

Docket No. ER06-1471, Westar Energy, Inc.
 Docket No. ER06-1467, Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
 Docket No. EL06-71, *Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc. v Southwest Power Pool*.
 Docket No. ER07-14, Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
 Docket Nos. ER07-211 and ER07-709, Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
 Docket No. ER07-314, Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
 Docket No. ER07-319, Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
 Docket No. ER07-603, Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

These meetings are open to the public.

For more information, contact John Rogers, Office of Energy Markets and Reliability, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission at (202) 502-8564 or john.rogers@ferc.gov.

Kimberly D. Bose,
 Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7-7311 Filed 4-17-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Guidelines for Submission of CDs, DVDs, and Other Electronic Media

April 12, 2007.

Take notice that the Commission is issuing notice of guidelines for submission of CDs, DVDs and other electronic media. An increasing number of traditionally paper documents submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) are now accompanied by one or more CDs, DVDs or other electronic media that contain all or part of the submission, or contain supplements to the submission. These guidelines address such submissions and require that, among other things, the CDs/DVDs contain the entire submission.

These guidelines apply to documents that cannot be submitted through any of the Commission's existing electronic gateways: The eFiling system, the eForms system, or the Electric Quarterly Reports (EQR) system. They thus are primarily intended for larger filings and those filings that contain Privileged, Critical Energy Infrastructure (CEII), or Non-Internet Public (NIP) information.

Persons following these guidelines will be granted an automatic waiver of the number of paper copies and may instead submit the requisite number of

copies of a filing on CD/DVD and reduce the number of paper copies to an original and two copies in most cases. These guidelines do *not* change any FERC requirements concerning service of submissions on customers, parties, or other persons.

The guidelines will be posted at: <http://www.ferc.gov/help/submission-guide.asp> and updated when necessary to reflect revised procedures or changes in media.

Kimberly D. Bose,
 Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7-7312 Filed 4-17-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-8301-1]

Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to South Dakota State Operating Permit for Pope & Talbot, Inc., Lumber Mill, Spearfish, SD

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of direct final order.

SUMMARY: This notice announces that the EPA Administrator has responded to a citizens' petition asking EPA to object to a State operating permit issued by the South Dakota Department of Environmental and Natural Resources (DENR). Specifically, the Administrator has partially granted and partially denied the petition submitted by Jeremy Nichols, and the other Petitioners, to object to the issuance of the operating permit issued to Pope and Talbot, Inc., for its lumber mill, located in Spearfish, South Dakota.

Pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act (Act), Petitioners may seek judicial review of those portions of the petition which EPA denied in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate Circuit. Any petition for review shall be filed within 60 days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**, pursuant to section 307(d) of the Act.

ADDRESSES: You may review copies of the final Order, the petition, and other supporting information at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129 after April 16, 2007. EPA requests that you contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to view the copies of these documents. You may view these documents Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., excluding

Federal holidays. If you wish to examine these documents, you should make an appointment at least 24 hours before the visiting day. The final Order is also available electronically at the each of the following addresses: http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitions/pope_talbot_decision2006.pdf, and <http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitiondb2006.htm>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Christopher Ajayi, Environmental Engineer, Air and Radiation Program, Office of Partnerships and Regulatory Assistance, Mail Code 8P-AR, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, CO 80202-1129, telephone (303) 312-6320, or e-mail at ajayi.christopher@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Clean Air Act (Act) affords EPA a 45-day period to review and object to, as appropriate, operating permits proposed by State permitting authorities. Section 505(b)(2) of the Act authorizes any person to petition the EPA Administrator within 60 days after the expiration of this review period to object to State operating permits if EPA has not done so. 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 object during the comment period or that the grounds for the objection or other issue arose after this period.

On April 11, 2006, the EPA received a petition from Petitioners requesting that EPA object to the issuance of the Title V operating permit issued by South Dakota Department of Environmental and Natural Resources (DENR) to Pope and Talbot, Inc., to operate a lumber mill in Spearfish, South Dakota ("the Facility").

The Petitioners request that EPA object to the issuance of the proposed permit and raise the following objections as the bases for their petition:

1. Permit fails to ensure compliance with Carbon Dioxide (CO) emission limits,
2. Permit lacks sufficient periodic monitoring of CO emissions,
3. Permit may need "schedule of compliance" because it fails to ensure that CO emission limits are below Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) levels and thus not in compliance with PSD requirements,
4. Permit fails to ensure compliance with South Dakota State

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_x) 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.

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_x for Youngstown are as follows:

	2005 MVEB (tpd)	2018 MVEB (tpd)
VOC	19.58	10.36
NO _x	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,