

If the COTP determines that the security zones need not be enforced for the full duration state in this notice of enforcement, a Broadcast Notice to Mariners may be used to grant general permission to enter all portions of the regulated areas.

Date : July 31, 2023. d

M.A. McDonne , d

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Sector Puget Sound.

[FR Doc. 2023-16682 Filed 8-3-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P d

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY d

40 CFR Part 52 d

[EPA-R04-OAR-2022-0892; EPA-R04-OAR-2022-0851; FRL-10928-02-R4] d

Air Plan Approval; Florida; Revision of Excess Emissions Provisions and Emission Standards; Amendments to Stationary Sources—Emission Standards d

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). d

ACTION: Final rule. d

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Florida on November 22, 2016, and supplemental on September 30, 2022, through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). The November 22, 2016, SIP revision is in response to EPA’s SIP Call published on June 12, 2015, concerning excess emissions during startup, shutdown, and malfunction (SSM) events. The September 30, 2022, supplemental SIP revision addresses additional SSM-related rule amendments identified by the State and the adoption of source specific sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emission limits. EPA is approving these SIP revisions and finds that they correct the deficiencies identified in the June 12, 2015, SIP Call. EPA is also approving a portion of a SIP revision submitted by FDEP on April 1, 2022, which modifies provisions that regulate emissions of SO₂, NO_x, and visible emissions and modifies requirements for major stationary sources of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and NO_x. d

DATES: This rule is effective September 5, 2023. d

ADDRESSES: EPA has established dockets for these actions under Docket Identification Nos. EPA-R04-OAR-2022-0892 and EPA-R04-OAR-2022-

0851. All documents in the dockets 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. d 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 and Radiation 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: Joel Huey, Manager, Multi-Air Pollutant Coordination 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) 562-9104. Mr. Huey can also be reached via electronic mail at huey.joel@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: d

I. Background

a. Florida’s November 22, 2016, and September 30, 2022, SIP Submissions

On November 22, 2016, FDEP submitted a revision to the Florida SIP (referred to hereinafter as Florida’s “Excess Emissions Rule SIP Revision”) in response to EPA’s June 12, 2015, action titled “State Implementation Plans: Response to Petition for Rulemaking; Restatement and Update of EPA’s SSM Policy Applicable to SIPs; Findings of Substantial Inadequacy; and SIP Calls to Amend Provisions Applying to Excess Emissions During Periods of Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction” (“2015 SSM SIP Action”). See 80 FR 33839 (June 12, 2015). In the Excess Emissions Rule SIP Revision, FDEP requests EPA approval of the following changes to the Florida SIP: (1) Removal of Florida Administrative Code Rule (referred to hereinafter referred to as “Rule”) 62-210.700(4) with the adoption of equivalent language to Rules 62-210.700(1) and (2); (2) amendment of Rule 62-210.700(3) to revise the particulate matter (PM) limits applicable during boiler cleaning (soot blowing)

and load changes by removing the statement that excess emissions during these periods “shall be permitted,” removing the exemption for pollutants other than PM visible emissions, and removing a specific allowance for visible emissions which exceed 60 percent opacity for up to four six-minute periods during the 3-hour period of excess emissions allowance for soot blowing or load change; (3) adoption of Rule 62-210.700(6), which states that Rules 62-210.700(1) and (2) shall not apply after May 22, 2018, to either category-specific or unit-specific limits that have been incorporated into Florida’s SIP; and (4) adoption of Rule 62-210.700(7), which states that after the State’s effective date of the rule change (October 23, 2016), Rules 62-210.700(1) and (2) shall not apply to new permit-specific emission limits established pursuant to Florida’s Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR) regulations (Rules 62-212.400 and 62-210.500). The Excess Emissions Rule SIP revision includes information demonstrating that these changes will not interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment of any National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and any reasonable further progress (RFP), or with any other applicable requirement of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act).

On September 30, 2022, FDEP submitted a supplemental revision (referred to hereinafter as Florida’s “Supplemental SSM SIP Revision”) to the State’s November 22, 2016, Excess Emissions Rule SIP Revision. In the Supplemental SSM SIP Revision, FDEP includes alternative SIP emission limits for those SIP emission limits that it identified as “problematic” if applied continuously and several changes to language throughout Chapter 62-296. The State requests EPA approval of the following changes: (1) Amendment of existing Rule 62-296.405, “Fossil Fuel Steam Generators with More Than 250 Million Btu Per Hour Heat Input,” and Rule 62-296.570, “Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT)—Requirements for Major VOC- and NO_x-Emitting Facilities,” to clarify how emissions are calculated, including during periods of startup, shutdown, and malfunction; (2) adoption of emissions-unit-specific SO₂ and NO_x emission limits for certain sulfuric acid plants (SAPs) and nitric acid plants (NAPs) in Florida; (3) removal of SO₂ emission limits in Rule 62-296.402, “Sulfuric Acid Plants”; and (4) removal of NO_x emission limits in Rule 62-296.408, “Nitric Acid Plants.” The

Supplemental SSM SIP revision includes technical support materials to demonstrate that these changes will not interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment of any NAAQS or RFP, or with any other applicable requirement of the Act.

On May 8, 2023, EPA propose to approve FDEP's November 22, 2016, and September 30, 2022, SIP revisions. See 88 FR 29598. That notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) is titled "Air Plan Approval; Florida; Revision of Excess Emissions Provisions an Emission Standards" (Excess Emissions Proposal). In the Excess Emissions Proposal, EPA also propose to determine that the SIP revisions correct the deficiencies that the Agency identified in the 2015 SSM SIP Action with respect to Florida. The reasons for the proposed approval and termination are stated in the Excess Emissions Proposal and will not be restated here. The public comment period for EPA's proposed approval and termination ends on June 7, 2023. EPA received one favorable comment and one set of comments in a joint letter submitted by the Sierra Club and the Environmental Integrity Project and (hereinafter collectively referred to as the Commenters) which agree in part and disagree in part with EPA's proposed action. Both sets of comments are available in Docket No. EPA-R04-OAR-2022-0892. *Id.*

b. Florida's April 1, 2022, SIP and Submission

On April 1, 2022, FDEP submitted a SIP revision seeking to revise Rules 62–296.405, "Fossil Fuel Steam Generators with More Than 250 Million Btu Per Hour Heat Input," and 62–296.570, "Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT)—Requirements for Major VOC- and NO_x-Emitting Facilities."¹ Florida's April 1, 2022, SIP revision includes technical support materials to demonstrate that the proposed changes and deletions to these rules will not interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment of any NAAQS or RFP, or with any other applicable requirement of the Act. *Id.*

Specifically, the April 1, 2022, submission contains changes to the following provisions in Rule 62–

296.405: 62–296.405(1)(a); 62–296.405(1)(c)1.; 62–296.405(1)(c)1.b. through e.; 62–296.405(1)(c)1.h. through i.; 62–296.405(1)(c)2.a., b., and c.; 62–296.405(1)(c)3.; 62–296.405(1)(c)3.; 62–296.405(1)(e); and 62–296.405(2). These provisions regulate emissions of SO₂, NO_x, and visible emissions from certain fossil fuel-fired steam generators with more than 250 million British thermal units (Btu) per hour heat input. The changes to these provisions revise a visible emissions limitation and clarify to whom the results of visible emissions testing must be submitted. The changes also remove outdated language, including emission limits for sources that have shut down or have more stringent federally enforceable limits, a specific citations for EPA test methods, and make minor wording edits. These changes do not allow for any pollutant emission increases and because they only (1) remove certain SIP rules that are either obsolete or that are redundant for units that have more stringent federally enforceable limits in the SIP and (2) revise other rules in a way that would not interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment, RFP, or any other applicable requirement of the CAA. *Id.*

The April 1, 2022, submission also removes obsolete provisions in Rule 62–296–570, "Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT)—Requirements for Major VOC- and NO_x-Emitting Facilities" and makes changes to clarify the intent of the Rule and update certain cross-references. FDEP developed Rule 62–296.570 to implement VOC and NO_x RACT for existing major sources of VOC and NO_x in its then moderate ozone nonattainment area—the South Florida Area (consisting of Broward, Dade, and Palm Beach Counties)—as required by CAA section 182.³ After EPA redesignated the South Florida Area to attainment, Florida revised its RACT rules such that Rule 62–296.570 now applies to the South Florida maintenance area.⁴ EPA has evaluated the State's non-interference and

demonstrated that the changes to Rule 62–296.570 would not interfere with any applicable requirement concerning attainment of any NAAQS or RFP, or any other applicable requirement of the CAA.

In a NPRM published on May 8, 2023, EPA propose to approve the portion of Florida's April 1, 2022, SIP revision seeking to amend Rules 62–296.405 and 62–296.570. See 88 FR 29591. That notice of proposed rulemaking is titled "Air Plan Approval; Florida; Amendments to Stationary Sources—Emission Standards" (Emission Standards Proposal). Comments on the Emission Standards Proposal were due on or before June 7, 2023. EPA received no comments on the Emission Standards Proposal.

II. Response to Comments

This section contains summaries of the comments received and EPA's responses.

Comment 1: Regarding the removal of SO₂ and NO_x emission limits from Rules 62–296.402, "Sulfuric Acid Plants," and 62–296.408, "Nitric Acid Plants," respectively, Commenters state that "EPA posits that a longer-term limit will protect the 1-hour SO₂ NAAQS if it is of comparable stringency to a maximum 1-hour NAAQS-protective 'critical emission value' that provides for attainment."⁵ Commenters then note that EPA's 2014 SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance (SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance)⁶ sets out a method that uses an "equivalency ratio" derived by compiling a representative distribution, or sample set, of actual emissions data on a 1-hour average to compute a distribution of longer-term emission averages and then a ratio of the 99th percentile of the longer-term values to the 99th percentile of the hourly values.⁷ Commenters assert that Florida's proposed longer-term average limits are based on EPA's SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance and that "one obvious problem" with the method is that the equivalency ratio can vary greatly depending on the selected data set.⁸ Commenters go on to state that EPA has not provided all relevant information about the data set used to

¹ On March 30, 2023, Florida submitted a letter to EPA with regarding the removal of Rule 62–296.405(1)(c)1.g. and 62–296.405(1)(c)2., from EPA's consideration. For this reason, EPA is not acting on the removal of (1)(c)1.g. and (1)(c)2. described in the April 1, 2022, SIP revision. The letter is available in the docket for this rulemaking.

² The April 1, 2022, submittal transmits several changes to other Florida SIP-approved rules. These changes are not addressed in this rulemaking and will be considered by EPA in a separate rulemaking.

³ See 60 FR 2688, 2689 (January 11, 1995) (approving Florida's January 8, 1993, SIP revision and noting that Florida's RACT rule "applies to the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendment requirement for RACT for existing major sources of VOCs and NO_x in Florida's moderate non-attainment area."). The fact that Rule 62–296.570 applies solely to existing units is further evidenced by language in Florida's January 8, 1993, SIP revision (available in the docket for this rulemaking), the May 31, 1995, and compliance date in Rule 62–296.570(4)(a)1, and the exclusion of new and modified major VOC- and NO_x emitting facilities subject to major new source review through Rule 62–296.570(1)(a) (referencing Rule 62–296.500(1)(b)).

⁴ See 60 FR 10325 (February 24, 1995) (re-designating the South Florida Area to attainment); 64 FR 32346 (June 16, 1999). *Id.*

⁵ Although this statement only appears in the comment regarding SO₂ limits in Rule 62–296.407, Commenters note in their comment regarding NO_x limits in Rule 62–296.408 that they "have the same concerns . . . as with the SO₂ limits." The comments on the NO_x limits relate to the 1-hour and NO₂ NAAQS.

⁶ See SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance, https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-06/documents/20140423guidance_nonattainment_sip.pdf.

⁷ See *supra* note 5.

⁸ *Id.*

calculate the source-specific limits and it is therefore unclear whether the selected data are appropriate and whether they yield standards comparable to what might result from other potentially representative data.

Response 1: Regarding the Commenters' statement that "EPA posits that a longer-term average limit will protect the 1-hour SO₂ NAAQS . . .," the Excess Emissions Proposal does not, as the statement may suggest, include new policy statements on the use of longer-term average limits for NAAQS attainment planning purposes. Rather, in the Excess Emissions Proposal, EPA merely summarizes the approach for establishing acceptable longer-term average emission limits included in the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance. The proposal also notes that all areas in Florida that have been through the attainment planning and/or designation process have been redesignated and, in Sections II.B.5.I. and II.B.5.II., details the methodology that Florida employs to determine proposed longer-term average emission limits for several sulfuric acid plants (SAPs) and nitric acid plants (NAPs) in the State. EPA also specifically highlights the differences between the attainment planning approach laid out in the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance and the assessment made for determining comparable stringent limits to replace the existing SIP-rule limits.

As discussed in the Excess Emissions Proposal, Florida's longer-term average emission limits for several SAPs and NAPs in the September 30, 2022, SIP revision are not based entirely on the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance. As FDEP explains in its SIP submittal, to set reasonable longer-term average emission limits that would be comparable to the existing SIP-rule emission limits proposed for removal from the SIP, the State made use of the statistical principles that EPA applied in the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance to calculate the equivalency ratios. In the Excess Emissions Proposal, EPA states that Florida made use of similar statistical approaches to the approach outlined in the guidance when developing its source-specific emission limits for SO₂ and NO_x. See 88 FR 29598, 29605–08. Making use of a similar statistical analysis of actual emissions data to develop longer-term average emission limits that would be comparable to existing SIP-rule emission limits and not allow emissions increases is not the same as applying the guidance for demonstrating that a prospective limit is sufficient to provide for attainment of the NAAQS. d

As noted above, the Excess Emissions Proposal discusses the methodology for determining the longer-term average emission limits that can replace the existing SIP rule SO₂ and emission limits for SAPs and the existing SIP rule NO_x emission limits for NAPs. The analysis demonstrates that the longer-term average emission limits are comparably stringent to those existing SIP emission limits and, therefore, do not allow any emissions increases. The detailed analysis describe in section II.B.5. of the Excess Emissions Proposal explains why the longer-term emission limits developed by Florida are comparably stringent to the existing SIP limits. The proposal also specifically details how Florida's approach in establishing longer-term average emission limits for certain SAPs and for the two NAPs in the State differs from EPA's approach detailed in the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance for the purpose of attainment planning, and it highlights the similarities, where relevant, between the two approaches. EPA did not state or suggest that Florida made use of actual modeled "critical emission values" (CEVs) to determine the new longer-term average emission limits proposed for incorporation into the SIP.

At the time of proposal, EPA had no information that there were any NAAQS issues that would require modeling a new CEV, and no new information has been provided to indicate that there would be NAAQS compliance issues around any of the facilities subject to this rulemaking. Rather, FDEP established new, source-specific emission limits and compared them to existing SIP emission limits in Rules 62–296.402 and 62–296.408. The starting point for the analysis was not a nonattainment planning situation, but instead a consideration of any potential relaxation to the SIP in replacing the existing SIP-rule emission limits with source-specific longer-term average emission limits.

As discussed in the Excess Emissions Proposal, the existing SIP emission limits proposed for removal from the SIP were only applicable to steady-state periods of operation, having functioned with an exemption for periods of SSM. With Florida's removal of exemptions for SSM in Rule 62–210.700, "Excess Emissions," in response to the 2015 SSM SIP Action, the State wanted to develop new, continuous emission limits that would apply during all periods of operation. Having been through the attainment planning process and an air quality designation process for several SAPs (*i.e.*, Mosaic Fertilizer's Riverview facility, Bartow facility, an

New Wales facility), FDEP recognizes that several SAPs in the State already have existing longer-term average, source-specific emission limits which were continuous and at least as stringent as the emission limits in Rule 62–296.402 (which have not been adopted for attainment planning purposes).

The State then proposed new, longer-term average emission limits for the remaining SAPs in the State, Mosaic South Pierce, Nutrien White Springs, and Tampa Electric Company (TECO) Polk, which would be based on an analysis of comparable stringency to the previously existing short-term limits using each source's continuous emissions monitoring system (CEMS) data, similar to the longer-term average emission limit approach developed in the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance. For this analysis, Florida used the existing SIP rule emission limits in place of the CEV concept used in the SO₂ Guidance to demonstrate how much a longer-term average limit should be scaled down to compensate for the longer averaging period and maintain the same level of emission limit stringency. Similarly, the State developed longer-term average continuous emission limits for the two NAPs in the State, Ascen Pensacola, and Traemark Nitrogen, which could build off of a similar analysis based on historical CEMS data. EPA has not suggested that FDEP made use of a modeled CEV for these SAPs and NAPs. The existing 3-hour average SIP emission limits were the baseline for the longer-term average analysis. See 88 FR 29598, 29605–08.

EPA disagrees with the Commenters that the Agency did not provide enough information to assess the appropriateness of the data sets used in the analysis. The Excess Emissions Proposal and associated docket provide sufficient relevant information about the data sets Florida used to calculate the source-specific limits. The State utilized over three years of CEMS data for Mosaic South Pierce, three years of data for Nutrien White Springs SAP F, two years of data for Nutrien White Springs SAP E, and three years of data for Ascen Pensacola.⁹ The data sets used were from the most recently available complete years and provide ample data points to perform robust analyses and to reach reliable conclusions.

EPA included the CEMS data as provided by FDEP for the Mosaic South Pierce SAPs, Nutrien White Springs

⁹ See "Nutrien White Springs Eq Ratio 2019–2021," "Mosaic SP SO₂ Equivalency Ratios," and "Ascen Nitric Acid Plant Equivalency Ratio" in the docket for this rulemaking.

SAPs, and the Ascend Pensacola NAP in the rulemaking docket at the time of a proposal. EPA also evaluated the analysis that FDEP performed in selecting longer-term average emission limits for these facilities. The Excess Emissions Proposal describes the use of 99th percentile 1-hour average, 3-hour average, 6-hour average, and 24-hour block average emissions, applicable for the SAPs, and the proposed longer-term average emission limits being evaluated. Similarly, EPA describes the use of the 98th percentile 1-hour average, 3-hour average, and 720-hour rolling average emissions for the Ascend Pensacola NAP.

As discussed in the Excess Emissions Proposal, for the Nutrien White Springs and Mosaic South Pierce SAPs, FDEP evaluated the ratio of the 24-hour:3-hour average 99th percentile emissions, then also considered the ratio of 24-hour:1-hour average 99th percentile emissions. FDEP then selected longer-term average emission limit (840 lbs/hr) in line with the most conservative (i.e., lowest) equivalency ratios determined for Nutrien White Springs and considered more stringent than the calculated equivalency ratios would have determined to be appropriate for Mosaic South Pierce. See 88 FR 29598,

29605–09. The ratio of the selected emission limit to the existing SIP emission limit (917 lbs/hr) is 0.916. The average of the two 24-hr:3-hr ratios determined for SAPs E (0.950) and F (0.914), would be 0.932. Therefore, the final limit across these two SAPs at Nutrien White Springs is in line with the lower end of what the 24-hr:3-hr equivalency ratios would indicate is an appropriate longer-term average emission limit and more stringent than what one would consider for the analysis across both SAPs would call for. Regarding Mosaic South Pierce, FDEP and Mosaic Fertilizer agreed upon an equivalency ratio of 0.750 for the source, which is lower than any of the 24-hr:3-hr or 24-hr:1-hr equivalency ratios included in the analysis of the CEMS data. See 88 FR 29598, 29605.

Regarding the TECO Polk SAP, with the new 6-hour average emission limit, the ratio between the selected limit and the existing SIP emission limit is in line with the lowest 6-hr:1-hr ratio from the available CEMS data for Nutrien White Springs and Mosaic South Pierce. See 88 FR 29598, 29610. For Ascend Pensacola, FDEP considered the ratio of the 720-hour:3-hour average 98th percentile emissions, then also considered the ratio of the 720-hour:1-

hour average 98th percentile emissions. The selected emission limit compared to the existing SIP emission limit for Ascend Pensacola and Tridemrk Nitrogen results in significantly more stringent ratio (0.867) than the CEMS data analysis would lead to for the 720-hr:3-hr (0.958) and 720-hr:1-hr (0.958) ratios. See 88 FR 29598, 29607, 29612–13. The ultimate longer-term average emission limits for these SAPs and NAPs were compared to these existing SIP emission limits and the ratios of longer-term average emissions to shorter-term average emissions in the CEMS data to assess the comparability with the existing SIP emission limits and therefore assess the potential relation to the SIP. FDEP developed its new source-specific emission limits in an appropriate way to ensure that the SIP is not relaxed and that increased emissions will not occur because of the SIP revision.

As shown in the tables below, and as discussed in the Excess Emissions Proposal,¹⁰ in all cases the maximum emissions theoretically allowed under the new source-specific limits are less than what is theoretically allowed under the existing SIP limits on both short-term and long-term (annual) basis.

Facility ^a	Existing SIP SO ₂ limits		New source-specific SIP SO ₂ limits	
	Combined unit maximum emissions allowed per hour (based on a 3-hour average) (lbs/hr)	Combined unit maximum emissions allowed per year (tons/yr)	Combined unit maximum emissions allowed per hour (based on longer-term averages, as indicated) (lbs/hr)	Combined unit maximum emissions allowed per year (tons/yr)
Nutrien White Springs	917	4,015	ⁱ 840	3,679
Mosaic South Pierce	1,000	4,380	ⁱⁱ 750	3,285
TECO Polk	^a 49.8	^a 218.3	^a ⁱⁱ 48.0	ⁱⁱⁱ 210.2 ^a

ⁱ24-hour average. ^a

ⁱⁱ6-hour average.

ⁱⁱⁱEPA notes that Table 5 in the Excess Emissions Proposal included a typographical error, reflecting 214.6 tons/year rather than 210.2 tons/year.

Facility ^a	Existing SIP NO _x limits		New source-specific SIP NO _x limits	
	Maximum emissions allowed per hour (based on a 3-hour average) (lbs/hr)	Maximum emissions allowed per year (tons/yr)	Maximum emissions allowed per hour (based on longer-term averages, as indicated) (lbs/hr)	Maximum emissions allowed per year (tons/yr)
Ascend Pensacola	187.5	821	^{iv} 162.6	712

¹⁰ Except where noted, each figure in the tables below appeared in the rulemaking docket.

corresponding facility in the Excess Emissions Proposal.

Facility	Existing SIP NO _x limits		New source-specific SIP NO _x limits	
	Maximum emissions allowed per hour (based on a 3-hour average) (lbs/hr)	Maximum emissions allowed per year (tons/yr)	Maximum emissions allowed per hour (based on longer-term averages, as indicated) (lbs/hr)	Maximum emissions allowed per year (tons/yr)
Trademark Nitrogen ...d.....	18.8	82.1	16.3	71.2

^{iv} 720-hour average.
^v 30-day average. d

Regarding the other impacted SAPs at Mosaic Fertilizer’s Riverview facility, Bartow facility, and New Wales facility, EPA notes in the Excess Emissions Proposal that these facilities already have longer-term average continuous emission limits that have been previously approved into the SIP to enable attainment of the 2010 SO₂ NAAQS.¹¹ EPA compares these source-specific emission limits, which in fact provide for attainment in the respective nonattainment areas, to the existing SIP emission limit at Rule 62–296.402 (which has not been relied upon to show attainment) and determine that these emission limits are at least as stringent as the limits provided in Rule 62–296.402. EPA is not reopening for comment these longer-term average limits for these facilities, as noted in the proposal, and the Commenters do not raise any issues with these facilities or their existing longer-term average source-specific emission limits with any specificity. See 88 FR 29598, 29612, 29615. The Excess Emissions Proposal refers readers to the actions in which EPA approved those source-specific emission limits for more detail on how those limits were developed. In that proposal, EPA only compares the new longer-term average limits with the existing limits at Rule 62–296.402. d

EPA also reiterates that, for the NAPs, the steady-state SIP emission limit was carried forward directly into the source-specific permits being approved into the SIP. This means, as EPA describes in the Excess Emissions Proposal, no effective change to the existing SIP emission limitations results from removing the Rule 62–296.408 emission limit from the SIP. Instead, the two NAPs each receive two new source-specific emission limits: the first covers the steady-state modes of operation and is the same as required by the existing SIP; the second applies at all times,

including periods of SSM, and is comparably stringent to the existing SIP emission limit. Therefore, the SIP is strengthened by the changes applicable to these sources.

Regarding all SAPs, except for the TECO Polk SAP, the New Source Performance Standard (NSPS) at 40 CFR part 60, subpart H, *Standards of Performance for Sulfuric Acid Plants*, imposes the same emission limit for steady-state periods as the most stringent emission limit in Rule 62–296.402 (i.e., 4 pounds of SO₂ per ton of sulfuric acid produced (lb/ton)). Therefore, EPA has several reasons to believe that steady-state emissions will not increase subsequent to this revision: (1) The new, longer-term average emission limits are not comparably stringent to the existing steady-state SIP-rule emission limit, (2) the longer-term average emission limits significantly reduce the total SO₂ emissions allowed on a short-term basis and also on a long-term (annual) basis, and (3) the NSPS will still apply to Nutrien White Springs and Mosaic South Pierce.

Comment 2: Commenters state that longer term limits cannot guarantee protection of 1-hour standards and generally should not be used to protect short-term NAAQS. Additionally, the Commenters state that if EPA chooses to allow longer-term emission limits, it should ensure that those limits are as protective as possible to ensure that the health-based standards are maintained at all times.

Response 2: EPA disagrees with the Commenters’ statement that longer-term average limits should not be used to protect short-term NAAQS. As discussed in Section II.B.5. of the Excess Emissions Proposal, EPA’s 2014 SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance provides procedures for using a statistical analysis to determine NAAQS-protective longer-term average emission limits for sources with variable emissions. In general, EPA believes that when the statistical procedure is used in the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance is

applied appropriately, longer-term average limits are comparably effective in achieving attainment of a short-term NAAQS in nonattainment areas. EPA has approved the application of the longer-term averaging policy on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the concepts recommended in the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance for several SO₂ nonattainment-area attainment SIPs and re-designation requests that require a NAAQS evaluation.¹² This includes attainment-SIP and re-designation-request approvals for SO₂ nonattainment areas in Florida. Appropriately set longer-term average limits can provide for attainment of a short-term NAAQS because they are set low enough that they are equally stringent as the respective shorter-term limits with higher thresholds.

Florida’s application of the statistical analysis procedures contained in EPA’s SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance for this SIP action was not for the purpose of demonstrating compliance with the short-term 1-hour SO₂ and NO₂ NAAQS. Rather, Florida’s analysis shows that replacement of the existing short-term SIP-approved limits with the new source-specific longer-term average emission limits would not allow for an increase in emissions and thereby lessen the stringency of the SIP. As a result, the control strategy needed to meet a comparably stringent longer-term emission limit would necessarily be as effective as the control strategy needed to meet the shorter-term emission limit. d

Moreover, the statistical procedures were used to develop source-specific longer-term average emission limits that will apply during all periods of operation and that are comparatively

¹² EPA analyzes and approves several SO₂ attainment SIPs and re-designation requests that provide for attainment of the 2010 short-term standard by determining the suitability of a just long term limits can be protective of the expected to 1-hour SO₂ standard. See, e.g., 87 FR 33095 (June 1, 2022), 85 FR 9666 (February 20, 2020), 83 FR 25922 (June 5, 2018), 84 FR 30420 (June 28, 2019), 82 FR 30749 (July 3, 2017).

¹¹ See 82 FR 30749 (July 3, 2017), 85 FR 9666 (February 20, 2020).

stringent to the existing shorter-term limits in Florida's SIP for SAPs and NAPs, which only apply during full-load operation and exclude SSM periods. While Florida's submission is neither intended nor required to demonstrate protection of 1-hour standards, such as what would be required of nonattainment SIP supported by modeling demonstration, Florida used appropriate source-specific datasets and appropriately applied statistical procedures to develop longer-term average emission limits that are comparatively stringent to the existing SIP emission limits such that the SIP revision will not result in emissions increases and consequently will not interfere with any applicable requirement of the CAA.

Comment 3: Commenters state that if EPA chooses to allow longer-term limits to protect short-term NAAQS, the Agency should ensure that the conversion factor used to calculate longer-term limit is appropriately low and that the facility would violate its longer-term limit if it violated its "critical emission value."

Response 3: EPA believes that the procedures used by Florida to calculate the longer-term average limits for the SAPs and NAPs discussed in the May 8, 2023, Excess Emissions Proposal are appropriate and provide for comparatively stringent longer-term average emission limits that apply during all periods of operation of the affected sources. The procedures used by Florida to derive the longer-term average limits are discussed and summarized in Section II.B.5. of the Excess Emissions Proposal. As shown in the example calculations provided for the Mosic South Pierce facility and described in the Excess Emissions Proposal, Florida used an equivalency ratio of 0.75 to establish the 24-hour SO₂ limit for the two SAPs, which is approximately 23 percent lower than the 0.978 equivalency ratio calculated by applying the procedure of the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance.¹³ Therefore, the 24-hour SO₂ limits established for these SAPs are even more stringent than limits that would be derived by strictly following the procedures in the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance. Likewise, the longer-term average limits for the other SAPs and NAPs subject to this rulemaking are relatively stringent to the longer-term average limits that were calculated following the procedures of the SO₂ Nonattainment Guidance.

As discussed in EPA's response to Comment 1, the concept of the "critical emission value" (CEV) is not applicable to the analysis Florida performed to

calculate the comparatively stringent longer-term average limits that apply during all periods of operation, including SSM events. Florida used the existing 3-hour SIP limits applicable to the SAPs and NAPs as the starting point for deriving comparatively stringent longer-term average limits. No CEVs were calculated. To the extent that Commenters may be referring to how the longer-term average emission limits are established relative to the existing 3-hour average SIP emission limits, EPA disagrees that the limits should be set such that they exceed twice of the existing 3-hour average limits would result in exceeding the longer-term average limit. The purpose of setting longer-term average emission limit is to allow for some level of emissions variability. Prior to this action, the existing SIP emission limits did not apply during periods of SSM, and with this change, comparatively stringent emission limit will apply all times, including those periods of SSM. EPA discussed the statistical approach that Florida employed in establishing its longer-term average emission limits which are comparable to existing SIP emission limits in the responses to Comments 1 and 2.

Comment 4: Commenters state that there appears to be no description in EPA's proposed rule or Florida's SIP submission regarding the removal of subpart G 62-296.405(1)(c)3, which provides that owners of fossil fuel steam generators shall monitor their emissions and the effects of the emissions on ambient concentrations of SO₂, in manner, frequency, and locations approved and deemed reasonably necessary and ordered by the Department. Commenters question why EPA has not included any analysis on how removing this provision would not interfere with attainment, reasonable further progress, or any other applicable requirement under section 110(l) of the Act.

Response 4: EPA's May 8, 2023, Excess Emissions Proposal (88 FR 29598), which addresses Florida's November 22, 2016, and September 30, 2022, SIP revisions, did not discuss the removal of subpart G 62-296.405(1)(c)3 because the Excess Emissions Proposal did not propose to remove it from the SIP. See 88 FR 29602 and 29603, n.15. Instead, EPA proposed to remove subpart G 62-296.405(1)(c)3 from the SIP in a different and separate notice of proposed rulemaking also published on May 8, 2023—the Emission Standards Proposal (88 FR 29591). In that notice, EPA explained the rationale for removal and proposed to find that the changes to

Rule 62-296.405 would not interfere with any requirement concerning attainment and RFP, or any other applicable requirement of the CAA. See 88 FR 29591, 29593-94. EPA did not receive any comments on the Emission Standards Proposal and is finalizing action on both the Emission Standards Proposal and the Excess Emissions Proposal in this final rulemaking.

As EPA explained in the Emission Standards Proposal, EPA proposed to remove subpart G (1)(c)3 from the SIP because, as FDEP notes in its April 1, 2022, SIP revision, the monitoring of stack emissions is regulated by SIP-approved Chapter 62-297, F.A.C., Stationary Sources—Emissions Monitoring, and subpart G (1)(c)3 is a discretionary ambient SO₂ monitoring provision that is no longer needed in the SIP. *Id.* FDEP explains that the State has the authority and capability of setting up ambient air quality monitoring stations needed. In addition, Rule 62-212.400(7) requires that the owner or operator of major stationary source or major modification under the PSD program provide any required monitoring and analysis as required in 40 CFR 52.21(m). Florida operates an approved plan for monitoring compliance with the SO₂ NAAQS and may require owners of fossil fuel steam generators to conduct ambient monitoring as needed when constructing or modifying emissions units.

Comment 5: Commenters speculate that specific plants are being removed from Rule 62-296.405, "Fossil Fuel Steam Generators with More than 250 Million Btu Per Hour Heat Input," because they no longer exist or are no longer permitted to operate. Commenters ask EPA to clarify why the plants are being removed.

Response 5: Similar to the response to Comment 4, EPA's May 8, 2023, Excess Emissions Proposal did not discuss the removal of SO₂ and NO_x standards for certain units from Rule 62-296.405 because the Excess Emissions Proposal did not propose to remove them from the SIP. Instead, EPA proposed to remove the standards for certain units from Rule 62-296.405 in the Emissions Standards Proposal and explained the rationale for such removal in that notice. EPA did not receive any comments on the Emission Standards Proposal and is finalizing action on both the Emission Standards Proposal and the Excess Emissions Proposal in this final rulemaking.

As EPA explained in the Emission Standards Proposal, EPA proposed to remove certain units from Rule 62-296.405 because Florida requested the

¹³ See *supra* note 9.

removal of SO₂ and NO_x standards from Rule 62–296.405 for units that have permanently shut down¹⁴ or have more stringent federally enforceable limits in the SIP. See 88 FR 29591, 29593–94.

Comment 6: A separate commenter expresses support for EPA’s Excess Emissions Proposal and urges EPA to approve Florida’s SIP revisions “an reinstate or issue new SIP calls for other states or local jurisdictions that have not yet revise their SSM provisions” The commenter mentions that “this will ensure a level playing field for all regulate facilities and promote environmental justice for all communities.”

Response 6: EPA acknowledges the commenter’s support for finalizing the Excess Emissions Proposal. To the extent that the comment refers to SIP calls for other states or local jurisdictions, the comment is outside the scope of this rulemaking, which addresses the 2015 SSM SIP Action with respect to Florida only. d

III. Final Actions

EPA is approving Florida’s November 22, 2016, SIP revision (Excess Emissions Rule SIP Revision) consisting of revisions to Rule Section 62–210.700, “Excess Emissions.” The revisions include the deletion of Rule 62–210.700(4), with the adoption of equivalent language to Rules 62–210.700(1) and (2); amendment of Rule 62–210.700(3), to clarify and restate the visible emissions and PM limits and applicable during boiler cleaning (soot blowing) and load changes; and adoption of Rule 62–210.700(6), which states that Rules 62–210.700(1) and (2) shall not apply after May 22, 2018, to either emission limits or unit-specific emission limits that have been incorporated into Florida’s SIP; and adoption of Rule 62–210.700(7), which states that after October 23, 2016, Rules 62–210.700(1) and (2), shall not apply to new permit-specific emission limits established pursuant to Florida’s PSD and NNSR regulations (Rules 62–212.400 and 62–210.500). EPA has determined that Florida’s Excess Emissions Rule SIP Revision is consistent with CAA requirements and adequately addresses the specific deficiencies that EPA identified in the 2015 SSM SIP Action with respect to the Florida SIP. d

¹⁴ As explained in the Emission Standards Proposal, on March 30, 2023, Florida with new its request to remove 62–296.405(1)(c)1.g and (1)(2), which include SO₂ and NO_x limits, respectively, for Florida Power and Light’s Manatee plant, which has not shut down. EPA accordingly does not propose to approve the removal of these subparagraphs. d

Additionally, EPA is approving Florida’s SIP revisions consisting of SSM-related other changes to Rule 62–296.405, “Existing Fossil Fuel Steam Generators with Greater than or Equal to 250 Million Btu Per Hour Heat Input,”¹⁵ and Rule 62–296.570, “Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT)—Requirements for Major VOC- and NO_x-Emitting Facilities”; removal of the sulfur dioxide emission limit in Rule 62–296.402, “Sulfuric Acid Plants”; and removal of the nitrogen oxides emission limit in Rule 62–296.408, “Nitric Acid Plants.” Further, EPA is approving into Florida’s SIP source-specific SO₂ and NO_x emission limits and construction permit conditions for five SO₂ emissions units and two NO_x emissions units. EPA finds that Florida’s April 1, 2022, SIP revision and the September 30, 2022, Supplemental SSM SIP Revision are consistent with CAA requirements and adequately address the additional regulations identified by the State as problematic. d

IV. Incorporation by Reference

In this document, EPA is finalizing regulatory text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with the requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, and as discussed in Sections I through III of this preamble, EPA is finalizing the incorporation by reference of Florida Rule 62–210.700, “Excess Emissions,” state effective October 23, 2016, which set a schedule by which the exemptions from applicable emission limits for startups, shutdowns, and malfunctions will be removed. EPA is also finalizing the incorporation by reference of the following Florida Rules: 62–296.402, “Sulfuric Acid Plants,” removing specific emission limits from the Florida SIP, state effective June 23, 2022, except for 62–296.402(1), 62–296.402(2)(a)2., 62–296.402(2)(b)2., and 62–296.402(3)(b); 62–296.405, “Existing Fossil Fuel Steam Generators with Greater than or Equal to 250 Million Btu Per Hour Heat Input,” revising and clarifying monitoring requirements and

¹⁵ The September 30, 2022, SIP revision includes the following typographical errors: (1) In paragraph 62–296.405(6)(b) as shown on page 33 of 126 in the submittal, one sentence (“In lieu of EPA Method 17, 5, 5B, or 5F”) appears in two places. The amendments to the State effective version of Rule 62–296.405, which start at page 73 of 126, show the revised text correctly at page 75 of 126 in the SIP submittal. (2) In paragraph 62–296.405(7)(a)4. as shown on page 35 of 126, two rule cross-references are not shown as revised. The amendments to the State effective version of Rule 62–296.405 show the revised cross-references correctly at page 77 of 126. (3) In paragraph 62–296.405(7)(b) as shown on page 35 of 126, a rule cross-reference is not shown as revised. The amendments to the State effective version of the rule show the revised cross-reference correctly at page 77 of 126. d

applicability, state effective June 23, 2022, except for 62–296.405(4)(a)2. through 5., 62–296.405(4)(a)8. and 9., 62–296.405(4)(b)1. and 2., 62–296.405(4)(b)4., and 62–296.405(5)(c).; 62–296.408, “Nitric Acid Plants,” removing specific emission limits, state effective November 23, 1994, except for 62–296.408(2); and 62–296.570, “Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT)—Requirements for Major VOC- and NO_x-Emitting Facilities,” removing an exemption from RACT requirements during startups, shutdowns, and malfunctions, state effective June 23, 2022. Additionally, EPA is finalizing the incorporation by reference of the specific new operating parameters, SO₂ emission caps, and compliance monitoring, record keeping, and reporting requirements for emission units EU 066 (SAP E) and EU 067 (SAP F) at Nutrien White Springs (Permit No. 0470002–132–AC),¹⁶ state effective January 1, 2023; EU 004 (SAP 10) and EU 005 (SAP 11) at Mosaic South Pierce (Permit No. 1050055–037–AC),¹⁷ state effective April 1, 2023; an EU 004 at TECO-Polk (Permit No. 1050233–050–AC),¹⁸ state effective January 1, 2023. The SO₂ emission standards specified in each permit are the basis for the removal of other SO₂ emission limits from the SIP. Finally, EPA is finalizing the incorporation by reference of the specific new operating parameters, NO_x emission caps, and compliance monitoring, record keeping, and reporting requirements for emission units EU 042 at Ascension Pensacola (Permit No. 0330040–076–AC),¹⁹ state effective January 1, 2023; and EU 001 at Truemark Nitrogen (Permit No. 0570025–016–AC),²⁰ state effective

¹⁶ Specifically, EPA is incorporating by reference into Florida’s SIP Specific Conditions 3 through 6 from Permit No. 0470002–132–AC issue to White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc., Suwannee River/Swift Creek Complex by FDEP on September 22, 2022. State effective January 1, 2023.

¹⁷ Specifically, EPA is incorporating by reference into Florida’s SIP Specific Conditions 4 through 7 from Permit No. 1050055–037–AC issue to Mosaic Fertilizer, LLC, South Pierce Facility by FDEP on September 22, 2022. State effective April 1, 2023.

¹⁸ Specifically, EPA is incorporating by reference into Florida’s SIP Specific Conditions 1 through 4 from Permit No. 1050233–050–AC issue to Tampa Electric Company Polk Power Station by FDEP on September 21, 2022. State effective January 1, 2023.

¹⁹ Specifically, EPA is incorporating by reference into Florida’s SIP Specific Conditions 1 through 6 from Permit No. 0330040–076–AC issue to Ascension Performance Materials Operations LLC Pensacola Plant by FDEP on September 20, 2022. State effective January 1, 2023. EPA notes that the condition numbers are misidentified on pages 43–44 of the Supplemental SSM SIP Revision as 1 and 5 through 9; in the permit, those conditions are numbered 1 through 6, as shown on pages 98–99 of the Supplemental SSM SIP Revision.

²⁰ Specifically, EPA is incorporating by reference into Florida’s SIP Specific Conditions 1 and 5

January 1, 2023. The NO_x emission stan ar s specifie in each permit are the basis for the removal of other NO_x emission limits from the SIP. EPA has ma e, an will continue to make, these materials generally available through www.regulations.gov an at the EPA Region 4 office (please contact the person i entifie in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this d preamble for more information). d Therefore, these materials have been approve by EPA for inclusion in the SIP, have been incorporate by d reference by EPA into that plan, are fully fe erally enforceable un er d sections 110 an 113 of the CAA as of the effective ate of the final rulemaking of EPA’s approval, an will be d incorporate by reference in the next up ate to the SIP compilation.²¹ d

V. St tuto y n Executive Or e d eviews

Un er the CAA, the A ministrator is require to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act an applicable Fe eral 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, provi e that they meet the criteria of the CAA. These actions merely approve state law as meeting Fe eral d requirements an oes not impose a itional requirements beyon those impose by state law. For that reason, these actions: d

- Are not significant regulatory actions subject to review by the Office of Management an Bu get un er d Executive Or ers 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) an 14094 (88 FR d 21879, April 11, 2023); d
- Do not impose an information collection bur en un er the provisions of the Paperwork Re uction Act (44 d U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Are certifie as not having ad significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities un er the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Do not contain any unfun e d man ate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as escribe in the Unfun e Man ates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);
- Do not have Fe eralism d implications as specifie in Executive Or er 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Are not subject to Executive Or er 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) because it approves a state program;

- Are not significant regulatory actions subject to Executive Or er d 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001); an
- Are not subject to requirements of Section 12() of the National Technology Transfer an A vancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA. d

In a ition, the SIP is not approve to apply on any In ian reservation lan or in any other area where EPA or an In ian tribe has e monstrate that a tribe has juris iction. In those areas of In ian country, these actions o not have tribal implications as specifie by Executive Or er 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor will they impose substantial irect costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

Executive Or er 12898 (Fe eral d Actions To A ress Environmental Justice in Minority Populations an Low-Income Populations, 59 FR 7629, Feb. 16, 1994) irects Fe eral agencies to i entify an a ress

“ disproportionately high an a verse human health or environmental effects” of their actions on minority populations an low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable an permitte by law. EPA efines d environmental justice (EJ) as “the fair treatment an meaningful involvement of all people regar less of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the evelopment, implementation, an enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, an policies.” EPA further efines the term fair treatment to mean that “no group of people shoul bear a isproportionate bur en of d environmental harms an risks, inclu ing those resulting from the d negative environmental consequences of in ustrial, governmental, an commercial operations or programs an policies.”

The FDEP i not evaluate EJ consi erations as part of its SIP submittal; the CAA an applicable implementing regulations neither prohibit nor require such an evaluation. EPA i not perform an EJ analysis an i not consi er EJ in these actions. Due to the nature of the actions being taken here, these actions are expecte to have a neutral to positive impact on the air quality of the affecte area. Consi eration of EJ is not require as part of these actions, an there is no information in the recor inconsistent with the state goal of E.O. 12898 of achieving EJ for people of color, low-income populations, an In igenous peoples.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as a e by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement

Fairness Act of 1996, generally provi es that before a rule may take effect, thed agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which inclu es a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress an to the Comptroller General of the Unite States. EPA will submit a report containing these actions an other require information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, an the Comptroller General of the Unite States prior to publication of the rule in the **Fe e egiste** . A major rule cannot take effect until 60 ays after it is publishe in the **Fe e egiste** . These actions are not a “major rule” as efine by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Un er section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for ju icial review of these actions must be file in the Unite States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by October 3, 2023. Filing a petition for reconsi eration by the A ministrator of this final rule oes not affect the finality of these actions for the purposes of ju icial review nor oes it exten the time within which a petition for ju icial review may be file , an shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. These actions may not be challenge later in procee ings to enforce its requirements. See section 307(b)(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CF P t 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxi e, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Lea , Nitrogen ioxi e, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting an recor keeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compoun s.

Date : July 24, 2023.

Je ne nne Gett e,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

For the reasons state in the preamble, EPA amen s 40 CFR part 52 as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

- 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to rea s follows:

Autho ity: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart K—Florida

- 2. In § 52.520:
 - a. Amen the table in paragraph (c) by:
 - 1. Un er the hea ing “Chapter 62–210 Stationary Sources—General Requirements,” revising thed entry “62–210.700”,

through 9 from Permit No. 0570025–016–AC issue to Tra emark Nitrogen, Inc., by FDEP on September 20, 2022. State effective January 1, 2023. d

²¹ See 62 FR 27968 (May 22, 1997).

- 2. Under the heading “Chapter 62–296 Stationary Sources—Emission Standards,” revising entries “62–296.402”, “62–296.405”, “62–296.408”, and “62–296.570”;
 - b. Amend the table in paragraph (d), by adding entries “Nutrien White Springs”; “Mosaic Fertilizer LLC—South Pierce Facility”; “Tampa Electric Company (TECO)—Polk Power Station”, “Ascend Pensacola”, and “Trademark Nitrogen” at the end of the table.
- The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 52.520 Identification of plan.
 * * * * *
 (c) * * * a

EPA-APPROVED FLORIDA LAWS AND REGULATIONS

State citation (section)	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Chapter 62–210 Stationary Sources—General Requirements				
62–210.700	Excess Emissions	10/23/2016	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication].	a
Chapter 62–296 Stationary Sources—Emission Standards				
62–296.402	Sulfuric Acid Plants	6/23/2022	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication].	Except for paragraphs (1), (2)(a)2., (2)(b)2., and (3)(b).
62–296.405	Existing Fossil Fuel Steam Generators with Greater than or Equal to 250 Million Btu Per Hour Heat Input. a	6/23/2022	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication].	Except for paragraphs (4)(a)2. through 5., (4)(a)8. and 9., (4)(b)1. and 2., (4)(b)4., and (5)(c).
62–296.408	Nitric Acid Plants	11/23/1994	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication].	Except for paragraph (2).
62–296.570	Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT)—Requirements for Major VOC- and NO _x -Emitting Facilities.	6/23/2022	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication].	a

(d) * * *

EPA-APPROVED FLORIDA SOURCE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Name of source	Permit No.	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Nutrien White Springs	0470002–132–AC.	1/1/2023	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication].	Conditions 3 through 6 at EU 066 a (SAP E) and EU 067 (SAP F).
Mosaic Fertilizer, LLC—South Pierce Facility.	1050055–037–AC.	4/1/2023	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication]. a	Conditions 4 through 7 at EU 004 (SAP 10) and EU 005 (SAP 11).
Tampa Electric Company (TECO)—Polk Power Station. a	1050233–050–a AC.	1/1/2023	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication].	Conditions 1 through 4 at EU 004.
Ascend Pensacola	0330040–076a AC.	1/1/2023	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication].	Conditions 1 through 6 at EU 042.
Trademark Nitrogen	0570025–016–AC.	1/1/2023	8/4/2023, [Insert citation of publication].	Conditions 1 and 5 through 9 at EU 001.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2023-15964 Filed 8-3-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P y

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY y

40 CFR Part 52 y

[EPA-R07-OAR-2023-0197; FRL-10826-02-R7] y

Air Plan Approval; State of Missouri; Construction Permits by Rule y

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). y

ACTION: Final rule. y

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving revisions to the Missouri State Implementation Plan (SIP) received on August 4, 2022. The submission removes a provision in the Missouri regulation “Construction Permits B Rule” that allows the burning of illegal and waste pharmaceutical drugs in crematories and animal incinerators. In the previous revision, submitted to EPA on March 7, 2019, EPA approved selected revisions of the rule but did not act on a portion of the revision that included the disposal of pharmaceuticals in crematories and animal incinerators because it conflicted with federal requirements on the incineration of illegal and waste pharmaceuticals. B removing the conflicting language, approval of these revisions ensures consistency between State and federal approved rules. These revisions along with other minor text changes are administrative in nature and do not impact the stringency of the SIP or air quality. The EPA’s approval of this rule revision is in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA). y

DATES: This final rule is effective on September 5, 2023. y

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2023-0197. All documents in the docket are listed on the www.regulations.gov website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. y 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 through www.regulations.gov or please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION** y

CONTACT section for additional information. y

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: y Steven Brown, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 Office, Air Quality Planning Branch, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219; y telephone number: (913) 551-7718; email address: brown.steven@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

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

I. What is being addressed in this document?

The EPA is approving a SIP revision submitted by the State of Missouri on August 4, 2022. Missouri requested the EPA to approve revisions to 10 Code of State Regulations (CSR) 10-6.062 in the Missouri SIP. The state has revised the rule to remove a provision in the Missouri regulation, “Construction Permits B Rule” that allowed the burning of illegal and waste pharmaceutical drugs in crematories and animal incinerators. In the previous revision, submitted to EPA on March 7, 2019, and in a final rulemaking, EPA approved selected revisions of the rule but did not act on a portion of the revision that included the disposal of pharmaceutical drugs because it conflicted with federal requirements on the incineration of illegal and waste pharmaceuticals. After review and analysis of the revisions, the EPA concluded that these changes do not have adverse effects on air quality. The full text of these changes can be found in the State’s submission, which is included in the docket for this action. The EPA’s analysis of the revisions can be found in the technical support document (TSD), also included in the docket. y

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

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 on this SIP revision from 12/01/2021 to 2/03/2022 and received no comments. The EPA’s Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) and supporting information contained in the docket were made available for public y

comment from March 22, 2023, to June 21, 2023 (88 FR 32715).

The EPA received one comment. The commenter did not support the incineration of illegal and waste pharmaceuticals because of the potential negative human health and environmental impacts. The state removed the language in the rule allowing the incineration of illegal and waste pharmaceuticals. Therefore, the rule is consistent with federal regulations and EPA is able to approve this revision. The comment is included in the docket.

In addition, as explained above and in more detail in the TSD, which is part of this docket, the revision meets the substantive SIP requirements of the CAA, including section 110 and implementing regulations.

III. What action is the EPA taking?

The EPA is taking final action to amend the Missouri SIP by approving the State’s revisions to rule 10-6.062 “Construction Permits B Rule.” Approval of these revisions will ensure consistency between State and federal approved rules. As described in the NPRM (88 FR 32715), and the TSD, the EPA has determined that these changes meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act and will not adversely impact air quality or the stringency of the SIP.

IV. Incorporation by reference

In this document, the EPA is finalizing regulatory text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is finalizing the incorporation by reference of the Missouri rule 10 CSR 10-6.062, state effective date July 30, 2022, which regulates the process by which sources can be exempt from 10 CSR 10-6.060 Construction Permits Required. 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).

Therefore, these materials have been approved by the EPA for inclusion in the State Implementation Plan, have been incorporated by reference by EPA into that plan, are fully enforceable under sections 110 and 113 of the CAA as of the effective date of the final rulemaking of the EPA’s approval, and will be incorporated by reference in the next update to the SIP compilation.¹

¹ 62 FR 27968, March 22, 1997.