on these figures, the cost impact on U.S. operators of the actions currently required is estimated to be between $6,600 and $16,500, or between $120 and $300 per airplane.

The new action (installation) that is proposed in this AD action would take approximately 3 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts would be provided by the manufacturer at no cost to operators. Based on these figures, the cost impact on U.S. operators of the proposed installation requirement of this AD is estimated to be $9,900, or $180 per airplane.

Based on the figures discussed above, the (combined) cost impact of this proposed AD on U.S. operators would be between $16,500 and $26,400, or between $300 and $480 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the current or proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39–9754 (61 FR 48614, September 16, 1996), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

Jetstream Aircraft Limited: Docket 96–NM–243–AD. Supersedes AD 96–19–06, Amendment 39–9754.

Applicability: Model 4101 airplanes having serial numbers 41004 through 41092 inclusive, on which Jetstream Service Bulletin J41–22–006, dated July 1, 1996 (Kit JK42867), has not been accomplished; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent overheat failure of the Flight Control Computer (FCC), which could result in smoke in the flight deck that could inhibit the ability of the flightcrew to safely operate and land the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 14 days after October 1, 1996 (the effective date of AD 96–19–06), perform a one-time inspection of the airplane records to determine the serial number, the total number of hours time-in-service accumulated, and the date of installation of the yaw damper servo in the autopilot system; and to determine the date of installation of Kit JK42716 (reference Jetstream Service Bulletin J41–53–016 or J41–22–007), if installed. Accomplish the inspection in accordance with Part 1 of the Accomplishment Instructions of Jetstream Alert Service Bulletin J41–A22–005, dated July 1, 1996. Thereafter, either remove and replace the yaw damper servo and install Kit JK42716 (if not installed previously), or render the yaw damper servo inoperative, in accordance with Part 2 or 3 of the alert service bulletin, respectively, at the time specified in paragraph (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) If Kit JK42716 has not been installed: Prior to the accumulation of 1,000 hours total time-in-service on the yaw damper servo, or within 30 days after October 1, 1996, whichever occurs later.

(2) If Kit JK42716 has been installed and the yaw damper servo was installed prior to the installation of Kit JK42716: Prior to the accumulation of 1,000 hours total time-in-service on the yaw damper servo, or within 30 days after October 1, 1996, whichever occurs later.

(3) If Kit JK42716 has been installed and the yaw damper servo was installed after the installation of Kit JK42716: Prior to the accumulation of 3,000 total hours time-in-service on the yaw damper servo, or within 30 days after October 1, 1996, whichever occurs later.

(b) Within 90 days after the effective date of this AD, install circuit breakers on the avionics relay panel (Kit JK42867) in accordance with Jetstream Service Bulletin J41–22–006, dated July 1, 1996. Accomplishment of this installation constitutes terminating action for the requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM–113.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on October 17, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–27239 Filed 10–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–NM–235–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the supersedure of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain

McDonnell Douglas DC–9 series airplanes, that currently requires repetitive visual inspections to detect corrosion and cracking of the fuselage upper skin and frames in the area of the loop antenna assemblies of the automatic direction finder (ADF), and repair, if necessary. This action would add a requirement to perform a visual and an eddy current inspection of the fuselage forward upper skin under the antennas, followed by the reinstallation of the ADF antennas using an improved procedure. This proposal is prompted by the development of a modification of the ADF antenna installation that would constitute terminating action for the required repetitive visual inspections. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent rapid decompression of the fuselage, significant structural damage, and subsequent reduced structural integrity of the airplane, due to problems associated with corrosion and fatigue cracking in the subject area.

DATES: Comments must be received by December 3, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96–NM–235–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Department C1–L51 (2–60). This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wahib Mina, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627–5324; fax (310) 627–5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 96–NM–235–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96–NM–235–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

On March 28, 1996, the FAA issued AD 96–07–51, amendment 39–9562 (61 FR 15882, April 10, 1996), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas DC–9 series airplanes, to require repetitive internal visual inspections to detect corrosion and cracking of the fuselage forward upper skin and to detect cracking of the fuselage frames in the subject area. That AD also requires repair of any corrosion or cracking found. That action was prompted by a report indicating that severe corrosion and a 39-inch crack of the forward fuselage upper skin was found during scheduled maintenance on a McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–31 series airplane. Additionally, subsequent inspection of the adjacent structure revealed cracking of the fuselage frame at fuselage station 275. The cracking found has been attributed to fatigue. Corrosion and fatigue cracking in these areas, if not detected and corrected in a timely manner, could result in rapid decompression of the fuselage, significant damage to adjacent structure, and subsequent reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

Actions Since Issuance of Previous Rule

Since the issuance of that AD, McDonnell Douglas has developed a new procedure for the installation of the ADF antennas. Installation of the antennas using the improved installation procedure will eliminate the need for repetitive inspections to detect corrosion and cracking of the fuselage upper skin for cracks and corrosion under the ADF loop antenna.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC–9–53–284, dated August 20, 1996, which describes procedures for a one-time visual and a one-time high frequency eddy current inspection to detect corrosion and cracking of the fuselage forward upper skin under the antennas. The service bulletin also describes procedures for repair of certain corrosion or cracking that is within the limits specified by the service bulletin. In addition, the service bulletin describes procedures for modification of the ADF antennas using an improved installation procedure. Accomplishment of the inspections and installation procedure eliminates the need for repetitive visual inspections of the area.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would supersede AD 96–07–51 to continue to require repetitive internal visual inspections to detect corrosion and cracking of the fuselage forward upper skin and to detect cracking of the fuselage frame in the area of the forward and aft loop antenna assemblies of the automatic direction finder (ADF).

The proposed AD would add a requirement for removing the ADF antennas and performing a one-time visual and a one-time high frequency eddy current inspection to detect corrosion and cracking of the fuselage forward upper skin under the antennas; reinstallation of the ADF antennas using an improved installation procedure would constitute terminating action for the previously required repetitive visual inspections. The proposed AD also would require repair of any corrosion or cracking detected that is within the limits specified by the service bulletin. Those actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously.

If any corrosion or cracking is detected that is beyond the limits specified in the service bulletin, the repair would be required to be

accomplished in acordance with a method approved by the FAA.

FAA's Determination Regarding Terminating Actions

The FAA has determined that long term continued operational safety will be better assured by modifications or design changes to remove the source of the problem, rather than by repetitive inspections. Long term inspections may not be providing the degree of safety assurance necessary for the transport airplane fleet. This, coupled with a better understanding of the human factors associated with numerous repetitive inspections, has led the FAA to consider placing less emphasis on special procedures and more emphasis on design improvements. The proposed modification requirement is in consonance with these considerations.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 569 McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 403 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

The actions that are currently required by AD 96–07–51 take approximately 5 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact on U.S. operators of the actions currently required is estimated to be $120,900, or $300 per airplane, per inspection.

The new actions that are proposed in this AD action would take approximately 16 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact on U.S. operators of the proposed requirements of this AD is estimated to be $386,880, or $960 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the current or proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39–9562 (61 FR 15882, April 10, 1996), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 96–NM–235–AD. Supersedes AD 96–07–51, Amendment 39–9562.

Applicability: Model DC–9 series airplanes having fuselage numbers 001 through 631 inclusive, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (c)(1) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent rapid decompression of the fuselage, significant structural damage, and subsequent reduced structural integrity of the airplane, due to problems associated with corrosion and fatigue cracking, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 15 days after April 15, 1996 (the effective date of AD 96–07–51, amendment 39–9562): Perform an internal visual inspection to detect corrosion and cracking of the fuselage forward upper skin and to detect cracking of the fuselage frame in the area of the forward and aft loop antenna assemblies of the automatic direction finder (ADF), in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC9–53A282, dated March 20, 1996.

(1) If no corrosion or cracking is detected: Repeat the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed six months.

(2) If any corrosion or cracking is detected that is within the limits specified in Chapter 53–04, Figure 29, of the DC–9 Structural Repair Manual (SRM): Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with Chapter 53–04, Figure 29, of the SRM. Repeat the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed six months.

(3) If any corrosion or cracking is detected in the fuselage forward upper skin, or if any cracking is detected in the fuselage frame, and that corrosion or cracking is outside the limits specified in Chapter 53–04, Figure 29, of the SRM: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(b) Within 24 months after the effective date of this AD: Remove the ADF antennas and perform visual and high frequency eddy current inspections to detect corrosion and cracking of the fuselage forward upper skin under the antennas, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–284, dated August 20, 1996; and accomplish the requirements of paragraph (b)(1), (b)(2), or (b)(3) of this AD, as applicable, at the times specified. Accomplishment of the actions specified in paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this AD constitute terminating action for the requirements of paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD.

(1) If no cracking or corrosion is detected: Prior to further flight, reinstall the ADF antennas using the improved installation procedure in accordance with the service bulletin.

(2) If any cracking or corrosion is detected that is within the limits specified in Chapter 53–04 of the DC–9 Structural Repair Manual (SRM): Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with Chapter 53–04 of the DC–9 SRM, and reinstall the ADF antennas using the improved installation procedure in accordance with the service bulletin.

(3) If any cracking or corrosion is detected that is outside the limits specified in Chapter 53–04 of the SRM: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airport Directorate.

(c)(1) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that

provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(2) Alternative methods of compliance, approved in accordance with AD 96–07–71, amendment 39–9562, are approved as alternative methods of compliance with this AD.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on October 17, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–27238 Filed 10–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[AZ–036–1–0008; FRL–5632–2]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona—Phoenix Nonattainment Area; PM_{10}

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: EPA today proposes to restore its approval of portions of the State implementation plan (SIP) submitted by the State of Arizona for the purpose of bringing about the attainment in the Phoenix Planning Area (PPA) of the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 10 micrometers (PM_{10}).

In April 1995, EPA approved the State's ''moderate'' area SIP as satisfying Federal requirements in the Clean Air Act for an approvable nonattainment area PM_{10} plan for the PPA. In May 1996, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Ober* v. *EPA* vacated EPA's approval and directed the Agency to provide an opportunity for comment on issues related to the reasonably available control measure (RACM) and reasonable further progress (RFP) demonstrations in the SIP. The intent of this proposed action is to comply with the Court's opinion by providing such an opportunity.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by December 23, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments must be submitted to Frances Wicher, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. Copies of the State's submittal and other information are contained in the docket for this rulemaking. The docket is available for inspection during normal business hours at the above Region 9 address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frances Wicher (A–2–1) U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, Air and Toxics Division, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 744–1248.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

A. Clean Air Act Requirements

On the date of enactment of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, PM_{10} areas, including the Phoenix Planning Area (PPA), meeting the conditions of section 107(d) of the Act were designated nonattainment by operation of law. Once an area is designated nonattainment, section 188 of the Act outlines the process for classification of the area and establishes the area's attainment date. In accordance with section 188(a), at the time of designation, all PM_{10} nonattainment areas were initially classified as ''moderate'' by operation of law. See 56 FR 11101 (March 15, 1991). A moderate area may subsequently be reclassified as ''serious'' under section 188(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) if at any time EPA determines that the area cannot practicably attain the PM_{10} NAAQS by the applicable attainment date for moderate areas, December 31, 1994. Moreover, a moderate area must be reclassified if EPA determines within six months after the applicable attainment date that, based on actual air quality data, the area is not in attainment after that date. See section 188(b)(2) of the CAA.[1]

The air quality planning requirements for moderate PM_{10} nonattainment areas are set out in subparts 1 and 4 of Title I of the Act. EPA has issued a ''General Preamble'' describing EPA's preliminary views on how the Agency intends to review SIPs and SIP revisions submitted under Title I of the Act, including those state submittals containing moderate PM_{10} nonattainment area SIP provisions. See generally 57 FR 13498 (April 16, 1992) and 57 FR 18070 (April 28, 1992).

Those states containing initial moderate PM_{10} nonattainment areas were required to submit, among other things, the following provisions by November 15, 1991:

1. Pursuant to section 189(a)(1)(C) of the CAA, provisions to assure that reasonably available control measures (RACM) (including such reductions in emissions from existing sources in the area as may be obtained through the adoption, at a minimum, of reasonably available control technology—RACT) shall be implemented no later than December 10, 1993;

2. Pursuant to section 189(a)(1)(B), either a demonstration (including air quality modeling) that the plan will provide for attainment as expeditiously as practicable but no later than December 31, 1994 or a demonstration that attainment by that date is impracticable;

3. Pursuant to section 189(c), for plan revisions demonstrating attainment, quantitative milestones which are to be achieved every 3 years and which demonstrate reasonable further progress (RFP) toward attainment by December 31, 1994;[2] and

4. Pursuant to sections 172(c)(2) and 171(1), for plan revisions demonstrating impracticability, such annual incremental reductions in PM_{10} emissions as are required by part D of the Act or may reasonably be required by the Administrator for the purpose of ensuring attainment of the PM_{10} NAAQS by the applicable attainment date.

B. EPA Approval of Arizona's Moderate Area PM_{10} Plan

On July 28, 1994, EPA proposed to approve The State of Arizona's moderate area PM_{10} implementation plan revision for the PPA. 59 FR 38402. In its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), EPA proposed to approve, among other elements in the plan, the State's RFP and RACM demonstrations as meeting the requirements of sections 172(c)(2), 171(1), 172(c)(1), and 189(a)(1)(C) of the CAA. Based on its

[1] On May 10, 1996, EPA published a final reclassification of the PPA as a serious PM_{10} nonattainment area based on actual air quality data. See 61 FR 21372. Having been reclassified, the area is required to meet the serious area requirements in the CAA, including a demonstration that the area will attain the PM_{10} NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable but no later than December 31, 2001. See sections 188(c)(2) and 189(b).

[2] As will be seen below, the PM_{10} plan for the PPA did not demonstrate attainment by December 31, 1994, but rather included the alternative demonstration that attainment by that date is impracticable. Therefore, section 189(c) does not apply and is not discussed further in this notice.