

On June 23, 1986, the DEQE submitted a letter stating that the DEQE adopted implementation guidance, developed for the regulation, which sets forth the requirements for "Reporting and Recordkeeping" and "Compliance Testing and Monitoring." Therefore, EPA is proposing to approve amendments to Massachusetts regulation 310 CMR 7.00 and the addition of 310 CMR 7.18(18), including the implementation guidance adopted pursuant to that regulation, as revisions to the SIP.

EPA is proposing to approve this Massachusetts SIP revision and is soliciting public comments on the issues discussed in this notice. These comments will be considered before taking final action. Interested parties may participate in the Federal rulemaking procedure by submitting comments to the ADDRESSES section of this notice.

Proposed Action

EPA is proposing to approve the revisions to 310 CMR 7.00 and 310 CMR 7.18(18), including the implementation guidance adopted pursuant to that regulation, submitted by the DEQE on February 21 and June 23, 1986, as well as the State's negative declaration submitted on November 8, 1985.

Under 5 U.S.C. section 605(b), I certify that these SIP revisions 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.

The Administrator's decision to approve or disapprove the plan revisions will be based on whether they meet the requirements of sections 110(a)(2)(A) through (K) and 110(a)(3) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, and EPA regulations in 40 CFR Part 51.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

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

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7410-7642.

Dated: October 14, 1986.

Michael R. Deland,

Regional Administrator, Region I.

[FR Doc. 87-3835 Filed 2-24-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 52

[A-5-FRL-3160-5]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Michigan

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: USEPA is proposing to approve a revision to the State of Michigan's total suspended particulate (TSP) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Michigan Act No. 65 of the Public Acts of 1986. Michigan's submittal of April 29, 1986, for Air Pollution Control Act (APCA) No. 65 revises the State's 1985 APCA No. 348, with respect to: (1) Car ferries having the capacity to carry more than 110 motor vehicles and (2) coal-fueled trains used in connection with tourism. USEPA believes that approval of this SIP revision will not jeopardize the attainment and maintenance of any national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS).

DATE: USEPA must receive comments on or before March 27, 1987.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to: Gary Gulezian, Chief, Regulatory Analysis Section (5AR-26), Air and Radiation Branch, Region V, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Please submit an original and three copies if possible. You may inspect copies of the submittal and USEPA's evaluation during normal business hours at:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Air and Radiation Branch, Region V, 230 South Dearborn, Chicago, Illinois 60604

Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Air Quality Division, Stevens T. Mason Building, 530 West Allegan, Lansing, Michigan 48909

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Toni Lesser, Regulatory Analysis Section (5AR-26), Air and Radiation Branch, Region V, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6037.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 29, 1986, the State of Michigan submitted APCA No. 65, an amendment to Act No. 348 of the 1985 Michigan APCA, as a revision to the Michigan TSP SIP. That submittal also included technical support documentation in the form of emission monitoring data and a screening analysis for the source, which indicated that the car ferry emissions have demonstrated no effect on

attainment or maintenance of the NAAQS for TSP resulting from uncontrolled operation of this source. APCA No. 65 was approved by the Governor of the State of Michigan on March 30, 1986. This Act amended APCA No. 348 of 1985 by adding Section 7a; which (first) exempts car ferries having the capacity to carry more than 110 motor vehicles and (second) exempts from the requirements of APCA No. 348, coal-fueled trains used in connection with either tourism, or the transportation of works of art, or items of historical interest.

USEPA has reviewed APCA No. 65 with respect to its impact on the attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS for all applicable criteria pollutants. In order for this revision to be approvable, it must be demonstrated that this SIP revision will not jeopardize attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS.

Car Ferries

Currently, the only car ferry operation to be affected by Michigan's APCA No. 65 is located in the City of Ludington, Mason County and is owned by the Michigan-Wisconsin Transportation Company. This Company operates a single car ferry ("City of Midland") between Ludington, Michigan and Kewaunee, Wisconsin on a daily basis. Ludington, Michigan is currently in attainment of all NAAQS and has one monitoring site in use. The nearest monitor to the ferry docks in Ludington did not record any exceedances of the TSP standards during the years of the monitor's operation (1977-1981); at which time two car ferries were in operation and the City of Ludington was designated as a TSP secondary nonattainment area.

Analysis of the receptor filters from the days when nonattainment level readings were recorded, showed no particulate matter traceable to car ferry emissions. USEPA believes that Michigan has made an adequate demonstration based on screening modeling with the Industrial Source Complex (ISC) model; assuming a maximum idling time of four hours in Ludington, Michigan, the impact of the car ferry service is less than the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) significant impact level of five micrograms per cubic meter on a 24-hour basis.

Coal-Fueled Trains

USEPA has reviewed APCA No. 65 with respect to the exemption of special coal-fueled trains. Michigan has only a few coal-fueled trains known to exist

that operate as amusement rides and tourist attractions. There are presently no coal-fueled trains in existence on commercial railroad lines. The only train that operates on a semi-regular basis is known as the "Art Train". The Art Train usually operates from early Spring to late Fall traveling from one city to another on a weekly basis.

USEPA believes the specific exemptions for tourism, transporting works of art, and transporting historical artifacts, contained in Michigan's APCA No. 65, have a negligible impact upon attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS.

USEPA's complete review of this SIP revision is contained in technical support documents (TSDs) dated July 18, 1986, and October 27, 1986. USEPA is today proposing to approve the Michigan Act No. 65 of the Public Acts of 1986 as a revision to the Michigan TSP SIP. USEPA believes that approval of this SIP revision will not jeopardize the attainment and maintenance of any NAAQS as a result of uncontrolled operation of this source.

A 30-day public comment period is being provided for this notice of proposed rulemaking. Public comments received on or before March 27, 1987, will be considered in USEPA's final rulemaking action.

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

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

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52:

Air pollution control, Particulate matter, Intergovernmental relations.

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

Dated: December 23, 1986.

Valdas V. Adamkus,
Regional Administrator.
[FR Doc. 87-3836 Filed 2-24-87; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 52

[A-7-FRL-3160-7]

Approval and Promulgation of the Nebraska; State Implementation Plan for Lead

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to fully approve the Nebraska State

Implementation Plan (SIP) for lead. All portions of the plan had been previously approved except as it pertained to Omaha. EPA approved portions of the Omaha lead SIP on January 31, 1985, but withheld approval of the control measures. Since that time, the state of Nebraska has developed and submitted, in draft form, a revised demonstration of attainment for lead in Omaha. This action proposes to approve the revised demonstration of attainment including the control measures which support that demonstration and requests public comment on that action.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 27, 1987.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Dwayne E. Durst, Environmental Protection Agency, Region VII, Air Branch, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. Copies of the state submittal and EPA's evaluation are available for inspection during normal business hours at the Region VII office at the above address and at the Nebraska Department of Environmental Control, 301 Centennial Mall, Lincoln, Nebraska.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dwayne E. Durst at (913) 236-2893, FTS 757-2893.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 31, 1985, EPA approved the Omaha lead SIP except for the control measures (48 FR 4510). These control measures were to be applied at the Asarco lead refinery in Omaha which is the principal source of lead in the area. EPA withheld approval of the control measures in the January 31, 1985, Federal Register because the measures were not sufficiently described and were therefore considered unenforceable. The state of Nebraska agreed to provide additional details concerning the control measures so EPA could proceed with final rulemaking on that one remaining portion of the Omaha lead SIP.

Before the state developed the information concerning the control measures, a revised demonstration of attainment dated January 18, 1985, was prepared by Asarco and submitted to the state. Asarco contended that the original control strategy was overly stringent because it was developed using diffusion modeling, which overpredicted the ambient lead levels in the vicinity of the Asarco lead refinery. One year of lead monitoring data from a newly established station near the point of predicted maximum concentration gave considerably lower lead levels than those predicted by the original modeling. Using monitored lead data, Asarco attempted to calibrate the

dispersion model by developing a correction factor which was applied to all modeled lead concentrations to reduce their value. Because of the limited amount of ambient lead data which were available, EPA did not accept the revised control strategy based upon the use of calibrated modeling.

A revised control strategy dated August 14, 1985, was developed by Asarco, submitted to the State, and adopted after public hearing by the Nebraska Environmental Control Council on September 27, 1985. The August 14 revision to the control strategy was based upon dispersion modeling adjusted to predict lower lead concentrations which supposedly more nearly correlated with the measured lead levels in the area. The adjustments in the modeling involved changes in source input data which Asarco and the State of Nebraska believed more nearly described the emission plume behavior from the sources than that which was used in the original modeling. This revised control strategy was submitted to EPA in October 1985 as a SIP revision.

EPA did not agree with all of the adjustments in the SIP submittal. Two items were of particular concern to EPA. One involved the use of plume enhancement for stacks located in the vicinity of one another. Asarco contended that the plume from such stacks should be modeled as though all the stack gases were being emitted from one stack even though in some cases, the stacks were nearly 35 feet apart. By theoretically representing all stack gases emanating from one stack, the model calculates a greater plume rise and thus, a lower ground-level lead concentration than if modeled using individual stacks. EPA determined that the combined plume representation gave too much plume enhancement for adjacent stacks and that no enhancement credit could be claimed unless on-site verification of plume enhancement was performed.

Another item of disagreement involved the height of the plume origin for fugitive lead emissions from certain buildings at the Asarco refinery. Asarco and the State of Nebraska argued that the height should be the top of the building because the heat-generating sources in the building caused the hot gases to rise to the top of the buildings where they were emitted. EPA contended that some of the emissions would be emitted from the sides of the building, and even those that were emitted from the building top would be diffused in the building wake which