

List of Subjects in 24 CFR Part 965

Energy conservation; Loan programs; housing and community development; Public housing; Utilities.

Accordingly, the Department amends 24 CFR Part 965, Subpart G, as follows:

PART 965—PHA-OWNED OR LEASED PROJECTS—MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

Subpart G—Consolidated Supply Program

1. The authority citation for Part 965 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 2, 3, 6, 9, United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437, 1437a, 1437d, 1427g); sec. 7(d), Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3535(d)). Subpart H is also issued under the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4821-4846).

§ 965.602 Definitions

2. In § 965.602, paragraph (f) is removed and paragraph (g) and (h) are redesignated as paragraph (f) and (g), respectively.

§ 965.604 [Removed and Reserved]

3. Section 965.604 is removed and reserved.

§ 965.605 Reports.

4. Section 965.605(a) is revised to read as follows:

(a) *Report on purchases.* Within 60 days after the expiration of a CSC, the Contractor shall submit a report to the CSC Contracting Officer including the contract number and the total dollar volume of PHA/IHA purchases under the contract during the preceding fiscal year.

Dated: May 14, 1989.

Thomas Sherman,
Acting General, Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Public and Indian Housing.

[FR Doc. 89-12666 Filed 5-26-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-33-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[FRL-3567-6]

Prevention of Significant Deterioration, Delegation of Authority to the State of Nevada

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of Final Rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Regional Administrator for EPA Region 9, San Francisco, has

amended the agreement delegating full authority to the State of Nevada to implement and enforce the Federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Program.

DATES: The effective date of the initial delegation was May 20, 1983. The effective date of the revised delegation is October 10, 1988.

ADDRESS: Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, 201 South Fall Street, Carson City, Nevada 89710.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Baker, New Source Section (A-3-1), Air Operations Branch, Air and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, California 94105, Telephone (415) 974-8209.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Environmental Protection Agency has delegated under the provision which are found in 40 CFR 52.21(u), to the State of Nevada: (A) Authority over all sources in that State subject to review for the prevention of significant deterioration of air quality, pursuant to Part C, 100-169 of Title I of the Clean Air Act as amended August 7, 1977 and the requirements promulgated in the July 1, 1979 edition of 40 CFR 52.21 as amended August 7, 1980 under authority of sections 101, 110 and 160-169 of the Clean Air Act; and (B) authority to review, administer, and enforce throughout the State the PSD requirements imposed by the Clean Air Act sections 101, 110 and 160-169, and 40 CFR 52.21 as amended August 7, 1980.

Information on this delegation together with a copy of the delegation is provided below:

On August 12, 1982, the Director of the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources requested delegation of authority for PSD. Full delegation was granted on May 20, 1983. The delegation was amended on October 5, 1988, and the amended delegation became effective on October 10, 1988. The following letter and attached agreement represent the terms and conditions of the amended delegation.

October 5, 1988.

Roland D. Westergard,
Director, Nevada DCNR, 201 South Fall
Street, Room 221, Carson City, Nevada
89710.

Dear Mr. Westergard: I have enclosed a revised version of the EPA-Nevada DCNR-DEP Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) delegation agreement for your signature. The State and EPA have agreed to amend the agreement to eliminate the dual concurrence provision. If you or your staff have any question about the delegation

agreement, please call Willard M. Chin at (415) 974-8233.

EPA will continue to provide policy guidance as well as technical assistance to the State's PSD program. We look forward to a close partnership in the permitting program.

Sincerely,

Daniel W. McGovern,
Regional Administrator.
Enclosure.

October 7, 1988.

Daniel W. McGovern,
Regional Administrator, U.S. EPA, Region IX,
215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, CA
94105.

Dear Mr. McGovern: Enclosed is the revised 9/15/88 version of the EPA-Nevada DCNR-DEP Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) delegation agreement which I have signed. As provided in the agreement, we will administer and enforce all provisions of the PSD delegation as contained in this revision effective today.

We look forward to a continuing close relationship with EPA in the control of air pollution.

Sincerely,

Roland D. Westergard,
Director.
Enclosure.

Amended Agreement for Delegation of Authority of the Regulations for Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality (40 CFR 52.21) Between USEPA and NDCNR-DEP

The undersigned, on behalf of the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Protection (NDCNR-DEP) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), hereby agree to the delegation of authority for the administrative, technical and enforcement elements of the source review provisions of 40 CFR 52.21, Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), as they may be amended and in accordance with the permit review requirements in 40 CFR Part 124, Subparts A and C, from the USEPA to the NDCNR-DEP, subject to the terms and conditions below. This delegation is enacted pursuant to 40 CFR 52.21 (u), Delegation of Authority.

I. General Delegation Conditions

A. Authority is delegated for all sources under the jurisdiction of NDCNR-DEP that are subject to review for PSD. This includes all source categories listed in 40 CFR 52.21 for each pollutant regulated by the Clean Air Act.

B. This delegation may be amended at any time by the formal written agreement of both the NDCNR-DEP and the USEPA, including amendments to add, change, or remove conditions or terms of this Agreement.

C. If the Regional Administrator determines that the State is not implementing or enforcing the PSD program in accordance with the terms and conditions of this delegation, the requirements of 40 CFR 52.21, 40 CFR Part 124, or the Clean Air Act, this delegation, after consultation with the NDCNR-DEP, may be revoked in whole or in part. Any such revocation shall be effective as of the date specified in a Notice of Revocation to the State. Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude USEPA from exercising its enforcement authority, as provided in paragraph V.B. below.

D. The permit appeal provisions of 40 CFR 124.19 shall apply to all appeals to the Administrator or permits issued by the NDCNR-DEP under this delegation. For purposes of implementing the federal permit appeal provisions under this delegation, if there is a public comment requesting a change in a draft preliminary determination or draft permit conditions, the final permit issued by NDCNR-DEP is required to contain statements which indicate that for Federal PSD purposes and in accordance with 40 CFR 124.15 and 124.19, (1) the effective date of the permit is 30 days after the final decision to issue, modify, revoke and reissue the permit; and (2) if an appeal is made to the Administrator, the effective date of the permit is suspended until such time as the appeal is resolved. The NDCNR-DEP shall inform USEPA (Region IX) in accordance with conditions of this delegation when there is public comment requesting a change in the preliminary determination or in a draft permit condition. Failure by NDCNR-DEP to comply with the terms of this paragraph shall render the subject permit invalid for Federal PSD purposes.

E. By this agreement, the NDCNR-DEP assumes authority for enforcement and permit modification/amendment for EPA issued NSR/PSD permits.

F. This delegation of authority becomes effective upon the date that both parties have signed this Agreement.

II. Communications Between USEPA and NDCNR-DEP

The NDCNR-DEP and USEPA will use the following communication procedures:

A. The NDCNR-DEP will report to the USEPA on a quarterly basis the compliance status of the sources that have received a PSD permit from either the NDCNR-DEP or USEPA. The Compliance Data System (CDS) will be used for this purpose. Compliance determinations will be made with

respect to the conditions established in the PSD permits.

B. The NDCNR-DEP will forward to USEPA, at the beginning of the public comment period, a summary of (1) the findings related to each PSD application and, (2) the justification for the NDCNR-DEP's preliminary determination. Should there be any comments or concerns about the pending PSD permit, USEPA will communicate these comments and concerns to the NDCNR-DEP as soon as possible prior to the close of the public comment period.

C. The NDCNR-DEP will forward to USEPA copies of the final action on the PSD permit applications at the time of issuance, as well as copies of substantive public comments.

D. The NDCNR-DEP will send USEPA copies of preliminary determinations on PSD permit modifications and amendments. USEPA will provide comments to the NDCNR-DEP prior to the close of the public comment period.

E. The NDCNR-DEP will send to EPA a copy of all applicability determinations and justifications made that would involve PSD exemptions due to offsetting or netting (40 CFR 52.21(b)(3) and 52.21(b)(21)).

III. Revisions to Title 40 CFR 52.21

A. This delegation covers any revisions that are promulgated for 40 CFR 52.21 and 40 CFR Part 124. The terms "40 CFR 52.21" and "40 CFR Part 124" as used in the delegation request and throughout this Agreement, include such regulations as are in effect on the date this Agreement is executed and any revisions that are promulgated after that date.

B. The revisions that have been promulgated for 40 CFR 52.21 since the effective date (May 27, 1983) of the previous delegation agreement include the following:

1. Stack Height Regulations: 40 CFR 51.100(hh), 51.100(kk), 51.118(b).
2. Revised Modeling Guidelines: 40 CFR 52.21(1).
3. PM-10 Regulations: 40 CFR 52.21(b)(23)(i), 52.21(c), 52.21(i)(4)(ix)(x), 52.21(i)(8)(i), 52.21(i)(11), 52.21(M)(1)(vii)(viii), 52.21(p)(5), 52.21(w)(2).

The NDCNR-DEP is required to incorporate the above revisions into its PSD review, and to ensure that any permits issued by the NDCNR-DEP comply with these final regulations.

C. In addition, the following USEPA policies apply to PSD review:

1. USEPA is responsible for the issuance of PSD permits on Indian Lands, under sections 110(c) and 301 of the Clean Air Act. States have no authority to establish air pollution

control requirements on Indian Reservations, unless requested to by the Tribal governing body.

2. According to USEPA guidance published on September 22, 1987 and supplemental guidance published on July 28, 1988, all delegated agencies must now consider pollutants not subject to the Clean Air Act in their Best Available Control Technology (BACT) determinations. The BACT determinations must include a review of the toxic effects of unregulated pollutants and the impact of the proposed BACT on the emissions of these pollutants.

3. The NDCNR-DEP must consult with the appropriate Federal, State, and local land use agencies prior to issuance of preliminary determinations on PSD permits. In particular, USEPA requires that the NDCNR-DEP must:

Notify the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and USEPA when a PSD permit application has been received, in order to assist USEPA in carrying out its non-delegable responsibilities under section 7 of the endangered Species Act (Pub. L. 97-304). NDCNR-DEP must:

(a) Notify potential applicants of the potential need for consultation between USEPA and the FWS if an endangered species may be affected by the project.

USEPA's data sheet may be used for this process (copy enclosed).

(b) Refrain from issuing a final PSD permit unless the FWS has determined that the proposed project will not adversely affect any endangered species.

4. According to USEPA guidance published on June 26, 1987, all delegated agencies are required to look at certain control options when making BACT determinations for municipal waste combustors. Specifically, these agencies should consider a dry scrubber for sulfur dioxide control, a baghouse or electrostatic precipitator for particulate control, and efficient combustion techniques for carbon monoxide control in their BACT determinations for this type of source.

5. Additional BACT guidance issued on December 1, 1987, by USEPA, states that the Regional Office is to encourage the application of "top-down" BACT determinations in the Region. This means that USEPA will consider as deficient any BACT determination that does not begin with the most stringent control options available for that source category.

6. Upon notification from EPA, NDCNR-DEP will implement such new regulations or directives pending revision of this agreement.

IV. Permits

A. In any matter involving interpretation of sections 160-169 of the Clean Air Act, or 40 CFR 52.21, and of 40 CFR Part 124 where guidance on the implementation, review, administration, or enforcement of these Sections has not been sent to the NDCNR-DEP, USEPA will be contacted and requested to provide the appropriate guidance.

B. The NDCNR-DEP will at no time grant any waiver to the PSD permit requirements.

C. Permits issued under this delegation shall contain language stating that the Federal PSD requirements have been satisfied.

D. Authorities to Construct must include appropriate provisions, as specified in Attachment A, to ensure permit enforceability. Permit conditions shall, at a minimum, contain reporting requirements on initiation of construction, startup, and source testing (where applicable). Upset/breakdown and malfunction conditions shall be included in all permits.

V. Permit Enforcement

A. The primary responsibility for enforcement of the PSD regulations in the State of Nevada (except for Clark and Washoe Counties) will rest with the NDCNR-DEP. However, the State has enforcement authority over sources in Clark and Washoe which generate electricity using steam produced by the burning of fossil fuel. The NDCNR-DEP will enforce the provisions that pertain to the PSD program, except in those cases where the rules or policy of the NDCNR-DEP are more stringent. In such cases, the NDCNR-DEP may elect to implement the more stringent requirements.

B. Taking into consideration the terms of the USEPA-NDCNR-DEP Enforcement Agreement, nothing in this delegation agreement shall prohibit EPA from enforcing the PSD provisions of the Clean Air Act, the PSD regulations or any PSD permit issued by the NDCNR-DEP pursuant to this agreement.

C. In the event that the NDCNR-DEP is unwilling or unable to enforce a provision of this delegation with respect to a source subject to the PSD regulations, the NDCNR-DEP will immediately notify the Regional Administrator. Failure to notify the Regional Administrator does not preclude USEPA from exercising its enforcement authority.

Date: 10-10-88.

Roland D. Westergard,
Department of Conservation & Natural
Resources—Division of Environmental
Protection.

Date: 10-5-88.

Daniel W. McGovern,
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Attachment A

1. Identification of all points of emission (both stack and fugitive).

2. Specification of a numerical emission limitation for each point of emission in terms of mass rate or concentration limitations. If emission testing based on a numerical emission limitation is feasible, the permit may instead prescribe a design, operational, or equipment standard. Any permits issued without numerical emission limitations must contain conditions which assure that the design characteristics or equipment will be properly maintained or that the operational conditions will be properly performed so as to continuously achieve the assumed degree of control.

3. Limitation of factors which were the basis for air quality impact analysis must be specified (e.g. hours of operation, stack height, materials processed which affect emissions).

4. Methods and frequency of determining continued compliance for each point of emission must be referenced (if part of the SIP or subject to NSPS or NESHAPS) or explicitly identified if a reference method is not used.

5. Record keeping requirements which enable the agency to ascertain continued compliance especially where factors such as hours of operation, throughput of materials, sulfur content of fuels, fuel usage, type or quantity of materials processed are conditions of the permit.

6. A condition that the permit will expire if the construction is not commenced within a certain specified time frame.

7. The condition that the source is responsible for providing sampling and testing facilities at its own expense.

8. Reporting requirements which enable the agency to monitor the progress of source construction and compliance including the date by which construction is completed, and if different from the completion of construction date, the date by which full compliance is to be achieved.

9. Permits issued under this delegation should contain language stating that the Federal PSD requirements have been satisfied.

10. As a courtesy to sources exempted from PSD review due to federally enforceable operational or process restrictions, or the use of controls more stringent than required by applicable SIP limits, the source should be advised that any relaxation of those limits may subject the entire source to full PSD review as if construction had not yet begun. Suggested language is as follows:

This source is exempt from PSD review because of (e.g. "a requirement that operation is limited to eight hours per day"). Any relaxation in this limit that increases your potential to emit above the applicable PSD threshold will require a full PSD review of the entire source.

The Regional Administrator finds good cause for foregoing prior public notice and for making this rulemaking effective immediately in that it is an administrative change and not one of substantive content. No additional substantive burdens are imposed on the parties affected. This delegation became effective on August 15, 1983; therefore, it serves no purpose to delay this technical revision, adding the State's address to the Code of Federal Regulations.

A copy of the request for delegation of authority is available for public inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9 Office, Air and Toxics Division, Air Operations Branch, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, California 94105.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Ozone, Sulfur oxides, Nitrogen dioxide, Lead, Particulate matter, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7501.

Date: May 16, 1989.

Daniel W. McGovern,
Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 89-12673 Filed 5-26-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 52

[A-1-FRL-3576]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Two Pratt & Whitney Facilities

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Connecticut.

These revisions establish and require the use of reasonably available control technology (RACT) to control volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from two Pratt & Whitney Division of United Technologies Corporation facilities in East Hartford and North Haven, Connecticut. The intended effect of this action is to approve two source-specific RACT determinations made by the State in accordance with commitments made in its 1982 Ozone Attainment Plan which was approved by EPA on March 21, 1984 (49 FR 10542). This action is being taken in accordance with section 110 of the Clean Air Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action will become effective July 31, 1989 unless notice is received on or before June 29, 1989 that adverse or critical comments will be submitted. If the effective date is delayed, timely notice will be published in the Federal Register.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Louis F. Gitto, Director, Air Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, JFK Federal Building, Room 2313, Boston, MA 02203. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, JFK Federal Building, Room 2313, Boston, MA 02203; and the Air Compliance Unit, Department of Environmental Protection, State Office Building, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David B. Conroy, (617) 565-3252; FTS 835-3252.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 7, 1989, the State of Connecticut submitted formal revisions to its state implementation plan (SIP). The revisions consist of State Order No. 8014 issued by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to Pratt & Whitney Division of United Technologies Corporation in East Hartford, Connecticut and State Order No. 8027 issued to Pratt & Whitney Division of United Technologies Corporation in North Haven, Connecticut. These State Orders were issued to these facilities to control volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from these facilities' VOC-emitting processes. The requirements of State Order No. 8014 and 8027 constitute reasonably available control technology (RACT) for these facilities as required by subsection 22a-174-20(ee). "Reasonably Available Control Technology for Large Sources," of

Connecticut's Regulations for the Abatement of Air Pollution.

Under subsection 22a-174-20(ee), the Connecticut DEP determines and imposes RACT on all stationary sources with the potential to emit one hundred tons per year or more of VOC that are not already subject to RACT under Connecticut's regulations developed pursuant to the control techniques guidelines (CTG) documents. EPA approved this regulation on March 21, 1984 (49 FR 10542) as part of Connecticut's 1982 Ozone Attainment Plan. That approval was granted with the agreement that all source-specific RACT determinations made by the DEP would be submitted to EPA as source-specific SIP revisions.

Summary of RACT Determination

Pratt & Whitney in East Hartford operates 33 open-top vapor degreasers that were in use prior to July 1, 1980. Pratt & Whitney in North Haven operates 29 open-top vapor degreasers that were in use prior to July 1, 1980. The control of solvent metal cleaning operations in Connecticut is covered under subsection 22a-174-20(l), "Metal cleaning," of Connecticut's regulations. Final approval of this regulation was granted by EPA on February 1, 1984 (49 FR 3988). Under subparagraph 22a-174-20(l)(2)(iii) of Connecticut's solvent metal cleaning regulation, however, open top vapor degreasers and conveyorized degreasers that were in operation prior to July 1, 1980 are exempt from meeting the control and operating requirements prescribed in subsection 22a-174-20(l). Therefore, all of the open-top vapor degreasers at both Pratt & Whitney facilities that were in operation prior to July 1, 1980 are exempt from meeting RACT under subsection 22a-174-20(l). These open-top vapor degreasers are now being required to meet RACT pursuant to subsection 22a-174-20(ee).

Pratt & Whitney in East Hartford has converted 29 of its 33 existing (pre-July 1, 1980) open-top vapor degreasers from perchloroethylene, a VOC, to 1,1,1 trichloroethane which is one of the organic compounds which EPA has designated as having negligible photochemical reactivity. It is not considered a VOC under the definition of VOC in Connecticut's SIP. As such, State Order No. 8014 is not requiring any control requirements on these 31 open top vapor degreasers. State Order No. 8014 does, however, contain requirements for the 29 open-top vapor degreasers in case Pratt & Whitney ever converts any of them back to using a VOC. State Order No. 8014 requires Pratt & Whitney to meet the control

requirements of subsection 22a-174-20(l) of Connecticut's regulations and some additional requirements in paragraph 7 of the State Order for any vapor degreaser that it converts back to a VOC on the day it starts production using the VOC.

Similarly, Pratt & Whitney in North Haven has converted 19 of its 29 existing open-top vapor degreasers from perchloroethylene to 1,1,1 trichloroethane. As such, State Order No. 8027 is also not requiring any control requirements on these 19 open-top vapor degreasers. State Order No. 8027 does, however, also contain requirements for the 19 open-top vapor degreasers in case Pratt & Whitney ever converts any of them back to using a VOC. State Order No. 8027 requires Pratt & Whitney to meet the control requirements of subsection 22a-174-20(l) of Connecticut's regulations and some additional requirements in paragraph 7 of the State Order for any vapor degreaser that it converts back to a VOC on the day it starts production using the VOC.

The remaining open-top vapor degreasers at the Pratt and Whitney facilities (4 at the East Hartford facility and 10 at the North Haven facility) continue to use VOC solvents. As RACT for these units, the State Orders are requiring these units to meet the requirements in subsection 22a-174-20(l) of Connecticut's regulations (Connecticut's solvent metal cleaning regulation) as well as other additional requirements contained in the State Order which increase the stringency of the control requirements imposed on these degreasing units.

In addition to each facility's degreasing operations, each facility has handwiping operations which use VOC to clean metal or fiberglass parts outside the confines of any degreaser. As RACT for these operations, the State Orders are requiring that all dispensing containers be equipped with a cover and be closed when not in use, all dirty rags and all rags that have previously been used be stored in covered containers, and no rags be visibly dripping during use.

In addition, each facility operates solvent recovery stills. As RACT for these operations, the State Orders are requiring that Pratt and Whitney cease operation of any solvent recovery still whenever the condenser coil outlet water temperature exceeds 100 °F. This is the temperature above which the solvent recovery still is achieving less than the minimum required ninety-five percent solvent recovery rate. The condenser coil outlet water temperature

on each solvent recovery is required to be monitored with an alarm which will be triggered should the condenser coil outlet water temperature exceed 100 °F. Furthermore, Pratt and Whitney is required to store all waste VOC, before being recovered in the solvent recovery stills or before being sent out as a waste product, in closed containers which prevent the evaporation of VOC to the atmosphere.

Additionally, each State Order requires Pratt & Whitney to maintain a recordkeeping system of all adds to each vapor degreaser using VOC at each facility. Further, Pratt & Whitney is required to maintain a recordkeeping system of all waste VOC that is generated from these vapor degreasers. With this information, Pratt & Whitney is required to calculate VOC emissions from its degreasing operations from each facility on a quarterly basis. Pratt & Whitney is also required to maintain a monthly recordkeeping system for each plant of all VOC used in the handwiping operations by VOC type.

EPA has reviewed State Order No. 8014 and State Order No. 8027 and has determined that the level of control required by these Orders represents RACT for Pratt & Whitney's East Hartford and North Haven facilities.

EPA is approving these SIP revisions without prior proposal because the Agency views these as noncontroversial amendments and anticipates no adverse comments. This action will be effective 60 days from the date of this **Federal Register** notice unless, within 30 days of its publication, notice is received that adverse or critical comments will be submitted. If such notice is received, this action will be withdrawn before the effective date by publishing two subsequent notices. One notice will withdraw the final action and another will begin a new rulemaking by announcing a proposal of the action and establishing a comment period. If no such comments are received, the public is advised that this action will be effective on July 31, 1989.

Final Action

EPA is approving Connecticut State Order No. 8014 and State Order No. 8027 as revisions to the Connecticut SIP. The provisions of State Order No. 8014 and State Order No. 8027 define and impose RACT on Pratt & Whitney's facilities in East Hartford and North Haven, respectively, as required by subsection 22a-174-20(ee) of Connecticut's regulations.

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

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by July 31, 1989. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Date: May 15, 1989.

Michael R. Deland,

Regional Administrator, Region I.

Subpart H, Part 52 of Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

Subpart H—Connecticut

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

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

2. Section 52.370 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(50) to read as follows:

§ 52.370 Identification of plan.

(c) * * *

(50) Revisions to the State Implementation Plan submitted by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) on April 7, 1989.

(i) Incorporation by reference

(A) Letter from the Connecticut DEP dated April 7, 1989 submitting a revision to the Connecticut State Implementation Plan.

(B) State Order No. 8014 and attached Compliance Timetable for Pratt & Whitney Division of United Technologies Corporation in East Hartford, Connecticut. State Order No. 8014 was effective on March 22, 1989.

(C) State Order No. 8027 and attached Compliance Timetable for Pratt & Whitney Division of United Technologies Corporation in North Haven, Connecticut. State Order No. 8027 was effective on March 31, 1989.

(ii) Additional materials

(A) Technical Support Document prepared by the Connecticut DEP providing a complete description of the reasonably available control technology determination imposed on Pratt and Whitney's East Hartford facility.

(B) Technical Support Document prepared by the Connecticut DEP providing a complete description of the reasonably available control technology determination imposed on Pratt and Whitney's North Haven facility.

[FR Doc. 89-12672 Filed 5-26-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 52

[FRL-3558-4]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Colorado

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This notice approves a revision to the Colorado Springs Carbon Monoxide (CO) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Colorado Springs submitted on June 15, 1988, by the Governor of Colorado. The revision includes the Clean Air Campaign (CAC), a voluntary no-drive program, into the SIP, which EPA is approving as helpful for attainment. The revision contains a new attainment demonstration, but it was developed prior to the May 26, 1988, CO SIP Call for Colorado Springs. This action does not address the issues raised in that SIP Call. Likewise, EPA is not acting on the attainment demonstration.

DATES: This action will be effective on July 31, 1989 unless notice is received by June 29, 1989 that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments. If the effective date is delayed, timely, notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the revision are available for public inspection between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday at the following offices: Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, Air Programs Branch, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202-2405 and Environmental Protection Agency, Public Information Reference Unit, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dale M. Wells, Air Programs Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, One Denver Place, Suite 500, 999 18th Street, Denver, Colorado 80202-2405, (303) 294-1773, (FTS) 564-1773.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 15, 1988, the Governor of Colorado submitted a CO SIP revision for Colorado Springs. The SIP included the CAC measure, as well as an attainment demonstration. The submittal did not