

**IV. Description of the Petition**

The complete petition provided by CMI contains the following information:

A. Identification of 16 HAPs emitted from the two-piece can subcategory

(Table 1). The petition provides more detailed information and analysis on ethylene glycol butyl ether (EGBE) and formaldehyde than on the other HAPs. The petitioner provides more data on

EGBE due to the fact that it is the HAP emitted in highest quantities, and more on formaldehyde because it is a probable human carcinogen emitted in moderate quantities.

TABLE 1.—IDENTIFICATION OF HAPS

HAP	Chemical abstract service registry No. (CASRN)
Ethylene glycol monobutyl ether (EGBE)	111-76-2
Formaldehyde	50-00-0
Diethylene glycol butyl ether (DGBE)	112-34-5
Diethylene glycol ethyl ether (DGEE)	111-90-0
Diethylene glycol hexyl ether (DGHE)	112-59-4
Ethylene glycol hexyl ether (EGHE)	112-25-4
Benzene	71-43-2
Ethyl benzene	100-41-4
Ethylene oxide	75-21-8
Hydrogen fluoride	7664-39-3
Methanol	67-56-1
Methyl isobutyl ketone	108-10-1
Propylene oxide	75-56-9
Styrene	100-42-5
Toluene	108-88-3
Xylenes	1330-20-7

B. For each HAP, the petitioner provides summaries of and references for qualitative and quantitative human health effects information based on data from EPA, the State of California and from industry. For EGBE and formaldehyde, CMI presents analyses of human health effects studies.

C. The petition includes emissions estimates for all HAPs listed in Table 1 and identifies the route of exposure of potential concern as being air. To assess maximum off-site air concentrations of HAPs, CMI uses a tiered modeling approach described in a 1992 EPA document, "A Tiered Approach for Assessing Risks due to Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants" (EPA-450/4-92-001). Tiered modeling involves the use of successive modeling techniques to move from conservative "worst case" estimates of the ambient concentrations of a substance emitted from a source toward more realistic site specific estimates of the ambient concentrations.

D. For all identified HAPs, the petitioner provides numerical estimates of risks to humans.

E. The CMI's ecological assessment addresses whether HAP emissions are likely to result in adverse environmental effects. The analysis and discussion consider emission levels, atmospheric fate, biodegradation and bioconcentration, and conclude that all HAP emissions from this subcategory are unlikely to have an adverse effect on aquatic biota, terrestrial wildlife, or other natural resources. To support this

position, the petitioner uses as its principle source of information the EPA's Hazardous Substances Database. For EGBE, CMI provides additional information; an ecological analysis for EGBE which was also submitted to the Agency under the petition to remove EGBE from the HAP list. The petitioner combines that analysis with a discussion of potential adverse impacts of EGBE from two-piece can operations and finds that adverse environmental effects are unlikely to occur as a result of EGBE emissions from the subcategory.

F. The petition includes an uncertainty analysis which considers emissions projections, emissions modeling, exposure analysis, mixtures and co-location of facilities.

The petition states that the data and parameters employed in each step of risk assessment embody some degree of uncertainty that could affect the conclusions drawn. The petitioner has attempted to reduce the likelihood of underestimation by using upper bound estimates, parameters and assumptions which result in maximum exposure estimates that do not exceed a health-based exposure limit for any emitted HAP. To further reduce the likelihood of underestimating risks, the petition considers additivity by summing the potential impacts of all of the emitted noncarcinogens and by summing potential impacts of all emitted carcinogens.

Dated: October 8, 1999.

**Robert Perciasepe,**  
Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 99-27142 Filed 10-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-6460-8]

**Adequacy Status of Lake and Porter Counties, Indiana Submitted Ozone Attainment Demonstration for Transportation Conformity Purposes**

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of inadequacy.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, EPA is notifying the public that EPA has found that the Lake and Porter Counties, Indiana ozone attainment demonstration does not contain adequate mobile source emission budgets. On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for conformity determinations until EPA has affirmatively found them adequate. Since the April 30, 1998, submittal does not contain adequate budgets, this attainment demonstration can not be used for future conformity determinations.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The finding and the response to comments

will be available at EPA's conformity website:

<http://www.epa.gov/oms/traq>, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity").

Ryan Bahr, environmental engineer, Regulation Development Section (AR-18J), Air Programs Branch, Air and Radiation Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-4366, bahr.ryan@epa.gov.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

Throughout this document, whenever "we", "us" or "our" is used, we mean EPA. Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region 5 sent a letter to the Indiana Department of Environmental Management on September 28, 1999, stating that the Lake and Porter Counties submitted ozone attainment demonstration does not contain adequate mobile source emission budgets. This finding will also be announced on EPA's conformity website: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/traq>, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity").

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to state air quality implementation plans and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which we determine whether a SIP's motor vehicle emission budgets are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review, and it also should not be used to prejudge EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

We've described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in guidance (May 14, 1999 memorandum titled "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision"). We followed this guidance in making our adequacy determination.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671 q.

Dated: October 7, 1999.

**David A. Ullrich,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 99-27387 Filed 10-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6460-7]

#### Adequacy Status of Milwaukee, WI Submitted Ozone Attainment Demonstration for Transportation Conformity Purposes

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of Inadequacy.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, EPA is notifying the public that EPA has found that the Milwaukee, Wisconsin ozone attainment demonstration does not contain adequate mobile source emission budgets. On March 2, 1999, the DC Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for conformity determinations until EPA has affirmatively found them adequate. Since the April 30, 1998, submittal does not contain adequate budgets, this attainment demonstration can not be used for future conformity determinations.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The finding and the response to comments will be available at EPA's conformity website: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/traq>, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity").

Michael G. Leslie, Regulation Development Section (AR-18J), Air Programs Branch, Air and Radiation Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604, (312) 353-6680, leslie.michael@epa.gov.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background:

Throughout this document, whenever "we", "us" or "our" is used, we mean EPA. Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region 5 sent a letter to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources on September 28, 1999, stating that the Milwaukee, Wisconsin submitted ozone attainment demonstration does not contain adequate mobile source emission budgets. This finding will also be announced on EPA's conformity website:

<http://www.epa.gov/oms/traq>, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity").

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to state air quality implementation plans and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which we determine whether a SIP's motor vehicle emission budgets are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review, and it also should not be used to prejudge EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

We've described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in guidance (May 14, 1999 memorandum titled "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision"). We followed this guidance in making our adequacy determination.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: October 7, 1999.

**David A. Ullrich,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 99-27388 Filed 10-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6460-9]

#### Adequacy Status of Chicago, IL Submitted Ozone Attainment Demonstration for Transportation Conformity Purposes

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of Inadequacy.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, EPA is notifying the public that EPA has found that the Chicago, Illinois ozone attainment demonstration does not contain adequate mobile source emission budgets. On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for conformity