

the same model version (*i.e.*, AERMOD version 14134) and modeling inputs (*i.e.*, source characteristics and emissions rates, meteorological data, background value, etc.) that the State used in its attainment plan modeling demonstration. The only modification the EPA made for its evaluation was adding receptors at 50-meter spacing within each facility's boundary. The EPA modeled scenarios specific to each of the four facilities' property, which included receptors only on the property of the facility in question and has all emissions sources from that facility removed from the analysis. For example, a scenario to evaluate the impacts on GPC's facility property included receptors placed within GPC's facility fence line and with the emission sources from LGS, Monsanto, and MPW operating and GPC not operating.

Table 1 provides the results of EPA's modeling analysis, which showed no violations within each of the four facilities' property when emissions from the other facilities were considered. The greatest impacts occurred within Grain Processing Corporation's property with a modeled highest 4th high of 164 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

TABLE 1—THE HIGHEST-4TH-HIGH PREDICTED IMPACTS ON EACH FACILITY'S PROPERTY

[Including background]

Impacted facility	Model impacts ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	1-hour SO_2 NAAQS ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
Grain Processing Corporation	164	196
Muscatine Power and Water	110	
Monsanto	97	
Louisa Generating Station	110	

The EPA proposes that the modeling submitted by Iowa with its nonattainment area plan, in addition to the supplemental modeling performed by the EPA and described above, demonstrates that the area is attaining the NAAQS.

VII. What action is EPA Region 7 taking?

In this second supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking, the EPA is: (1) Considering adoption of an alternative policy regarding exemptions for excess emissions in the State of Iowa from the national policy detailed in the EPA's 2015 SSM SIP Action; (2) proposing simultaneously withdrawal of the SSM SIP call for Iowa if the alternative SSM policy for the State is adopted; and (3)

proposing approval of Iowa's SIP for the 2010 1-hour SO_2 NAAQS for the Muscatine nonattainment area, including the attainment plan control strategy.

VIII. 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, the 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);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866.
- 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 the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTA) because this rulemaking does not involve technical standards; 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).

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).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, SSM policy, Start-up, shutdown and malfunction, Sulfur oxides.

Dated: June 16, 2020.

James Gulliford,

Regional Administrator, Region 7.

[FR Doc. 2020–13380 Filed 6–19–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R07–OAR–2020–0289; FRL–10010–55–Region 7]

Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Control of Emissions From Industrial Surface Coating Operations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve revisions to the Missouri State Implementation Plan (SIP) received on March 20, 2019. The submission revises a Missouri regulation that restricts emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from industrial surface coating operations in Clay, Jackson, and Platte Counties in Missouri. Specifically, the revisions to the rule remove unnecessary restrictive words, adds exemptions, including definitions specific to the rule, corrects test method references, removes obsolete requirements specific to sources that have closed, changes sections to the standard rule format, and makes minor clarifications and grammatical changes. The new exemptions are consistent with the Control Techniques Guidelines (CTG) for several types of surface coating or apply to activities that are regulated under other federal or state regulations that limit emissions of VOCs. The new exemptions are needed to make the rule consistent with the St. Louis version of this rule, *10 Code of State Regulation*

(CSR) 10–5.330 Industrial Surface Coating Operations. These exemptions are not expected to result in an emission increase.

The other revisions are administrative in nature and do not impact the stringency of the SIP or air quality. Approval of these revisions will ensure consistency between State and federally-approved rules.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 22, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R07–OAR–2020–0289 to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket ID No. for this rulemaking. Comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov/>, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on sending comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the “Written Comments” heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Stone, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 Office, Air Quality Planning Branch, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219; telephone number (913) 551–7714; email address stone.william@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

I. Written Comments

- II. What is being addressed in this document?
- III. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?
- IV. What action is the EPA taking?
- V. Incorporation by Reference
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Written Comments

Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R07–OAR–2020–0289, at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. The 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. The 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>.

II. What is being addressed in this document?

The EPA is proposing to approve revisions to 10 CSR 10–2.230 “Control of Emissions from Industrial Surface Coating Operations”, which restricts emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from industrial surface coating operations in Clay, Jackson, and Platte Counties in Missouri. These revisions are described in detail in the technical support document (TSD) included in the docket for this action.

Missouri received three comments from EPA during the comment period. Missouri responded to all three comments, as noted in the State submission included in the docket for this action. In response to EPA’s comments, Missouri submitted a letter providing supplemental information regarding the revisions.

Therefore, the EPA is proposing to approve the revisions to this rule because it will not have a negative impact on air quality.

III. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?

The State submission has met the public notice requirements for SIP submissions in accordance with 40 CFR 51.102. The submission also satisfied the completeness criteria of 40 CFR part 51, appendix V. The state provided public notice of the revisions from August 1, 2018, to October 4, 2018, and held a public hearing on September 27, 2018. The state received and addressed eight comments. As explained in more detail in the TSD which is part of this docket, the SIP revision submission meets the substantive requirements of the CAA, including section 110 and implementing regulations.

IV. What action is the EPA taking?

The EPA is proposing to amend the Missouri SIP by approving the State’s request to revise 10 CSR 10–2.230 “Control of Emissions from Industrial Surface Coating Operations”. Approval of these revisions will ensure consistency between State and federally-approved rules. The EPA has

determined that these changes will not adversely impact air quality.

The EPA is soliciting comment on the substantive and administrative revisions detailed in this proposal and the TSD. The EPA is not soliciting comment on existing rule text that has been previously approved by the EPA into the SIP. Final rulemaking will occur after consideration of any comments.

V. Incorporation by Reference

In this document, the EPA is proposing to include regulatory text in an EPA final rule that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with the requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is proposing to incorporate by reference the Missouri State Implementation Plan and Supplemental modeling analyses described in the proposed amendments to 40 CFR part 52 set forth below. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials generally available through www.regulations.gov and at the EPA Region 7 Office (please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble for more information).

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the Clean Air Act (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, the EPA’s role is to approve State choices, if 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);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866.
- 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 the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTA) because this rulemaking does not involve technical standards; 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).

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).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: June 10, 2020.

James Gulliford,

Regional Administrator, Region 7.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the EPA proposes to amend 40 CFR part 52 as set forth below:

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 AA—Missouri

- 2. In § 52.1320, the table in paragraph (c) is amended by revising the entry “10–2.230” to read as follows:

§ 52.1320 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

EPA-APPROVED MISSOURI REGULATIONS

Missouri citation	Title	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Missouri Department of Natural Resources				
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
Chapter 2—Air Quality Standards and Air Pollution Control Regulations for the Kansas City Metropolitan Area				
10–2.230	Control of Emissions from Industrial Surface Coating Operations.	3/30/2019	[Date of publication of the final rule in the Federal Register], [Federal Register citation of the final rule].	
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2020–13049 Filed 6–19–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 282

[EPA–R06–UST–2018–0704; FRL–10009–04–Region 6]

Texas: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions and Incorporation by Reference

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA or Act), the Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve revisions to the State of Texas Underground Storage Tank (UST) program submitted by the State. This action is based on EPA’s determination that these revisions satisfy all requirements needed for program approval. This action also proposes to codify EPA’s approval of Texas’s State program and to incorporate by reference those provisions of the State regulations that we have determined meet the requirements for approval. The provisions will be subject to EPA’s inspection and enforcement authorities under sections 9005 and 9006 of RCRA subtitle I and other applicable statutory and regulatory provisions.

DATES: Send written comments by July 22, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Submit any comments, identified by EPA–R06–UST–2018–0704 by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

2. *Email:* lincoln.audray@epa.gov.
Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–R06–UST–2018–0704. EPA’s policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be available online at <https://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 <https://www.regulations.gov>, or email. The Federal <https://www.regulations.gov> website is an “anonymous access” system, which means the EPA will not