New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). Specifically, the Administrator has denied a petition submitted by the New York Public Interest Research Group (NYPIRG) to object to the State operating permit issued to the Albert Einstein College of Medicine at Yeshiva University (Yeshiva), in Bronx, NY. The Administrator has partially granted and partially denied a petition submitted by NYPIRG to object to the State operating permit issued to Action Packaging Corporation (Action Packaging), in Brooklyn, NY. The Administrator has also partially granted and partially denied a petition submitted by NYPIRG to object to the State operating permit issued to Kings Plaza Total Energy Plant (Kings Plaza), in Brooklyn, NY.

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

ADDRESSES: You may review copies of the final orders, the petitions, and other supporting information at the EPA, Region 2, 290 Broadway, New York, New York 10007–1866. If you wish to examine these documents, you should make an appointment at least 24 hours before visiting day. Each of the final orders is also available electronically at: *http://www.epa.gov/region07/programs/artd/air/title5/petitiondb/petitiondb2000.htm.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Riva, Chief, Permitting Section, Air Programs Branch, Division of Environmental Planning and Protection, EPA, Region 2, 290 Broadway, 25th Floor, New York, New York 10007–1866, telephone (212) 637–4074.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The 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 raise these issues during the comment period or the grounds for the issues arose after this period.

I. Yeshiva

On March 15, 2000, the EPA received a petition from NYPIRG, requesting that EPA object to the issuance of the title V operating permit to Yeshiva. The petition raises issues regarding the permit application, the permit issuance process, and the permit itself. NYPIRG asserts that (1) NYSDEC violated the public participation requirements of 40 CFR 70.7(h) by inappropriately denying NYPIRG's request for a public hearing; (2) the permit is based on an incomplete permit application in violation of 40 CFR 70.5(c); (3) the permit entirely lacks a statement of basis as required by 40 CFR 70.7(a)(5); (4) the permit repeatedly violates the 40 CFR 70.6(a)(3)(iii)(A) requirement that the permittee submit reports of any required monitoring at least every six months; (5) the permit distorts the annual compliance certification requirement of CAA section 114(a)(3) and 40 CFR 70.6(c)(5); (6) the permit does not assure compliance with all applicable requirements as mandated by 40 CFR 70.1(b) and 70.6(a)(1) because it illegally sanctions the systematic violations of applicable requirements during startup/shutdown, malfunction, maintenance, and upset conditions; (7) the permit does not require prompt reporting of all deviations from permit requirements as mandated by 40 CFR 70.6(a)(3)(iii)(B); and (8) the permit does not assure compliance with all applicable requirements as mandated by 40 CFR 70.1(b) and 70.6(a)(1) because many individual permit conditions lack adequate periodic monitoring and are not practically enforceable.

NYPIRG raises each of these issues in the petitions on Action Packaging and Kings Plaza, as well. In each of these petitions, the eighth issue is subdivided into several detailed points, some which are permit-specific and some which are shared among the other permits.

On January 16, 2002, the Administrator issued an order denying the petition on Yeshiva. The order explains the reasons behind EPA's conclusion that NYPIRG has failed to demonstrate that Yeshiva's permit does not assure compliance with the Act on the grounds raised.

II. Action Packaging

On April 7, 2000, the EPA received a petition from NYPIRG, requesting that EPA object to the issuance of the title V operating permit to Action Packaging, on the grounds listed above. On January 16, 2002, the Administrator issued an order partially granting and partially denying the petition. The order explains the reasons behind EPA's conclusion that the NYSDEC must reopen the permit to require adequate monitoring of the exhaust gas temperature from the facility's incinerator, and to properly address the applicable requirements of the Maximum Achievable Control Technology standard regulating air toxics from this industry. The order also explains the reasons for denying NYPIRG's remaining claims.

III. Kings Plaza

On May 5, 2000, the EPA received a petition from NYPIRG, requesting that EPA object to the issuance of the title V operating permit to Kings Plaza on the grounds listed above. On January 16, 2002, the Administrator issued an order partially granting and partially denying the petition. The order explains the reasons behind EPA's conclusion that the NYSDEC must reopen the permit to properly reference the facility's plan for complying with the Reasonably Available Control Technology requirements for nitrogen oxides (NO_X), and resolve discrepancies in the monitoring for NO_X. The order also explains the reasons for denying NYPIRG's remaining claims.

Dated: February 11, 2002.

Jane M. Kenny,

Regional Administrator, Region 2.

[FR Doc. 02–4258 Filed 2–20–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[CA071–NOA; FRL–7148–5]

Adequacy Status for Transportation Conformity Purposes of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets in the San Francisco Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of adequacy status.

SUMMARY: In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that it has found the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the submitted San Francisco Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard (adopted October 24, 2001) are adequate for transportation conformity purposes.

DATES: The adequacy finding is effective March 8, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: This notice, the findings letter and its enclosures (giving the basis for the adequacy finding and responses to public comments) are available on EPA's conformity web site: *http://www.epa.gov/otaq/traq,* (once there, click on the ''Conformity'' button, then

look for ''Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity''). You may also contact Ginger Vagenas, U.S. EPA, Region IX, Air Division AIR–2, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105; (415) 972–3964 or *vagenas.ginger@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Note: In this document, ''we,'' ''us'' and ''our'' refer to EPA.

Today's notice is an announcement of a finding that we have already made. On February 14, 2002, EPA Region IX sent a letter to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), stating that motor vehicle emission budgets in the San Francisco Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard (revised September 2001 and submitted by CARB on November 30, 2001) are adequate for transportation conformity purposes. These budgets are for the year 2006 and are 164.0 tons per day of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and 270.3 tons per day of nitrogen oxides (NO_X).

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA). Our conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to state air quality implementation plans (SIPs) and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not cause 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). An adequacy review is separate from the SIP completeness review required by CAA section 110(k)(1). In addition, it should not be used to prejudge our ultimate action on the SIP. Even when we find budgets in a SIP adequate for transportation conformity purposes, we may still later disapprove the SIP.

We have described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in guidance (May 14, 1999 memo titled ''Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision''). We followed this guidance in making our adequacy determination.

Dated: February 14, 2002.

Wayne Nastri,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 02–4259 Filed 2–20–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7146–2]

Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2000

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of documents availability and request for public comments.

SUMMARY: The Draft Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2000 is available for public review. Annual U.S. emissions for the period of time from 1990–2000 are summarized and presented by source category and sector. The inventory contains estimates of carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFC), perflourocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexaflouride (SF6) emissions. The inventory includes estimates of carbon sequestration in U.S. forests and, new this year, an updated assessment of emissions from the electric power industry. The technical approach used in this report to estimate emissions and sinks for greenhouse gases is consistent with the methodologies recommended by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and reported in a format consistent with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) reporting guidelines. The Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks is the latest in a series of annual U.S. submissions to the Secretariat of the UNFCCC.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before March 25, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to Mr. Michael Gillenwater at: Environmental Protection Agency, Clean Air Markets Division (6204N), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460, Fax: (202) 565–6673. You are welcome and encouraged to send an email with your comments to *Gillenwater.Michael@epa.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Michael Gillenwater, Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Atmospheric Programs, Clean Air Markets Division, (202) 564–4092, *Gillenwater.Michael@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The draft reports can be obtained by visiting the U.S. EPA's global warming site at *http://www.epa.gov/globalwarming/publications/emissions/.*

Dated: February 11, 2002.

Robert Brenner,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 02–3772 Filed 2–15–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7148–1]

Notice of Proposed Administrative Cost Recovery Settlement Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 122(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (''CERCLA''), notice is hereby given of a proposed administrative cost recovery settlement under section 122(h)(1) of CERCLA concerning the Geneva City Dump site in Geneva, Ohio which was signed by the EPA Superfund Division Director, Region 5, on February 7, 2002. The settlement resolves an EPA claim under section 107(a) of CERCLA against the City of Geneva. The settlement requires the City of Geneva to pay to the Hazardous Substances Superfund $160,000 in two payments. The first 50% payment is due within 30 days of the effective date of the settlement. The second 50% payment is due within one year of the effective date of the settlement or before March 31, 2003, whichever is earlier.

For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the settlement. The Agency will consider all comments received and may modify or withdraw its consent to the settlement if comments received disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. The Agency's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at the Superfund Records Center, located at 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Seventh Floor, Chicago, Illinois.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before March 25, 2002.

ADDRESSES: The proposed settlement and additional background information relating to the settlement are available for public inspection at the Superfund