

HEINONLINE

Citation: 40 Fed. Reg. 23746 1975

Provided by:

US EPA Libraries



Content downloaded/printed from [HeinOnline](#)

Wed Jun 7 13:34:57 2017

-- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>

-- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

IOWA

Source	Location	Regulation involved	Date adopted	Variance expiration date	Final compliance date
Scoville Manufacturing Co., carado window and door division, grinding system (Item No. 3).	Dubuque.....	4.3(2)a	Nov. 14, 1974	June 30, 1975	June 30, 1975
Katelman Foundry, Inc., Cupola.	Council Bluffs..	4.4(4)	Feb. 13, 1975	Mar. 13, 1975	Mar. 13, 1975
Armour & Co. (the Greyhound Corp.), bollers Nos. 1, 3, 4, and 5.	Mason City.....	4.3(2)bdo.....	July 31, 1975	July 31, 1975
Headford Brothers & Hitchins Foundry Co., cupola.	Waterloo.....	4.4(4)	Aug. 8, 1974	June 1, 1975	June 1, 1975
Green Products Co., alfalfa dehydrating plant.	Conrad.....	4.3(2)a	Feb. 13, 1975	May 1, 1975	May 1, 1975
Gra-Iron Foundry Corp., cupola.	Marshalltown....	4.4(4)do.....	Mar. 15, 1975	Mar. 15, 1975
Progressive Foundry, Inc., cupola.	Perry.....	4.4(4)do.....	Apr. 23, 1975	Apr. 23, 1975
Farmers Mutual Cooperative Co., cyclone on headhouse.	Alton.....	4.4(6)do.....	June 15, 1975	June 15, 1975
Wapsie Valley Creamery, Inc., whey spray dryer.	Independence....	4.3(2)ado.....	July 29, 1975	July 29, 1975
Houdaille Industries, Inc., viking pump division, sand silo.	Cedar Falls.....	4.3(2)ado.....	June 3, 1975	June 3, 1975
Rohlin Construction Co., asphaltic concrete plant D.	LaPorte.....	4.4(2)do.....	May 20, 1975	May 20, 1975
Spencer Municipal Hospital, incinerator.	Spencer.....	4.4(2)do.....	July 31, 1957	July 31, 1975
Norris Construction Co., asphaltic concrete plant No. 250.	Ottumwa.....	4.4(2)do.....	May 16, 1975	May 16, 1975
Iowa Road Builders Co., asphaltic concrete plant.	Ames.....	4.4(2)do.....	July 31, 1975	July 31, 1975
Cessford Construction Co., asphaltic concrete plant No. 1.	LeGrand.....	4.4(2)do.....	Apr. 15, 1975	Apr. 15, 1975

[FR Doc.75-14363 Filed 5-30-75;8:45 am]

[FRL 369-8]

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Maintenance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards

On July 10, 1974, the Administrator proposed in the FEDERAL REGISTER (39 FR 25330) a list of areas that have the potential for violation of specified national ambient air quality standards by 1985 for all States except those in EPA's Region V (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin). In the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 12, 1974 (39 FR 28906), the Administrator proposed a similar list for the Region V States. The identification of these "air quality maintenance areas" (AQMAS) is required under 40 CFR 51.12 (e) and (f), published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of June 18, 1973 (39 FR 15834) and subsequently amended on May 8, 1974 (39 FR 16343). The preamble to the July 10, 1974, proposal contains detailed background information concerning the Administrator's proposed identification of these areas and their relationship to the implementation planning process; the reader is referred to that preamble for this information.

In the FEDERAL REGISTER of April 29, 1975, the Administrator published the final identification of AQMAS for the States of Alabama, Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, and Washington, the territories of Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and American Samoa and a partial AQMA list for the State of Iowa. In the preamble to that rulemaking, the Administrator presented some background information pertaining to the maintenance of air quality standards and responded to general comments that had

been received. The reader is also referred to that preamble.

The action below presents the full final identification of AQMAS for the States of Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa (including the remaining AQMAS), Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, and a partial final identification for the State of Ohio. The Administrator is taking the following actions on these States:

(a) Approval of the supplemental information that the States submitted to the Administrator under 40 CFR 51.12(e) and which the Administrator has determined to be adequate and in accordance with EPA's Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas. The approved supplemental information contains either the list of areas identified by the States or a justification why there are no such areas.

(b) Disapproval of plans for which States did not submit adequate supplemental information containing either a list of areas identified pursuant to 40 CFR 51.12(e) or a justification why there are no such areas.

(c) Identification of areas that have the potential for violation of a national standard by 1985. In some cases, such identifications include, where applicable, the Administrator's own area identification, in addition to the areas identified by the States and approved by the administrator. Where the Administrator disapproves a State's plan because of an inadequate submittal, the Administrator either identifies AQMAS or indicates that there are no such areas under 40 CFR 51.12(e) and (f).

The Administrator is reviewing the AQMA lists submitted by the remaining States and will publish a list for those States at a later time, along with the

remainder of the AQMAS for Ohio. These AQMA lists are being published later than the August 16, 1974, date for publication specified in the May 8, 1974, FEDERAL REGISTER notice referred to above because the task of area identification proved to be more difficult and time-consuming than had previously been anticipated. The Administrator regrets the delay but believes that a more appropriate list of AQMAS will result from the additional time and effort expended.

For the areas identified by the Administrator under 40 CFR 51.12(e) and (f), the States are required to submit a detailed analysis of the impact on air quality of projected growth. Where the analysis indicates that the national air quality standards will not be maintained, the States must also submit plans containing measures to ensure maintenance of national standards during the ensuing 10-year period. The AQMA identification-analysis-plan development procedure must be repeated at least every 5 years to ensure continuing maintenance of national standards.

SUMMARY OF STATE ACTIONS

The Administrator is taking action on 18 State implementation plans. He is approving 11 plans under the air quality maintenance provisions of 40 CFR 51.12 (e) and disapproving 6; the remaining State plan, Iowa, had been previously approved. A total of 59 AQMAS are being identified for at least one pollutant. Of these, 56 are identified for particulate matter, 28 for sulfur dioxide, 14 for carbon monoxide, 14 for photochemical oxidants, and 3 for nitrogen dioxide.

A discussion of specific actions relating to each State, including a general response to comments received, is presented below.

COLORADO

The State of Colorado has identified five AQMAS pursuant to a hearing held on May 9, 1974.

Four of the identifications include the rapidly growing front range of Colorado, including the municipalities of Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Denver, Boulder, Loveland, Greeley, and Fort Collins. The fifth area, located in northwestern Colorado, is being identified because of the potential for significant oil shale and coal development within its boundaries.

Colorado's formal submission from the Governor was received on June 7, 1974, and has been reviewed by the Administrator for both content and procedural acceptability. In the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), the Administrator proposed to approve Colorado's June 7, 1974, submittal and identify the five AQMAS chosen by Colorado. On the basis of his review of the State submittal and supplemental information received dated January 29, 1975, the Administrator is approving the Colorado identifications as an official supplement to the State implementation plan.

Comments received on the AQMA proposal supported the identifications as proposed. Concern was expressed that

the identifications should reflect consideration of non-significant deterioration of air quality, and indirect source review requirements. The reader is referred to the FEDERAL REGISTER preambles of December 5, 1974 (39 FR 42510) and April 29, 1975 which explain the relationships of AQMAs to non-significant deterioration areas and the indirect source review requirements respectively. In addition, comments received indicated that AQMA boundaries should consider the jurisdictional boundaries of sub-state planning units. The AQMAs as proposed and adopted by Colorado and approved by EPA do correspond to sub-state planning unit boundaries. It is thus the Administrator's judgment that these concerns have been considered in the identifications for Colorado.

In light of new information and analysis effected subsequent to EPA's proposal of AQMA identifications, EPA added Moffat County to the oil shale AQMA as well as identifying the entire AQMA for sulfur oxides. Justification for the designation of Moffat County and the addition of sulfur dioxide to the AQMA, as well as the identification of the Colorado-Utah Oil Shale Area as an interstate AQMA, are discussed in the technical support document mentioned below. These changes are the only changes made from the EPA AQMA proposal of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330).

The information submitted by the State of Colorado to document its identifications was not sufficiently detailed to justify the identifications requested. Hence, EPA and the State agency, working together, prepared additional supporting information. This information is included in the technical support documentation, which, along with the State submittal, is available for public inspection at the Region VIII offices of EPA, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203, and at the Division of Air Pollution Control, Colorado Department of Health, 4210 E. 11th Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80220.

CONNECTICUT

On April 15, 1974, the Administrator received AQMA identification material for the State of Connecticut from the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection. A public hearing was held on this submittal by the State on April 9, 1974. In the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), the Administrator proposed to approve the State's submittal and identify the Connecticut AQMA as suggested by the State. A letter dated September 19, 1974, was received from the Governor's office concurring with the proposed identifications. After substantive review of the State's submittal, the Administrator is approving the State's identification of one area in the State—the total Connecticut portions of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut, and Hartford-New Haven-Springfield Interstate Air Quality Control Regions—as an AQMA for sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, carbon monoxide and photochemical oxidants. (This area does not encompass the entire State.) No com-

ments were received pertaining to the July 10, 1974, proposed rulemaking publication of this action in the FEDERAL REGISTER. The State submittal and EPA's technical support documentation on which this action is based are available for public inspection at the offices of the U.S. EPA, Region I, and the offices of the Department of Environmental Protection, State Office Building, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut 06115.

ILLINOIS

The State of Illinois did not submit AQMA identifications to the Administrator, although public hearings on candidate AQMAs had been completed by the Illinois Pollution Control Board on and prior to October 15, 1974. The AQMA proposals now being considered by Illinois, however, correspond with the Administrator's identifications presented below.

A total of six AQMAs were proposed by the Administrator on August 12, 1974 (39 FR 28906), for the State of Illinois. These included the Chicago Interstate, Decatur, Peoria, Rock Island, St. Louis Interstate and the Springfield Metropolitan areas.

Testimony at the public hearings held by the Administrator on August 26 and 27, 1974, and material subsequently received concerning grain handling regulations led to a reanalysis for the Rock Island and Springfield AQMA identifications and the determination that these areas need not be identified. Detailed calculations and supporting information for this action are found in the technical support documentation to this rulemaking.

Because of the anticipated growth of both mobile and stationary air pollution sources in the Chicago SMSA, the Administrator is identifying the entire SMSA of Cook, DuPage, Lake, Will, Kane, and McHenry counties in Illinois for sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, photochemical oxidants, and carbon monoxide. Although the AQMA was not proposed for carbon monoxide, the Administrator is identifying this area for carbon monoxide because existing transportation control strategies are estimated to be insufficient to attain and maintain the Federal primary standards for carbon monoxide. The addition of CO to the AQMA is the only change in the AQMA identification from the proposal. This determination is based on air quality data collected by the Administrator since the development of the current transportation control plan. The Chicago SMSA forms the Illinois portion of the Illinois-Indiana-Wisconsin Interstate AQMA.

Subsequent to the proposal of the Illinois portion of the St. Louis Interstate AQMA, Monroe County was added to Madison and St. Clair counties because of the anticipated growth which may occur if the new proposed St. Louis Metropolitan area airport is constructed in Illinois. The AQMA's pollutant identification reflects no change from the EPA proposal and is being identified for particulate matter, sulfur dioxide and photochemical oxidants.

The counties of Peoria, Woodford, and Tazewell, which constitute the Peoria AQMA, have been designated for sulfur dioxide and particulate matter. Macon County constitutes the Decatur AQMA and has been designated for particulate matter based on recent air quality data. Identification of these two AQMAs reflect no change from the August 12, 1974, proposal.

Copies of the Federal hearing records and the technical support documents are available for inspection during normal business hours at the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, 2200 Churchill Road, Springfield, Illinois, as well as the Region V Offices of the EPA at 230 S. Dearborn, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

INDIANA

The State of Indiana has not submitted any material concerning AQMA identifications under 40 CFR 51.12(e). Consequently, in the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 12, 1974 (39 FR 28906), the Administrator proposed for identification a AQMAs 9 of the 11 SMSAs in the State of Indiana. These included counties in the Anderson, Evansville, Chicago, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Lafayette, Louisville, South Bend, and Terre Haute SMSAs. At the public hearings held by EPA on August 21 and 22, 1974, in Indianapolis and Evansville, respectively, and in subsequent correspondence, local and State agencies as well as various citizen groups questioned the validity of projection data and other basic assumptions made by EPA.

Following the hearings, the Administrator re-examined data and AQMA identifications as follows: (1) In those areas proposed for identification due to the presence of one or two major sources, such as electric power plants, modeling was performed on the emissions from the large sources; (2) in all other areas proposed for identification recalculated peak to mean pollutant concentration relationships were used to estimate the expected 1985 air quality. The technical support documentation presents the detailed calculation and results of the reanalysis described above.

Modeling results indicated that the counties of Morgan in the Indianapolis AQMA and Warrick in the Evansville Interstate AQMA, and the proposed AQMAs of Cincinnati (Dearborn County) and Terre Haute (Sullivan, Vigo, and Vermillion Counties) need not be identified. Similarly, the restudy of projected air quality through 1985 indicates that the proposed AQMAs of Anderson (Madison County), Lafayette (Tippecanoe County), and South Bend (St. Joseph County) do not have to be identified.

The areas identified as AQMAs in the action below are; Lake and Porter Counties as the Indiana portion of the Illinois-Indiana-Wisconsin Interstate AQMA, Clark and Floyd Counties as the Indiana portion of the Louisville Interstate AQMA, Marion County as the Indianapolis AQMA and Vanderburgh County as the Evansville Interstate AQMA.

MICHIGAN

Copies of the public hearing record and the technical support documentation are available for inspection during normal business hours at the Indiana Division of Air Pollution Control, 1330 W. Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as well as the EPA Region V Office at 230 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

IOWA

In the FEDERAL REGISTER of April 29, 1975, the Administrator identified three areas in Iowa (Cedar Rapids, Des Moines, and Waterloo) as AQMAs, but indicated that other identifications for Iowa were pending. In the action below, Iowa's AQMA identification is completed with the addition of the Council Bluffs, Davenport, and Dubuque areas as AQMAs. For information concerning the Iowa AQMA action, the reader is referred to the FEDERAL REGISTER of April 29, 1975.

In the action below, the Administrator is approving the State's submittal that identified the remaining three areas as AQMAs. The only change from the EPA proposal is the identification of the Council Bluffs area as an interstate AQMA. Identification of the Council Bluffs AQMA resulted from the Administrator's decision to identify the Omaha, Nebraska, area contiguous with Council Bluffs as an AQMA for particulate matter. Explanation of the Administrator's determination for the Omaha area may be found in the discussion of the Nebraska action (found elsewhere in this notice) and in the technical support documentation for this action.

The technical support data for and comments received on the Iowa AQMA identifications are available for public inspection at the Iowa Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Management Division, 3920 Delaware Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa, in addition to the EPA Region VII office.

MASSACHUSETTS

On May 21, 1974, the Administrator received AQMA identifications for the State of Massachusetts. Public hearings were held by the State on this submittal at the following dates and locations in Massachusetts:

April 30, 1974, Lawrence
May 1, 1974, Worcester
May 2, 1974, Springfield
May 3, 1974, Boston.

In the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), the Administrator proposed to approve the State's submittal and to identify four areas as AQMAs. A letter, dated July 23, 1974, was received from the Governor's office concurring with the proposed identifications. After review of the State's submittal, the Administrator is approving the State's identification of the four areas as having the potential for violation of at least one national ambient air quality standard within 10 years. These areas are the Boston, Springfield, Worcester, and Lawrence-Haverhill AQMAs. The State submittal and EPA's technical support documentation on which this approval is based are available for pub-

lic inspection at the offices of the U.S. EPA, Region I, and at the following locations in the State:

Massachusetts Bureau of Air Quality Control
Room 320, 600 Washington Street
Boston, MA 02111
Board of Health Office
Pittsfield, MA
Central Mass. Air Pollution Control District
75 B. Grove Street
Worcester, MA
Merrimack Valley Air Pollution Control District
Tewksbury State Hospital
Regional Health Office
Tewksbury, MA
Pioneer Valley Air Pollution Control District
1414 State Street
Springfield, MA
Southeastern Mass. Air Pollution Control District
Southeast Regional Health Office
Lakeville State Hospital
Lakeville, MA.

Comments on the July 10, 1974, proposal were received from the Massachusetts Public Interest Research Group (Mass PIRG) and John D. Spengler, Ph.D. of the Harvard University, School of Public Health. The comments from Mass PIRG indicated that areas with inconclusive data should be identified so that they would be studied in depth and the identification could be withdrawn if the analysis indicated no problem. They felt that problems may develop for maintenance of standards in these areas before the next formal analysis is required. Dr. Spengler's comments were concerned with growth outside SMSAs, particularly along major transportation routes. The Administrator believes that the comments of Mass PIRG and Dr. Spengler have merit and will take action on these comments. In the preamble to the first rulemaking that identified AQMAs published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of April 29, 1975, the Administrator gave notice of his intent to propose as a requirement to 40 CFR 51 that States would have to establish a system of collecting information on growth and development throughout the State, not just in SMSAs or AQMAs. If the information collected indicates that an area may have the potential for violating a national ambient air quality standard, the State would have to identify the area as an AQMA. A more detailed discussion on this matter appears in the FEDERAL REGISTER of April 29, 1975. The Administrator believes that the system he will propose answers the comments raised by both Mass PIRG and Dr. Spengler.

There were some towns inadvertently omitted from the July 10, 1974, publication which have been included in the final notice. Arlington, Burlington, and Reading were omitted from the Boston area; and Southwick and Warren were omitted from the Springfield area. These towns have all now been included in their respective areas. In addition, Williamsburg was included in the Springfield area by mistake and has been removed from the final notice.

The State of Michigan Department of Natural Resources submitted AQMA identifications to EPA on June 27, 1974 and a supplement on October 18, 1974 after holding public hearings in Detroit and Grand Rapids on May 6, 1974. These submissions proposed that the Detroit Metropolitan Area (consisting of Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties) be designated as an AQMA for particulate matter. The Administrator reviewed that submission and finds it approvable but is making some additions.

On August 12, 1974 (39 FR 28906) the Administrator proposed the identification of the Detroit metropolitan area for sulfur dioxide, and Ann Arbor, Battle Creek, Bay City, Flint, Lansing, Grand Rapids, Saginaw, and Toledo (Monroe County) metropolitan areas as AQMAs for particulate matter in addition to the State's proposed AQMA. Written comments on the proposal were requested. In addition, to address these proposed designations, the Administrator gave notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER of January 16, 1975 (40 FR 2869) of public hearings to be held on January 28 and 29, 1975, in Lansing and Grand Rapids, Michigan, respectively, in order to insure opportunity for public participation in the identification process.

As a result of comments received mainly from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and a reanalysis conducted by EPA during the AQMA proposal comment period the Administrator has determined that only the Detroit and Toledo metropolitan area AQMAs need to be identified. EPA's technical support documentation discusses these changes in detail.

Copies of the proceedings of the State hearings, comments received and technical support documentation for this rulemaking are available for inspection during normal business hours at the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Stevens T. Mason Building, Lansing, Michigan 48926, and the Region V Office of EPA at 230 S. Dearborn, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

MINNESOTA

The State did not submit AQMA identification material to the Administrator prior to June 15, 1974. Therefore, in the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 12, 1974 (39 FR 28906), the Administrator proposed (1) to disapprove the plan for failure to comply with § 51.12(e) of this chapter and (2) to identify the Minneapolis-St. Paul and Duluth areas as AQMAs. The Administrator conducted hearings on this proposal in Minneapolis on August 22, 1974, and in Duluth on August 23, 1974. The State of Minnesota has cooperated with EPA in analyzing the various portions of the State of AQMA identification.

On November 15, 1974, the Governor of Minnesota submitted recommended AQMA identifications to EPA. This identification included only the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area for sulfur dioxide and particulate matter and defined that area as the seven counties

composing the Minneapolis-St. Paul Air Quality Control Region (AQCR). The State submission failed to identify the Duluth areas as an AQMA and did not provide justification for the failure to identify the area.

Having reviewed the submission and analyzed appropriate air quality data, the Administrator is approving the Governor's identification of the seven county area (the Minneapolis-St. Paul AQMA) for sulfur dioxide and particulate matter. These seven counties are Hennepin, Ramsey, Washington, Scott, Carver, Dakota, and Anoka.

In addition, pursuant to public hearing comments, written comments received since the public hearing in Duluth, and the re-evaluation of existing air quality data, the Duluth AQMA for particulate matter is being identified to include only the City of Duluth rather than the entire St. Louis County as had been proposed on August 12, 1974. Also, the State of Minnesota requested that the City of Superior, Wisconsin, be added to the Duluth AQMA to form an interstate AQMA; EPA has reviewed information submitted by the State of Wisconsin, including current air quality and emission data, and determined that a need for an interstate AQMA does not exist at this time. The Administrator intends that States examine growth projections for areas such as Superior through the system for collecting information on growth and development throughout the State. This system remains unproposed at the present. A discussion of the system appears in the discussion of the Massachusetts action above.

Copies of the public hearing record and the technical support documentation for this rulemaking are available for inspection during normal business hours at the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 1935 West County Road, B-2, Roseville, Minnesota, as well as the EPA Region V Office at 230 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

MONTANA

The State of Montana's AQMA material identified eight areas as AQMAs. The State made the material available to the public in April, 1974, and held a public hearing in Helena, on May 24, 1974. The State did not receive any comments at the public hearing. At that time, the Montana State Board of Health and Environmental Sciences acted to adopt the designations. The Governor submitted these identifications to the Administrator on June 24, 1974. On July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330) the Administrator, after a preliminary review, proposed to approve the State submission. EPA received no comments on the proposed identifications.

The Governor of Montana met with the Regional EPA Administrator on November 15, 1974, to discuss the possibility of having AQMA boundaries modified to facilitate planning and implementation of their overall environmental planning program. As a result of their meeting, the Governor of Montana submitted to the Regional Administrator on January 24,

1975, several revisions to their area identifications. The identifications promulgated below for the State reflect the revisions to the proposed AQMA identifications that the Governor requested.

The revised identifications for Montana include modifications to AQMA boundaries in Billings, Anaconda, Butte, Helena, and Kallispell, which have existing pollution problems due to current industrial development, the Missoula AQMA and the Southeastern Montana Coal Resource AQMA.

Montana's revised submissions were reviewed by the Administrator for content and procedural adequacy and are being approved below. The Montana submission has been complemented by analyses performed by the EPA Region VIII Office in order to provide the basis for identification of the six AQMAs. This final rulemaking does not include the identifications of the Great Falls AQMA, the Helena AQMA for particulates, and the Missoula AQMA for sulfur dioxide. The Anaconda and Butte AQMAs have been combined into one AQMA which has been identified for both particulates and sulfur dioxide. These changes were made in light of further analysis of air quality data and growth factors after receipt of the Governor's submission on AQMA identifications. The technical support documentation presents a detailed discussion of these changes.

Copies of the State submittals, hearing record, and the technical support documents, along with other relevant materials, are available for inspection during normal business hours at the offices of the Montana State Department of Health and Environmental Sciences, Cogswell Building, Helena, Montana, in addition to the EPA Region VIII office at 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado.

NEBRASKA

On May 9, 1974, the Administrator received AQMA identification material from the Nebraska Department of Environmental Control for the State of Nebraska subsequent to a public hearing held by the State in Lincoln, Nebraska, on April 11, 1974.

The State evaluated the Lincoln, Omaha and Sioux City areas and determined that none of these areas present the potential for a violation of a National Ambient Air Quality Standard within ten years. In his proposal of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), the Administrator proposed to approve the State's determination. Copies of the State's identification material were made available for public inspection at EPA's regional office in Kansas City, Missouri, and at the office of the Nebraska Department of Environmental Control in Lincoln, Nebraska. Written comments were solicited from the public, and none were received.

After careful review of the State's submittal and additional information by EPA, reanalysis of the State submittal by EPA indicates that the Omaha, Nebraska, area should be identified as an AQMA for particulate matter. The Administrator concurs with the State of Nebraska that other areas analyzed as

potential AQMAs need not be identified as AQMAs. Details of the EPA evaluation of the Nebraska submission are found in the technical support documentation.

Technical support documentation received from the State of Nebraska and developed by EPA relevant to the action taken in this rulemaking is available for public inspection at the Nebraska Department of Environmental Control, 1424 P Street, Lincoln, Nebraska, and the EPA Region VII office.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

On May 20, 1974, the Administrator received AQMA material for the State from the New Hampshire Air Pollution Control Agency. A public hearing on this material was held on April 18, 1974, by the State. The State evaluated the Manchester and Nashua SMSAs and determined that neither area presents the potential for a violation of a national ambient air quality standard within the next 10 year period. In the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974, the Administrator proposed to approve the State submittal and identify no AQMAs in the State. No comments were received pertaining to the July 10, 1974, proposed rulemaking. After a review of the State's submittal, the Administrator is not designating any AQMAs in the State. The State's submittal and EPA's technical support documentation, upon which this approval is based, is available for public inspection at the offices of the U.S. EPA, Region I, and at the offices of the New Hampshire Air Pollution Control Agency, State Laboratory Building, Hazen Drive, Concord, New Hampshire 03301.

NEW MEXICO

The Air Quality Division of the New Mexico Environmental Improvement Agency submitted a list of proposed identifications of AQMAs to EPA on April 10, 1974. Public hearings were held by the New Mexico Environmental Improvement Board in the cities of Santa Fe, Farmington, Albuquerque, Las Cruces, and Roswell during the period of June 24-July 18, 1974.

The EPA proposal of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), contained all of the proposed AQMA identifications submitted by the State agency, with two additions by EPA. For the Four Corners AQMA, which the State identified for only carbon monoxide, EPA proposed to add sulfur dioxide. Air quality diffusion calculations applied earlier by EPA to the operation of the Four Corners and San Juan power plants had indicated that sulfur dioxide standards may be exceeded in the area. EPA proposed to identify the Grant County AQMA for sulfur dioxide because ambient concentrations of sulfur dioxide has exceeded standards in the vicinity of the copper smelter at Hurley, New Mexico, and there is no State or Federal regulation yet in effect designed to result in attainment and maintenance of secondary sulfur dioxide standards.

EPA held a public hearing on the proposed designations of AQMAs in New Mexico in Santa Fe on August 19, 1974.

The main comments at the public hearing pertained to the two additions by EPA. The State contended that, because of regulations promulgated by EPA (40 CFR 52.1624), in the FEDERAL REGISTER of March 21, 1974, (39 FR 10582) limiting emissions of sulfur oxides from the Four Corners and San Juan power plants, there is no need for identification of the Four Corners Area for sulfur dioxide. Also, the date set by EPA for attainment of both primary and secondary standards for sulfur dioxide in that area and the date for final compliance with the EPA-promulgated regulations are the same: July 31, 1977. This indicated that there was some probability that standards for sulfur dioxide may be exceeded for some of the 1975-1985 period of concern in identifying AQMAS. EPA originally interpreted this as providing justification for identification of the area for sulfur dioxide. On re-evaluation, EPA concludes that its regulation is adequate for attainment and maintenance of standards, and EPA is not identifying the Four Corners area for sulfur dioxide in the action below.

Opposition to the identification of the Grant County area for sulfur dioxide came from the State and also from the company owning and operating the copper smelter at Hurley (Kennecott Copper Corporation). The State claimed that, rather than identify the area as an AQMA, EPA should promulgate a regulation to control smelter emissions that would result in attainment and maintenance of secondary standards for sulfur dioxide. The State also asked if the proposed designation of Grant County was a substitute for a specific regulation limiting emissions from the smelter.

In response, EPA states that although a regulation for control of smelter emissions to result in attainment and maintenance of secondary standards for sulfur dioxide has not yet been promulgated, the first and primary responsibility for developing such a regulation and submitting it to EPA for approval was that of the State, in accord with the Clean Air Act. The State did not develop such regulation within an extended period of the statutory timetable for submittal of the plan for attainment and maintenance of secondary standards, which period ended on July 31, 1973. Therefore, EPA has had the obligation of developing such regulation and is proceeding to develop it. EPA expects to propose the regulation at a later date. Far from being a substitute for the planned regulation, EPA proposed the identification of the Grant County area as a corollary action to provide that the area receive the necessary attention and analysis aimed toward attainment and maintenance of standards for sulfur dioxide.

Spokesmen for the Kennecott Copper Corporation argued that the identification for sulfur dioxide is unnecessary, pointing out that the smelter at Hurley is regulated by both State and Federal governments as are other smelters. As explained above, present regulations are not sufficient to result in attainment and

maintenance of the secondary sulfur dioxide standard.

EPA's position is that where a single point source is responsible for air quality violations and emissions from future sources do not appear to jeopardize an air quality standard, there is no need for identification of the area as an AQMA if a control strategy can be developed specifically to control that source.

The City of Farmington objected to its inclusion in the Four Corners AQMA for both sulfur dioxide (proposed by EPA) and carbon monoxide (proposed by State), and the city of Roswell has protested the State-proposed identification of Chaves County as an AQMA for carbon monoxide. As explained above, the identification of the Four Corners AQMA for sulfur dioxide is withdrawn herein. With regard to carbon monoxide, EPA has reviewed the analysis of the State for Farmington and Roswell, and has concluded that it is in accordance with the guidelines. Thus, EPA does not have adequate reason to change the proposed identifications for carbon monoxide and is promulgating the same herein. Questions as to the validity of the State analysis will be resolved upon detailed AQMA analysis after AQMA identification.

As indicated above, EPA is not identifying the Four Corners and Grant County areas for sulfur dioxide. Thus the identifications promulgated herein are those as submitted by the New Mexico Environmental Improvement Agency. Nonetheless, this promulgation contains a disapproval of the State submittal on the grounds that it was submitted prior to the State public hearings and thus could not have accounted for public comment at those hearings, and because the submittal was not officially made by the Governor. EPA has carefully reviewed the analysis and proposed identifications submitted by the State, made its own analysis, and evaluated and considered all comments made at the public hearing on August 19, 1974, and sent directly to the Regional Office. The identifications promulgated herein provide an official listing of AQMAS for New Mexico and are made in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 51.12 (e) and (f).

The analysis and submittal of the State, and technical support documentation of this action are available for inspection during normal business hours at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VI, Air Program Branch, 1600 Patterson Street, Dallas, Texas 75201; and at the New Mexico Environmental Improvement Agency, Air Quality Division, P.E.R.A. Building, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501. A copy of the transcript of the public hearing held by EPA, and other comments received, are also available for inspection at the Regional Office.

NORTH DAKOTA

The State of North Dakota identified two AQMAS pursuant to a public hearing held on May 22, 1974, in Bismarck. The AQMA identification material was officially submitted by the North Dakota State Department of Health to the Ad-

ministrator on June 6, 1974, and by the Governor on June 26, 1974. On July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330) the Administrator proposed approval of the State submission. All comments received by the State and by EPA on the proposed AQMA identifications supported the proposal. One comment suggested that the McLean, Mercer, Oliver AQMA be expanded to include Morton and Burleigh counties, but this was unsubstantiated by any evidence of need.

The Administrator has reviewed North Dakota's submissions, for both content and procedural acceptability and is approving the North Dakota identifications as an official supplement to the State implementation plan.

The identifications as proposed included the North Dakota portion of the Fargo-Moorhead SMSA and the central portion of the State that contains large deposits of lignite coal. Power plant and coal gasification development is expected to occur in this latter area. The AQMAS identified below for the State reflect no changes from the July 10, 1974, proposal.

Copies of the State submittals, EPA's technical support documentation, comments received, and other materials relative to this proposal are available for inspection at the Environmental Health and Engineering Services, State Department of Health, State Capital, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501, in addition to the Region VIII office of EPA at 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado.

OHIO

The State of Ohio has not submitted any material concerning AQMA identifications under 40 CFR 51.12(e). Consequently, in the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 12, 1974 (39 FR 28906), the Administrator proposed for identification as AQMAS 13 of the 17 SMSAs in the State of Ohio. These included the metropolitan areas of Akron, Canton, Cleveland, Lorain, Cincinnati, Hamilton-Middleton, Steubenville, Youngstown, Toledo, Columbus, Mansfield, Dayton, and Springfield.

Testimony presented at public hearings held by EPA on August 26, 27, and 28, 1974, in Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland, respectively, plus material subsequently received indicated the need for redefining the boundaries of proposed AQMAS to make them consistent with the State's intergovernmental system of local governments. Subsequent analysis by the Administrator justified combining the proposed Akron and Canton AQMAS, Springfield and Dayton AQMAS, Cleveland and Lorain AQMAS, and the proposed Cincinnati and Hamilton-Middleton AQMAS.

This rulemaking presents seven AQMAS for identification. Two potential interstate AQMAS in the Cincinnati and Steubenville areas are being withheld temporarily pending review of the need for AQMA identification in adjacent border States. In order to keep AQMA geographic boundaries consistent with existing state district offices and local air pollution control agency jurisdictions, plus substate planning regions, county

lines were used rather than township or SMSA boundaries, as appeared in the August 12, 1974 proposal.

Several public comments related to the need for interstate pollution control regions along the Ohio-West Virginia border and the Ohio-Pennsylvania border. Although interstate planning cooperation will be necessary to meet the national ambient air quality standards successfully, present analysis does not justify the designation of the Youngstown area as an interstate AQMA. The Steubenville identification as aforementioned is being withheld temporarily pending review of the need for identification of contiguous areas.

Public concern was expressed over the projections for attainment of the sulfur dioxide ambient air quality standards, given the lack of a Federally-approved control strategy in Ohio for this pollutant. On the basis of these concerns, EPA performed further calculations which resulted in the decision to identify the Toledo and Steubenville areas in Ohio for sulfur dioxide.

Copies of the hearing record and the technical support documentation are available for inspection during normal business hours at the Ohio EPA, 361 E. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, as well as the EPA Region V Office at 230 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The State of South Dakota has not submitted any material concerning AQMA's under 40 CFR 51.12(e); hence, the Administrator determined whether any areas should be identified as AQMA's. On July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), the Administrator proposed to identify the Sioux Falls area as an AQMA.

A public hearing was conducted by EPA on the proposed identification on August 22, 1974, in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, at which time the State expressed concern regarding the maintenance of standards in the Rapid City area, especially for suspended particulates. A more detailed analysis of that area performed by EPA indicated that an AQMA identification was warranted for Lawrence, Meade, Pennington, and Custer Counties. These four counties were chosen to facilitate areawide planning for the area surrounding Rapid City and reflect an addition to the proposal. The Sioux Falls AQMA was expanded from the proposal to include Lincoln County, in addition to Minnehaha County. No comments on the substantive nature of the AQMA identification were received by EPA other than the comment noted above presented by the State of South Dakota at the EPA public hearing. Copies of the hearing record and the technical support documents are available for inspection during normal business hours at the Department of Environmental Protection, State Office Building #2, Pierre, South Dakota, as well as the Region VIII office of EPA, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado.

UTAH

In April 1974, the Utah State Division of Health submitted its preliminary

recommendations for identification of AQMA's to the EPA. The State used the back-up method outlined in Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas in its identification calculations. The State's preliminary calculations indicated that the Salt Lake City and Provo SMSA's should be identified as AQMA's for particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide. Because Utah did not conduct public hearings on its identifications, EPA is disapproving the State's submittal. In the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), EPA proposed that four AQMA's be identified in Utah and conducted public hearings on the proposal in Salt Lake City, Vernal, and Price on September 4-6, 1974. As a result of information gathered at these hearings and of further analyses performed by the State and EPA, certain modifications of the July 10, 1974, proposal are being made.

Subsequent analyses performed by EPA of the NO_x data available indicate discrepancies between various measurement techniques. Hence, Salt Lake City and Provo will not be identified for NO_x at this time.

The Governor, in meetings with the Regional Administrator subsequent to the public hearing, requested that for any AQMA identifications in Utah, the substate planning district boundaries be used where possible. Further discussions with Utah personnel led to the identification as AQMA's of six planning districts and Wayne County. The original areas proposed are included in this promulgation, although the AQMA boundaries, in response to consultations with Utah, have been expanded. The Salt Lake City AQMA now includes Salt Lake County, which inclusion makes the boundary identical to the Governor's proposed water quality planning area identified under section 208 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. The Provo AQMA consists of the counties of Utah, Wasatch, and Summit, which area constitutes the Mountainland Association of Governments (AOG). The oil shale AQMA now includes the counties of Uintah, Duchesne, and Daggett, which make up the Uintah Basin AOG. Davis County is now included with Morgan and Weber counties; the entire area constitutes a substate planning district. The coal development AQMA now consists of two AOG's, the Southeastern, the Southwestern, and Wayne County. The Southwestern AOG consists of Beaver, Iron, Washington, Garfield and Kane counties. The Southeastern AOG consists of Carbon, Emery, Grand, and San Juan counties. Wayne county is included even though it is situated away from the rest of its substate planning district, because it is slated for development of two major power plants in the early 1980's.

The primary comment of those persons testifying against the AQMA identification at the public hearing was that existing regulations and procedures are adequate to ensure maintenance of national standards. Some testified that proposed control requirements for SO₂ in the Salt

Lake AQMA will preclude potential violations of national ambient air quality standards. Also, some contended that Federal new source performance standards and State and Federal new source review procedures will adequately maintain air quality standards in the natural resource development areas. However, these contentions were not substantiated by any quantitative information. Testimony given by the Sierra Club urged addition of SO₂ to the Provo AQMA, but presently available data do not justify such identification.

Copies of the EPA public hearing record and technical support documentation for the rulemaking taken herein are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the offices of the Utah State Department of Social Services, 44 Medical Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah, and at the offices of the EPA Region VIII, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado.

WISCONSIN

The State of Wisconsin held public hearings on the identification of AQMA's on April 15, 1974, in Milwaukee and on April 16, 1974, in Appleton, Wisconsin. The Administrator received the official submission of the State AQMA proposals on June 21, 1974.

The identifications submitted by Wisconsin included seven urbanizing counties of southeast Wisconsin for particulate matter, photochemical oxidants, and sulfur dioxide, and three counties in east-central Wisconsin for particulate matter. In the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 12, 1974 (39 FR 28906), the Administrator proposed to approve the State's submittal and accept their AQMA's. In the action below, the Administrator is approving the State's material.

The State of Minnesota has expressed concern over the lack of inclusion of the City of Superior, Wisconsin, in the Duluth, Minnesota, AQMA for total suspended particulates. Discussions among the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin and EPA, however, did not substantiate the need for the interstate AQMA at this time. The Administrator intends that States examine growth projections for areas such as Superior through the system for collecting information on growth and development throughout the States. This system remains unproposed at the present. A discussion of the system appears in the discussion of the Massachusetts action above. No other comments other than the aforementioned comments from the State of Minnesota were received by the Administrator on the EPA proposal for Wisconsin.

The Administrator altered the Wisconsin AQMA identifications slightly to include the southeast Wisconsin region in an interstate AQMA with parts of Illinois and Indiana to provide a formal mechanism for the three states to jointly address related pollution problems.

The State AQMA material and EPA's technical support data for these AQMA designations are available for inspection during normal business hours at the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin,

as well as the EPA Region V Office at 230 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

WYOMING

The State of Wyoming issued a hearing notice on the identification of Sweetwater County as an AQMA on May 6, 1974. A hearing was held on June 6, 1974, in Casper. Wyoming subsequently submitted AQMA identification material on July 22, 1974, from the Department of Environmental Quality, and on August 7, 1974, by the Governor. The Administrator reviewed the submissions for both content and procedural adequacy and found them to be acceptable, but proposed additions.

The State submissions only identified Sweetwater County as an AQMA for particulate matter. Oil shale and coal industry development, as well as the expansion of existing trona (source of soda ash used in glass manufacturing) plants and the probability of the development of new plants, are expected to be significant air pollution contributors in the identified area.

In addition to the State identification of the Sweetwater AQMA for particulate matter, EPA proposed in the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), to include SO₂ in the Sweetwater AQMA and to identify the Powder River Basin AQMA for particulate matter and sulfur dioxide because of potential coal development impacts. Public hearings were held by EPA on August 28 and 29, 1974 in Gillette and Rock Springs to address the pertinent issues. Based upon information received at the public hearing plus additional analyses performed by the State and the EPA Region VIII office, modifications from the original proposed rulemaking have been made and are reflected in the area identifications below.

Development of coal mining and conversion facilities does not appear at this time to be significant enough to create a problem with maintenance of the national standards for particulate matter and SO₂ in Johnson and Sheridan Counties proposed in the Powder River Basin AQMA; hence, these counties are not being included in the AQMA. Impacts from the announced proposed coal development in this AQMA also do not show the need for considering SO₂ in a maintenance plan; hence, the identification does not include this pollutant. Development of coal gasification facilities in the Powder River Basin AQMA indicates that a potential photochemical oxidant problem may exist; thus this pollutant has been added to the AQMA identification. No change, from the proposal, was made in the Sweetwater AQMA.

Testimony received at the public hearings was generally supportive of the AQMA identifications. The State of Wyoming, however, expressed concern as to whether there is sufficient justification for inclusion of photochemical oxidants to the Powder River Basin AQMA, and testimony from the public sector urged the inclusion of Johnson and Sheridan Counties in addition to Campbell and

Converse Counties in the Powder River Basin AQMA. The State was urged through public comments received to develop SO₂ emission regulations to control the proposed development.

Copies of the State submittal, hearing records, and the technical support documents are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Wyoming Department of Health, State Office Building, Cheyenne, Wyoming, in addition to the EPA Region VIII office at 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado.

AVAILABILITY OF STATE SUBMITTALS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION

State submittals and technical support documentation (including the Administrator's evaluation of State-submitted AQMA material) for the list of AQMAs will be available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Freedom of Information Center, EPA, Room 206, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, and at each of the Regional Offices listed below. Each Regional Office will have only the material for the States within its respective region.

Region	States	Address
I	Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire.	John F. Kennedy Federal Bldg., Room 2111, Boston, Mass. 02203.
V	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin.	Federal Bldg., 230 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
VI	New Mexico	1600 Patterson St., Suite 1100, Dallas, Tex. 75201.
VII	Iowa, Nebraska	1735 Baltimore Ave., Kansas City, Mo. 64103.
VIII	Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming.	1860 Lincoln St., Suite 900, Denver, Colo. 80203.

The Administrator finds good cause for making this rulemaking effective immediately in order that the affected States may begin to develop detailed air quality maintenance area analyses if they have not already begun to do so.

(Secs. 110, 301(a), Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857c-5, 1857g(a)))

Dated: May 23, 1975.

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Administrator.

Subpart G—Colorado

§ 52.320 [Amended]

1. Section 52.320 is amended by inserting the dates "June 7, 1974," and "January 29, 1975" in chronological order in paragraph (c) (5).

2. Subpart G is amended by adding § 52.341 as follows:

§ 52.341 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which were identified by the State of Colorado are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality stand-

ards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Colorado Springs Air Quality Maintenance Area (State Planning and Management District 4)

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and carbon monoxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: El Paso County.

(2) Colorado-Utah Oil Shale Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Colorado portion) (State Planning and Management District 11).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Garfield County Moffat County
Mesa County Rio Blanco County

(3) Metropolitan Denver Air Quality Maintenance Area (State Planning and Management District 3).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, carbon monoxide, photochemical oxidants and nitrogen dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Adams County Denver County
Arapahoe County Douglas County
Boulder County Gilpin County
Clear Creek County Jefferson County

(4) North Central Colorado Air Quality Maintenance Area (State Planning and Management District 2).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, carbon monoxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Larimer County Weld County

(5) Pueblo Air Quality Maintenance Area (State Planning and Management District 7).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and carbon monoxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Pueblo County.

Subpart H—Connecticut

§ 52.370 [Amended]

3. In § 52.370, paragraph (c) is amended by adding the date, "April 15, [1974]," in proper chronological order.

4. Subpart H is amended by adding § 52.379 as follows:

§ 52.379 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The area listed below, which was identified by the State of Connecticut, is hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12(e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violations of the specified air quality standards within 10 years.

(1) The Connecticut Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: All portions of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut, and Hartford-New Haven-Springfield Interstate Air Quality Control Regions (as defined in 40 CFR Part 81) that are located within the State of Connecticut.

Subpart O—Illinois

5. Subpart O is amended by adding § 52.735 as follows:

§ 52.735 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The requirements of § 51.12(e) of this chapter are not met because the State neither identified areas of the State which have the potential for violation of air quality standards within 10 years nor provided a justification that there are no such areas in the State.

(b) The areas listed below are identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdiction or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Decatur Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Macon County.

(2) Illinois-Indiana-Wisconsin Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Illinois portion).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, photochemical oxidants and nitrogen dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Cook County	Lake County
Du Page County	McHenry County
Kane County	Will County

(3) Peoria Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Peoria County	Woodford County
Tazewell County	

(4) St. Louis Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Illinois Portion).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Madison County	St. Clair County
Monroe County	

Subpart P—Indiana

6. Subpart P is amended by adding § 52.792 as follows:

§ 52.792 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The requirements of § 51.12(e) of this chapter are not met because the State neither identified areas of the State that have the potential for violation of air quality standards within 10 years nor provided a justification that there are no such areas in the State.

(b) The areas listed below are identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial areas of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Evansville Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Indiana portion).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of the area: Vanderburgh County.

(2) Illinois-Indiana-Wisconsin Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Indiana portion).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of the area:

Porter County	Lake County
---------------	-------------

(3) Indianapolis Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of the area: Marion County.

(4) Louisville Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Indiana portion).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of the area:

Clark County	Floyd County
--------------	--------------

Subpart Q—Iowa

7. § 52.832 is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.832 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which were identified by the State of Iowa are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within ten years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Cedar Rapids Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Linn County.

(2) Des Moines Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Carbon monoxide and particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Polk County.

(3) Dubuque Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Dubuque County.

(4) Omaha-Council Bluffs Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Iowa portion).

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Pottawattamie County.

(5) Davenport Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Scott County.

(6) Waterloo Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Black Hawk County.

Subpart W—Massachusetts

§ 52.1120 [Amended]

8. Paragraph (c)(3) is amended by adding the date, "July 23, 1974," in proper chronological order.

9. Subpart W is amended by adding § 52.1157 as follows:

§ 52.1157 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below, which were identified by the State of Massachusetts, are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. Each identified area consists of all the territory included within the boundaries of the given jurisdictions.

(1) Boston Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

In Suffolk County: the cities of Boston, Chelsea, and Revere; the town of Winthrop.

In Essex County: the cities of Beverly, Lynn, Peabody and Salem; the towns of Boxford, Danvers, Hamilton, Lynnfield, Manchester, Marblehead, Middleton, Nahant, Saugus, Swampscott, Topsfield, and Wenham.

In Middlesex County: the cities of Cambridge, Everett, Malden, Medford, Melrose, Newton, Somerville, Waltham, and Woburn; the towns of Acton, Arlington, Ashland, Bedford, Belmont, Boxborough, Burlington, Carlisle, Concord, Framingham, Holliston,

Lexington, Lincoln, Natick, North Reading, Reading, Sherborn, Stoneham, Sudbury, Wakefield, Watertown, Wayland, Weston, Wilmington, and Winchester.

In Norfolk County: the city of Quincy and the towns of Bellingham, Braintree, Brookline, Canton, Cohasset, Dedham, Dover, Foxborough, Franklin, Holbrook, Medfield, Medway, Millis, Milton, Needham, Norfolk, Norwood, Randolph, Sharon, Stoughton, Walpole, Wellesley, Westwood, Weymouth, and Wrentham.

In Plymouth County: the towns of Abington, Duxbury, Hanover, Hanson, Hingham, Hull, Kingston, Marshfield, Norwell, Pembroke, Rockland, and Scituate.

(2) Lawrence-Haverhill Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

In Essex County: the cities of Haverhill and Lawrence; the towns of Amesbury, Andover, Georgetown, Groveland, Merrimac, Methuen, North Andover, Salisbury, and West Newbury.

(3) Springfield Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

In Hampden County: the cities of Chicopee, Holyoke, Springfield, and Westfield, the towns of Agawam, East Longmeadow, Hampden, Longmeadow, Ludlow, Monson, Palmer, Southwick, West Springfield, and Wilbraham.

In Hampshire County: the city of Northampton and the towns of Belchertown, Easthampton, Granby, Hadley, Hatfield, Southampton, South Hadley.

In Worcester County: the city of Warren.

(4) Worcester Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

In Worcester County: the city of Worcester and the towns of Auburn, Berlin, Brookfield, Charlton, East Brookfield, Grafton, Holden, Leicester, Millbury, Northborough, Northbridge, North Brookfield, Oxford, Paxton, Shrewsbury, Spencer, Sterling, Sutton, Upton, Uxbridge, Webster, West Boylston, and Westboro.

Subpart X—Michigan

10. Paragraph (c) of § 52.1170 is amended by adding paragraph (c) (4) as follows:

§ 52.1170 Identification of plan.

(c) * * *

(4) June 27 and October 18, 1974 by the State of Michigan Department of Natural Resources.

11. Subpart X is amended by adding § 52.1178 as follows:

§ 52.1178 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards

within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Detroit Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Macomb County, Oakland County, and Wayne County.

(2) Toledo Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Michigan Portion).

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Monroe County.

Subpart Y—Minnesota

12. Paragraph (c) of § 52.1220 is amended by adding paragraph (7) as follows:

§ 52.1220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *
(7) November 15, 1974.

13. Subpart Y is amended by adding § 52.1229 as follows:

§ 52.1229 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Duluth Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: City of Duluth.

(2) Minneapolis-St. Paul Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Anoka County	Ramsey County
Carver County	Scott County
Dakota County	Washington County
Hennepin County	

Subpart BB—Montana

§ 52.1370 [Amended]

14. Section 52.1370 is amended by inserting the dates, "June 24, 1974" and "January 25, 1975" in chronological order in paragraph (c) (2).

15. Subpart BB is amended by adding § 52.1381 as follows:

§ 52.1381 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which were identified by the State of Montana are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Anaconda-Butte Air Quality Maintenance area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Deer Lodge County Silver Bow County.

(2) Billings Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and carbon monoxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Big Horn County	Carbon County
(excluding North- ern Cheyenne In- dian Reservation).	Sweet Grass County
	Yellowstone County

(3) Helena Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Lewis and Clark
County

(4) Kalispell Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Flathead County Lake County

(5) Missoula Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and carbon monoxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Missoula County.

(6) Southeastern Montana Coal Resource Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Carter County	Powder River County
Custer County	
Fallon County	Rosebud County
Northern Cheyenne Indian Reserva- tion in Bighorn County	Treasure County

Subpart CC—Nebraska

§ 52.1420 [Amended]

16. § 52.1420 is amended by inserting the date, "May 9, 1974" in chronological order in paragraph (c) (1).

17. Subpart CC is amended by adding § 52.1435 as follows:

§ 52.1435 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The area listed below is hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified area consists of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Omaha-Council Bluffs Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Nebraska Portion).

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of the area:

Douglas County Sarpy County

Subpart EE—New Hampshire

§ 52.1520 [Amended]

18. In § 52.1520, paragraph (c) is amended by adding the date, "May 20, 1974," in proper chronological order.

19. Subpart EE is amended by adding § 52.1528 as follows:

§ 52.1528 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) Based upon information submitted by the State of New Hampshire, the Administrator does not identify any areas pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

Subpart GG—New Mexico

20. Subpart GG is amended by adding § 52.1633 as follows:

§ 52.1633 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The requirements of §§ 51.4 and 51.12(e) of this chapter are not met because the State did not account for public comment at State public hearings on the identification of areas which have the potential for violation of air quality standards within 10 years and did not make an official submittal of material pertaining to such identification.

(b) The areas listed below are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12(e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Albuquerque Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(1) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Bernalillo County

(2) Four Corners Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Carbon monoxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: San Juan County.

(3) Las Cruces Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Carbon monoxide and particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Dona Ana County.

(4) Roswell Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Carbon monoxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Chaves County.

(5) Santa Fe Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Carbon monoxide and particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Santa Fe County.

Subpart JJ—North Dakota

21. Paragraph (c) of § 52.1820 is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.1820 Identification of plan.

(c) Supplemental information was submitted on:

(1) June 6, 1974, by the Department of Health, Division of Environmental Engineering; and

(2) June 26, 1974.

22. Subpart JJ is amended by adding § 52.1827 as follows:

§ 52.1827 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which are identified by the State of North Dakota are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12(e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Cass Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Cass County.

(2) McLean-Mercer-Oliver Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

McLean County Oliver County
Mercer County

Subpart KK—Ohio

23. Subpart KK is amended by adding § 52.1883 as follows:

§ 52.1883 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The requirements of § 51.12(e) of this chapter are not met because the State neither identified areas of the State that have the potential for violation of the national ambient air quality standards within 10 years nor provided a justification that there are no such areas in the State.

(b) The areas listed below are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Akron-Canton Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Portage County Summit County
Stark County

(2) Cleveland Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Cuyahoga County Lake County
Geauga County Lorain County

(3) Columbus Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Franklin County.

(4) Dayton Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Clark County Montgomery County
Greene County

(5) Mansfield Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Richland County.

(6) Toledo Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Ohio portion):

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

Lucas County Wood County

(ii) Geographical composition of the area:

(7) Youngstown Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of the area:

Mahoning County Trumbull County

Subpart QQ—South Dakota

24. Subpart QQ is amended by adding § 52.2176 as follows:

§ 52.2176 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The requirements of § 51.12(e) of this chapter are not met since the State neither identified areas of the State which have the potential for violation of air quality standards within 10 years nor provided a justification that there are no such areas in the State.

(b) The areas listed below are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12(e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial areas encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the areas so delimited.

(1) Black Hills Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Custer County Meade County
Lawrence County Pennington County

(2) Sioux Falls Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Lincoln County Minnehaha County

Subpart TT—Utah

25. Subpart TT is amended by adding § 52.2345 as follows:

§ 52.2345 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The requirements of § 51.4 and § 51.12(e) of this chapter are not met since the State did not conduct a public hearing on the identification of areas which have the potential for violation of an air quality standard within 10 years.

(b) The areas listed below are identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Colorado-Utah Oil Shale Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Utah Portion).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Daggett County Uintah County
Duchesne County

(2) Northcentral Utah Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Davis County Weber County
Morgan County

(3) Provo Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Summit County Wasatch County
Utah County

(4) Salt Lake City Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Salt Lake County

(5) Southeastern Utah Coal Resource Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Carbon County Grand County
Emery County San Juan County

(6) Southwestern Utah Coal Resource Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Beaver County Kane County
Garfield County Washington County
Iron County

(7) Wayne County Coal Resource Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Wayne County.

Subpart YY—Wisconsin

§ 52.2570 [Amended]

26. § 52.2570 is amended by adding the date, June 21, 1974, in proper chronological order in paragraph (c) (2).

27. Subpart YY is amended by adding § 52.2580 as follows:

§ 52.2580 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below, which were identified by the State of Wisconsin, are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Illinois-Indiana-Wisconsin Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Wisconsin portion).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, photochemical oxidants, and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Kenosha County Walworth County
Milwaukee County Washington County
Ozaukee County Waukesha County
Racine County

(2) Lake Michigan Subregion Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Brown County Winnebago County
Outagamie County

Subpart ZZ—Wyoming

28. § 52.2620 is amended by revising paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 52.2620 Identification of plan.

(c) Supplemental information was submitted on:

(1) March 28, and May 3, 1972, and on

February 27, 1973, by the Wyoming Department of Health and Social Services;

(2) July 22, 1974, by the Department of Environmental Quality;

(3) August 7, 1974.

29. Subpart ZZ is amended by adding § 52.2627 as follows:

§ 52.2627 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described areas including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Powder River Basin Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which an area is identified: Particulate matter and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of the area:

Campbell County Converse County

(2) Sweetwater Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area: Sweetwater County

[FR Doc.76-14368 Filed 5-30-76;8:45 am]