the rule, if it believes the rule is somehow improper.

Compliance Date Extension Policy

A detailed discussion of USEPA's rationale for proposing disapproval of compliance date extensions, and of the Clean Air Act provisions and USEPA policy related to compliance date extensions generally appears in Appendix A of the proposed rulemaking published on November 8, 1988 at 53 FR 45103. That Appendix A discussion reiterates that even under a compliance date extension compliance should be expeditious. The State has not demonstrated that these compliance date extensions are expeditious. The State has not provided any information indicating that similar sources have been unable to comply in a timely fashion. In addition, USEPA policy also requires the timely attainment and maintenance of the ozone standard and, where relevant, "Reasonable Further Progress" (RFP) towards timely attainment. This second criterion is the criterion which USEPA has been using throughout its review of these extension requests. This criterion has been addressed in one or more of USEPA's technical support documents dated September 14, 1983, May 10, 1984, May 16, 1984, September 13, 1985, and November 29, 1985. Because the basis for disapproval discussed in the July 3, 1985 proposal still remains, USEPA is disapproving these revisions on the grounds given in that proposal.

Final Action

USEPA disapproves the final SIP revisions for Arvey, Moore American, and Meyercord because the proposed revisions do not conform with USEPA's compliance date extension policy, and because the State has not demonstrated that this compliance schedule is as expeditious as practicable.

Under Executive Order 12291, today's action is not "Major". It has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review. Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act Petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by April 24, 1989. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Ozone, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons.

Dated: February 10, 1989.

Jack Moore,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 89-4022 Filed 2-22-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

---

40 CFR Part 52

[FRL-3525-8]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Visibility Protection; Long-Term Strategy and Implementation Control Strategies

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This notice approves the general plan provisions and long-term strategy for visibility in a revision to the Texas State Implementation Plan (SIP). This action is a result of rulemaking on November 24, 1987 (52 FR 45132), in which EPA disapproved SIPs of States which failed to comply with the provisions of 40 CFR 51.302 (visibility implementation control strategies) and 51.306 (visibility long-term strategy). Additional details are discussed in the proposed rulemaking on March 12, 1987 (52 FR 7802).

The Governor of Texas submitted a SIP Revision for Visibility Protection on November 18, 1987. Supplemental information was submitted on February 17, and June 8, 1988. Review of the SIP revision indicated that Texas has met the criteria of 40 CFR 51.302 and 51.306. Consequently, this notice also revokes the November 24, 1987, Federally promulgated plan for Texas.

DATES: This action will become effective on April 24, 1989 unless notice is received within 30 days that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to Mr. Thomas Diggs, Chief (6T-AN), SIP/NSR Section, Air Programs Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least twenty-four hours before visiting day.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Air Programs Branch (6T-AN), 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Public Information Reference Unit, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

Texas Air Control Board, 6330 Highway 290 East, Austin, Texas 78723.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. John Crocker, Air Programs Branch, SIP/NSR Section, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, telephone (214) 655-7214 or (FTS) 255-7214. Reference Docket File Number TX-88-3.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

A. Regulatory Requirements and Litigation Challenges

Section 169A of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7491, sets as a national goal "* * * the prevention of any future, and the remedying of any existing, impairment of visibility in mandatory Class I Federal areas which impairment results from manmade air pollution." Section 169A requires visibility protection for mandatory Class I Federal areas where EPA has determined that visibility is an important value. "Mandatory Class I Federal areas" are certain national parks, wildernesses, and international parks, as described in section 162(a) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7472(a), 40 CFR 81.400 through 81.437. Section 169A specifically requires EPA to promulgate regulations requiring certain States to amend their State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to provide for visibility protection.

On December 2, 1980, EPA promulgated the required visibility regulations in 45 FR 80084, codified at 40 CFR 51.300 *et seq.* In broad outline, the visibility regulations require 36 States listed in § 51.300(b) to (1) coordinate SIP development with the appropriate Federal land managers (FLMs), (2) develop a program to assess and remedy visibility impairment from new and existing sources, (3) develop a long-term (10 to 15 years) strategy to assure reasonable progress toward the national goal, (4) develop a visibility monitoring strategy to collect information on visibility conditions, and (5) consider in all aspects of visibility protection any "integral vistas" identified by the end of 1985 by the FLM's as critical to the visitor's enjoyment of the Class I areas. The regulations required the States to submit to EPA their revised SIPs to satisfy those provisions by September 2, 1981. (See 45 FR 80091, codified at 40 CFR 51.302(a)(1).) That rulemaking resulted in numerous parties seeking judicial review of the visibility regulations. In March 1981, the Court stayed the litigation pending EPA action on related administrative petitions for reconsideration of the visibility regulations filed with the Agency.

In December 1982, the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California alleging that EPA failed to perform a nondiscretionary duty under section 110 of the Act to promulgate visibility SIPs.

B. Settlement Agreement

A negotiated settlement agreement between EPA and EDF required EPA to promulgate visibility SIPs on a specific schedule. It required EPA to promulgate Federal Implementation Plans (FIPs) for visibility in States where SIPs are deficient with respect to the 1980 visibility regulations. Specifically, the first part of the agreement required EPA to propose and promulgate FIPs which cover the monitoring and new source review (NSR) provisions under 40 CFR 51.305 and 51.307. The EPA proposed such plan revisions for 34 States (including Texas) on October 23, 1984, at 49 FR 42670. Texas submitted its Part I Plan for NSR on December 11, 1985. EPA published a Notice of Delegation of Authority for Visibility NSR under the Federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program on November 4, 1986 (51 FR 40072), since it met the requirements of the 1980 visibility NSR regulations, 40 CFR 51.307. Texas did not submit a visibility monitoring strategy in its Part I plan. Consequently, EPA promulgated a Federal monitoring plan in the July 12, 1985, **Federal Register** (50 FR 28544).

The second part of the settlement agreement required EPA to determine the adequacy of the SIPs to meet the remaining provisions of the visibility regulations. These provisions are the general plan provisions including implementation control strategies (40 CFR 51.302), integral vista protection (§§ 51.302 through 51.307), and long-term strategies (§ 51.306). The settlement agreement required EPA to propose and promulgate FIPs to remedy any deficiencies on a specified schedule.

On January 23, 1986, at 51 FR 3046, EPA preliminarily determined the SIPs of 32 States were deficient with respect to the remaining visibility provisions.

A revised settlement agreement required EPA to propose and promulgate FIPs to address the deficiencies relating to the general plan requirements and long-term strategies and allowed EPA to defer proposing and promulgating FIPs to remedy deficiencies related to impairment which the Federal land managers (FLMs) have certified to EPA. As currently revised, the agreement allows EPA until August 31, 1989, to propose remedies for existing impairment in certain of the affected areas. See 53 FR 35956 (September 15, 1988).

On March 12, 1987, at 52 FR 7802, EPA proposed to disapprove the SIPs of 32 States (including Texas) for failing to meet the general plan and long-term strategy requirements of 40 CFR 51.302 and 51.306. There, EPA proposed that control strategies to remedy existing impairment were unnecessary in the SIPs for 28 States (including Texas) and deferred a decision on the necessity of best available retrofit technology (BART) in four States (Arizona, Maine, Minnesota, and Utah).

The States were given the opportunity to avoid Federal promulgation of the FIPs if they submitted SIP revisions to EPA by August 31, 1987. Three States (Georgia, Florida, and Kentucky) met this deadline. Several States (including Texas) submitted draft or final SIPs after the August 31 date. The settlement agreement required EPA to promulgate FIPs for States which failed to meet the submittal deadline. Therefore, on November 24, 1987, at 52 FR 45132, EPA promulgated FIPs for 29 States (including Texas) to meet the general visibility plan requirements and long-term strategies of 40 CFR 51.302 and 51.306.

C. Today's Action

On November 18, 1987, the Governor of Texas submitted a Part II SIP Revision for Visibility Protection to meet the visibility general plan requirements and long-term strategies. Supplemental information was submitted on February 17, and June 8, 1988. The SIP revision is entitled "State Implementation Plan Revisions for Visibility Protection in Class I Areas: Phase I, September 18, 1987." EPA has reviewed the State's submittal and developed an evaluation report.[1] The report concludes that the Texas SIP revision meets all of the requirements for a Part II Visibility Protection Plan as outlined in 40 CFR 51.302 (visibility implementation control strategies) and 51.306 (visibility long-term strategy). This evaluation report is available for inspection by interested parties during normal business hours at the EPA Region 6 office. Today's action approves the Texas SIP revision as meeting the Part II Visibility Protection Plan requirements of 40 CFR 51.302 and 51.306 and the criteria discussed in 52 FR 7802. Today's action also revokes the FIP promulgated for Texas on November 24, 1987, at 52 FR 45132.

Texas has two mandatory Class I areas: Big Bend National Park, and Guadalupe Mountains National Park. No other Class I areas currently exist in the State. The SIP commits the State to visibility protection consistent with the Clean Air Act to be afforded within the national park boundaries. The SIP is to be reviewed every three years and revised as necessary.

Requirements

A. General Plan Requirements

The visibility regulations provide general plan requirements for the visibility SIPs. Section 51.302 sets specific State (and EPA in lieu of States) and FLM coordination requirements which must occur when developing a SIP. The general plan requirements of § 51.302(c) require that the SIPs include:

1. An assessment of visibility impairment and a discussion of how each element of the plan relates to the national goal;

2. Emission limitations, or other control measures, representing best available retrofit technology (BART) for certain sources;

3. Provisions to protect integral vistas identified pursuant to § 51.304;

4. Provisions to address any existing impairment certified by the FLM; and

5. A long-term (10–15 years) strategy for making reasonable progress toward the national goal.

(See 52 FR 7803 and 52 FR 45133 for further discussion of the general plan requirements and the process for developing control strategies to remedy existing impairment.)

The regulations require the State to adopt control strategies only to remedy impairment which has been reasonably attributed to a specific source or group of sources.

B. Long-Term Strategy

The regulations require that the long-term strategy be a 10 to 15-year plan for making reasonable progress toward the national goal. The long-term strategy must cover any existing impairment that the FLM certified and any integral vista that the FLMs have declared at least 6 months before plan submission. A long-term strategy must be developed which covers each Class I area within the State and each Class I area in another State that may be affected by sources within the State. The strategy must be coordinated with existing plans and goals for a Class I area including those of the FLMs. The strategy must state with reasonable specificity why it is

[1] Evaluation Report for the Texas Part II Visibility Protection Plan in Mandatory Class I Federal Areas, October 1988.

adequate for making reasonable progress toward the national goal. The long-term strategy and SIP must provide for the review of the impact of new sources (see § 51.307). The State must consider as a minimum the following six factors in the long-term strategy:

1. Emission reductions due to ongoing air pollution control programs;
2. Additional emission limitations and schedules for compliance;
3. Measures to mitigate the impacts of construction activities;
4. Source retirement and replacement schedules;
5. Smoke management techniques for agricultural and forestry management purposes including such plans as currently exist within the State for these purposes; and
6. Enforcement of emission limitations and control measures.

The SIP must include a statement as to why these factors were or were not addressed in developing the long-term strategy.

The State must commit to periodic review of the SIP on a schedule not less frequent than every 3 years. A periodic report must be developed in consultation with the FLMs and must contain the following:

1. Progress achieved in remedying existing impairment;
2. The ability of the long-term strategy to achieve reasonable progress toward the national goal;
3. Any change in visibility conditions since the last report or since plan approval;
4. Additional measures, including the need for SIP revisions, that may be necessary to achieve progress toward the national goal;
5. The progress achieved in implementing BART and meeting other schedules laid out in the long-term strategy;
6. The impact of any exemption granted under § 51.303; and
7. The need for BART to remedy existing impairment in an integral vista declared since plan approval.

C. Integral Vistas

Where the FLM has adopted an integral vista under § 51.304, the regulations require the State to (1) analyze for BART any facility where impairment in an integral vista has been reasonably attributed to that facility, (2) consider any integral vistas established 12 months prior to SIP submittal in its long-term strategy, and (3) coordinate with the FLMs on any permit application under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program where the proposed facility or modification may affect visibility in an integral vista. The FLM identified only one integral vista, and that one is located in Maine (see 46 FR 22707). Therefore, EPA proposed to disapprove only the State of Maine's SIP for failing to provide for the protection of these vistas. Thus, the visibility protection plan requirements for integral vistas (§§ 51.302 through 51.307) are applicable only for Maine.

D. Federal Remedy

On November 24, 1987, at 52 FR 45132, EPA disapproved the SIPs of 29 States (including Texas) for failing to comply with the provisions in EPA's existing regulations for visibility protection in mandatory Class I Federal areas dealing with impairment which can be reasonably attributed to a source. EPA also incorporated Federal implementation plans into the SIPs of these States to meet the general visibility plan requirements and long-term strategies of 40 CFR 51.302 and 51.306. These actions were proposed on March 12, 1987, at 52 FR 7802 and are in accordance with the settlement agreement with the EDF.

State Submittal

A. General Plan Requirements/FLM Coordination

Under section 165(d) of the Clean Air Act, the FLM is given an affirmative responsibility to protect air quality related values, including visibility, in lands within a Class I area. The FLM must maintain these areas consistent with congressional land use goals. The visibility regulations (40 CFR 51.302) allow the FLM the opportunity to identify visibility impairment and to recommend elements for inclusion in the long-term strategy.

The State of Texas has met the visibility general plan requirements of § 51.302. The State has accorded the FLM opportunities to participate and comment on its visibility SIP revision. Comments by the FLM were submitted to the State during the State's public notice period, and they were considered by the State and incorporated where applicable. The State has committed in the SIP to consult continually with the FLM on the review and implementation of the visibility program.

The Texas Part II Visibility Protection Plan incorporated into the SIP revision the following: (1) A determination that there is no existing visibility impairment that is reasonably attributable to specific sources; (2) a discussion of the SIP elements and how each element of the plan relates to the national goal; and (3) a long-term (10–15 years) strategy. Since no existing reasonably attributable impairment has been identified, all elements of the plan are intended to prevent future impairment of visibility. If existing reasonably attributable impairment is later identified, the State will revise its plan to remedy the impairment. Currently, there are no integral vistas in Texas.

B. Long-Term Strategy

The Texas visibility long-term strategy section included the following: (1) Coordination with the FLM; (2) consideration of the six required factors for a long-term strategy; (3) a provision for the review of the impact of new sources; and (4) provisions for periodic review (i.e., every 3 years) of the plan, which review must include consultation with the Federal land manager and a report to the public and to EPA on progress toward the national goal.

C. EPA Evaluation Summary

These provisions meet EPA criteria and EPA is approving this phase of the plan. EPA has reviewed the State's submittal and developed an evaluation report. The report shows that the Texas SIP revision meets all of the requirements for a Part II Visibility Protection Plan as specified in 40 CFR 51.302 (visibility implementation control strategies) and 51.306 (visibility long-term strategy).

Final Action

By this notice, EPA is approving the Texas SIP revision as meeting the Part II Visibility Protection Plan requirements of 40 CFR 51.302 and 51.306 and the criteria discussed in 52 FR 7802. (One should reference that March 12, 1987, notice for additional information.) The SIP commits to a 3 year periodic review and making any changes deemed necessary. The SIP, therefore, has established the commitment to review the visibility requirements listed in 40 CFR Part 51 Subpart P—Protection of Visibility. This SIP revision remedies the deficiencies for all the remaining visibility requirements of Subpart P (i.e., §§ 51.302 and 51.306) as identified in the November 24, 1987 (52 FR 45132), Federally promulgated plan. Consequently, this notice also revokes that Federal promulgation for Texas.

EPA has reviewed these revisions to the Texas SIP and is approving them as submitted. This action is taken without prior proposal because the changes are non-controversial and EPA anticipates no adverse comments on them. The public should be advised that this action will be effective 60 days from the date of this Federal Register notice. However, if notice is received within 30 days of publication that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments, this action will be withdrawn and a subsequent notice will be published before the effective date. The subsequent notice will withdraw the final action and will begin a new rulemaking by announcing a proposal of the action and establishing a comment period.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by April 24, 1989. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

Under 5 U.S.C. section 605(b), I certify that this SIP revision will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (See 46 FR 8709).

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Sulfur oxides.

Note.—Incorporation by reference of the State Implementation Plan for the State of Texas was approved by the Director of the Federal Register on July 1, 1982.

Date: February 10, 1989.

Robert E. Layton, Jr.,
Regional Administrator.

PART 52—[AMENDED]

40 CFR Part 52, Subpart SS, is amended as follows:

Subpart SS—Texas

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

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7642.

2. Section 52.2270 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(66) to read as follows:

§ 52.2270 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(66) Part II of the Visibility Protection Plan was submitted by the Governor on November 18, 1987. This submittal includes a visibility long-term strategy and general plan provisions as adopted by the Texas Air Control Board on September 18, 1987.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Revision entitled, "State Implementation Plan Revisions for Visibility Protection in Class I Areas: Phase I, September 18, 1987" (including Appendices A and B).

(B) Texas Air Control Board Order No. 87-15, adopted September 18, 1987.

(ii) Additional material.

(A) None.

3. Section 52.2304, paragraph (c) *Long-term strategy* is removed.

§ 52.2304 Visibility protection. [Amended]

[FR Doc. 89-4024 Filed 2-22-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

---

40 CFR Part 62

[FRL-3526-7; MS-012]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Mississippi; Total Reduced Sulfur Plan

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: On October 30, 1987, the State of Mississippi submitted its plan for the control of total reduced sulfur (TRS) for kraft pulp mills. The plan became effective in the State on November 1, 1987. This plan for TRS from kraft pulp mills was adopted pursuant to the requirements of section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. Today, EPA is approving the TRS plan for Mississippi.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action is effective March 27, 1989.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the State's submittal may be examined during normal business hours at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV, Air Programs Branch, 345 Courtland Street NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365

Mississippi Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Pollution Control, Post Office Box 10385, Jackson, Mississippi 39205.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Rosalyn D. Hughes, Air Programs Branch, EPA Region IV, at the above address and telephone number (404) 347-2864 or FTS 257-2864.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 30, 1987, the State of Mississippi submitted to EPA a plan to control total reduced sulfur emissions (TRS) from kraft pulp mills. On September 7, 1988 (53 FR 34549), EPA proposed approval of the Mississippi TRS plan. No comments were received on the proposed action. This plan was developed to meet the requirements of section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. Under section 111(d), EPA established procedures whereby states submit plans to control existing sources of designated pollutants. Designated pollutants are defined as pollutants which are not included on a list published under sections 108(a) (Air Quality Criteria and Control Techniques) of the Clean Air Act, but to which a standard of performance for new sources applies under section 111. TRS is such a pollutant. Under section 111(d), emission standards are to be adopted by the states and submitted to EPA for approval. The standards limit the emissions of designatedpollutants from existing facilities which, if new, would be subject to the new source performance standards (NSPS) set forth at 40 CFR Part 60. Such facilities are called designated facilities.

The procedures under which states submit these plans to control existing sources are defined in Subpart B of 40 CFR Part 60. According to Subpart B, the states are required to develop plans within federal guidelines for the control of designated pollutants. EPA will publish guideline documents for development of state emission standards along with the promulgation of any NSPS for a designated pollutant. These guidelines apply to designated pollutants and include information such as a discussion of the pollutant's effects, description of control techniques and their effectiveness, costs and potential impacts. Also as guidance for the states, recommended emission limits and times for compliance are set forth and control equipment which will achieve these emission limits is identified.

In Subpart B, two types of designated pollutants are discussed. One type of designated pollutant may cause or contribute to the endangerment of public health. It is referred to as a health-related pollutant. The other type of designated pollutant is a welfare-related pollutant, for which adverse effects on public health have not been demonstrated.

For welfare-related pollutants such as TRS, states have the option of balancing emission guidelines, times for compliance, and other information provided in a guideline document against other factors of public concern in the establishment of emission standards, compliance schedules and variances, as long as the guideline document and Subpart B public hearing information are considered and all the other requirements of Subpart B are met. Therefore, states have greater flexibility in establishing plans for the control of TRS. Factors other than technology and costs can be considered in developing a TRS plan.

In Mississippi, four draft pulp mills are affected by this plan for existing facilities: International Paper Company, Moss Point; International Paper Company, Natchez; International Paper Company, Vicksburg; and Georgia-Pacific Corporation, Monticello.

The guidance document, *Kraft Pulping, Control of TRS Emissions from Existing Mills,* EPA-450/2-78-003b, was published by EPA in March 1979. This document was used by Mississippi in the development of emission limits for TRS emissions from affected facilities except for TRS emissions from smelt dissolving tanks and recovery boilers. The emission limit for smelt dissolving tanks was set to correspond to the New Source Performance Standard (NSPS) (40 CFR Part 60, Subpart BB, Kraft Pulp Mills) smelt dissolving tank emission limit because of the inconsistency of having newer plants meet a less restrictive NSPS emission limit than the guidance document emission limit for existing plants. Also, the emission limit for recovery boilers was set higher than the rate recommended in the guidance document for three mills, International Paper's Natchez and Vicksburg mills and Georgia Pacific's Monticello mill. This was based on economic factors. Using economic factors from the guidance documents for an acceptable operating cost for annual tons of pulp produced, the State concluded that for the two International Paper mills and the Georgia Pacific mill, it would be an undue economic burden to meet the EPA-recommended emission rate for recovery boilers.

Final Action

Based on the foregoing, EPA hereby approves the Mississippi TRS plan. This action is effective March 27, 1989.

For further information on EPA's analysis, the reader may consult a Technical Support Document which contains a detailed review of the technical justification, including the economic impact. This is available at the EPA Region IV address given above.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by April 24, 1989. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 62

Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Paper and paper products industry.

Dated: February 10, 1989.

Lee A. DeHihns, III,

Acting Regional Administrator.

Part 62 of Chapter I, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended as follows:

PART 62—[AMENDED]

Subpart Z—Mississippi

1. The authority citation for Part 62 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7642.

2. Section 62.6100 is amended by adding paragraphs (b)(2) and (c)(3) to read as follows:

§ 62.6100 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) Control of total reduced sulfur emissions from existing kraft pulp mills, submitted on October 30, 1987.

(c) * * *

(3) Kraft pulp mills.

3. An undesignated center heading and § 62.6122 are added to Subpart Z to read as follows:

Total Reduced Sulfur Emissions From Kraft Pulp Mills

§ 62.6122 Identification of sources.

The plan applies to existing facilities at the following kraft pulp mills:

(a) Georgia-Pacific Corporation, Monticello.

(b) International Paper Company, Moss Point.

(c) International Paper Company, Natchez.

(d) International Paper Company, Vicksburg.

[FR Doc. 89-4134 Filed 2-22-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 97

[FCC 89-38]

Amateur Radio Service; Identification Procedure for Amateur Stations Operating Under a Reciprocal Permit

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action clarifies the station identification procedure for amateur stations operated by aliens pursuant to the authority conferred by a reciprocal permit. The rule amendment is necessary so that there will be greater precision in the provisions of the rule. The rule change will facilitate compliance because of its clarity and precision.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 17, 1989.

ADDRESS: Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street NW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maurice J. DePont, Federal Communications Commission, Private Radio Bureau, Washington, DC 20554, (202) 632-4964.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Memorandum Opinion and Order, adopted February 1, 1989, and released February 14, 1989. The complete text of this Commission action, including the rule amendment, is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (Room 230), 1919 M Street NW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this Memorandum Opinion and Order, including the rule amendment, may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037.

Summary of Memorandum Opinion and Order

1. On May 24, 1988, the Commission released an Order, 3 FCC Rcd 2988 (1988), which rewrote a station identification rule to require that an alien operating under a reciprocal permit give the United States letter-numeral designating the general location of the alien's amateur station first, followed by the alien's station call sign. David B. Popkin requested that the Commission reconsider its Order by making the subject rule, § 97.313, 47 CFR 97.313, more precise.

2. The petitioner requested that the word "slant" be added to the rule as another option to describe the slant mark "/" during telephony transmissions and that the rule specifically state that the identification be made in the English language. The petitioner also requested other minor changes in the rule's wording.

3. The Commission granted the petitioner's suggestions, with modifications, but declined to include the requirement for the use of the English language in the telephony identification procedure on the ground that that requirement was currently