

the requirements of the Act on the grounds raised.

Dated: November 6, 2002.

**J.I. Palmer, Jr.,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

[FR Doc. 02-29332 Filed 11-18-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[Petition IV-2001-6; FRL-7409-8]

### Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to State Operating Permit for King Finishing; Dover (Screven County), Georgia

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final order on petition to object to a state operating permit.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Clean Air Act section 505(b)(2) and 40 CFR 70.8(d), the EPA Administrator signed an order, dated October 9, 2002, denying a petition to object to a state operating permit issued by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) to King Finishing located in Dover, Screven County, Georgia. This order constitutes final action on the petition submitted by the Georgia Center for Law in the Public Interest (GCLPI or Petitioner) on behalf of the Sierra Club. Pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act (the Act) any person may seek judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of this notice under section 307 of the Act.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the final order, the petition, and all pertinent information relating thereto are on file at the following location: EPA Region 4, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. The final order is also available electronically at the following address: [http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitions/kingfinishing\\_decision2001.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitions/kingfinishing_decision2001.pdf).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Art Hofmeister, Air Permits Section, EPA Region 4, at (404) 562-9115 or [hofmeister.art@epa.gov](mailto:hofmeister.art@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Act affords EPA a 45-day period to review and, as appropriate, object to operating permits proposed by state permitting authorities under title V of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7661-7661f. Section 505(b)(2) of the Act and 40 CFR 70.8(d) authorize any person to petition the EPA

Administrator to object to a title V operating permit within 60 days after the expiration of EPA's 45-day review period if EPA has not objected on its own initiative. 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.

GCLPI submitted a petition on behalf of the Sierra Club to the Administrator on October 9, 2001, requesting that EPA object to a state title V operating permit issued by EPD to King Finishing. The Petitioner maintains that the King Finishing permit is inconsistent with the Act because of: (1) The inadequacy of the public participation process and related public notice; (2) the permit's apparent limitation of enforcement authority and credible evidence; and (3) the inadequacy of the monitoring and reporting requirements.

On October 9, 2002, the Administrator issued an order denying this petition. The order explains the reasons behind EPA's conclusion that the Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the King Finishing permit is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act on the grounds raised.

Dated: November 6, 2002.

**J.I. Palmer, Jr.,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

[FR Doc. 02-29333 Filed 11-18-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[WA-01-003; FRL-7410-3]

### Adequacy Status of the State Implementation Plan Revision for Carbon Monoxide in the Spokane Serious Nonattainment Area, Spokane, WA

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

**ACTION:** Notice of adequacy determination.

**SUMMARY:** In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that we have found the motor vehicle emissions budget submitted in the State Implementation Plan Revision for Carbon Monoxide in the Spokane Serious Nonattainment Area, Spokane, Washington adequate for conformity purposes. On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that submitted SIPs cannot be used for

conformity determinations until EPA has affirmatively found them adequate. As a result of our finding, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council, Washington Department of Transportation, and the U.S. Department of Transportation are required to use the motor vehicle emissions budget in this submitted attainment plan for future transportation conformity determinations.

**DATES:** This finding is effective December 4, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The finding will be available at EPA's conformity Web site: <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 Wayne Elson, U.S. EPA, Region 10 (OAQ-107), 1200 Sixth Ave, Seattle WA 98101; (206) 553-1463 or [elson.wayne@epa.gov](mailto:elson.wayne@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region 10 sent a letter to the Washington Department of Ecology on November 1, 2002, stating that the motor vehicle emissions budget in the State Implementation Plan Revision for Carbon Monoxide in the Spokane Serious Nonattainment Area, Spokane, Washington is adequate.

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's 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 budget is adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review.

We have 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.