

(EPD) to Shaw Industries, Inc.—Plant No. 80 (Shaw) located in Dalton, Whitfield County, Georgia. This order constitutes final action on the petition submitted by the Georgia Center for Law in the Public Interest (GCLPI) on behalf of Georgia Forest Watch (Petitioner). 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/shaw80\\_decision2001.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitions/shaw80_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, to 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 Georgia Forest Watch to the Administrator on November 26, 2001, requesting that EPA object to a state title V operating permit issued by EPD to Shaw. The Petitioner maintains that the Shaw 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; (3) the inadequacy of the monitoring and reporting requirements; and (4) the incompleteness of the permit itself as well as the corresponding narrative.

On November 15, 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 Shaw permit is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act on the grounds raised.

Dated: December 6, 2002.

**A. Stanley Meiburg,**  
*Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4.*  
[FR Doc. 02–32905 Filed 12–27–02; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[Petition IV–2001–10; FRL–7432–3]

### Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to State Operating Permit for Shaw Industries, Inc.—Plant No. 2; Dalton (Whitfield County), GA

**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 November 15, 2002, denying a petition to object to a state operating permit issued by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) to Shaw Industries, Inc.—Plant No. 2 (Shaw) located in Dalton, Whitfield County, Georgia. This order constitutes final action on the petition submitted by the Georgia Center for Law in the Public Interest (GCLPI) on behalf of Georgia Forest Watch (Petitioner). 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/shaw2\\_decision2001.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitions/shaw2_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, to 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 Georgia Forest Watch to the Administrator on November 26, 2001, requesting that EPA object to a state title V operating permit issued by EPD to Shaw. The Petitioner maintains that the Shaw 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; (3) the inadequacy of the monitoring and reporting requirements; and (4) the incompleteness of the permit itself as well as the corresponding narrative.

On November 15, 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 Shaw permit is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act on the grounds raised.

Dated: December 6, 2002.

**A. Stanley Meiburg,**  
*Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4.*  
[FR Doc. 02–32906 Filed 12–27–02; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPT–2002–0066; FRL–7286–6]

### Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program, Proposed Chemical Selection Approach for Initial Round of Screening; Request for Comment

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice sets forth for public comment the approach EPA plans to use for selecting the first group of chemicals to be screened in the