

### Description of Alternatives

Construction of the FHWA preferred alternative will require removal and modification of Western's transmission system. Western evaluated seven preliminary electrical transmission reconfiguration options as part of the EIS. All options require removal of existing spans and towers and construction of new spans. Three of the options would require removal of the existing A&N Switchyard and replacing a single-phase circuit with a double-phase circuit to the Mead Substation (phase two). Additionally, the Sugarloaf Mountain Alternative requires a realignment of two of the Hoover-Mead transmission lines to accommodate the new highway alignment.

Western determined the best engineering approach for the phase one and two modifications discussed above based on an evaluation of the electrical conditions on the transmission lines and switchyards and current transmission line construction and electrical standards.

The No Action Alternative was evaluated in the EIS and found to not meet the Project purpose and need.

### Mitigation Measures

The Final EIS identified mitigation measures needed to reduce the impacts of the Project. The specific measures are discussed in the FHWA ROD on pages 22 to 35 and in Chapter 3 of the EIS. Western is adopting those measures that are applicable to its action and will issue a Mitigation Action Plan (MAP) prior to any construction activities that will address the adopted and standard mitigation measures. Some of the measures include restricting vehicular traffic to existing access roads or public roads, recontouring and reseeding disturbed areas, environmental awareness training for all construction and supervisory personnel, and mitigation of radio and television interference generated by transmission lines. Long-term operations of the transmission line will follow Western's standard operating procedures and will not be affected by this action. The mitigation that applies to the construction of the new lines and the upgrading of the existing lines includes the following provisions:

1. Protection of the desert tortoise and banded Gila monster through compliance with the FHWA Biological Opinion.
2. Protection of Cultural and Historical resources as signators to the Programmatic Agreement.
3. Adoption of mitigation measures as specified in the FWHA EIS.

4. Monitor actions for compliance with Western's standard mitigation measures.

This ROD has been prepared in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508) and DOE Procedures for Implementing NEPA (10 CFR part 1021). Upon approval, the MAP will be made available.

Dated: September 20, 2002.

**Michael S. Hacsakaylo,**

*Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 02–24862 Filed 9–30–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450–01–P**

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7386–6]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Criteria for Classification of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Practices, Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements—40 CFR Part 257, Subpart B

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that the following Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval: Criteria for Classification of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Practices, Recordkeeping and Reporting requirements—40 CFR Part 257, Subpart B, ICR #1745.04, OMB Control #2050–0154, expiring September 30, 2002. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden and cost; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before October 31, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments, referencing EPA ICR No. 1745.04 and OMB Control No. 2050–0154, to the following addresses: Susan Auby, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Collection Strategies Division (Mail Code 2822T), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; and to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725

17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For a copy of the ICR contact Susan Auby at EPA by phone at (202) 566–1672, by e-mail at [auby.susan@epa.gov](mailto:auby.susan@epa.gov), or download off the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/icr> and refer to EPA ICR No. 1745.04. For technical questions about the ICR contact Paul Cassidy at 703–308–7281 in the Office of Solid Waste.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Criteria for Classification of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Practices, Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements—40 CFR Part 257, Subpart B, OMB Control No. 2050–0154, EPA ICR No. 1745.04, expiring September 30, 2002. This is a request for extension of a currently approved collection.

In order to effectively implement and enforce final changes to 40 CFR part 257, subpart B on a State level, owners/operators of construction and demolition waste landfills that receive CESQG hazardous wastes will have to comply with the final reporting and recordkeeping requirements. The 1984 Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended, mandated that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) revise the Criteria for Solid Waste Disposal Facilities that may receive household hazardous wastes and conditionally exempt small quantity generator (CESQG) wastes. EPA submitted a Report to Congress in October 1988 that assessed the impacts on human health and the environment associated with Subtitle D (non-hazardous waste) units. While this study found that the revised Criteria for municipal solid waste disposal units were necessary to protect human health and the environment, the report failed to draw a conclusion relating to industrial Subtitle D units. The limited data on such units indicated that there might be a basis for concern and further study was needed.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR chapter 15. The **Federal Register** document required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on May 1, 2002 (67 FR 21668); no comments were received. Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and record keeping

burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 67 hours per response. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

*Respondents/Affected Entities:* Construction and demolition waste landfill owners/operators and State Agencies.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 145.

*Frequency of Response:* On occasion.

*Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden:* 9,675 hours.

*Estimated Total Annualized Capital, O&M Cost Burden:* \$938.

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques to the addresses listed above. Please refer to EPA ICR No. 1745.04 and OMB Control No. 2050-0154 in any correspondence.

Dated: September 2, 2002.

**Oscar Morales,**

*Director, Collection Strategies Division.*

[FR Doc. 02-24805 Filed 9-30-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[UT-001-0050; FRL-7388-2]

### Adequacy Status of the Utah County, Utah PM<sub>10</sub> State Implementation Plan Revision for Transportation Conformity Purposes

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of adequacy.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, EPA is notifying the public that we have found that the motor vehicle emissions budgets (for 2010 and 2020) in the Utah County, Utah particulate matter of 10

micrograms in size or smaller (PM<sub>10</sub>) State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted on July 3, 2002, are adequate for conformity purposes. On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that submitted SIPs cannot be used for conformity determinations until EPA has affirmatively found them adequate. As a result of our finding, the Mountainland Association of Governments, the Utah Department of Transportation, and the U.S. Department of Transportation are required to use the 2010 and 2020 motor vehicle emissions budgets from this submitted SIP revision for future conformity determinations.

**DATES:** This finding is effective October 16, 2002.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kerri Fiedler, Air & Radiation Program (8P-AR), United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, 999 18th Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466, (303) 312-6493.

The letter documenting our finding is available at EPA's conformity website: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/transp/conform/adequacy.htm>.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document wherever "we," "us," or "our" are used we mean EPA.

This action is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. We sent a letter to the Utah Department of Environmental Quality on September 5, 2002 stating that the 2010 and 2020 PM<sub>10</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> motor vehicle emissions budgets in the submitted Utah County PM<sub>10</sub> SIP revision are adequate. This finding has also been announced on our conformity website at <http://www.epa.gov/oms/transp/conform/adequacy.htm>.

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. Our conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to SIPs and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a 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). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from our completeness review, and it also should not be used to prejudge our ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a

budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved, and vice versa.

We've described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in a memo entitled, "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision," dated May 14, 1999. We followed this guidance in making our adequacy determination.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: September 23, 2002.

**Robert E. Roberts,**

*Regional Administrator, Region VIII.*

[FR Doc. 02-24916 Filed 9-30-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7387-7]

### EPA Science Advisory Board, Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meetings of the Contaminated Sediment Science Plan Review Panel; and Notification of Cancelled Meetings of the Human Health Research Strategy Review Panel

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given of three meetings of the Contaminated Sediment Science Plan Review Panel (CSSP Review Panel) of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Science Advisory Board (SAB). The Panel will meet on the dates and times noted below. All times noted are Eastern Time. All meetings are open to the public, however, seating is limited and available on a first come basis. For teleconference meetings, available lines may also be limited.

*Important Notice:* The document that is the subject of this SAB review, Contaminated Sediment Science Plan, June 13, 2002 draft, is available on the SAB Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/sab/panels/cssprpanel.html>. Any questions concerning the draft document should be directed to the program contact noted below.

*Background—*The background for this review and the charge to the panel were published in the 67 FR 49336, July 30, 2002. The notice also included a draft charge to the panel, a call for nominations for members of the panel in certain technical expertise areas needed to address the charge and described the process to be used in forming the panel.