first implementation period. EPA is approving the regional haze plan portion of the SIP submittal and amending the SIP accordingly.

B. Infrastructure SIPs

By statute, plans meeting the requirements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) of the CAA are to be submitted by states within three years (or less, if the Administrator so prescribes) after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS to provide for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of the new or revised NAAQS. EPA has historically referred to these SIP submissions made for the purpose of satisfying the requirements of sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) as "infrastructure SIP" submissions. Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) require states to address basic SIP elements such as for monitoring, basic program requirements, and legal authority that are designed to assure attainment and maintenance of the newly established or revised NAAQS. More specifically, section 110(a)(1) provides the procedural and timing requirements for infrastructure SIPs. Section 110(a)(2) lists specific elements that states must meet for the infrastructure SIP requirements related to a newly established or revised NAAQS. The contents of an infrastructure SIP submission may vary depending upon the data and analytical tools available to the state, as well as the provisions already contained in the state's implementation plan at the time in which the state develops and submits

submission incorporating into Georgia's SIP the State's regulations requiring Georgia EGUs to participate in CSAPR state trading programs for annual NO_x and SO₂ emissions integrated with the CSAPR federal trading programs and thus replacing the corresponding FIP requirements. In the October 13, 2017, action, EPA did not take any action regarding Georgia's request in this July 26, 2017, SIP submission to revise the State's regional haze plan nor regarding the prong 4 element of the 2008 8-hour ozone, 2010 1-hour NO₂, 2010 1-hour SO₂, and 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

⁷ In its regional haze plan, Georgia concluded and EPA found acceptable the State's determination that no additional controls beyond CAIR are reasonable for SO₂ for affected Georgia EGUs for the first implementation period, with the exception of five EGUs at three facilities owned by Georgia Power. See 77 FR 11464 (February 27, 2012).

³ EPA has promulgated FIPs relying on CSAPR participation for BART purposes for Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, 77 FR at 33654, and Nebraska, 77 FR 40150, 40151 (July 6, 2012). EPA has approved SIPs from several states relying on CSAPR participation for BART purposes. See, e.g., 82 FR 47393 (October 12, 2017) for Alabama; 77 FR 34801 (June 12, 2012) for Minnesota; and 77 FR 46952 (August 7, 2012) for Wisconsin.

⁴ Legal challenges to this rule are pending. *Nat'l Parks Conservation Ass'n v. EPA*, No. 17–1253 (D.C. Cir. filed November 28, 2017).

⁵ EPA proposed to approve the Georgia and South Carolina SIP revisions adopting CSAPR budgets on August 16, 2017 (82 FR 38866), and August 10, 2017 (82 FR 37389), respectively.

⁶ On October 13, 2017, (82 FR 47930), EPA approved the portions of the July 26, 2017, SIP

the submission for a new or revised NAAQS.⁸

Section 110(a)(2)(D) has two components: 110(a)(2)(D)(i) and 110(a)(2)(D)(ii). Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) includes four distinct components, commonly referred to as “prongs,” that must be addressed in infrastructure SIP submissions. The first two prongs, which are codified in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), are provisions that prohibit any source or other type of emissions activity in one state from contributing significantly to nonattainment of the NAAQS in another state (prong 1) and from interfering with maintenance of the NAAQS in another state (prong 2). The third and fourth prongs, which are codified in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II), are provisions that prohibit emissions activity in one state from interfering with measures required to prevent significant deterioration of air quality in another state (prong 3) or from interfering with measures to protect visibility in another state (prong 4). Section 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) requires SIPs to include provisions ensuring compliance with sections 115 and 126 of the Act, relating to interstate and international pollution abatement.

A state can meet prong 4 requirements via confirmation in its infrastructure SIP submission that the state has an approved regional haze plan that fully meets the requirements of 40 CFR 51.308 or 51.309. 40 CFR 51.308 and 51.309 specifically require that a state participating in a regional planning process include all measures needed to achieve its apportionment of emission reduction obligations agreed upon through that process. A fully approved regional haze plan will ensure that emissions from sources under an air agency’s jurisdiction are not interfering with measures required to be included in other air agencies’ plans to protect visibility.

Georgia’s May 14, 2012, 2008 8-hour Ozone submission; March 25, 2013, 2010 1-hour NO₂ submission; October 22, 2013, 2010 1-hour SO₂ submission as supplemented on July 25, 2014; and December 14, 2015, 2012 annual PM_{2.5} submission rely on the State having a fully approved regional haze plan to satisfy its prong 4 requirements. EPA is approving the regional haze plan portion of the State’s July 26, 2017, SIP revision and converting EPA’s previous action on Georgia’s regional haze plan from a limited approval/limited disapproval to a full approval because

final approval of this portion of the SIP revision would correct the deficiencies that led to EPA’s limited approval/limited disapproval of the State’s regional haze plan. Specifically, EPA’s approval of this portion of Georgia’s July 26, 2017, SIP revision would satisfy the SO₂ and NO_x BART requirements and SO₂ reasonable progress requirements for EGUs formerly subject to CAIR and the requirement that a LTS include measures as necessary to achieve the State-adopted RPGs. Because a state may satisfy prong 4 requirements through a fully approved regional haze plan, EPA is also converting the Agency’s September 26, 2016, conditional approvals to full approvals of the prong 4 portion of Georgia’s May 14, 2012, 2008 8-hour Ozone submission; March 25, 2013, 2010 1-hour NO₂ submission; October 22, 2013, 2010 1-hour SO₂ submission as supplemented on July 25, 2014; and December 14, 2015, 2012 annual PM_{2.5} submission.

In a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) published on February 2, 2018 (83 FR 4886), EPA proposed to take the following actions: (1) Approve the regional haze plan portion of Georgia’s July 26, 2017, SIP submission to change reliance from CAIR to CSAPR; (2) convert EPA’s limited approval/limited disapproval of Georgia’s February 11, 2010, regional haze plan as supplemented on November 19, 2010, to a full approval; (3) remove EPA’s FIP for Georgia which replaced reliance on CAIR with reliance on CSAPR to address the deficiencies identified in the limited disapproval of Georgia’s regional haze plan; and (4) convert EPA’s September 26, 2016, conditional approvals to full approvals of the prong 4 portion of Georgia’s May 14, 2012, 2008 8-hour Ozone submission; March 25, 2013, 2010 1-hour NO₂ submission; the State’s October 22, 2013, 2010 1-hour SO₂ submission as supplemented on July 25, 2014; and the State’s December 14, 2015, 2012 annual PM_{2.5} submission. The details of Georgia’s submission and the rationale for EPA’s actions are explained in the NPRM. Comments on the proposed rulemaking were due on or before March 5, 2018. EPA received no adverse comments on the proposed action.

II. Final Actions

As described above, EPA is taking the following actions: (1) Approving the regional haze plan portion of Georgia’s July 26, 2017, SIP submission to change reliance from CAIR to CSAPR; (2) converting EPA’s limited approval/limited disapproval of Georgia’s February 11, 2010, regional haze plan as

supplemented on November 19, 2010, to a full approval; (3) removing EPA’s FIP for Georgia which replaced reliance on CAIR with reliance on CSAPR to address the deficiencies identified in the limited disapproval of Georgia’s regional haze plan; and (4) converting EPA’s September 26, 2016, conditional approvals to full approvals of the prong 4 portion of Georgia’s May 14, 2012, 2008 8-hour Ozone submission; March 25, 2013, 2010 1-hour NO₂ submission; the State’s October 22, 2013, 2010 1-hour SO₂ submission as supplemented on July 25, 2014; and the State’s December 14, 2015, 2012 annual PM_{2.5} submission. All other applicable infrastructure requirements for the infrastructure SIP submissions have been or will be addressed in separate rulemakings.

III. 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. These actions merely approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and do not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, these actions:

- Are not significant regulatory actions 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);
- Are not Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory actions because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866;
- Do not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Are 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.*);
- Do 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);
- Do not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Are not economically significant regulatory actions based on health or

⁸ For additional information regarding EPA’s approach to the review of infrastructure SIP submissions, see, e.g., 81 FR 57544 (August 23, 2016) (proposal to approve portions of Georgia’s infrastructure SIP for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS).

safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);

- Are not significant regulatory actions subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Are 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
- Do 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).

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 as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor will it impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

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 the

Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing these actions and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. These actions are 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 these actions must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by July 3, 2018. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of these actions 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. These actions 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, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate

Matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides.

Dated: April 20, 2018.

Onis “Trey” Glenn, III,
Regional Administrator, Region 4.

40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

- 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart L—Georgia

§ 52.569 [Removed and Reserved]

- 2. Section 52.569 is removed and reserved.

- 3. Section 52.570(e) is amended by adding entries for “110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS”, “110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 1-hour SO₂ NAAQS”, “110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 Annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS”, “110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-hour Ozone NAAQS”, and “Regional Haze Plan Revision” at the end of the table to read as follows:

§ 52.570 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

EPA-APPROVED GEORGIA NON-REGULATORY PROVISIONS

Name of nonregulatory SIP provision	Applicable geographic or nonattainment area	State submittal date/ effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
* * *				
110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 1-hour NO ₂ NAAQS.	Georgia	3/25/2013	5/4/2018, [Insert Federal Register citation] ..	Addressing Prong 4 only.
110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 1-hour SO ₂ NAAQS.	Georgia	7/25/2014	5/4/2018, [Insert Federal Register citation] ..	Addressing Prong 4 only.
110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 Annual PM _{2.5} NAAQS.	Georgia	12/14/2015	5/4/2018, [Insert Federal Register citation] ..	Addressing Prong 4 only.
110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-hour Ozone NAAQS.	Georgia	5/14/2012	5/4/2018, [Insert Federal Register citation] ..	Addressing Prong 4 only.
Regional Haze Plan Revision	Georgia	7/26/2017	5/4/2018, [Insert Federal Register citation] ..	

§ 52.580 [Removed and Reserved]

■ 4. Section 52.580 is removed and reserved.

[FR Doc. 2018–09412 Filed 5–3–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**Defense Acquisition Regulations System****48 CFR Part 201**

[Docket DARS–2018–0017]

RIN 0750–AJ69

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Statement of Purpose for Department of Defense Acquisition (DFARS Case 2018–D005)

AGENCY: Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: DoD is issuing a final rule amending the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) to implement a section of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 to revise the DFARS to include a statement of purpose.

DATES: Effective May 4, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Kelly Hughes, telephone 571–372–6090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Background**

DoD is amending the DFARS to implement section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 (Pub. L. 115–404). Section 801 directs the insertion of a statement of purpose for Department of Defense acquisition in the DFARS. This rule adds the statement of purpose to DFARS 201.101.

II. Applicability to Contracts at or Below the Simplified Acquisition Threshold and for Commercial Items, Including Commercially Available Off-the-Shelf Items

This rule does not add any new provisions or clauses or impact existing provisions or clauses. The rule merely adds a purpose statement to the regulations.

III. Publication of This Final Rule for Public Comment Is Not Required by Statute

The statute that applies to the publication of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) is the Office of Federal Procurement Policy statute (codified at

title 41 of the United States Code). Specifically, 41 U.S.C. 1707(a)(1) requires that a procurement policy, regulation, procedure or form (including an amendment or modification thereof) must be published for public comment if it relates to the expenditure of appropriated funds, and has either a significant effect beyond the internal operating procedures of the agency issuing the policy, regulation, procedure or form, or has a significant cost or administrative impact on contractors or offerors. This final rule is not required to be published for public comment, because it clarifies the purpose of the defense system as required by the NDAA for FY 2018. There is no cost or administrative impact on contractors or offerors. These requirements affect only the internal operating guidance of the Government.

IV. Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

Executive Orders (E.O.s) 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). E.O. 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This is not a significant regulatory action and, therefore, was not subject to review under section 6(b) of E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, dated September 30, 1993. This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804.

V. Executive Order 13771

This rule is not subject to Executive Order (E.O.) 13771, Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs, because the rule relates to agency organization, management, or personnel.

VI. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Because a notice of proposed rulemaking and an opportunity for public comment are not required to be given for this rule under 41 U.S.C. 1707(a)(1) (see section III. of this preamble), the analytical requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) are not applicable. Accordingly, no regulatory flexibility analysis is required and none has been prepared.

VII. Paperwork Reduction Act

The rule does not contain any information collection requirements that

require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Part 201

Government procurement.

Amy G. Williams,

Deputy, Defense Acquisition Regulations System.

Therefore, 48 CFR part 201 is amended as follows:

PART 201—FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATIONS SYSTEM

■ 1. The authority citation for part 201 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 41 U.S.C. 1303 and 48 CFR chapter 1.

■ 2. Add section 201.101 to subpart 201.1 to read as follows:

201.101 Purpose.

(1) The defense acquisition system, as defined in 10 U.S.C. 2545, exists to manage the investments of the United States in technologies, programs, and product support necessary to achieve the national security strategy prescribed by the President pursuant to section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043) and to support the United States Armed Forces.

(2) The investment strategy of DoD shall be postured to support not only the current United States armed forces, but also future armed forces of the United States.

(3) The primary objective of DoD acquisition is to acquire quality supplies and services that satisfy user needs with measurable improvements to mission capability and operational support at a fair and reasonable price.

[FR Doc. 2018–09488 Filed 5–3–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**Defense Acquisition Regulations System****48 CFR Parts 212, 246, and 252**

[Docket DARS–2016–0014]

RIN 0750–AI92

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Amendments Related to Sources of Electronic Parts (DFARS Case 2016–D013)

AGENCY: Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Final rule.