

EXHIBIT 246.71.—INTERNATIONAL SURFACE AIR LIFT SERVICE NETWORK COUNTRIES AND RATES—Continued

Country	City	Code	Rate group
Nicaragua	Managua	MGA	2
Niger	Niamey	NIM	4
Nigeria	Lagos	LOS	4
Norway	Oslo	OSL	1
Oman	Muscat	MCT	4
Pakistan	Karachi	KHI	4
Panama	Panama City	PTY	2
Papua New Guinea	Port Moresby	POM	3
Paraguay	Asuncion	ASU	2
Peru	Lima	LIM	2
Philippines	Manila	MNL	3
Poland	Warsaw	WAW	1
Portugal	Lisbon	LIS	1
Qatar	Doha	DOH	4
Reunion Island	St Denis	RUN	4
Romania	Bucharest	BUH	1
Russia	Moscow	MOW	1
San Marino	Rome	ROM	1
Saudi Arabia	Dhahran	DHA	4
Senegal	Dakar	DKR	4
Singapore	Singapore	SIN	3
South Africa	Johannesburg	JNB	4
Spain ³	Madrid	MAD	1
Sri Lanka	Colombo	CMB	4
Sudan	Khartoum	KRT	4
Suriname	Paramaribo	PBM	2
Sweden	Stockholm	STO	1
Switzerland	Basel	BSL	1
Syria	Damascus	DAM	4
Taiwan	Taipei	TPE	3
Tanzania	Dar es Salaam	DAR	4
Thailand	Bangkok	BKK	3
Togo	Lome	LFW	4
Trinidad and Tobago	Port of Spain	POS	2
Tunisia	Tunis	TUN	4
Turkey	Istanbul	IST	1
Uganda	Kampala	KLA	4
United Arab Emirates	Dubai	DXB	4
Uruguay	Montevideo	MVD	2
Venezuela	Caracas	CCS	2
Yemen	Sanaa	SAH	4
Zambia	Ndola	NLA	4
Zimbabwe	Harare	HRE	4

Footnotes:

¹ To expedite service, Japan Post has requested that ISAL shipments to Japan be separated by two destinations delivery zones as follows: Osaka (OSA) for postal codes 52–79, 91, and Tokyo (TYO) for all other postal codes.

² Including the Canary Islands.

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 98–1670 Filed 1–23–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[IL160–1a; FRL–5951–6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois

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

ACTION: Direct Final Rule.

SUMMARY: On August 20, 1997, Illinois submitted a variance to allow Marathon Oil to emit particulate matter in increased quantities from June 14, 1996, to September 5, 1996, to allow the company to defer repairs of its control equipment until a scheduled system shutdown. The submittal included modeling to indicate that the temporary emissions increase would not be expected to cause a violation of air quality standards. USEPA is approving this variance because air quality standards continue to be protected.

DATES: This action is effective on March 27, 1998 unless USEPA receives written adverse or critical comments by February 25, 1998. If the effective date is delayed, timely notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to: J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), United States Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Copies of the State’s submittal are available for inspection at the following address: (It is recommended that you telephone John Summerhays at (312) 886–6067, before visiting the Region 5 Office.) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division (AR–18J), 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Summerhays, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

Region 5, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6067.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The State's submittal addresses emissions at the Fluid bed Catalytic Cracking Unit (FCCU) at Marathon Oil Company's refinery in Robinson, in Crawford County, Illinois. The FCCU uses catalyst in particle form to convert heavier petroleum materials into lighter, more valuable products. At issue are the quantity of particles that may be emitted from this unit. The normal emission limit for this unit, according to an equation based on the weight of material input to the process under normal capacity operation, is about 84 pounds per hour. The variance requested by the company and granted by the State authorizes emissions of 450 pounds per hour for the relevant 3-month period.

The circumstances leading to the company's variance request involved discovery of evidence that emissions from the FCCU were exceeding the unit's limit and suggesting problems with the cyclones at the unit. Repair of the cyclones requires a month-long shutdown of the FCCU, which would dramatically reduce production of gasoline. The company argued that allowance to defer remedying the problems was needed to avoid undue hardship on the company, because immediate repair would be less efficient (due to difficulties of working on hot equipment in hot weather and due to reduced preparation for repairs) and would eliminate gasoline production for much of the peak driving season. The company sought the variance until the maintenance shutdown that was already scheduled for October 1996 (subsequently rescheduled to commence September 5, 1996).

II. Review of Submittal

Crawford County is designated unclassifiable for PM_{10} . Consequently, given that the variance would be a temporary relaxation of the State Implementation Plan (SIP), the principal review criterion is whether the variance has been demonstrated not to threaten continued attainment of the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).

The company provided limited modeling to demonstrate the impact of the variance. This modeling used the Industrial Source Complex Model to simulate potential impacts of the FCCU, using relevant plume release characteristics and using meteorological data from Terre Haute, Indiana. This modeling estimated the impact of 450 pounds per hour of emissions of total suspended particulate matter, which

was assumed to include 13.5 percent or 60.75 pounds per hour of PM_{10} emissions. The estimate impact of these emissions was a peak 24-hour average PM_{10} impact of 1.8 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$) and a peak annual average PM_{10} impact of 0.13 $\mu g/m^3$. These impacts are well below the 24-hour PM_{10} standard of 150 $\mu g/m^3$ and the annual PM_{10} standard of 50 $\mu g/m^3$.

An important issue not adequately addressed by the company was whether the addition of the FCCU impact to the impacts of other relevant sources would cause concentrations above the NAAQS. The State addressed this issue in part by examining PM_{10} air quality data at its nearest monitoring site, approximately 50 miles northwest, in Charleston, Coles County, Illinois. No exceedances had been recorded at this site. The State indicated that no other facilities with significant emissions were present near the facility, but the State did not address the impacts of other emission points within the Marathon refinery. Also, unfortunately, neither the company nor the State provided a copy of the inputs or outputs of the modeling or otherwise provided full details of the analysis, most notably with respect to switches used (e.g. for stack tip downwash). Nevertheless, it is reasonable to presume that any deviations from recommended approaches to these unaddressed issues would not change the general magnitude of FCCU's estimated impact.

USEPA in its review considered other readily available information. USEPA examined the concentrations observed at the Coles County monitoring site from 1994 to 1996, which included a peak 24-hour average of 47 $\mu g/m^3$ and a 3-year average of 18 $\mu g/m^3$. USEPA also examined concentrations in Vigo County, Indiana, approximately 45 miles to the north-northeast, where the highest 24-hour average concentration in 1994 to 1996 among several sites was 75 $\mu g/m^3$, and the highest 3-year average was 29 $\mu g/m^3$. USEPA further examined emissions data submitted by Illinois to the national emissions data base. This data base shows estimated plant total emissions of particulate matter of about 700 tons per year, or about 160 pounds per hour. Much of these emissions are from combustion sources (e.g. heaters); thus, a high fraction of the total particulate matter emissions will be PM_{10} . Also, plumes for these other units are likely to be hotter and higher than the FCCU plume. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that complete modeling of the emissions of this facility would show impacts in the same order of magnitude as those found for the FCCU. Since the addition

of even ten times the modeled FCCU impact to concentrations monitored at available monitoring sites is well below the air quality standards, it is reasonable to conclude that the emissions allowed under the variance requested by Marathon would not cause violations of the NAAQS.

Ordinarily, USEPA would expect the source or the State to provide a more thorough analysis of whether a requested variance might cause a violation of the NAAQS. However, special circumstances in this case give USEPA adequate assurances that the NAAQS will not be violated. First, and most importantly, a substantial attainment margin exists, such that attainment would likely be shown even if a more complete analysis of various aspects of this issue were to show substantially greater concentrations. Second, although the nearest monitors are relatively distant, the various locations are expected to encounter similar air quality as would be found near the Marathon facility. Third, the temporary nature of the variance means that emissions are potentially elevated for a much shorter period than the five years modeled, such that the likelihood of violations is reduced, which in a qualitative way supports a conclusion that the variance will not threaten attainment.

III. Today's Action

USEPA is approving the variance adopted by the Illinois Pollution Control Board on November 21, 1996, for the Marathon Oil Company refinery near Robinson, Illinois. This variance provides a temporary emissions limit of 450 pounds per hour for the FCCU at this facility.

A noteworthy characteristic of this variance is that the period for which the variance applies is wholly in the past. Therefore, aside from judging whether the variance is approvable, USEPA must also judge whether the variance warrants inclusion as a codified element of the Illinois SIP. USEPA is undertaking an effort to revise its presentation of SIPs in a manner that more clearly identifies the enforceable elements of each SIP. Part of this effort is to eliminate referencing of variances that have expired long ago and thus are no longer of interest. The variance for Marathon alters the limitation to be enforced for approximately three months in 1996 but has no effect on the current regulations governing emissions at this facility. Consequently, USEPA is not codifying the variance for Marathon as part of the Illinois SIP. Nevertheless, for USEPA enforcement purposes, the emissions limitation that applies to

Marathon's FCCU for the June 14 to September 5, 1996, period is the limitation given in the State's variance rather than the otherwise applicable limitation in the State's regulations.

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting, allowing or establishing a precedent for any future request for revision to any SIP. Each request for revision to the SIP shall be considered separately in light of specific technical, economic, and environmental factors and in relation to relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

IV. Administrative Requirements

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866 review.

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 *et seq.*, USEPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Alternatively, USEPA may certify that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. This action affects a only one source and therefore does not affect a substantial number of small entities.

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, USEPA must undertake various actions in association with any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to state, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under state or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to state, local, or tribal governments, or the private sector, result from this action.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by March 27, 1998. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See Section 307(b)(2)).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: January 8, 1998.

Michelle D. Jordan,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region V.
[FR Doc. 98-1763 Filed 1-23-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Part 1842

Miscellaneous Revisions to the NASA FAR Supplement Coverage on Contract Administration

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This is a final rule amending the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) contract administration policy to update references to OMB Circulars and NASA internal guidance documents and to provide revised guidance on audit followup procedures.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 26, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jack Horvath, NASA, Office of Procurement, Analysis Division (Code HC), (202) 358-0456.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

NFS sections 1842.101 and 1842.7301 reference OMB Circulars A-88 and A-128. Both of these have been cancelled and replaced by OMB Circular A-133, and the NFS references are updated accordingly. Section 1842.102-70(b) provides guidance for NASA Centers on advising NASA Headquarters of changes in contract administration activity. This section is further clarified to indicate that NASA Center reports to Headquarters are required semiannually. Finally, changes are made to section 1842.7301 to include references to new NASA guidance documents and to clarify audit followup activities.

Impact

NASA certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small business entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). This final rule does not impose any reporting or recordkeeping requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Part 1842

Government procurement.

Tom Luedtke,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Procurement.

Accordingly, 48 CFR part 1842 is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 48 CFR part 1842 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 2473(c)(1).

PART 1842—CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

1842.101 [Amended]

2. In paragraph (a)(i) to section 1842.101, the phrase "OMB Circular No. 88" is revised to read "OMB Circular No. A-133".

3. In paragraph (a)(ii) to section 1842.101, "(Code HS)" is revised to read "(Code HK)".

1842.102-70 [Amended]

4. In section 1842.102-70, paragraph (b) introductory text is revised to read as follows:

1842.102-70 Review of administration and audit services.

* * * * *

(b) A summary, including a negative summary, of the Center's assessment shall be submitted by the procurement officer to the Headquarters Office of Procurement (Code HK) by not later than January 15 and June 15 of the fiscal year. The summary shall include—

* * * * *

1842.7301 [Amended]

5. Section 1842.7301 is revised to read as follows:

1842.7301 NASA external audit follow-up system.

(a) This section implements OMB Circular No. A-50, NASA Policy Directive (NPD) 1200.1, and NASA Procedures and Guidelines (NPG) 1200.1, "Management Accountability and Control, Audit Liaison, and Audit Follow-up", which provide more detailed guidance. Recommendations for external audits (OMB Circular No. A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Institutions) shall be resolved by formal review and approval procedures analogous to those at 1815.406-171.

(b) The external audit followup system tracks up contract and OMB Circular No. A-133 audits where NASA has resolution and disposition authority. The objective of the tracking system is to ensure that audit recommendations are resolved as expeditiously as possible, but at a