

EPA Region III—Phase I Utility Plans

Plant name	Rated capacity (mw)	1996 SO ₂ emissions (tons)	Generation efficiency	
			(mw/ton)	ton/mw
Kammer	712.5	119,369	0.00597	168
Armstrong	326.4	32,150	0.01015	98
Hatfields Ferry	1728.	153,413	0.01126	89
Shawville	625.	53,945	0.01159	86
Martins Creek 1&2	312.5	24,601	0.01270	79
CP Crane 1&2	399.84	28,744	0.01391	72
Cheswick	565.25	39,980	0.01414	71
Albright	140.25	9,246	0.01517	66
Mount Storm	1662.48	107,211	0.01551	64
Fort Martin	1152.	71,152	0.01619	62
Portland	426.7	25,783	0.01655	60
Morgantown	1252.	72,778	0.01720	58
Chalk Point	728.	37,211	0.01956	51
Sunbury	621.	20,450	0.03037	33
Mitchell	1632.6	53,152	0.03072	33
Brunner Island	1558.73	47,771	0.03263	31
Conemaugh	1872.	40,182	0.04659	21
Harrison	2052.	16,469	0.12460	08

There are two responses to AEP's concern that there are potentially only eight years for capital recovery of the cost of a scrubber. First, AEP could have elected to install a scrubber in 1987 when the final stack height rules were promulgated. In that case the time for capital recovery would more than double. Secondly, there is no assurance that the Kammer plant will in fact be retired in 2008.

The additional contention by AEP that scrubber technology cannot be considered because it cannot assure air quality compliance under all operating conditions has no validity. Many of the state and federal air pollution control requirements involve devices which can, and do, shutdown or malfunction and require maintenance. These instances do have the potential to result in air quality violations. Nevertheless these devices are relied upon to protect air quality. To accept AEP's argument in this regard would undermine almost all air pollution control programs.

At the time of the Congressional deliberation on the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, it was suggested that the stack height provisions would no longer be necessary because the acid rain control provisions would serve to reduce SO₂ emissions. The Congress rejected this notion and reaffirmed that constant emission controls were to be required versus using dispersion from tall stacks to achieve and maintain the ambient air quality goals and standards under Title I of the Act.

Therefore, the State of West Virginia has been informed by EPA that it cannot approve the analysis which seeks to demonstrate the infeasibility of Kammer's meeting the emission rate equivalent to the new source

performance standard. The SIP development project for Marshall County should go forward with the Kammer plant modeled at the grandfathered stack height of 600 feet.

Dated: August 11, 1998.

W. Michael McCabe,
Regional Administrator, Region III.
[FR Doc. 98-22340 Filed 8-18-98; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6147-7]

Acid Rain Program: Permit Modification

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of permit modification.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is issuing, as a direct final action, a permit modification revising the early election plan for the Rockport plant in Indiana in accordance with the Acid Rain Program regulations (40 CFR parts 72 and 76). Because the Agency does not anticipate receiving adverse comments, the modification is being issued as a direct final action.

DATES: The permit modification issued in this direct final action will be final on September 28, 1998 or 40 days after publication of a similar notice in a local publication, whichever is later, unless significant, adverse comments are received by September 18, 1998 or 30 days after publication of a similar notice in a local publication, whichever is later. If significant, adverse comments

are timely received on the permit modification, the permit modification will be withdrawn through a notice in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Administrative Records. The administrative record for the permit, except information protected as confidential, may be viewed during normal operating hours at EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL, 60604.

Comments. Send comments, requests for public hearings, and requests to receive notice of future actions to EPA Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, Attn: Cecilia Mijares (address above). Submit comments in duplicate and identify the permit to which the comments apply, the commenter's name, address, and telephone number, and the commenter's interest in the matter and affiliation, if any, to the owners and operators of all units in the plan. All timely comments will be considered, except those pertaining to standard provisions under 40 CFR 72.9 or issues not relevant to the permit modification.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Cecilia Mijares (312) 886-0968.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title IV of the Clean Air Act directs EPA to establish a program to reduce the adverse effects of acidic deposition by requiring reductions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions from coal-fired electric utility boilers and by issuing permits reflecting this requirement. Today, EPA is taking action to delete a provision in the early election plan in the Acid Rain permit for the Rockport plant in Indiana. Under the plan, Rockport units 1 and 2 must comply with a NO_x emission limit of 0.50 lb/mmBtu from

1997 through 2007 and with a NOx emission limit of 0.46 lb/mmBtu thereafter. The eliminated provision requires Rockford units 1 and 2 to burn only Powder River Basin coal during 1997–2007. The designated representative is John McManus.

If significant, adverse comments are timely received on the permit modification, comments on the permit modification will be addressed in a subsequent notice of permit modification based on the draft permit modification that is published elsewhere in this **Federal Register** and that is identical to this direct final action.

Dated: August 11, 1998.

Brian J. McLean,

Director, Acid Rain Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 98–22338 Filed 8–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6147–8]

Acid Rain Program: Draft Permit Modification

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of draft permit modification.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is issuing for comment a draft permit modification revising the early election plan for the Rockport plant in Indiana in accordance with the Acid Rain Program regulations (40 CFR parts 72 and 76). Because the Agency does not anticipate receiving adverse comments, the permit modification is also being issued as a direct final action in the notice of permit modification published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**.

DATES: Comments on the draft permit modification, and any request for public hearing, must be received no later than September 18, 1998 or 30 days after the date of publication of a similar notice in a local newspaper, whichever is later.

ADDRESSES: *Administrative Record.* The administrative record for the permit, except information protected as confidential, may be viewed during normal operating hours at EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL, 60604.

Comments. Send comments, requests for public hearings, and requests to receive notices of future actions to EPA Region 5, Air and Radiation Division,

Attn: Cecilia Mijares (address above). Submit comments in duplicate and identify the permit to which the comments apply, the commenter's name, address, and telephone number, and the commenter's interest in the matter and affiliation, if any, to the owners and operators of all units in the plan. All timely comments will be considered, except those pertaining to standard provisions under 40 CFR 72.9 or issues not relevant to the draft permit modification.

Hearings. To request a public hearing, state the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. EPA may schedule a hearing if EPA finds that it will contribute to the decision-making process by clarifying significant issues concerning the draft permit modification.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Cecilia Mijares (312) 886–0968.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: If no significant, adverse comments are timely received, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this draft permit modification, and the permit modification issued as a direct final action in the notice of permit modification published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register** will automatically become final on the date specified in that notice. If significant, adverse comments are timely received on the draft permit modification, the permit modification in the notice of permit modification will be withdrawn and public comment received based on this notice of draft permit modification will be addressed in a subsequent notice of permit modification. Because the Agency will not institute a second comment period on this notice of draft permit modification, any parties interested in commenting should do so during this comment period.

For further information, see the information provided in the notice of permit modification published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 11, 1998.

Brian J. McLean,

Director, Acid Rain Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 98–22339 Filed 8–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6148–5]

Science Advisory Board; Emergency Notification of a Public Advisory Committee Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that the Environmental Health Committee (EHC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on September 8–9, 1998, beginning no earlier than 8:30 a.m. and ending no later than 6:00 p.m. on each day. All times noted are Eastern Standard Time. The meeting is open to the public; however, seating will be on a first-come basis. The meeting will be held at the Madison Room at the Quality Hotel Courthouse Plaza which is located at 1200 N. Courthouse Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201. This meeting was originally scheduled for August 18–19 and was announced in the **Federal Register** August 5, 1998 (63 FR 41820–41821). The cancellation of the August 18–19, 1998 meeting was also announced in the **Federal Register**.

Purpose: The purpose of the meeting is to conduct a technical review of the Lead 403 Rule, focusing on the proposed standards that were developed by the EPA to prioritize abatement and hazard control activities under Title X of the Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act on September 8–9, 1998. Both sessions are open to the public.

Draft Charge Questions: The EHC has been asked to respond to the following, draft Charge questions which are subject to revision:

General

1. In each of the specific areas identified below, have we used the best available data? Have we used this data appropriately? Have we fairly characterized the variability, uncertainties and limitations of the data and our analyses?

2. Are there alternative approaches that would improve our ability to assess the relative risk impacts of candidate options for paint, dust, and soil hazard standards?

3. The approach employs risk assessment models that were primarily developed for use in site-specific or localized assessments. Has the use and application of the Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model (IEUBK) and empirical model in this context been sufficiently explained and justified? Is our use of these tools to estimate nationwide impacts technically sound?

4. Are there any critical differences in environmental lead-blood lead