

annual average rate for NO<sub>x</sub> for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.70 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1 and 2 shall not be greater than 723,608 mmBtu and 731,528 mmBtu respectively; units 1 and 2 at Wansley in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO<sub>x</sub> for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.43 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1 and 2 shall not be less than 43,995,205 mmBtu and 46,349,195 mmBtu respectively; units 4 and 5 at Watson in Mississippi, in which the actual annual average rate for NO<sub>x</sub> for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.60 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 4 and 5 shall not be greater than 12,086,872 mmBtu and 20,127,887 mmBtu respectively; and units 1–7 at Yates in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO<sub>x</sub> for units 1–7 shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.59 lb/mmBtu for units 1–3, 0.44 lb/mmBtu for units 4 and 5, and 0.36 lb/mmBtu for units 6 and 7, and the actual heat input for units 1–3 shall not be greater than 2,185,838 mmBtu for unit 1, and 2,694,591 mmBtu each for units 2 and 3, and not less than 4,188,728 mmBtu each for units 4 and 5, and 10,404,101 mmBtu and 11,655,498 mmBtu each for units 6 and 7, respectively. The Designated Representative is Charles D. McCrary.

U.S. EPA is also issuing, under 40 CFR 76.11, an additional NO<sub>x</sub> averaging plan with which the following units shall comply for compliance year 1999: units 1–4 at Gallatin in Tennessee, in which the actual annual average rate for NO<sub>x</sub> for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.42 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1–4 shall not be less than 12,874,000 mmBtu, 14,938,000 mmBtu, 18,188,000 mmBtu, and 18,527,000 mmBtu respectively; units 1–5 at Colbert in Alabama, in which the actual annual average rate for NO<sub>x</sub> for each unit 1–4 shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.47 lb/mmBtu, and for unit 5, 0.49 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1–5 shall not be less than 12,412,000 mmBtu, 12,410,000 mmBtu, 12,189,000 mmBtu, 10,372,000 mmBtu, and 26,441,000 mmBtu respectively; and units 1–10 at Johnsonville in Tennessee, in which the actual annual average rate for NO<sub>x</sub> for each unit 1–10 shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.51 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1–10 shall not be greater than 7,469,000 mmBtu, 7,440,000 mmBtu, 7,390,000 mmBtu, 6,348,000 mmBtu, 5,590,000 mmBtu, 6,205,000 mmBtu, 8,880,000 mmBtu, 8,805,000 mmBtu, 8,534,000 mmBtu, and 8,451,000

mmBtu respectively. The Designated Representative is Joseph R. Bynum.

Under each plan, the actual Btu-weighted annual average NO<sub>x</sub> emission rate for the units in the plans shall be less than or equal to the Btu-weighted annual average NO<sub>x</sub> emission rate for the units had they each been operated, during the same period of time, in compliance with the applicable emission limitations under 40 CFR 76.5, 76.6, or 76.7.

Dated: November 18, 1999.

**Larry F. Kertcher,**

*Acting Director, Clean Air Markets Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs, Office of Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 99–30779 Filed 11–26–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[AZ–018–NOA; FRL–6481–5]

### Adequacy Status of the Maricopa County Submitted CO Attainment Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes

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

**ACTION:** Notice of adequacy.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, EPA is notifying the public that we have found that submitted Maricopa County Carbon Monoxide (CO) Attainment Plan is adequate for conformity purposes. As a result of our finding, the Maricopa Association of Governments and the Federal Highway Administration are required to use the CO motor vehicle emissions budget from the submitted CO Attainment Plan for future conformity determinations. This determination is effective December 14, 1999.

**DATES:** This budget is effective December 14, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The finding and the response to comments are 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"). You may also contact Karina O'Connor, U.S. EPA, Region IX, Air Division AIR–2, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105; (415) 744–1247 or [occonnor.karina@epa.gov](mailto:occonnor.karina@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Today's document is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region IX sent a letter to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on November 5,

1999 stating that the submitted Maricopa County CO Attainment Plan is adequate for conformity purposes. This finding has also been announced on our 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. Our conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to state air quality implementation plans (SIPs) 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 our completeness review which is required by section 110(k)(1) of the Clean Air Act, and it also should not be used to prejudice 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 memo 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: November 8, 1999.

**Felicia Marcus,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 99–30899 Filed 11–26–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6481–6]

### 42 U.S.C. 122(h), Proposed Administrative Agreement for Collection of CERCLA Past Costs

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to execute an Administrative Agreement (Agreement) under section 122 of CERCLA for collection of a percentage of past response costs at the Gary