will be considered, except those pertaining to standard provisions under 40 CFR 72.9 and issues not relevant to the draft NO_X compliance plans.

Hearings. To request a public hearing on the draft NO_X compliance plans, submit a written request stating the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing and explaining how a hearing will contribute to the decision-making process. EPA may schedule a hearing if EPA finds that it will contribute to the decision-making process by clarifying significant issues affecting the draft NO_X compliance plans.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jenny Jachim, U.S. EPA Region 4, (404) 562–9126.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: If no significant, adverse comments are timely received, no further activity is contemplated in relation to the draft NO_X compliance plans and the NO_X compliance plans issued as a direct final action in the notice of final NO_X compliance plans published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register** will automatically become final on the date specified in that notice. If significant, adverse comments are timely received on a draft NO_X compliance plan, the relevant NO_X compliance plan in the notice of final NO_X compliance plans will be withdrawn. Because the Agency will not institute a second comment period on this notice of draft NO_X compliance plans, any parties interested in commenting should do so during this comment period.

For further information and a detailed description of the NO_X compliance plans, see the information provided in the notice of final NO_X compliance plans elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**.

Dated: November 18, 1999.

Larry F. Kertcher,

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

[FR Doc. 99–30778 Filed 11–26–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6480–9]

Acid Rain Program: Acid Rain Compliance Plan

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of final nitrogen oxides compliance plans.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency is issuing, as a direct final action, nitrogen oxides (NO_X) compliance plans in accordance with the Acid Rain Program regulations (40 CFR parts 72 and 76). Because the Agency does not anticipate receiving adverse comments, the compliance plans are being issued as a direct final action.

DATES: The NO_X compliance plans issued in this direct final action will be final on January 10, 2000 unless significant, adverse comments are received by December 29, 1999. If significant, adverse comments are timely received on a NO_X compliance plan in this direct final action, the relevant NO_X compliance plan will be withdrawn through a notice in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: *Administrative Records.* The administrative record for the NO_X compliance plans, except information protected as confidential, may be viewed during normal operating hours at U.S. EPA Region 4, 100 Alabama Street SW, Atlanta, GA 30303.

Comments. Send comments to Winston A. Smith, Director, Air, Pesticides, and Toxic Management Division at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jenny Jachim, U.S. EPA Region 4, (404) 562–9126.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Significant, adverse public comments received on a NO_X compliance plan in this direct final action that are timely received will be addressed in a subsequent approval or denial of a NO_X compliance plan. Such approval or denial will be based on the draft NO_X compliance plan in the notice of draft NO_X compliance plan that is published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register** and that is identical to this direct final action.

U.S. EPA is issuing, under 40 CFR 76.11, a NO_X averaging plan with which the following units shall comply for compliance year 1999: units 1–4 at Arkwright in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X for each unit shall not exceed the alternative contemporaneous annual emission limitation (ACEL) of 1.00 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1–4 shall not be greater than 652,199 mmBtu each; units 1–4 at Bowen in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.44 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1–4 shall not be less than 42,974,115, mmBtu, 39,890,926 mmBtu, 59,808,558 mmBtu, and 56,547,329 mmBtu respectively; unit 2 at Branch in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.80 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input shall not be greater than 13,635,168 mmBtu; units 4–7 at Crist in Florida, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.59 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 4–7 shall not be greater than 4,330,920 mmBtu, 3,518,988 mmBtu, 13,451,097 mmBtu, and 20,422,854 mmBtu respectively; units 1 and 2 at Daniel in Mississippi, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.30 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1 and 2 shall not be less than 21,244,417 mmBtu and 29,987,051 mmBtu respectively; units 1 and 2 at Gadsden in Alabama, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.67 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1 and 2 shall not be greater than 3,412,000 mmBtu and 2,160,000 mmBtu respectively; units 1–5 at Gaston in Alabama, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X for units 1–4 shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.45 lb/mmBtu, and for unit 5, 0.48 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1–4 shall not be less than 13,871,000 mmBtu, 15,349,000 mmBtu, 13,799,000 mmBtu, 13,796,000 mmBtu respectively, and for unit 5, not greater than 46,496,000 mmBtu; units 1–4 at Hammond in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X for units 1–3 shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.80 lb/mmBtu, and for unit 4, 0.50 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1–3 shall not be greater than 3,252,464 mmBtu each; units 1–3 at Kraft in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.60 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input for units 1–3 shall not be greater than 1,434,816 mmBtu each; units 1 and 2 at McDonough in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X for each unit shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.45 lb/mmBtu; unit 1 at McIntosh in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.84 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input shall not be greater than 5,272,714 mmBtu; unit 3 at Mitchell in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.65 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input shall not be greater than 3,087,400 mmBtu; unit 3 at Scherer in Georgia, in which the actual annual average rate for NO_X shall not exceed the ACEL of 0.32 lb/mmBtu, and the actual heat input shall not be less than 51,627,214 mmBtu; units 1 and 2 at Scholz in Florida, in which the actual

annual average rate for NO_X 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_X 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_X 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_X 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_X 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_X 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_X 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_X 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_X emission rate for the units in the plans shall be less than or equal to the Btu-weighted annual average NO_X 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 *oconnor.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 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 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