

- (c) Shaw Industries, Plant No. 80 (GA)—November 15, 2002;
- (d) Shaw Industries, Plant No. 2 (GA)—November 15, 2002;
- (e) Oglethorpe Power Wansley Combined Cycle Energy Facility (GA)—November 15, 2002;
- (f) Columbia University (NY)—December 15, 2002;
- (g) Elmhurst Hospital (NY)—December 15, 2002;
- (h) Starrett City (NY)—December 15, 2002;
- (i) Bergen Point Sewage Treatment Plant (NY)—December 15, 2002;
- (j) Maimonides Medical Center (NY)—December 15, 2002;
- (k) Lovett Generating Station (NY)—January 30, 2003;
- (l) Danskammer Generating Station (NY)—January 30, 2003;
- (m) Con Edison 74th Street Station (NY)—January 30, 2003.

The proposed consent decree also requires EPA to provide the plaintiffs with notice of signature of each order within five business days following signature. In addition, the proposed consent decree requires EPA to deliver a notice of each order to the Office of Federal Register for prompt publication no later than thirty days following signature and to not take any steps to delay publication of such notice. After EPA has fulfilled all of its obligations under the proposed consent decree, the proposed consent decree will terminate and the lawsuits will be dismissed with prejudice.

For a period of thirty days following the date of publication of this notice, EPA will receive written comments relating to the proposed consent decree from persons who were not named as parties or intervenors to the lawsuits in question. EPA or the United States Department of Justice may withdraw or withhold consent to the proposed consent decree if the comments disclose facts or considerations that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the Act. Unless EPA or the United States Department of Justice determines, following the comment period, that consent is inappropriate, the final consent decree will be entered with the court and will establish deadlines for the Administrator's responses to the remaining petitions that are subject to the lawsuits in question.

Dated: December 4, 2002.

**Lisa K. Friedman,**

*Associate General Counsel, Air and Radiation Law Office, Office of General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 02-31359 Filed 12-11-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7419-8]

### Clean Water Act Section 303(d): Availability of List Decisions

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the availability of EPA decisions identifying water quality limited segments and associated pollutants in Arizona and Nevada to be listed pursuant to Clean Water Act Section 303(d)(2), and requests public comment. Section 303(d)(2) requires that states submit and EPA approve or disapprove lists of waters for which existing technology-based pollution controls are not stringent enough to attain or maintain state water quality standards and for which total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) must be prepared.

On December 5, 2002, EPA partially approved and partially disapproved Arizona's submittal. Specifically, EPA approved Arizona's listing of 32 waters, associated pollutants, and associated priority rankings. EPA disapproved Arizona's decisions not to list 19 water quality limited segments and associated pollutants, and additional pollutants for 3 water bodies already listed by the State. EPA identified these additional water bodies and pollutants along with priority rankings for inclusion on the 2002 Section 303(d) list.

On November 20, 2002, EPA partially approved and partially disapproved Nevada's submittal. Specifically, EPA approved Nevada's listing of 84 waters, associated pollutants, and associated priority rankings. EPA disapproved Nevada's decisions not to list 15 water quality limited segments and associated pollutants, and additional pollutants for 38 water bodies already listed by the State. EPA identified these additional water bodies and pollutants along with priority rankings for inclusion on the 2002 Section 303(d) list.

EPA is providing the public the opportunity to review its decisions to add waters and pollutants to Arizona and Nevada's 2002 Section 303(d) lists, as required by EPA's Public Participation regulations [40 CFR part 25]. EPA will consider public comments in reaching its final decisions on the additional water bodies and pollutants identified for inclusion on Arizona and Nevada's final lists.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted to EPA on or before January 13, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the proposed decisions should be sent to David

Smith, TMDL Team Leader, Water Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, telephone (415) 972-3416, facsimile (415) 947-3537, e-mail [smith.davidw@epa.gov](mailto:smith.davidw@epa.gov). Oral comments will not be considered. Copies of the proposed decisions concerning Arizona and Nevada which explain the rationale for EPA's decisions can be obtained at EPA Region 9's Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/region09/water/TMDL> by writing or calling Mr. Smith at the above address. Underlying documentation comprising the record for these decisions are available for public inspection at the above address.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Smith at (415) 972-3416 or [smith.davidw@epa.gov](mailto:smith.davidw@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires that each state identify those waters for which existing technology-based pollution controls are not stringent enough to attain or maintain state water quality standards. For those waters, states are required to establish TMDLs according to a priority ranking.

EPA's Water Quality Planning and Management regulations include requirements related to the implementation of Section 303(d) of the CWA [40 CFR 130.7]. The regulations require states to identify water quality limited waters still requiring TMDLs every two years. The lists of waters still needing TMDLs must also include priority rankings and must identify the waters targeted for TMDL development during the next two years [40 CFR 130.7]. On March 31, 2000, EPA promulgated a revision to this regulation that waived the requirement for states to submit Section 303(d) lists in 2000 except in cases where a court order, consent decree, or settlement agreement required EPA to take action on a list in 2000 [65 FR 17170].

Consistent with EPA's regulations, Arizona submitted to EPA its listing decisions under Section 303(d)(2) on October 17, 2002. On December 5, 2002, EPA approved Arizona's listing of 32 waters and associated priority rankings. EPA disapproved Arizona's decisions not to list 19 water quality limited segments and associated pollutants, and additional pollutants for 3 water bodies already listed by the State. EPA identified these additional waters and pollutants along with priority rankings for inclusion on the 2002 Section 303(d) list. EPA solicits public comment on its identification of 19 additional waters and associated pollutants, and additional pollutants for 3 waters

already listed by the State, for inclusion on Arizona's 2002 Section 303(d) list.

Consistent with EPA's regulations, Nevada submitted to EPA its listing decisions under Section 303(d)(2) on October 1, 2002. On November 20, 2002, EPA approved Nevada's listing of 84 waters and associated priority rankings. EPA disapproved Nevada's decisions not to list 15 water quality limited segments and associated pollutants, and additional pollutants for 38 water bodies already listed by the State. EPA identified these additional waters and pollutants along with priority rankings for inclusion on the 2002 Section 303(d) list. EPA solicits public comment on its identification of 15 additional waters and associated pollutants, and additional pollutants for 38 waters already listed by the State, for inclusion on Nevada's 2002 Section 303(d) list.

Dated: November 27, 2002.

**Catherine Kuhlman,**

*Acting Director, Water Division, EPA Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 02-31239 Filed 12-11-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

### Farm Credit Administration Board; Regular Meeting; Sunshine Act

**AGENCY:** Farm Credit Administration.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), that the January 9, 2003 regular meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board) will not be held. The FCA Board will hold a special meeting at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, January 7, 2003. An agenda for this meeting will be published at a later date.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Jeanette C. Brinkley, Acting Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, (703) 883-4009, TTY (703) 883-4056.

**ADDRESS:** Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102-5090.

Dated: December 9, 2002.

**Jeanette C. Brinkley,**

*Acting Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.*

[FR Doc. 02-31407 Filed 12-9-02; 5:04 pm]

BILLING CODE 6705-01-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

November 27, 2002.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Communications Commissions, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

**DATES:** Written comments should be submitted on or before January 13, 2003. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all comments to Les Smith, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1-A804, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554 or via the Internet to [lesmith@fcc.gov](mailto:lesmith@fcc.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Les Smith at (202) 418-0217 or via the Internet at [lesmith@fcc.gov](mailto:lesmith@fcc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 3060-1002.

*Title:* Cable Horizontal and Vertical Ownership Information Collection.

*Form Number:* N/A.

*Type of Review:* Revision of currently approved collection.

*Respondents:* Business or other for-profit entities.

*Number of Respondents:* 146.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 30 mins. (0.5 hrs.).

*Frequency of Response:* One-time reporting requirement.

*Total Annual Burden:* 162 hours.

*Total Annual Costs:* None.

*Needs and Uses:* Under Section 613(f) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, the FCC is directed to establish reasonable limits on the number of subscribers that may be reached through cable operators' owned or affiliated cable systems and on the number of channels that can be occupied by cable operators' owned or affiliated programming networks. This information collection will assist the Commission in its rulemaking proceeding revising these rules consistent with a court remand and reversal of previous rules.

*OMB Control Number:* 3060-0863.

*Title:* Satellite Delivery of Network Signals to Unserved Households for Purposes of the Satellite Home Viewer Act (SHVA).

*Form Number:* N/A.

*Type of Review:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Respondents:* Business or other for profit entities.

*Number of Respondents:* 848.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 30 minutes (0.5 hrs.).

*Frequency of Response:* Recordkeeping; On occasion reporting requirements; Third party disclosure.

*Total Annual Burden:* 125,000 hours.

*Total Annual Costs:* None.

*Needs and Uses:* In February 1999, the FCC released a *Report and Order* (R&O), FCC 99-14, that described a method for measuring the Grade B signal strength at a household so that the satellite and broadcast industries and consumers would have a uniform method for calibrating actual household signal strength and thereby determine which consumers are "unserved" by over-the-air network signals. The written records of test results are made after testing and predicting the strength of a television station's signal. The R&O also endorsed a computer model to predict whether a household is likely to be able to receive a signal of the required strength. In May 2000, the FCC released a First Report and Order (First R&O), FCC 00-185, that prescribed an improved point-to-point predictive model (Individual Location Longley-Rice (ILLR)), which provides a reliable and presumptive means for determining whether the over-the-air signal of a network affiliated television station can be received at an individual location. The model can be refined when