

... certified it has no major sources in ... source category. ... the revisions and the rationale for ... proposed action are explained in ... NPR cited above and will not be ... stated here. No public comments were ... received on the NPR.

**Final Action**

EPA is approving the emission limits ... compliance schedules for the five ... sources identified above. Consequently, ... remaining condition for approval of ... the 1979 ozone attainment plan is ... satisfied. EPA also notes that the federal ... requirement for regulation of ... miscellaneous metal parts coaters does ... not apply in New Hampshire because ... the State has no major sources of this ...

As a result of today's action, the ... rules for sanctions proposed by EPA at ... 4972 (February 3, 1983) concerning ... the Southern New Hampshire Air ... Quality Control Region no longer apply. ... The Office of Management and Budget ... has exempted this rule from the ... requirements of Section 3 of Executive ... Order 12291.

Under Section 307(b)(1) of the Act, ... petitions for judicial review of this ... action must be filed in the United States ... Court of Appeals for the appropriate ... circuit by December 19, 1983. This action ... may not be challenged later in ... proceedings to enforce its requirements. ... See Sec. 307(b)(2).

**List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52**

Air pollution control, Ozone, Sulfur ... oxides, Nitrogen dioxide, Lead, ... Particulate matter, Carbon monoxide, ... Hydrocarbons, and Intergovernmental ... relations, Incorporation by reference.

Authority: Section 110(a) and 301(a) of the ... Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7410(a) ... and 7601(a)).

Note.—Incorporation by reference of the ... State Implementation Plan for the State of ... New Hampshire was approved by the ... Director of the Federal Register on July 1, ... 1982.

Dated: October 14, 1983.

William D. Ruckelshaus,  
Administrator.

**PART 52—[AMENDED]**

Part 52 of Chapter I, Title 40 of the ... Code of Federal Regulations is amended ... as follows:

**Subpart EE—New Hampshire**

1. Section 52.1520 paragraph (c) is ... amended by adding paragraph (25) as ... follows:

§ 52.1520 Identification of plan.

(c) \* \* \*

(25) Revisions to the State ... Implementation Plan for ozone, ... consisting of emission limits and ... compliance schedules for Oak Materials ... Group, Ideal Tape Co., Markem Corp., ... Essex Group, and Nashua Corp.'s ... Merrimack Facility, were submitted on ... December 23, 1982, December 30, 1982, ... January 19, 1983, and March 18, 1983.

**§ 52.1527 [Amended]**

2. Section 52.1527(a), Part D— ... conditional approval, is removed and ... reserved.

3. Section 52.1527(c), Part D—no ... action, is removed and reserved.

(FR Doc. 83-28588 Filed 10-19-83; 8:45 am)  
BILLING CODE 6550-50-M

**40 CFR Part 52**

[Region II, Docket No. 12; A-2-FRL 2454-8]

**Approval and Promulgation of ... Implementation Plans; Revision to the ... Commonwealth of Puerto Rico ... Implementation Plan**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection ... Agency.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This final rule announces that ... the Environmental Protection Agency ... (EPA) is approving, in part, a request ... from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico ... to revise its Implementation Plan. This ... approval has the effect of establishing ... EPA-approved fuel oil sulfur content ... limitations for 78 sources in Puerto Rico ... for national ambient air quality ... standards for sulfur dioxide. EPA is ... taking no action, at this time, with ... regard to eight additional sources whose ... sulfur assignments require additional ... justification.

**EFFECTIVE DATES:** The action is effective ... on October 20, 1983 for all the affected ... sources except for the Peerless facility. ... For the Peerless facility this action will ... be effective December 19, 1983 unless ... notice is received within 30 days that ... someone wishes to submit adverse or ... critical comments.

**ADDRESSES:** A copy of the ... Commonwealth of Puerto Rico's ... submittal, EPA's review of this material ... and comments received during EPA's ... public comment period are available for ... inspection during normal business hours ... at the following locations:

- Environmental Protection Agency, Air ... Programs Branch, Room 1005, Region ... II Office, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, ... New York 10278
- Environmental Protection Agency, ... Public Information Reference Unit, 401

M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. ... 20460  
Office of the Federal Register, Room ... 8401, 1100 L Street, NW., Washington, ... D.C. 20408

All comments dealing with the sulfur ... assignment for the Peerless facility ... should be addressed to: Jacqueline E. ... Schafer, Regional Administrator, ... Environmental Protection Agency, ... Region II Office, 26 Federal Plaza, New ... York, New York 10278.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** ... William S. Baker, Chief, Air Programs ... Branch, Environmental Protection ... Agency, Region II Office, 26 Federal ... Plaza, New York, New York 10278, (212) ... 264-2517.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On March 3, 1981 the Commonwealth ... of Puerto Rico's Environmental Quality ... Board (EQB) submitted to the ... Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) ... a proposed revision to its ... Implementation Plan. This revision ... concerns fuel oil sulfur content ... limitations (known as "sulfur ... assignments") applicable to 110 sources ... in Puerto Rico. During the spring and ... summer of 1982, EQB supplemented this ... original submittal with several ... additional submittals of technical ... information.

Sulfur assignments are regulated by ... the EQB in accordance with Rules 209 ... and 410 of the Commonwealth of Puerto ... Rico's "Regulation for the Control of ... Atmospheric Pollution." Appendix IX to ... this regulation (formerly called ... "Appendix B") lists the source-by- ... source sulfur assignments. This ... Appendix was originally approved by ... EPA on September 11, 1975 (40 FR ... 42191); however, since that time, ... changes have been made to certain of ... the assignments and certain omissions ... to the originally approved list were ... discovered. Today's Federal Register ... notice addresses these changes and ... omissions.

As previously noted, the March 3, ... 1981 Puerto Rico submittal identified ... sulfur assignments for 110 sources; ... however, only 95 of these were ... determined to be subject to EPA review ... and approval. Because the sulfur ... assignments for the remaining 15 ... sources were not revised from those ... previously approved by EPA on ... September 11, 1975, they are not subject ... to further EPA review.

A notice of proposed rulemaking on ... Puerto Rico's March 3, 1981 plan ... revision request was published in the ... Federal Register on February 28, 1983

(48 FR 8307). The reader is referred to this February 28, 1983 notice for a detailed description of Puerto Rico's proposal. In its February 28, 1983 notice EPA identified 85 sources whose specific sulfur assignments were being proposed for approval. For the 10 remaining sources EPA indicated that it intended to take no action at this time because of a number of unresolved questions concerning the potential of their assignments to violate the national ambient air quality standards for sulfur dioxide. EPA also advised the public that comments would be accepted as to whether the proposed revision to the Puerto Rico Implementation Plan should be approved or disapproved. During the comment period, which ended on March 30, 1983, EPA received eight comments.

#### Discussion of Comments Received

None of the comments received opposed EPA's proposed approval of the sulfur assignments for the 85 sources. Comments received from Yabucoa Sun Oil and Upjohn Manufacturing Company identified inaccuracies in Puerto Rico's data which were reflected by EPA in Table 1, "Approvable Sulfur-In-Fuel Assignment," of the February 28, 1983 proposal. Specifically Yabucoa Sun Oil's Hydrogen Plant Heater unit was listed with a proposed sulfur assignment of 0.50 percent, by weight. The company pointed out that it had been given approval by EQB to burn fuel oil with a sulfur content of 2.50 percent, by weight. The Upjohn Manufacturing Company noted that three boilers are in operation at its facility instead of two boilers as listed in Table 1.

The Puerto Rico EQB has confirmed to EPA that the sulfur assignment for Yabucoa Sun Oil's Hydrogen Plant Heater is, in fact, 2.50 percent, by weight, and that the Upjohn Manufacturing Company has been issued permits for three boilers. Since the air quality modeling analysis performed by EPA assumed the correct sulfur dioxide emission rates for these units, demonstration of attainment of standards is not affected by these two inaccurate entries. These two errors have been corrected in the listing of the sources and sulfur assignments appearing at the end of today's notice.

The State of Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection inquired as to why EPA used the COMPLEX II model in assessing the air quality impacts resulting from this plan revision. The COMPLEX II model was chosen by EPA because it is a model developed by

EPA for use in areas with terrain features such as are found in Puerto Rico. Connecticut also questioned whether the air quality impact of the proposed plan revision on total suspended particulate concentrations was analyzed. Puerto Rico's requested revision only affects sulfur dioxide emission limitations, and does not alter existing approved particulate matter emissions limits. Since these particulate matter limitations have been demonstrated to provide for attainment of air quality standards, no additional analysis was conducted by EQB or EPA.

In comments submitted on January 18, 1983 EQB urged EPA to approve its 0.20 percent fuel oil sulfur assignment for the Peerless facility. Peerless was one of the ten sources listed in Table 2, "Sulfur-In-Fuel Assignments Requiring Additional Technical Justification," of EPA's February 28, 1983 proposed rulemaking notice.

EPA has conducted an analysis of the air quality impact of this facility using an EPA-approved model. This analysis indicated that the predicted maximum air quality impact from the use of 0.20 sulfur content fuel oil at Peerless is  $7.9 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  on a 3-hour basis,  $1.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  on a 24-hour basis and  $0.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  on an annual basis. These concentrations are below the significance levels contained in Title 40 Code of Regulations Part 51, Appendix S—Emission Offset Interpretative Ruling. The significance levels for sulfur dioxide are  $25 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  on a 3-hour basis,  $5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  on a 24-hour basis and  $1.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  on an annual basis. Based on this analysis, EPA has determined that the use of 0.20 sulfur content fuel oil will not cause or contribute to violations of the national ambient air quality standards. As a result, EPA is approving the requested sulfur assignment for the Peerless facility.

Because in its February 28, 1983 proposed rulemaking notice, EPA advised the public that the Peerless facility was one of the ten sources on which no action was being taken, the public should be advised that today's approval of the Peerless sulfur assignment will not be effective until 60 days from the date of this **Federal Register** notice. If notice is received within 30 days that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments, this action to approve Peerless's sulfur assignment will be withdrawn and two subsequent notices will be published before the effective date. One notice will withdraw the final action and the other will begin a new rulemaking by

announcing a proposal of the action and establishing a comment period. This course of action is being followed because approval of Peerless's sulfur assignment is viewed as noncontroversial and it is anticipated that no adverse comments will be received.

In its January 13, 1983 letter EQB also informed EPA that it had revoked permits for several sources that were included by EQB in its implementation plan revision request. Since these sources are unable to operate, they are no longer being considered as part of today's action. Specifically, EQB has revoked the permits for eight facilities which were listed by EPA in Table 1, "Approvable Sulfur-In-Fuel Assignments," of the February 28, 1983 proposed rulemaking notice. The affected sources are as follows:

Arroyo Dye Works  
Arroyo Pharmaceutical  
Inter Hosiery  
January Industries  
Mecelo Caguas,  
Manhattan Hospital  
Univis Optical  
Vanity Paper Company

In addition, permits were revoked for emission points at the following facilities listed in Table 1 of the February 28, 1983 proposed rulemaking notice:

Central Guanica—Number 3  
Puerto Rico Distillers—Numbers 2 & 3 Inc.—  
Arecibo  
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority—Units  
1 & 4—San Juan

Based on these changes the number of sources with approvable sulfur-in-fuel assignments has been reduced from 85 to 77. However, as noted previously, the Peerless facility has been added to this list resulting in a total of 78 sources with approvable sulfur-in-fuel assignments.

In its January 18, 1983 letter EQB also informed EPA that it has revoked permits for the Oxochem facility and 29 of the 56 units at the Commonwealth Oil Refinery Corporation (CORCO) facility. These two facilities are also part of the ten listed in Table 2, "Sulfur-In-Fuel Assignments Requiring Additional Technical Justification," of the February 28, 1983 proposed rulemaking notice.

As a result of EQB's comments regarding Peerless, Oxochem and CORCO, the number of sources that EPA is not taking action on at this time has been reduced from ten to eight (27 units at CORCO are still affected). The revised list is as follows:

SULFUR-IN-FUEL ASSIGNMENTS REQUIRING ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

Source name	Description	Old percentage standards	Proposed percentage standards	
Betteroads Asphalt Aguada Cartonera Nacional Commonwealth Oil Refining Corp.	Oil Burner.....		2.50	
	2 Boilers.....		2.30	
	HCC CO BA-154.....		1.00	
	HCC CO BA-2-154.....		1.00	
	Boiler B-803.....	1.00	1.00	
	Boiler B-804.....	1.00	1.00	
	Vaccum BA-151B.....	1.00	1.00	
	Aux. Crude BA-102.....	1.00	1.00	
	Crude Vac BA101-151A.....	1.00	1.50	
	Lt. Crude BA 402-4.....	1.00	1.00	
	Hot Belt BA-201.....	1.00	1.00	
	Crude-Vac BA-101-151.....	1.00	1.50	
	Visbreaker BA-1101-2.....	1.00	1.00	
	Unif. Stripv BA-1302.....	1.00	1.00	
	Crude Charge BA-1302.....	1.00	1.00	
	Plat. Rerun AH-700.....	1.00	1.00	
	Prefact. DH-107.....	1.00	1.00	
	Xylene Splitter H-901.....	0.01	0.01	
	Detol H-801.....	0.01	0.01	
	Xylene Splitter H-902.....		1.00	
	Platfor. AH-100-102.....	0.01	0.01	
	Unit Depent. HT AH-20.....	1.00	1.00	
	Unif. Charger AH-200.....	1.00	1.00	
	Plat. Depent. AH-103.....	1.00	1.00	
	Boiler B-501-2.....	1.00	1.00	
	Boiler 503-4.....		1.00	
	Fractioner H-1202.....	1.00	1.00	
Stabilizer H-1201.....	1.00	1.00		
Octafiner H-1200.....	1.00	1.00		
Dupont Puerto Rico Inc Ponce Asphalt-Humacao Ponce Cement <sup>1</sup>	2 boilers.....		2.50	
	Dryer.....	3.10	1.00	
	Kiln #1-114.....	3.10	2.50	
	Kiln #2-114.....	3.10	2.50	
	Kiln #3-114.....	3.10	2.50	
	Kiln #4-176.....	3.10	2.50	
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority-Guayama.	Kiln #5-233.....		2.50	
	Kiln #6-518.....	3.10	2.50	
	Lime Kiln.....	3.10	2.50	
	3 Boilers.....	3.10	2.50	
	Units 1, 2, 3, 4.....	1.00	1.50	
	Units 5-1, 5-2, 6-1, 6-2.....	1.00	1.50	
	GT PBK 1-1 & 1-2.....	0.50	0.50	
	Union Carbide Caribe.....	23 Furnaces S5-1.....	0.01	0.01
		Steam SPHEATER S5-2.....	0.01	0.01
		Steam SPHEATER S5-3.....	0.01	0.01
RECYC SPHEATER S5-4.....		0.01	0.01	
Turbine GEN S3-4.....		0.05	0.05	
Boiler I S3-3.....		0.50	1.00	
Boiler II S3-3.....		0.50	1.00	
Boiler III S3-3.....		0.50	1.00	
Hidrotreater S5-5.....		0.01	0.01	
Oxide II IGT S6-20.....			0.50	
Tetralin HET. S6-13.....			0.01	
Pack Boiler <sup>2</sup> .....			0.50	
Waste Boiler <sup>2</sup> .....			0.50	

<sup>1</sup> The description of the Kilns at this source has been changed based on comments submitted to EPA by EQB in a January 18, 1983 letter.  
<sup>2</sup> The sulfur assignment for this emission point is not subject to EPA review and approval since it was developed by EQB pursuant to EPA's previously approved new source review procedures. This emission point is listed for public information purposes only.

EQB also noted in its January 18, 1983 letter that permits were revoked for four sources from Table 3, "Sulfur-In-Fuel Assignments Previously Approved by EPA," of the February 28, 1983 proposed rulemaking notice. The affected sources are as follows:

- Diazlite Inc.
- Puerto Rico Olefins
- Central Fajardo
- Puerto Rico Distillers-Camay

Also, permits for units "GR PBK 1-1 and 1-2" from the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority's Aguirre plant were revoked by EQB. These sources are not subject to EPA review and are included for informational purposes only.

One final comment contained in the January 18, 1983 letter was a request that the sulfur-in-fuel-oil assignment for Casera Foods be changed from the 1.2 percent contained in the SIP revision submitted to EPA, to 2.25 percent. Since this change in sulfur assignment requires an additional air quality modeling demonstration and must be subject to public comment, EPA is unable at this time to approve this revised sulfur assignment. However, EPA will address the revised sulfur assignment for Casera Foods in a future Federal Register.

EPA also received comments in letters dated March 25, March 30 and May 27, 1983 from the Puerto Rico Manufacturers Association (PRMA). The PRMA

requested additional time to provide information and comments on that portion of the proposed rulemaking action related to the ten sources (as just noted, based on today's action the number of affected sources has been reduced to eight) for which EPA intended to take no action. EPA agrees to receive and consider any further information and comments PRMA may have on the eight sources prior to taking final action with respect to their sulfur assignments. Since final action on these sources will have to be preceded by an additional proposal and opportunity for public comment, any additional information or comments can be accommodated without difficulty.

PRMA also noted that the proposed sulfur assignment for five units of Union Carbide Caribe, Inc. (one of the sources on which EPA is not taking action) have not changed from earlier EPA-approved sulfur limits. The fact that EPA is taking no action at this time on the sulfur assignments for the eight sources listed earlier in no way affects the applicable SIP sulfur assignment for any individual emission point whose sulfur assignment had been previously approved by EPA.

In its February 28, 1983 proposed rulemaking notice, EPA listed for purposes of public information the sulfur assignments for 35 sources developed by EQB pursuant to EPA's previously approved new source review procedures and for 15 sources whose sulfur assignments were not revised from those previously approved by EPA on September 11, 1975. During the comment period, the SK&F Company questioned why the sulfur assignments established for its facilities at Guayama and Cidra were not listed in the proposed rulemaking notice. The sulfur assignments for both facilities were established by EPA and EQB pursuant to the federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit program. Since the federally implemented PSD permit program is part of the Puerto Rico Implementation Plan (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations Part 52.2729) the sulfur assignments for both facilities are federally approved. PSD affected sources were not listed in the February 28, 1983 Federal Register notice.

In addition, EPA stated in its February 28, 1983 Federal Register notice that 80 of the 85 sources are included in the PSD baseline. In fact, all 85 of the sources are included in the baseline. EPA presumed in its determination that actual emissions are equivalent to allowable emission levels. No information was presented to EPA during the comment period to indicate that emissions differed substantially from the

allowable limits. However, if in the future it can be shown that actual emissions were significantly less than allowable emissions at the time the baseline was triggered, the actual emission levels will be used in calculating PSD increment consumption. This procedure is consistent with EPA's PSD regulations.

Finally, the Caribbean Gulf Refining Corporation noted that in Table 3 of the proposed rulemaking notice, "Sulfur-In-Fuel Assignments Previously Approved by EPA," emission unit CH-3 is no longer in operation and N-2 has been replaced by YB-1 and Yb-2. As noted previously, the sulfur assignments for these units were provided for public information purposes only and are not affected by today's notice.

**Final Determination**

Based on EPA's analysis of the Puerto Rico submittal and a review of the comments received, EPA has concluded that sulfur assignments for 78 of the 86 (as noted earlier, nine sources have shut-down since the original EQB submittal and the number of sources subject to EPA review and approval has been reduced from 95 to 86) sources can be approved as not causing a violation of the national ambient air quality standards for sulfur dioxide. Therefore, the sulfur assignments for the 78 sources meet the requirements of Section 110 of the Clean Air Act and are approved. These sources and sulfur assignments are as follows:

Source name	Description	Approved sulfur assignment <sup>1</sup>
Abbott Chemical	Boiler-econ	2.09
	Boiler	2.09
	Boiler-econ	2.09
Asfalto Mayaguezано	Dryer	2.50
Asfalto D'Oeste	Boiler	2.50
Bacardi Corp. Catano	Boiler	2.50
	Boiler	2.50
	Boiler <sup>2</sup>	2.50
Betterroads San Juan	Oil burner	2.50
Bristol Corp.	Boiler	2.50
	Boiler	1.94
Bumble Bee	Boiler	2.50
	Boiler <sup>2</sup>	2.50
	Incinerator <sup>2</sup>	2.50
Cadillac Uniform	2 boilers	2.50
Caribe Hilton	2 boilers	2.50
Casera Food	2 steam boilers	1.20
Central Cambalache	Numbers 1 & 2	2.50
	Numbers 3 & 4	2.50
Central Coloso	Boiler 1	2.50
	Boiler 2	2.50
Central Guanica	2 boilers	2.50
Central Mercedita	Boiler 5	2.50
	Boilers 6 to 9	2.50
Central Plata	Boilers 818 Y	2.50
	Boiler 1500	2.50
	Boiler 1800	2.50
Central Roig	Boilers 1 to 5	2.50
	Boiler 6	2.50
Centro Medico	2 boilers	2.50
Cerveceria Corona	3 boilers	2.50
Cerveceria India	Boiler	2.50
	Boiler	2.50

Source name	Description	Approved sulfur assignment <sup>1</sup>
Condado Holiday Inn	2 boilers	2.50
Consolidated Cigar	2 boilers	2.50
Destileria Serralles	Boiler	2.50
Durite Corp.	Boiler	2.50
Eli Lilly Co.—Carolina	3 boilers	2.50
Eli Lilly Co.—Mayaguez	2 boilers	2.50
	Incinerator	2.50
Glamourette Fashions	6 boilers	2.00
Goya De PR	Boiler 600 HP	1.50
	Boiler 800 HP	1.50
	Boiler 1200 HP	1.50
Hanes Textiles	2 boilers	2.50
Hospital Regional of Bayamon	2 boilers	2.50
Inabon Asphalt Inc.	Dryer	2.50
Industrial Siderurgica	2 boilers	2.00
Industria Lechera Puerto Rico	2 boilers	2.50
Inland Chemicals	Steam boiler	0.20
Inland Paper Co	2 boilers	2.50
La Concha Hotel	2 boilers	2.50
Merck, Sharp & Dohme	4 boilers	2.50
Molinos De Puerto Rico	Boiler	2.50
National Packing	3 boilers	2.50
	Boiler <sup>2</sup>	2.50
Neptune Packing	2 boilers	2.50
Olympic Mills	Boiler	2.50
	Ciler heater <sup>2</sup>	2.50
	Boiler <sup>2</sup>	2.50
Peerless <sup>2</sup>	Heater	0.20
Pfizer Inc.	2 boilers	2.01
	Incinerator <sup>2</sup>	2.01
Phillips Corp.	66-950-0070	0.10
	66-950-0060	0.10
	51-000-0010	2.50
	3.4-360-4010	2.50
	3.2-360-2010	0.15
	3.1-360-1020	0.15
	3.1-360-1030	2.00
	1.1-360-1010	0.15
	1.3-360-3050	2.50
	1.3-360-3020-30-40	2.50
	1.3-360-3010	2.50
	1.2-360-2050	0.15
	1.2-360-2040	0.15
	1.2-360-2030	2.50
	1.2-360-2020	2.50
	1.2-360-2010	0.15
	1.1-360-1020	2.50
	2.4-360-4050	0.15
	2.4-360-4040	2.50
	2.4-360-4030	2.50
	2.4-360-4020	2.50
	2.4-360-4010	2.50
	2.1-360-1020	0.15
	2.1-360-1010	0.15
	51-000-0020	2.45
	51-000-0030	2.45
	51-000-0040	2.45
Placco Company	Boiler	1.00
	Tube boiler	1.00
	Oil heater	1.00
	Oil heater	1.00
	2 ASP heaters	1.00
	Dryer	0.81
Ponce Asphalt-Ponce		
Ponce Candy	2 boilers	2.50
	Boiler <sup>2</sup>	2.50
Pittsburgh Plate & Glass Industries	2 boilers	1.00
Puerto Rico Asphalt—Aguadilla	2 boilers	0.01
Puerto Rico Asphalt—Arecibo	Burner	2.50
Puerto Rico Asphalt—Bayamon	Burner	1.90
Puerto Rico Asphalt—Carolina	Burner	1.90
Puerto Rico Asphalt—Salinas	Burner	2.50
Puerto Rico Dairy Inc.	2 boilers	2.50
Puerto Rico Distillers Inc.—Arecibo	3 burners	2.50
Puerto Rico Glass	Numbers 1-3	2.00
	Number 4	1.50
	Number 5	0.50

Source name	Description	Approved sulfur assignment <sup>1</sup>
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority—Aguadilla	Jet PPK 1-1 & 1-2	0.50
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority—Ceida	GT PBK 1-1 & 1-2	0.50
	Jet	0.50
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority—Covadonaga	Jet PPK 1-1 & 1-2	0.50
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority—Jobs	GT PBK 1-1 & 1-2	2.50
	Jet PPK 1-1 & 1-2	2.50
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority—Palo Seco	Units 1 & 2	2.50
	Units 3/1 & 3/2	2.50
	Units 4/1 & 4/2	2.50
	GT PBK 1-1	0.50
	GT PBK 1-2	0.50
	GT PBK 2-1	0.50
	GT PBK 2-2	0.50
	GT PBK 3-1	0.50
	GT PBK 3-2	0.50
	Jet PPK 1 & 2	0.50
	Jet 1	0.50
	Units 5 & 6	2.00
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority—San Juan	Units 7-1 & 7-2	2.00
	Units 8-1 & 8-2	2.00
	Units 9-1 & 9-2	2.00
	Units 10-1 & 10-2	2.00
	Jet PPK 1	0.50
	Jet 1	0.50
	GT PBK 1-1 & 1-2	0.50
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority—Vega Baja		
Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority—Yabucoa	GT PBK 1-1 & 1-2	0.50
RCA Del Caribe	3 boilers	2.00
Rexach Asphalt—San Juan	Burner	1.75
San Juan Cement	Kilns #1-3	2.50
	3 boilers	2.50
Schering	3 boilers	2.50
Squibb Manufacturing Inc.	2 boilers	2.48
	Brule incinerator	2.48
	Garver & Davis	2.48
	Waste heat boiler	2.48
	Incinerator <sup>2</sup>	0.50
	Boiler <sup>2</sup>	2.48
Star-Kist Tuna	4 boilers	2.50
	Boiler <sup>2</sup>	2.50
Sun Harbor	2 fire tube boilers	2.40
To-Rico Inc.	Boiler	2.50
Travenol Labs	Boiler	2.50
Union Carbide Films	2 boilers	2.50
Union Carbide Grafito	36 furnaces	0.20
	Boiler	0.20
	Boiler	0.20
	C1S-1, 2 and 3 <sup>2</sup>	0.20
	2 pre-heaters <sup>2</sup>	0.20
	Hot water heater <sup>2</sup>	0.20
	Incinerator <sup>2</sup>	0.20
	3 boilers	2.50
Upjohn Manufacturing Corp.		
V. Soske Shops Inc.	Boiler	2.50
Winthrop Labs	2 boilers	2.00
Yabucoa Sun Oil	Boilers	2.50
	Crude heaters	2.50
	Heaters	2.00
	Hydrotreater	2.50
	Hydrogen plant heater	2.50
	Desulf. heater	2.50
	Solar generator	2.50

<sup>1</sup> Percent sulfur, by weight.  
<sup>2</sup> The sulfur assignments for these emission points are not subject to EPA review and approval since they were developed by EQB pursuant to EPA's previously approved new source review procedures. These emission points are listed for public information purposes only.  
<sup>3</sup> The sulfur assignment for this source is effective December 19, 1983.

As previously noted, EPA intends to take no action at this time on the fuel oil sulfur assignments for the eight

remaining sources listed earlier because of a number of unresolved questions concerning their potential to violate the national ambient air quality standards for sulfur dioxide. EQB and EPA have agreed to reevaluate in the near future the sulfur assignments for these sources using a more refined air quality impact analysis.

With the exception of the approval of a 0.20 percent sulfur assignment for the Peerless facility discussed earlier, this action is being made immediately effective because it imposes no hardship on the affected sources, and no purpose would be served by delaying its effective date.

Under Section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, judicial review of this action is available only by the filing of a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of today. Under Section 307(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act, the requirements which are the subject of today's notice may not be challenged later in civil or criminal proceedings brought by EPA to enforce these requirements.

Pursuant to the provision of 5 U.S.C. 605(b) the Administrator has certified that SIP approvals under Section 110 of the Clean Air Act will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (46 FR 8709, January 27, 1981). The attached rule constitutes a SIP approval under Section 110 within the terms of the January 27 certification. This action only approves an action by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It imposes no requirements.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Ozone, Sulfur oxides, Nitrogen dioxide, Lead, Particulate matter, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference.

(Secs. 110 and 301, Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7410 and 7601))

Dated: October 14, 1983.

**Note.**—Incorporation by reference of the Implementation Plan for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was approved by the Director of the Federal Register on July 1, 1982.

William D. Ruckelshaus,

Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

## PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Title 40, Chapter I, Subchapter C, Part 52, Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

### Subpart BBB—Puerto Rico

1. Section 52.2720 is amended by adding new paragraph (c)(39) as follows:

#### § 52.2720 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(30) Revision submitted on March 3, 1981 by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico's Environmental Quality Board which establishes fuel oil sulfur content limitations (known as "sulfur assignments") applicable to the 110 sources. On October 20, 1983, 78 of these 110 sources had their sulfur assignments approved by EPA.

[FR Doc. 83-28589 Filed 10-19-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

### 40 CFR Part 60

[AD-FRL 2387-5]

#### Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources; Alternative Sampling Procedures for Sulfuric Acid Plants

##### Correction

In FR Doc. 83-26378 beginning on page 44700 in the issue of Thursday, September 29, 1983, make the following corrections:

#### § 60.84 [Corrected]

1. On page 44701, first column, § 60.84(d), lines six and seven from the bottom, the formula should be corrected to read as follows:

$$E_{SO_2} = C_{SO_2} S \frac{1}{0.265 - 0.0126(O_2) - A(CO_2)}$$

2. On the same page, column two, § 60.84 (d), column three of the table, line three "2.660 × 10<sup>-6</sup>" should read "2.660 × 10<sup>-6</sup>" and line four "2.660 × 10<sup>-7</sup>" should read "1.660 × 10<sup>-7</sup>".

#### § 60.85 [Corrected]

3. On the same page, column three, § 60.85 (e), last line "C<sub>SO<sub>2</sub></sub>" should read "C<sub>SO<sub>2</sub></sub>".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Research and Special Programs Administration

#### 49 CFR Parts 192 and 195

[Amdts. 192-46 and 195-29; Docket No. PS-74]

#### Transportation of Natural and Other Gas and Hazardous Liquids by Pipeline; Repair or Removal of Girth Weld Defects

**AGENCY:** Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB), Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** These amendments change the pipeline construction requirements of Parts 192 and 195 by modifying the present regulations on the repair or removal of defective girth welds utilizing performance standards for weld repair. The revised requirements permit the more cost effective repair of a weld crack as well as the repair of any weld defect in a previously repaired area provided that qualified weld repair procedures are followed. The procedures must assure that the soundness and mechanical properties of a repaired weld will be equal to an acceptable original weld.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 21, 1983.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William A. Gloe, 202-426-2082, regarding the content of these amendments, or the Dockets Branch, 202-426-3148, regarding copies of the amendments or other information in the docket.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The requirements of 49 CFR Parts 192 and 195 governing the repair or removal of girth weld defects were derived from editions of industry codes that were in effect at the time of issuance of the original Federal pipeline safety regulations. As derived from American National Standards Institute (ANSI) B31.8 for gas pipelines, and from ANSI B31.4 for liquid pipelines, Part 192 and Part 195 treat weld repair and removal differently. Part 192 requires that "a weld must be removed if it has a crack that is more than 2 inches long or that penetrates either the root or second bead." By this language, and by a previous statement that unacceptable welds must be removed or repaired, Part 192 permits the repair of certain cracks that are up to 2 inches long. The 1983 edition of ANSI B31.8 specifies that: