extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The Energy Star Buildings and Green Lights programs are voluntary programs aimed at preventing pollution. These programs focus on reducing utility-generated emissions by reducing the demand for energy. EPA first created the Green Lights program to encourage corporations, state and local governments, colleges and universities, and other organizations to adopt energy efficient lighting as a profitable means of preventing pollution and improving lighting quality. With the success of the Green Lights program, EPA developed the Energy Star Buildings program to encourage business of all sizes, state and local governments, Federal Agencies, academic and other non-profit organizations to make more comprehensive energy efficiency improvements in their buildings. In designing the Energy Star Buildings program, EPA made the energy efficient lighting upgrades of the Green Lights program the first stage of the Energy Star Buildings' five-stage upgrade program. Both of these programs need to collect initial information to establish participation in them, monitor progress in completing energy efficiency upgrades, and measuring reductions in energy usage. EPA will use information requested from participants to further evaluate the overall results of the program and make adjustments, if necessary. Participation in the Energy Star Buildings and Green Lights programs is voluntary and may be terminated by Partners, Allies, Endorsers or EPA at any time. EPA does not expect that organizations will deem any information collected under the program to be confidential. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15. The **Federal Register** document required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on 4/19/99 (FR Vol 64., No. 74); no comments were received.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information will vary depending on the type of participant, and the specific collection activity. For example: the total estimated respondent burden for completing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is 5.1 hour per respondent. The burden for collection requirements associated with applying for the Energy Star label is estimated to be 3.8 hours per respondent. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Respondents/Affected Entities: Participants in EPA' Energy Star Buildings (Green Lights, Energy Small Business) voluntary program.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 4,318.

Frequency of Response: One-time, annually, and/or periodically, dependent upon type of respondent.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 217,714 hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Capital, Operating/Maintenance Cost Burden: $14,716.

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques to the following addresses. Please refer to EPA ICR No. 1772.02 and OMB Control No. 2060–0347 in any correspondence.

Ms. Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Policy, Regulatory Information Division (2137), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460;

and

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: August 6, 1999.

Richard T. Westlund,

Acting Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 99–20867 Filed 8–11–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[Region VII Tracking No. 081–1081; FRL–6418–8]

Inadequacy Status of Submitted State Implementation Plans for Transportation Conformity Purposes

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of inadequacy status.

SUMMARY: In this document, Region VII is augmenting the national list of submitted State Implementation Plans (SIP) with motor vehicle emissions budgets that have been reviewed for adequacy for transportation conformity purposes as identified in 64 FR 31217–31219 (June 10, 1999). This document describes a finding of inadequacy for the emissions budget for St. Louis, Missouri.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher D. Hess, U.S. EPA, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101; (913) 551–7213 or hess.christopher@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's conformity rule, 40 CFR part 93, 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).

On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that submitted SIPs cannot be used for conformity determinations unless EPA has affirmatively found the conformity budget adequate. Where EPA finds a budget inadequate, it cannot be used for further conformity determinations.

The new process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets is contained in a May 14, 1999, memo titled ''Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision.'' EPA will be revising the conformity rule to codify this guidance. You can obtain this guidance at *http://www.epa.gov/oms/transp.htm*.

Status of Submitted Budgets

In Region VII, the only submitted budgets for transportation conformity purposes pertain to the St. Louis metropolitan area and that area's 15% plan and attainment demonstration for the pollutant ozone.

In a letter dated May 27, 1999, from EPA to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Region VII determined that the area's budgets are inadequate and we are publishing that finding in this document. As stated in the May 14, 1999, guidance, EPA's adequacy review is not to be used to prejudge EPA's ultimate approval or disapproval of the submitted SIPs. Approvability of the SIPs will be addressed in a future rulemaking.

Because the area has performed certain other emissions analyses, its transportation programs may continue despite this finding of inadequacy regarding submitted budgets. Furthermore, the state is anticipated to submit new budgets by November 15, 1999.

Dated: July 30, 1999.

William Rice,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VII.

[FR Doc. 99–20866 Filed 8–11–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6419–3]

Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to Proposed State Operating Permit for Monroe Electrical Generating Plant Entergy Louisiana, Inc.; Monroe, Ouachita Parish, Louisiana

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of final order on petition to object to State operating permit.

SUMMARY: This document announces that the EPA Administrator has partially granted and partially denied a petition to object to a proposed State operating permit issued by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) to the Monroe Electrical Generating Plant, Entergy Louisiana, Inc., Monroe, Ouachita Parish, Louisiana. Pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act (Act), petitioner may seek judicial review of those portions of the petition which EPA denied in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of this decision under section 307 of the Act.

ADDRESSES: You may review copies of the final order, the petition, and other supporting information at the EPA, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733. If you wish to examine these documents, you should make an appointment at least 24 hours before visiting day. The final order is also available electronically at the following address: http:www.epa.gov/ ttn/ oarpg/ramain.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jole Luehrs, Chief, Air Permitting Section, Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, EPA, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, telephone (214) 665–7250, or electronic mail at luehrs.jole@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Act affords EPA a 45-day period to review, and object to as appropriate, operating permits proposed by State permitting authorities. Section 505(b)(2) of the Act authorizes any person to petition the EPA Administrator within 60 days after the expiration of this review period to object to State operating permits if EPA has not done so. Petitions must be based only on objections to the permit that were raised with reasonable specificity during the public comment period provided by the State, unless the petitioner demonstrates that it was impracticable to raise these issues during the comment period or the grounds for the issues arose after this period.

Ms. Merrijane Yerger, Managing Director of the Citizens for Clean Air and Water (Petitioner), submitted a petition to the Administrator on February 9, 1999, seeking EPA's objection to the proposed title V operating permit to be issued to the Monroe Electrical Generating Plant (Monroe plant) owned and operated by Entergy Louisiana, Inc. (Entergy) and located in the city of Monroe, Ouachita Parish, Louisiana. The petition objects to issuance of the proposed permit on five grounds: (1) LDEQ failed to subject the Monroe plant to prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) review, (2) the maximum capacity of the Monroe plant may have been increased by some unknown method at some time between 1976 and the time of the title V application without being subject to PSD review and New Source Performance Standards, (3) the proposed permit fails to incorporate enforceable one-hour maximum emission rate limitations for sulfur dioxide and other criteria pollutants, (4) the proposed permit includes apparent annual emissions increases that suggest PSD review should be conducted for the sulfur dioxide emissions, and (5) sufficient information has not been provided in Entergy's permit application to ensure compliance with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act disposal requirements.

In addition, the Petitioner requested the following: (1) that EPA issue an information request letter to Entergy and the City of Monroe under section 114 of the Act, requiring them to disclose all matters raised by this petition; and (2) that EPA conduct an on-site inspection of the Monroe plant to determine whether PSD and NSPS have been triggered.

On June 11, 1999, the Administrator issued an order partially granting and partially denying the petition. The order explains the reasons behind EPA's conclusion that the proposed title V operating permit fails to assure compliance with applicable PSD requirements as set forth in the Louisiana State Implementation Plan. The order also explains the reasons for denying Petitioner's remaining claims.

Dated: July 30, 1999.

W. B. Hathaway,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 99–20868 Filed 8–11–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6419–8]

Request for Applications for the National Environmental Education Advisory Council

Due Date: September 24, 1999.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Section 9(a) and (b) of the National Environmental Education Act of 1990 (PL–101–619) mandates a National Environmental Education Advisory Council. The Advisory Council provides advice, consults with, and makes recommendations to the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on matters relating to the activities, functions, and policies of EPA under the Act. EPA is requesting nominations of candidates for membership on the Council. The Act requires that the Council be comprised of eleven (11) members appointed by the Administrator of EPA, after consultation with the Secretary of U.S. Department of Education. Members represent a balance of perspectives, professional qualifications, and experience. The Act