remaining provisions in the direct final § 75.18(b) remain in effect.

No other significant, adverse comments were received by EPA on the direct final rule. Thus, all other provisions of the direct final rule became final on July 17, 1995 and remain in effect.

EPA is merely reinstating a few provisions of the original January 11, 1993 rule pending response to adverse comments on proposed amendments of those provisions. The requirements of Executive Orders 12866 and 12875, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Unfunded Mandates Act, and the Paperwork Reduction Act are therefore not applicable to this notice. All applicable administrative requirements will be met when the proposed amendments are addressed in a future final rule.

For additional information, see the direct final rule. 60 FR 26510 (May 17, 1995).

### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 75

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon dioxide, Continuous emission monitors, Electric utilities, Incorporation by reference, Nitrogen oxides, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur dioxide.

Dated: August 2, 1995.

#### Brian J. McLean,

Director, Acid Rain Division.

1. The authority citation for part 75 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7601 and 7651, et seq.

2. Section 75.18 is amended by removing paragraph (b)(3) and by revising paragraph (b)(2) to read as follows:

# § 75.18 Specific provisions for monitoring emissions from common and by-pass stacks for opacity.

\* \* \* \* \* (b) \* \* \*

- (2) A continuous opacity monitoring system is already installed and certified at the inlet of the add-on emissions controls.
- 3. Section 75.20 is amended by revising paragraph (f) to read as follows:

## § 75.20 Certification and recertification procedures.

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) Certification/recertification procedures for alternative monitoring systems. The designated representative representing the owner or operator of each alternative monitoring system approved by the Administrator as equivalent to or better than a continuous emission monitoring system according to the criteria in subpart E of this part shall apply for certification to the Administrator prior to use of the system under the Acid Rain Program, and shall apply for recertification to the Administrator following a replacement, modification, or change according to the procedures in paragraph (c) of this section. The owner or operator of an alternative monitoring system shall comply with the notification and application requirements for certification or recertification according to the procedures specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

(1) The Administrator will publish each request for initial certification of an alternative monitoring system in the **Federal Register** and, following a public comment period of 60 days, will issue a notice of approval or disapproval.

(2) No alternative monitoring system shall be authorized by the Administrator in a permit issued pursuant to part 72 of this chapter unless approved by the Administrator in accordance with this part.

4. Section 75.41 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(1), (b)(1)(i), (b)(2)(iv)(A), (b)(2)(iv)(C), (c)(1)(i), (c)(1)(ii), and (c)(2)(ii) to read as follows:

### §75.41 Precision criteria.

(a) \* \* \*

(1) Data from the alternative monitoring system and the continuous emission monitoring system shall be collected and paired in a manner that ensures each pair of values applies to hourly average emissions during the same hour.

\* \* \* \* \* (b) \* \* \* (1) \* \* \*

(i) Apply the log transformation to each measured value of either the certified continuous emissions monitoring system or certified flow monitor, using the following equation:

 $l_v$ =ln  $e_v$ (Eq. 11)

where,

e<sub>v</sub>=Hourly value generated by the certified continuous emissions monitoring system or certified flow monitoring system

 l<sub>v</sub>=Hourly lognormalized data values for the certified monitoring system and to each measured value, e<sub>p</sub>, of the proposed alternative monitoring system, using the following equation to obtain the lognormalized data values, l<sub>p</sub>:

l<sub>p</sub>=ln e<sub>p</sub> (Eq. 12) where,

e<sub>p</sub>=Hourly value generated by the proposed alternative monitoring system. 
$$\label{eq:lp} \begin{split} l_p \!\!=\! & Hourly\ lognormalized\ data\ values\ for \\ the\ proposed\ alternative\ monitoring \\ system. \end{split}$$

\* \* \* \* \* (2) \* \* \* (iv) \* \* \*

(A) The set of measured hourly values, e<sub>v</sub>, generated by the certified continuous emissions monitoring system or certified flow monitoring system.

\* \* \* \* \*

(C) The set of hourly differences,  $e_{\nu}$ –  $e_p$ , between the hourly values,  $e_{\nu}$ , generated by the certified continuous emissions monitoring system or certified flow monitoring system and the hourly values,  $e_p$ , generated by the proposed alternative monitoring system.

(c) \* \* \* (1) \* \* \*

(i) Calculate the variance of the certified continuous emission monitoring system or certified flow monitor as applicable,  $S_{\rm v}^2$ , and the proposed method,  $S_{\rm p}^2$ , using the following equation.

$$S^{2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (e_{i} - e_{m})^{2}}{n-1}$$

(Eq. 23) where.

e<sub>i</sub>=Measured values of either the certified continuous emission monitoring system or certified flow monitor, as applicable, or proposed method.

e<sub>m</sub>=Mean of either the certified continuous emission monitoring system or certified flow monitor, as applicable, or proposed method values.

n=Total number of paired samples.

(ii) Determine if the variance of the proposed method is significantly different from that of the certified continuous emission monitoring system or certified flow monitor, as applicable, by calculating the F-value using the following equation.

$$F = \frac{S_p^2}{S_p^2}$$

(Eq. 24)

Compare the experimental F-value with the critical value of F at the 95-percent confidence level with n-1 degrees of freedom. The critical value is obtained from a table for F-distribution. If the calculated F-value is greater than the critical value, the proposed method is unacceptable.

(2) \* \* \*