analyzers with multiple monitoring paths are used, each monitoring path could potentially be substituted for one point SO<sub>2</sub> monitor. Modeling, and perhaps saturation monitoring (a short term study involving the use of portable monitors deployed around the source). could be used to determine the area of expected maximum concentration based on the most predominant wind direction. One monitor would be placed at the fence line downwind of the predominant wind direction. A second monitor would be placed in the modeled maximum concentration area based on the predominant wind direction. Since wind directions around an SO<sub>2</sub> source may be significantly different from one season to another, this same procedure would be repeated for the second most frequent wind direction. For some cases, two or more of these locations may coincide and thereby reduce the number of monitors, or allow for a State or local agency to locate sites in alternative locations. In other cases, additional monitors would probably be needed for situations of complex terrain and/or meteorology. The EPA also encourages the use of open path SO<sub>2</sub> analyzers in combination with point SO<sub>2</sub> monitors to obtain better spatial coverage around the targeted sources. One open path SO<sub>2</sub> analyzer using multiple monitoring paths could potentially replace several of the point SO<sub>2</sub> monitors, depending on factors such as meteorology, terrain, and obstructions. Open path analyzers may be particularly useful in assessing ambient SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations over large populated areas, such as parks and recreation centers, where people are expected to jog/exercise. The EPA solicits comments on the location, number and type of SO<sub>2</sub> monitors, the various available monitoring technologies, and the need to waive minimum monitoring requirements.

The concentration gradients are expected to be sharper around these targeted sources of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. As a result, the SO<sub>2</sub> monitors located to measure population exposures over a wide area are unlikely to adequately characterize these peaks. Therefore, appendix D is being revised to allow the use of microscale SO<sub>2</sub> sites for SLAMS monitors, and to encourage middle/ neighborhood scale measurements as appropriate in populated areas near these targeted sources. The microscale measurements for SO<sub>2</sub> would represent concentrations over an area ranging from several meters to up to about 100 meters. The EPA solicits comments on the use of micro, middle, and neighborhood scale monitors, both point monitors and/or open path analyzers, around point sources of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

The EPA is also proposing that the SO<sub>2</sub> monitors around these targeted sources of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions be classified as SLAMS monitors. Section 2.3 requires that monitoring be performed for a minimum of 2 years. After that time, a decision should be made during the annual network review as to whether the monitoring should be continued around the targeted source, or the monitors redeployed around a different targeted source based on measured concentration levels, changes in plant process operations, etc. The EPA solicits comments on the SLAMS classification of the SO<sub>2</sub> monitors around the targeted sources and a waiver provision to relocate the monitors before the full 2 years based on a review of the data.

With this proposal, EPA is also requiring the collection of 5-minute  $SO_2$  concentrations at the targeted sites. The EPA solicits comment on the need to require 5-minute concentrations at NAMS or other SLAMS sites, and if supplementary criteria should be considered for this additional request (e.g., require 5-minute  $SO_2$  monitor data if 1-hour concentration exceeds some level).

### D. Appendix F—Annual SLAMS Report

A proposed revision to section 2.1.1 of appendix F would reword this section to provide greater clarity and add a requirement to report the number of 5-minute hourly maximum observations. Section 2.1.2 would similarly be reworded for clarity and to require that the 24-hour averages reported in the annual report for SO<sub>2</sub> be based on block (midnight to midnight) averaging periods and the 3-hour averages also to be based on block averaging periods. Reporting of the number of values in specified ranges of 24-hour average concentrations would be deleted because of new revisions to 40 CFR part 58 data reporting requirements.

Reporting of 5-minute hourly maximums would also be added. The EPA solicits comments on the need for reporting additional summary data if a multiple exceedance form of the standard is adopted.

# E. Appendix G—Air Quality Index Reporting and Daily Reporting

The EPA proposes to revise the  $SO_2$  ambient concentrations contained in Tables 1 and 2 and in Figure 3 to correspond to the proposed new episode criteria and significant harm levels.

#### VIII. Transition Issues

Since the existing NAAQS would be retained even if a 5-minute NAAQS is promulgated, all existing requirements and attainment dates will remain in place as to the existing NAAQS.

IX. Other Clean Air Act Amendment Authorities Affecting SO<sub>2</sub> Sources

The EPA is also developing a voluntary program as part of the acid rain program to encourage nonutility sources to reduce their emissions of SO<sub>2</sub>. The voluntary entry into the acid rain program, known as the opt-in program, allows nonaffected sources (nonaffected under title IV), the opportunity to receive their own allowances, undertake emission reductions and trade the extra allowances they would no longer need for compliance with the acid rain program. Again, such participating sources would be under the same obligations to meet all other air regulatory requirements.

These nonutility sources that could participate in the opt-in program are the same group of sources of concern for establishing a 5-minute SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. Assuming entry occurred prior to the imposition of the 5-minute standard, the source could accelerate its emissions reductions and offset the cost of such reductions through participation in the opt-in program. The EPA believes the development of options for a 5-minute SO<sub>2</sub> standard and the opt-in program protects public health and provides an opportunity for cost reduction.

# X. Public Participation

### A. Comments and the Public Docket

The EPA welcomes comments on all aspects of this proposed rulemaking. Commenters are especially encouraged to give suggestions for changing any aspects of the proposal that they find objectionable. All comments, with the exception of proprietary information, should be directed to Docket No. A–94–55 with regard to part 51 and Docket No. A–94–56 with regard to part 58 (see ADDRESSES).

Commenters who wish to submit proprietary information for consideration should clearly separate such information from other comments by: (1) Labeling proprietary information "Confidential Business Information," and (2) sending proprietary information directly to the contact person listed (see FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT) and not to the public docket.

This will help ensure that proprietary information is not inadvertently placed in the docket. If a commenter wants EPA to use a submission labeled as