

information collection request most recently approved by OMB, from 30,488 hours currently to an estimated 43,466 hours. At the time of the last clearance of this ICR in May 1995, EPA estimated the burden for respondents to be 30,488 hours annually, an increase of 12,978 hours from the burden total in the OMB inventory at the time. The increase in burden reflects the increase in the number of petitions requesting a FIFRA section 18 exemption. Based on currently available information, this change represents an increase in annual respondents from 296 to 422.

According to the procedures prescribed in 5 CFR 1320.12, EPA has submitted this ICR to OMB for review and approval. Any comments related to the renewal of this ICR should be submitted within 30 days of this document, as described above.

Dated: May 27, 1998.

**Richard T. Westlund,**

*Acting Director, Regulatory Information Division.*

[FR Doc. 98-14589 Filed 6-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6105-4]

### Ambient Air Monitoring Reference and Equivalent Methods Applications for Reference or Equivalent Method Determinations

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of applications.

**SUMMARY:** Notification is given that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has received five new applications for reference or equivalent method determinations under 40 CFR part 53. The applications were received from Rupperecht and Patashnick Company, Incorporated, Albany, New York (two applications); Advanced Pollution Instrumentation, Incorporated, San Diego, California; Horiba Instruments Incorporated, Irvine, California; and DKK Corporation, Tokyo, Japan.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Frank F. McElroy, Human Exposure and Atmospheric Sciences Division (MD-46), National Exposure Research Laboratory, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711. Phone: (919) 541-2622, email: mcelroy.frank@epamail.epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In accordance with regulations at 40 CFR part 53, the EPA examines various

methods for monitoring the concentrations of certain pollutants in the ambient air. Methods that are determined to meet specific requirements for adequacy are designated as either reference or equivalent methods, thereby permitting their use under 40 CFR part 58 by States and other agencies in determining attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The EPA is hereby announcing that it has received five new applications for reference or equivalent method determinations under 40 CFR part 53. Publication of a notice of receipt of such applications is required by section 53.5.

On February 3, 1998, EPA received two applications from the Rupperecht and Patashnick Company, Incorporated, 25 Corporate Circle, Albany, New York 12203 to determine if methods based on that Company's Partisol<sup>®</sup>-FRM Model 2000 (single) and Partisol<sup>®</sup>-Plus Model 2025 (sequential) PM-10 Air Samplers should be designated as reference methods for PM<sub>10</sub>. The EPA received an application on February 24, 1998, from Advanced Pollution Instrumentation, Incorporated, 6565 Nancy Ridge Drive, San Diego, California 92121 for an equivalent method determination for their Model 400A UV Photometric Ozone Analyzer. An application was received on March 26, 1998 from Horiba Instruments Incorporated, 17671 Armstrong Avenue, Irvine, California 92614 for an equivalent method determination for Horiba's Model APSA-360ACE ambient SO<sub>2</sub> monitor. And on April 14, 1998, the EPA received an application from DKK Corporation, 4-13-14, Kichijoji Kitamachi, Musashino-shi, Tokyo, 180-8630, Japan for a reference method determination for DKK's Model GLN-114E Nitrogen Oxides Analyzer.

If, after appropriate technical study, the Administrator determines that any or all of these methods should be designated as either reference or equivalent methods, notice thereof will be published in a subsequent issue of the **Federal Register**.

**Thomas A. Clark,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.*

[FR Doc. 98-14585 Filed 6-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6104-9]

### Proposed Settlement Agreement, Clean Air Act Suit

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed settlement; request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act, as amended ("Act"), 42 U.S.C. 7413(g), notice is hereby given of a proposed settlement agreement, which was lodged with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") on April 15, 1998, to address a lawsuit filed by the Natural Resources Defense Council. This lawsuit, which was filed pursuant to section 307(b) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7607(b), concerns, among other things, EPA's alleged failure to list, and determine whether to regulate hazardous air pollutant emissions from, electric utility steam generating units under section 112 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7412. In the proposed settlement agreement, the EPA agrees to: (i) Undertake, and publish the results of, an analysis of the emission reductions of SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, and mercury (and the effect on mercury removal costs) that would be achieved through an array of strategies to control SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and mercury; and, (ii) proposed and promulgate a new reference test method for determining the ambient concentration of mercury in water.

For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this document, EPA will receive written comments relating to the proposed settlement agreement from persons who were not named as parties or intervenors to the litigation in question. EPA or the Department of Justice may withhold or withdraw consent to the proposed settlement agreement if the comments disclose facts or circumstances that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the Act. Unless EPA or the Department of Justice determines, following the comment period, that consent is inappropriate, the final settlement agreement will contain the requirements listed above.

A copy of the proposed settlement agreement was lodged with the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on April 15, 1998. Copies are also available from Phyllis Cochran, Air and Radiation Law