

# HEINONLINE

Citation: 52 Fed. Reg. 8723 1987



Content downloaded/printed from  
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)  
Tue Mar 1 17:14:06 2016

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

Test Report

---

Thursday  
March 19, 1987

---

**Part IV**

**Environmental  
Protection Agency**

---

**40 CFR Part 61**

**National Emission Standards for  
Hazardous Air Pollutants; Review and  
Revision of the Standards for Mercury;  
Final Rule; Review**

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## 40 CFR Part 61

[AD-FRL-3072-7]

### National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Review and Revision of the Standards for Mercury

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

**ACTION:** Final Rule; Review.

**SUMMARY:** Today's action promulgates revisions to the national emission standards for the hazardous air pollutant mercury [Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) Registry Number 7439-97-6]. Revisions were proposed in the Federal Register on December 26, 1984. These revisions add monitoring, reporting, and one-time emission testing requirements to the standards for mercury-cell chlor-alkali plants and allow an owner or operator the option of developing and submitting for approval a plant-specific monitoring plan. The revisions also allow the owner or operator of any facility affected by 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart E, up to 15 days to verify the validity of source test data prior to reporting the results to the Administrator.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 19, 1987. These revisions become effective upon promulgation and apply to all new and existing affected facilities.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, judicial review of the actions taken by this notice is available *only* by the filing of a petition for review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit within 60 days of today's publication. Under section 307(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act, the requirements that are the subject of today's notice may not be challenged later in civil or criminal proceedings brought by EPA to enforce these requirements.

**ADDRESSES:** *Review Documents.* The document summarizing emissions information gathered during the review of the standards may be obtained from the EPA Library (MD-35), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-2777. Please refer to "Review of National Emission Standards for Mercury," EPA-450/3-84-014b.

The document summarizing current information on the potential health effects associated with mercury exposures may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22161, telephone

number (703) 487-4650 (NTIS stock number PB-85-123925). Refer to "Mercury Health Effects Update," EPA-600/8-84-019F, August 1984. The price of the document, including shipping, is \$19.95.

**Docket.** Docket No. A-82-41, containing information considered by EPA in developing the revisions, is available for public inspection and copying between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, at EPA's Central Docket Section, West Tower Lobby, Gallery 1, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

**Policy issues:** Ms. Dianne Byrne or Mr. Gil Wood, Standards Development Branch, Emission Standards and Engineering Division (MD-13), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-5578  
**Technical issues:** Mr. John Copeland or Dr. James Crowder, Industrial Studies Branch, Emission Standards and Engineering Division (MD-13), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-5601.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Summary of Review and Revisions

The national emission standards for mercury limit emissions from mercury ore processing facilities, sludge incineration and drying plants, and mercury-cell chlor-alkali plants. During its review of the standards, the EPA identified two areas in which revisions were warranted. The first area pertains to the appropriate amount of time, following completion of performance tests, that should be provided for reporting the results of those tests to the Administrator. The standards allowed 30 days following completion of the performance tests for the samples to be analyzed and emissions to be determined and required that the results be reported on the day after the determination was made. These revisions change that requirement. An owner or operator is now allowed 15 days after the determination of emissions to notify the Administrator of the test results. The additional 2 weeks are to provide time for the results to be reviewed and verified at the source before they are sent to the Administrator.

The second area in which revisions to the standards were warranted pertains to the monitoring and recordkeeping requirements for chlor-alkali plants. Compliance data for the hydrogen and

end box ventilation streams at mercury-cell chlor-alkali plants indicated that, while many plants emit at levels just below the standard during normal operations, excess emissions have occurred during periods of control systems failures. To ensure that control systems are properly operated and maintained on a continuous basis, specific monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements have been added to the standards as well as a requirement for a one-time performance test. These requirements were fully described in the preamble to the proposed revisions (49 FR 50146, December 26, 1984).

In response to comments received on the proposed requirements, an alternative monitoring/recordkeeping/reporting provision has been added to the standards. This alternative allows each owner or operator of a mercury-cell chlor-alkali plant the option of developing and submitting for approval a plant-specific monitoring plan. To be approved, an alternative monitoring plan must adhere to the guidelines that are provided in the regulation.

The proposed standards required each owner or operator of a mercury-cell chlor-alkali plant that uses housekeeping practices to comply with the standard for cell room ventilation systems to maintain daily records of all leaks or spills of mercury in the cell room. These requirements have not changed.

As explained in the preamble to the proposed revisions and in the background document for the promulgated standards, the review of the standards did not indicate a need to revise the emission limits for the three source categories that are covered by the standards or to regulate additional sources of mercury emissions under these standards at this time.

##### II. Summary of Impacts of the Revisions

Extending the time limit for the submission of test data is intended to improve the quality of test results that are submitted and should have no environmental, economic, cost or energy impacts.

The addition of monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements for mercury-cell chlor-alkali plants will benefit the environment by encouraging plant operators to adopt the best practices for operating and maintaining process equipment and control devices. The additional reduction in mercury emissions has not been quantified. The average yearly cost to each plant during the first 3 years that the revisions are in

effect would be approximately \$9,000. Most of this cost is attributable to the one-time performance test.

### III. Public Participation

Prior to proposal of the revisions, interested parties were advised by public notice in the *Federal Register* (48 FR 50606, November 2, 1983) of a meeting of the National Air Pollution Control Techniques Advisory Committee to discuss recommended revisions to the mercury standard. This meeting was held on November 29, 1983. The meeting was open to the public, and each attendee was given an opportunity to comment on the standards recommended for proposal.

The proposed revisions were published in the *Federal Register* on December 26, 1984 (49 FR 50146). The preamble to the proposed revisions discussed the availability of the review document, which summarized the emissions information gathered during the review, and of the health effects document, which summarized current information on potential health effects associated with mercury exposures. Public comments were solicited at the time of proposal, and copies of the documents were distributed to interested parties.

To provide interested persons the opportunity for oral presentation of data, views, or arguments concerning the proposed standards, the opportunity for a public hearing was provided. However, a public hearing was not requested. The public comment period was from December 26, 1984, to March 13, 1985. Ten comment letters were received concerning issues relative to the proposed revisions and to the conclusions drawn as a result of the review. The comments have been carefully considered and, where determined to be appropriate by the Administrator, changes have been made in the proposed revisions.

### IV. Major Comments Received and Changes to the Proposed Revisions

The Agency received two major comments on the proposed monitoring and recordkeeping requirements for mercury-cell chlor-alkali plants. Chlor-alkali plant representatives commented that the standards should allow submittal (to the Administrator) of plant-specific compliance plans as an alternative to the proposed monitoring requirements. Various reasons supporting such a provision were provided by the commenters (and are summarized in section 2.1 of the review document). In response to these comments, the standards were revised to provide for the option of submittal of

alternative plant-specific monitoring plans. Owners and operators who elect to submit such plans must adhere to the seven guidelines stated in § 61.55(c) of the regulation. The monitoring plan must ensure not only compliance with the emission limits but also proper operation and maintenance of emissions control systems.

Several commenters believed that the requirement to record all incidences of mercury leaks or spills should be changed to require recording only incidences of unpredictable or significant leaks or spills that require immediate corrective actions. While the Agency agrees that the leaks or spills of primary interest are those that are "significant," neither the Agency nor representatives from several chlor-alkali companies could offer an acceptable definition of a "significant" leak or spill. Without such a definition, the commenters' request could not be adopted.

One major comment was received in the area of EPA's evaluation of indirect exposures to mercury emissions. The commenter claimed that the Agency's ambient air guideline of 1.0 microgram of mercury per cubic meter of air was based solely on the health effects of inhaled mercury and ignored exposures to mercury emissions that are deposited on land, water, or other surfaces. This commenter believed a re-evaluation of the ambient guideline level was warranted and that the re-evaluation should take into account total human exposures to mercury, including deposited mercury in its more toxic methylated forms.

As stated in section 2.5 of the review document, the Agency considered mercury exposures from dietary ingestion as well as from inhalation in setting the ambient air guideline level. The guideline level also includes a safety factor of ten. However, the effects of mercury emissions on other environments (such as drinking water) and the accumulation of methyl mercury in food (primarily fish) were not fully addressed in the NESHAP review. The EPA is presently reviewing available information concerning these effects, and studies are currently underway to gather the necessary data. These include studies of biochemical mechanisms (for example, the biochemical cycling of mercury) and health and environmental effects (for example, the bioaccumulation of methylmercury in fish) from the deposition of mercury. A preliminary report of the results of studies addressing the bioaccumulation of mercury in fish (the primary source of ingested mercury) is scheduled for 1989 with an integrated report on mercury

bioaccumulation scheduled for 1992. As the results of these studies become available, the Agency will take action as appropriate. However, at this time, the Agency does not have a sufficient basis for revising the ambient guideline level.

One commenter believed the Agency should re-evaluate its decision not to regulate mercury emissions from power plants. This commenter believed the Agency should revise its calculations of mercury emissions to include coals with higher mercury contents than those assumed in the calculations. The commenter referred to reports of mercury concentrations in some American coals as high as 1.6 parts per million (ppm), a level four times higher than the concentration that was used in the Agency's analysis. He stated that the Agency cannot conclude that the ambient guideline will not be exceeded until an analysis of the ambient concentrations expected from plants burning high-mercury coals is completed.

The commenter also objected to EPA's approach to regulating toxic emissions from coal-fired boilers. He stated that by analyzing toxic components of boiler emissions one-by-one, there is a strong bias against control since only a fraction of the total health risk is compared with the total control cost. The commenter believed that EPA should abandon this approach and should require the use of particulate control techniques to capture all toxic emissions, including mercury.

To examine the potential for mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants to exceed the ambient air guideline, the Agency reviewed the data on the mercury content of coals available in the United States (Docket item IV-B-1). The highest mercury level reported for the 48 contiguous states is 8 parts per million (ppm) for subbituminous coal and 3.3 ppm for bituminous coal with an average of 0.1 ppm for subbituminous coal and 0.21 ppm for bituminous coal. The worst case estimates for a large 4000 megawatt (MW) coal-fired power plant firing 8 ppm subbituminous coal is 870 pounds of mercury per day. According to dispersion estimates, a 4000 MW plant emitting 790 pounds of mercury per day would cause a maximum ground level concentration of 1.0  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . This indicates that in the extreme case a large coal-fired power plant could emit mercury at levels high enough to exceed the ambient guideline. However, typically, mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants are expected to be well below the ambient guideline level.

The Agency is currently studying the combined effect of identified trace

element (including mercury) emissions from fossil-fuel combustion. For mercury, estimates are being made of nationwide emissions and of maximum concentrations associated with four sectors of coal burning: utility, industrial, commercial, and residential combustors. The results of this study will be used to determine the need and appropriate mechanism for regulating mercury emissions from fossil-fuel combustion.

Another major comment received pertained to mercury emissions from synthetic fuel processes. The commenter stated that there are data indicating that mercury emissions from oil shale retort operations can equal or exceed emissions from the currently regulated source categories. He believed these data demonstrate the need to set a national emission standard for mercury emissions from oil shale retorting and the need to examine the potential for mercury emissions from other synthetic fuel processes that are under active consideration.

At the present time there is only one retort plant in operation in the United States that is capable of processing more than 100 tons per day of raw shale to produce crude oil. Estimates of mercury emissions from this operation indicate that ambient mercury levels would be less than  $0.04 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , a level well below the ambient guideline level of  $1.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (Docket item IV-A-2).

Construction of new retort operations or startup of existing plants that have been shut down is not anticipated in the near future. Furthermore, projections of mercury emissions from hypothetical commercial-scale operations indicate that emissions from a large size facility would still be below the ambient guideline level (Docket item IV-A-2).

In view of the low level of emissions from the oil shale retort that is currently in operation and the lack of anticipated growth in this industry in the near future, oil shale retorting operations are not being added as a source category to be regulated by the current mercury NESHAP. If oil shale retort operations become economically feasible, the Agency will review its decision not to regulate mercury emissions from these operations under these standards.

#### V. Administrative

The docket is an organized and complete file of all the information considered by EPA in the development of this rulemaking. The docket is a dynamic file, since material is added throughout the rulemaking development. The docketing system is intended to allow members of the public and industries involved to readily identify

and locate documents so that they can effectively participate in the rulemaking process. Along with the statement of basis and purpose of the proposed and promulgated standards and EPA responses to significant comments, the contents of the docket, except for interagency review materials, will serve as the record in case of judicial review [section 307(d)(7)(A)].

As prescribed by section 112, the promulgation of these standards was preceded by the Administrator's earlier determination that mercury is a hazardous air pollutant. This determination was based on the finding that previously unregulated mercury emissions might cause or contribute to an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness. The intent of the standards is to protect the public health with an ample margin of safety. In accordance with section 117 of the Act, publication of these promulgated standards was preceded by consultation with appropriate advisory committees, independent experts, and Federal departments and agencies.

This regulation will be reviewed again 5 years from the date of this promulgation. This review will include an assessment of such factors as the need for integration with other programs, the existence of alternative control methods, enforceability, improvements in emission control technology, and reporting requirements.

Information collection requirements associated with this regulation (those included in 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart A and Subpart E) have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* and have been assigned OMB control number 2060-0097.

Under Executive Order 12291, EPA is required to judge whether a regulation is a "major rule" and therefore subject to the requirements of a regulatory impact analysis (RIA). The Agency has determined that this regulation would result in none of the adverse economic effects set forth in Section 1 of the Order as grounds for finding a regulation to be a "major rule." This regulation will not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, result in a major increase in costs or prices, or have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment productivity, or innovation. The Agency has, therefore, concluded that this regulation is not a "major rule" under Executive Order 12291.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires the identification of potentially adverse impacts of Federal regulations

upon a substantial number of small business entities. The Act specifically requires the completion of a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis in those instances where small business impacts are possible. None of the companies affected by these revisions meets the Small Business Administration definition of a small business, and thus, no regulatory flexibility analysis was required.

Pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 605(b), I hereby certify that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 61

Air pollution control, Asbestos, Beryllium, Hazardous substances, Mercury, Radionuclides, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Vinyl chloride.

Dated: March 11, 1987.

Lee M. Thomas,  
Administrator.

#### PART 61—NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS

For reasons set out in the preamble, 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart E, is amended as set forth below.

1. The authority citation for Part 61 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7412, 7414, and 7601(a).

2. Section 61.53 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(4), (b)(4), (c)(4), and (d)(5) to read as follows:

##### § 61.53 Stack sampling.

(a) \* \* \*

(4) All samples shall be analyzed and mercury emissions shall be determined within 30 days after the stack test. Each determination shall be reported to the Administrator by a registered letter dispatched within 15 calendar days following the date such determination is completed.

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) \* \* \*

(4) All samples shall be analyzed and mercury emissions shall be determined within 30 days after the stack test. Each determination shall be reported to the Administrator by a registered letter dispatched within 15 calendar days following the date such determination is completed.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(4) An owner or operator may carry out approved design, maintenance, and housekeeping practices. A list of approved practices is provided in

Appendix A of "Review of National Emission Standards for Mercury," EPA-450/3-84-014a, December 1984. Copies are available from EPA's Central Docket Section, Docket item number A-84-41, III-B-1.

(d) \* \* \*

(5) All samples shall be analyzed and mercury emissions shall be determined within 30 days after the stack test. Each determination shall be reported to the Administrator by a registered letter dispatched within 15 calendar days following the date such determination is completed.

\* \* \* \* \*

3. Section 61.54 is amended by revising paragraph (f) to read as follows:

**§ 61.54 Sludge sampling.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) All sludge samples shall be analyzed for mercury content within 30 days after the sludge sample is collected. Each determination shall be reported to the Administrator by a registered letter dispatched within 15 calendar days following the date such determination is completed.

\* \* \* \* \*

4. Section 61.55 is amended by revising the title and paragraph (a) and by adding paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) as follows:

**§ 61.55 Monitoring of emissions and operations.**

(a) Wastewater treatment plant sludge incineration and drying plants. All the sources for which mercury emissions exceed 1,600 g per 24-hour period, demonstrated either by stack sampling according to § 61.53 or sludge sampling according to § 61.54, shall monitor mercury emissions at intervals of at least once per year by use of Method 105 of Appendix B or the procedures specified in § 61.53 (d) (2) and (4). The results of monitoring shall be reported and retained according to § 61.53(d) (5) and (6) or § 61.54 (f) and (g).

(b) Mercury cell chlor-alkali plants—hydrogen and end-box ventilation gas streams.

(1) The owner or operator of each mercury cell chlor-alkali plant shall, within 1 year of the date of publication of these amendments or within 1 year of startup for a plant with initial startup after the date of publication, perform a mercury emission test that demonstrates compliance with the emission limits in § 61.52, on the hydrogen stream by Reference Method 102 and on the end-box stream by Reference Method 101 for the purpose of establishing limits for parameters to be monitored.

(2) During tests specified in paragraph (b)(1) of this section, the following control device parameters shall be monitored, except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, and recorded manually or automatically at least once every 15 minutes:

(i) The exit gas temperature from uncontrolled streams;

(ii) The outlet temperature of the gas stream for the final (i.e., the farthest downstream) cooling system when no control devices other than coolers and demisters are used;

(iii) The outlet temperature of the gas stream from the final cooling system when the cooling system is followed by a molecular sieve or carbon adsorber;

(iv) Outlet concentration of available chlorine, pH, liquid flow rate, and inlet gas temperature of chlorinated brine scrubbers and hypochlorite scrubbers;

(v) The liquid flow rate and exit gas temperature for water scrubbers;

(vi) The inlet gas temperature of carbon adsorption systems; and

(vii) The temperature during the heating phase of the regeneration cycle for carbon adsorbers or molecular sieves.

(3) The recorded parameters in paragraphs (b)(2)(i) through (b)(2)(vi) of this section shall be averaged over the test period (a minimum of 6 hours) to provide an average number. The highest temperature reading that is measured in paragraph (b)(2)(vii) of this section is to be identified as the reference temperature for use in paragraph (b)(6)(ii) of this section.

(4)(i) Immediately following completion of the emission tests specified in paragraph (b)(1) of this section, the owner or operator of a mercury cell chlor-alkali plant shall monitor and record manually or automatically at least once per hour the same parameters specified in paragraphs (b)(2)(i) through (b)(2)(vi) of this section.

(ii) Immediately following completion of the emission tests specified in paragraph (b)(1) of this section, the owner or operator shall monitor and record manually or automatically, during each heating phase of the regeneration cycle, the temperature specified in paragraph (b)(2)(vii) of this section.

(5) Monitoring devices used in accordance with paragraphs (b)(2) and (b)(4) of this section shall be certified by their manufacturer to be accurate to within 10 percent, and shall be operated, maintained, and calibrated according to the manufacturer's instructions. Records of the certifications and calibrations shall be retained at the chlor-alkali plant and made available for inspection by

the Administrator as follows:

Certification, for as long as the device is used for this purpose; calibration for a minimum of 2 years.

(6)(i) When the hourly value of a parameter monitored in accordance with paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section exceeds, or in the case of liquid flow rate and available chlorine falls below the value of that same parameter determined in paragraph (b)(2) of this section for 24 consecutive hours, the Administrator is to be notified within the next 10 days.

(ii) When the maximum hourly value of the temperature measured in accordance with paragraph (b)(4)(ii) of this section is below the reference temperature recorded according to paragraph (b)(3) of this section for three consecutive regeneration cycles, the Administrator is to be notified within the next 10 days.

(7) Semiannual reports shall be submitted to the Administrator indicating the time and date on which the hourly value of each parameter monitored according to paragraphs (b)(4)(i) and (b)(4)(ii) of this section fell outside the value of that same parameter determined under paragraph (b)(3) of this section; and corrective action taken, and the time and date of the corrective action. Parameter excursions will be considered unacceptable operation and maintenance of the emission control system. In addition, while compliance with the emission limits is determined primarily by conducting a performance test according to the procedures in § 61.53(b), reports of parameter excursions may be used as evidence in judging the duration of a violation that is determined by a performance test.

(8) Semiannual reports required in paragraph (b)(7) of this section shall be submitted to the Administrator on September 15 and March 15 of each year. The first semiannual report is to be submitted following the first full 6 month reporting period. The semiannual report due on September 15 (March 15) shall include all excursions monitored through August 31 (February 28) of the same calendar year.

(c) As an alternative to the monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements in paragraphs (b)(2) through (8) of this section, an owner or operator may develop and submit for the Administrator's review and approval a plant-specific monitoring plan. To be approved, such a plan must ensure not only compliance with the emission limits of § 61.52(a) but also proper operation and maintenance of emissions control systems. Any site-specific monitoring

plan submitted must, at a minimum, include the following:

(1) Identification of the critical parameter or parameters for the hydrogen stream and for the end-box ventilation stream that are to be monitored and an explanation of why the critical parameter(s) selected is the best indicator of proper control system performance and of mercury emission rates.

(2) Identification of the maximum or minimum value of each parameter (e.g., degrees temperature, concentration of mercury) that is not to be exceeded. The level(s) is to be directly correlated to the results of a performance test, conducted no more than 180 days prior to submittal of the plan, when the facility was in compliance with the emission limits of § 61.52(a).

(3) Designation of the frequency for recording the parameter measurements, with justification if the frequency is less than hourly. A longer recording frequency must be justified on the basis of the amount of time that could elapse during periods of process or control system upsets before the emission limits would be exceeded, and consideration is

to be given to the time that would be necessary to repair the failure.

(4) Designation of the immediate actions to be taken in the event of an excursion beyond the value of the parameter established in 2.

(5) Provisions for reporting, semiannually, parameter excursions and the corrective actions taken, and provisions for reporting within 10 days any significant excursion.

(6) Identification of the accuracy of the monitoring device(s) or of the readings obtained.

(7) Recordkeeping requirements for certifications and calibrations.

(d) Mercury cell chlor-alkali plants—cell room ventilation system.

(1) Stationary sources determining cell room emissions in accordance with § 61.53(c)(4) shall maintain daily records of all leaks or spills of mercury. The records shall indicate the amount, location, time, and date the leaks or spills occurred, identify the cause of the leak or spill, state the immediate steps taken to minimize mercury emissions and steps taken to prevent future occurrences, and provide the time and

date on which corrective steps were taken.

(2) The results of monitoring shall be recorded, retained at the source, and made available for inspection by the Administrator for a minimum of 2 years.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 2060-0097)

5. Section 61.56 is added to Subpart E to read as follows:

**§ 61.56 Delegation of authority.**

(a) In delegating implementation and enforcement authority to a State under section 112(d) of the Act, the authorities contained in paragraph (b) of this section shall be retained by the Administrator and not transferred to a State.

(b) Authorities which will not be delegated to States: Sections 61.53(c)(4) and 61.55(d). The authorities not delegated to States listed are in addition to the authorities in the General Provisions, Subpart A of 40 CFR Part 61, that will not be delegated to States (§§ 61.04(b), 61.12(d)(1), and 61.13(h)(1)(ii)).

[FR Doc. 87-5803 Filed 3-18-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M