

Implementation Plan (SIP) and Title V permit modification procedure in accordance with state of South Dakota's rule,

- 5. Permit fails to require sufficient periodic opacity monitoring,
- 6. Permit fails to require prompt reporting of opacity deviations,
- 7. Permit does not require "prompt" reporting,
- 8. Permit fails to subject the facility to Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT), and
- 9. Permit contains other Conditions (5.4, 6.1, 6.3 and 6.5) that warrant objection by the Administrator.

On March 22, 2007, the Administrator issued an Order partially granting and partially denying the petition. The Order explains the reasons for partially granting the petition and directs DENR to revise and/or remove specific permit language and/or discussions in the Statement of Basis. The Order also directs DENR to provide additional information to support certain permit Conditions. Finally, the Order explains the reasons for denying the petitioners' remaining claims.

Dated: April 4, 2007.

**Kerrigan G. Clough,**

*Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 8.*

[FR Doc. E7-7351 Filed 4-17-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[OH-166-1; FRL-8301-6]

**Adequacy Status of the Youngstown, OH, Submitted 8-Hour Ozone Redesignation and Maintenance Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of adequacy.

**SUMMARY:** In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that we have found that the motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs) for volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) in the Youngstown, Ohio area (Columbiana, Mahoning, and Trumbull Counties) are adequate for use in transportation conformity determinations. Ohio submitted these budgets with an 8-hour ozone redesignation request and maintenance plan on December 4, 2006, and February 20, 2007. As a result of our finding, Youngstown, Ohio must use the MVEBs from the submitted 8-hour ozone redesignation and maintenance plan for future conformity determinations.

**DATES:** This finding is effective May 3, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Anthony Maietta, Life Scientist, Criteria Pollutant Section (AR-18J), Air Programs Branch, Air and Radiation Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-8777, [Maietta.anthony@epa.gov](mailto:Maietta.anthony@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, whenever "we", "us" or "our" is used, we mean EPA.

**Background**

Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. On March 21, 2007, EPA Region 5 sent a letter to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency stating that the 2009 and 2018 MVEBs for the Youngstown area, which were submitted with the 8-hour ozone redesignation request and maintenance plan, are adequate. Receipt of these MVEBs was announced on EPA's conformity Web site, and no comments were submitted. The finding is available at EPA's conformity Web site: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/adequacy.htm>.

The adequate 2009 and 2018 MVEBs, in tons per day (tpd), for VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> for Youngstown are as follows:

	2005 MVEB (tpd)	2018 MVEB (tpd)
VOC .....	19.58	10.36
NO <sub>x</sub> .....	33.71	13.29

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 and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a State Implementation Plan (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). We have described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in our July 1, 2004, preamble starting at 69 FR 40038, and we used the information in these resources while making our adequacy determination. Please note that an

adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review, and it also should not be used to prejudice EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

The finding and the response to comments are available at EPA's conformity Web site: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/adequacy.htm>.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: April 5, 2007.

**Walter W. Kovalick,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. E7-7367 Filed 4-17-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0103; FRL-8124-4]

**Pyridate; Notice of Receipt of Requests to Voluntarily Cancel and to Terminate Uses of Certain Pesticide Registrations**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with section 6(f)(1) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended, EPA is issuing a notice of receipt of a request by a registrant to voluntarily cancel its registrations for all products containing the pesticide pyridate. This notice announces receipt by EPA of a request from the registrant Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., to cancel all remaining pyridate product registrations. The request would terminate the last pyridate products registered for use in the United States. The last remaining pyridate products registered under FIFRA Section 3 were cancelled in 2004 for failure to pay the required annual maintenance fee (See Unit II for **Federal Register** cite), but there are several FIFRA 24(c) Special Local Needs registrations (for weed control on mint) that are still active. Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., the registrant for all of the currently registered FIFRA 24(c) products, has requested cancellation of all of the remaining pyridate 24(c) products. EPA intends to grant this request at the close of the comment period for this announcement unless the Agency receives substantive comments within the comment period that would merit its further review of the request, or unless the registrant withdraws their request within this period. Upon acceptance of this request, any sale,