that only the ''eddy current surface probe inspection'' be repeated; however, the AD indicates that merely the ''eddy current inspection'' must be repeated. –

These operators have requested that the FAA clarify AD 95–11–11 to indicate exactly which type of eddy current inspection is to be conducted as the initial and repetitive inspection. –

In considering this request, and upon further review of the wording of the current AD, the FAA concurs that some clarification is necessary. –

It was the FAA's intent that the requirements of AD 95–11–11 be parallel to those actions recommended by the manufacturer in its referenced service bulletin. The intended requirements of the AD were that affected operators would conduct an initial eddy current bolt hole inspection and eddy current surface probe inspection to detect fatigue cracks in the subject areas, and would repeat only the eddy current surface probe inspection thereafter. However, as AD 95–11–11 is currently worded, operators may incorrectly interpret the requirements as requiring that both types of eddy current inspections be repeated. Such misinterpretation could result in operators conducting unnecessary repetitive eddy current bolt hole inspections, which would be of no significant safety value and would entail incurring needless additional costs in labor and downtime. –

Since it is obvious that these requirements are not totally clear in the way that AD 95–11–11 is currently worded, the FAA has determined that the wording of paragraph (a) the AD must be revised to clarify the intent of the required actions. This action revises that paragraph to specify that, initially, both an eddy current bolt hole inspection and an eddy current surface probe inspection are required within 1,800 landings after the effective date of this AD. The eddy current surface probe inspection must then be repeated at intervals not to exceed 1,800 landings.

Action is taken herein to clarify these requirements of AD 95–11–11 and to correctly add the AD as an amendment to section 39.13 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 39.13). The effective date of the rule remains July 3, 1995. –

The final rule is being reprinted in its entirety for the convenience of affected operators. –

Since this action only clarifies a current requirement, it has no adverse economic impact and imposes no additional burden on any person. Therefore, notice and public procedures hereon are unnecessary.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39 –

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Correction –

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES –

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended] –

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39–9244 (60 FR 28524, June 1, 1995), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), amendment 39–9315, to read as follows:

95–11–11 R1 McDonnell Douglas: Amendment 39–9315. Docket 94–NM–176–AD. Revises AD 95–11–11, Amendment 39–9244.

Applicability: Model DC–10–10, –15, –30, –40, and KC–10 (military) series airplanes; as listed in McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin A54–106, Revision 2, dated November 3, 1994; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (d) of this AD to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously. –

To prevent failure of the wing pylon aft bulkhead due to fatigue cracking, which could lead to separation of the engine and pylon from the airplane, accomplish the following: –

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 1,800 landings after the effective date of this AD, conduct an eddy current bolt hole inspection and an eddy current surface probe inspection to detect fatigue cracks in the pylon aft bulkhead flange, upper pylon box web, fitting radius, and adjacent tangent areas, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin A54–106, Revision 2, dated November 3, 1994. Repeat the eddy current surface probe inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 1,800 landings. –

(b) If any crack is found during any inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. –

(c) Accomplishment of the gap inspection and necessary shimming in accordance with ''Phase III,'' as specified in McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin A54–106, Revision 2, dated November 3, 1994, constitutes terminating action for the inspections required by paragraph (a) of this AD. –

(d) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.–

(e) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished. –

(f) The inspection shall be done in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin A54–106, Revision 2, dated November 3, 1994. This incorporation by reference was approved previously by the Director of the Federal Register, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51, as of July 3, 1995 (60 FR 28524, June 1, 1995). Copies may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Dept. C1–L51 (2–60). Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, Transport Airplane Directorate, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC. –

(g) This amendment is effective on July 3, 1995.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on July 17, 1995.

James V. Devany,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–18029 Filed 7–21–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 93–NM–105–AD; Amendment 39–9307; AD 95–15–04]

Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Corporate Jets Model BAe 125–800A and –1000A Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Raytheon Corporate Jets Model BAe 125–800A and –1000A airplanes, that requires inspections to detect corrosion of the wing leading edge skins, including the wing anti-ice fluid distribution panel (TKS panel) rebate and radius; repair, if necessary; and subsequent corrosion protection treatment. This amendment also requires inspections and treatments of the landing/taxiing lamp window assembly recess and stall vane spoiler rebate/radius. This amendment is prompted by reports of corrosion of the wing leading edge skin at the interface with the TKS panels. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent reduced structural integrity of the wing leading edge section at the interface with the TKS panels and stall vane spoilers, which could adversely affect the flight characteristics of the airplane.

DATES: Effective August 23, 1995.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of August 23, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Raytheon Corporate Jets, Inc., 3 Bishops Square Street, Albans Road West, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL109NE, United Kingdom. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Schroeder, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2148; fax (206) 227–1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Raytheon Corporate Jets Model BAe 125–800A and –1000A airplanes was published as a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the **Federal Register** on April 17, 1995 (60 FR 19183). That action proposed to require inspections to detect corrosion of the wing leading edge skins, including the wing anti-ice fluid distribution panel (TKS panel) rebate and radius; repair, if necessary; and subsequent corrosion protection treatment. That action also proposed to require inspections and treatments of the landing/taxiing lamp window assembly recess and the stall vane spoiler rebate/radius.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. No comments were submitted in response to the proposal or the FAA's determination of the cost to the public. The FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

The FAA estimates that 154 Model BAe 125–800A and –1000A airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD. It will take approximately 130 work hours per airplane to accomplish the inspections and treatment of the wing leading edge skins (including the TKS rebate and radius) at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $1,201,200, or $7,800 per airplane.

The total cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

95–15–04 Raytheon Corporate Jets, Inc. (Formerly DeHavilland, Inc.; Hawker Siddeley; British Aerospace, PLC): Amendment 39–9307. Docket 93–NM–105–AD.

Applicability: Model BAe 125–800A and –1000A airplanes, as listed in Raytheon Corporate Jets Service Bulletin S.B. 57–77, Revision 1, dated October 28, 1993, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (c) of this AD to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent reduced structural integrity of the wing leading edge skin and wing anti-ice fluid distribution panel (TKS panel) interface joint, which could adversely affect the flight characteristics of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Accomplish the actions specified in paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(3), and (a)(4) of

this AD within the time schedule indicated in each paragraph, and in accordance with Corporate Jets Limited Service Bulletin S.B. 57–77, dated May 20, 1993, or Raytheon Corporate Jets Service Bulletin S.B. 57–77, Revision 1, dated October 28, 1993.

(1) Within 24 months since airplane manufacture, or within 12 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a detailed visual inspection to detect corrosion of the polished surface of the top and bottom leading edge skins on each wing, in accordance with either service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with either service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair the wing leading edge skins in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(2) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (a)(1) of this AD, conduct a detailed visual inspection to detect corrosion of the wing anti-ice fluid distribution panel (TKS panel) rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing, in accordance with either service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with either service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(3) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (a)(2) of this AD, conduct a dye penetrant inspection to detect corrosion of the TKS panel rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing, in accordance with either service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with either service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in the service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(4) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (a)(3) of this AD, accomplish both of the following actions in accordance with either service bulletin:

(i) Apply enhanced protective treatment to the TKS panel rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing; and

(ii) Conduct a flight check of the airplane stall warning system and stall characteristics.

(b) Accomplish the actions specified in paragraphs (b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3) of this AD within the time schedule indicated in each paragraph, and in accordance with Raytheon Corporate Jets Service Bulletin S.B. 57–77, Revision 1, dated October 28, 1993:

Note 2: Any inspection specified in paragraph (b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3) of this AD that was conducted prior to the effective date of this AD in accordance with Corporate Jets Limited Service Bulletin S.B. 57–77, dated May 20, 1993, is considered to be in compliance with this paragraph.

Note 3: The actions required by paragraph (b) of this AD may be accomplished in conjunction with the actions required by paragraph (a) within the compliance time required by paragraph (a).

(1) Within 2 years after the effective date of this AD, conduct a detailed visual inspection to detect corrosion of the landing/taxiing lamp window assembly recess and the stall vane spoiler rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with the service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(2) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (b)(1) of this AD, conduct a dye penetrant inspection to detect corrosion of the landing/taxiing lamp window assembly recess and the stall vane spoiler rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with the service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(3) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (b)(2) of this AD, accomplish both of the following actions in accordance with the service bulletin:

(i) Apply enhanced protective treatment to the landing/taxiing lamp window assembly recess and the stall vane spoiler rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing; and

(ii) Conduct a flight check of the airplane stall warning system and stall characteristics.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113.

Note 4: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM–113.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(e) The actions shall be done in accordance with the following service bulletins, as applicable, which contain the specified effective pages:

Service bulletin referenced and date–	Page No.–	Revision level shown on page–	Date shown on page
Corporate Jets Limited–	1–13–	Original–	May 20, 1993.
S.B. 57–77, May 20, 1993			
Raytheon Corporate Jets–	1–9, A1–A5–	1–	Oct. 28, 1993.
S.B. 57–77, Revision 1, October 28, 1993–	10–14–	Original–	May 20, 1993.

This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Raytheon Corporate Jets, Inc., 3 Bishops Square Street, Albans Road West, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL109NE, United Kingdom. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(f) This amendment becomes effective on August 23, 1995.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on July 6, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–17033 Filed 7–21–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

19 CFR Part 10

[T.D. 95–31]

RIN 1515–AB53

Express Consignments; Formal and Informal Entries of Merchandise; Administrative Exemptions; Correction

AGENCY: Customs Service, Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document makes a correction to the document published in the **Federal Register** which adopted final rules implementing two Customs Modernization provisions of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act concerning raising administrative exemptions and exempting from entry requirements specified merchandise. The document also clarified the entry procedures for shipments by express consignment operators or carriers.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This correction is effective July 24, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gregory R. Vilders, Attorney, Regulations Branch, (202) 482–6930.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 14, 1995, Customs published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 18983) T.D. 95–31 which adopted final rules to implement two Customs Modernization provisions of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act concerning raising administrative exemptions and exempting from entry requirements specified merchandise. The document also clarified the entry procedures for shipments by express consignment operators or carriers.

This document corrects an editing error contained in the final rule document (T.D. 95–31) that amended the interim rule document (T.D. 94–51), which revised § 10.151. In the interim rule document, § 10.151 was revised, in part, to provide for certain documentary forms of evidence to establish fair retail value for purposes of obtaining an exemption from duty. As revised, the interim language of the pertinent clause read ''as evidenced by the bill of lading (or other document filed as the entry) or manifest listing each bill of lading,''. In the final rule document an additional form of evidence was added—oral declarations—to the documentary forms already provided for. However, in adding this new form of evidence, the amendatory language failed to properly place the words '', an oral declaration'' between the words ''as evidenced by'' and ''the'', with the result that the subject clause now reads ''as evidenced by the, an oral declaration.'' Accordingly, this document corrects that editing error by adding the words ''an oral declaration'' after the words ''as evidenced by'' so that the corrected clause will read as follows: ''As evidenced by an oral declaration, the bill of lading (or other document filed as the entry), or the manifest listing each bill of entry''.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the final rule publication of April 14, 1995 (T.D. 95–31) (60 FR 18983), is corrected as follows:

§ 10.151 [Corrected]

On page 18990, in the third column under the heading Part 10, the second amendatory instruction is corrected to read as follows: 2. In § 10.151, add the words ''an oral declaration,'' following the words ''as evidenced by'' in the first sentence.

Dated: July 14, 1995.

Harold M. Singer,

Chief, Regulations Branch.

[FR Doc. 95–17984 Filed 7–21–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820–02–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[FRL–5260–3]

Approval of Existing Federally Enforceable State and Local Operating Permit Programs To Limit Potential To Emit for Hazardous Air Pollutants; State of Alabama; Knox County, Tennessee

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: On January 25, 1995, the State of Alabama through the Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM) submitted a letter requesting approval of the State's existing Federally enforceable state operating permits (FESOP) program under section 112(l) of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA). On February 6, 1995, Knox County, Tennessee through the Knox County Department of Air Pollution Control (KCDAPC) submitted a letter requesting approval of the County's exisiting Federally enforceable local operating permits (FELOP) program under section 112(l) of the CAA. The two agencies submitted these requests to provide each Agency the ability to issue Federally enforceable operating permits to hazardous air pollutant (HAP) sources regulated under section 112 of the CAA. EPA is approving both of these requests under section 112(l) of the CAA for purposes of limiting PTE for HAP sources.

DATES: This action will be effective by September 22, 1995 unless notice is received by August 23, 1995 that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments. If the effective date is delayed, timely notice will be published in the **Federal Register.**

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Scott Miller at the EPA Regional office listed below.

Copies of the material submitted by both agencies may be examined during normal business hours at the following locations:

Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (Air Docket 6102), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, Air Programs Branch, 345 Courtland Street NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365.

Alabama Department of Environmental Management, Air Division, 1751 Congressman W.L. Dickinson Drive, Montgomery, Alabama 36109.

Knox County Department of Air Pollution Control, City/County Building, Suite 339, 400 West Main Street, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Miller, Air Programs Branch, Air, Pesticides & Toxics Management Division, Region 4 Environmental Protection Agency, 345 Courtland Street NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365. The telephone number is 404/347–2864.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 28, 1989 (54 FR 27274), EPA published criteria for approving and incorporating into the SIP regulatory programs for the issuance of FESOP and FELOP. Permits issued pursuant to an operating permit program approved into the SIP as meeting these criteria may be considered Federally enforceable. EPA has encouraged states and local agencies to develop such FESOP and FELOP