landing gear brake system, per the service bulletin.

(1) If no hydraulic accumulator with P/N BACA11E2 (vendor P/N 2660472–2 or 2660472M2) is installed: No further action is required by this paragraph.

(2) If any hydraulic accumulator with P/N BACA11E2 (vendor P/N 2660472–2 or 2660472M2) is installed: Within 18 months or 6,000 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, whichever is first, replace the subject hydraulic accumulator with a new or modified accumulator, per the service bulletin.

Note 6: Inspections and replacements done prior to the effective date of this AD per Boeing Special Attention Service Bulletin 737–32–1334, dated May 11, 2000, are considered acceptable for compliance with the corresponding actions in this AD.

Note 7: Boeing Special Attention Service Bulletin 737–32–1334, Revision 1, refers to Parker Service Bulletin 2660472–29–63, dated December 12, 2000, as the appropriate source of service information for modification of the hydraulic accumulators that are subject to replacement per Service Bulletin 737–32–1334, Revision 1.

Spares

(e) As of the effective date of this AD, no one may install a hydraulic accumulator with a P/N listed in paragraph (a)(2), (b)(2), (c)(2), or (d)(2) of this AD on any airplane.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(f) 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, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Seattle ACO.

Note 8: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Seattle ACO.

Special Flight Permits

(g) 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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 13, 2002.

Ali Bahrami,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 02–12517 Filed 5–17–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 245–0311b; FRL–7202–2]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a revision to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_X) and carbon monoxide (CO) from electric power generating steam boilers. We are proposing to approve a local rule under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: Any comments on this proposal must arrive by June 19, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

You can inspect a copy of the submitted rule revision and EPA's technical support document (TSD) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see a copy of the submitted rule revision and TSD at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 ''I'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX; (415) 947–4118.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposal addresses the approval of local BAAQMD Rule 9–11. In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, we are approving this local rule in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe this SIP revision is not controversial. If we receive adverse comments, however, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in subsequent action based on this proposed rule. We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, please see the direct final rule.

Dated: April 17, 2002.

Keith Takata,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 02–12411 Filed 5–17–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MN66–01–7291b; FRL–7206–4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Minnesota

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: We are proposing to approve a site-specific revision to the Minnesota Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Marathon Ashland Petroleum, LLC (Marathon Ashland), located in the cities of St. Paul Park and Newport, Washington County, Minnesota. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency requested in their February 6, 2000, submittal that EPA approve into the Minnesota SO_2 SIP certain portions of the Title V permit for Marathon Ashland and remove the Marathon Ashland Administrative Order from the state SO_2 SIP. The request is approvable because it satisfies the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Specifically, we are proposing to approve into the SIP only those portions of the permit cited as ''Title I condition: SIP for SO_2 NAAQS 40 CFR pt. 50 and Minnesota State Implementation Plan (SIP).'' In addition, we are proposing to remove the Marathon Ashland Administrative Order from the state SO_2 SIP. In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, we are approving the SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal, because we view this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipate no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If we receive adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. We will not