

vessel sewage have been designated by regulations promulgated by EPA. This information collection request will focus on the effectiveness of no-discharge zones for vessel sewage designated under Clean Water Act section 312(f)(3) and the effectiveness of current MSD technologies. There would be separate surveys developed for boat owners and operators, marina owners and operators, State and local government officials, MSD manufacturers, and U.S. Coast Guard accepted independent laboratories.

The survey developed for boat owners and operators would address the boater's experience with using pumpout or dump facilities in no-discharge zones. Specifically, the survey would seek information with regards to whether the pumpout or dump facilities were working or not working when the boater attempted to use them. It would address whether the boater would use the facilities if they were available and how often the boaters actually use the facilities. Respondents would be selected from North-Atlantic States, Mid-Atlantic States, California, the Florida Keys, and the Great Lakes. Approximately, 600 respondents from the geographical regions would be selected for response. The information collection would be voluntary and would not include CBI. The survey developed for marina owners and operators would address the downtime of pumpout and dump facilities located in no-discharge zones and the use of those facilities by boaters. Respondents would be selected from North-Atlantic States, Mid-Atlantic States, California, the Florida Keys, and the Great Lakes. Approximately, 80 marina owners or operators from the geographical regions would be selected for response. The information collection would be voluntary and would not include CBI. Also, a survey would be developed for State and local government officials to determine if the designation of no-discharge zones has been effective in addressing water quality issues of the particular water body, and if boaters were in compliance. Respondents would be selected from North-Atlantic States, Mid-Atlantic States, California, the Florida Keys, and the Great Lakes. Approximately, 100 respondents from the geographical regions would be selected for response. The information collection would be voluntary and would not include CBI. The information collected from the surveys would be used to assess the overall effectiveness of no-discharge zones for vessel sewage established under Clean Water Act section 312(f)(3) to determine if

modifications to the program are needed.

An additional survey would be developed to review current MSD technology. The information on MSDs that would be requested includes effluent constituents and their concentrations; bacteria eradication processes and suspended solids removal; and cost and installation. This information would be used to help determine the effectiveness of the current MSD technologies. Approximately, 30 MSD manufacturers and 8 U.S. Coast Guard accepted independent laboratories would be selected for response. Responding to the collection of information would be voluntary. The survey would provide instructions on the procedures for making CBI claims, and the respondents would also be informed of the terms and rules governing protection of CBI obtained under the Clean Water Act. 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 EPA would like to solicit comments to:

(i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

*Burden Statement:* EPA estimates that 35 marina owners and operators would respond to the survey. It would probably take 20 minutes to complete the survey. Also, EPA estimates that the total burden for marina owners and operators would be 12 hours and \$240. EPA estimates that 350 boat owners and operators would respond to the survey, and at a maximum, it would take 20 minutes for each respondent to complete the survey. EPA estimates that the total burden for boat owners and operators would be 117 hours and

\$1,800. EPA estimates that 70 State and local government officials would respond to the survey, and at a maximum, it would take 2 hours for each respondent to complete the survey. EPA estimates that the total burden for State and local government officials would be 140 hours and \$4,900. EPA estimates that 20 MSD manufacturers would respond to the survey, and it would take them approximately 2 hours to complete it. The total burden for MSD manufacturers would be 40 hours, and the total cost would be \$800. Lastly, EPA estimates that 7 U.S. Coast Guard accepted independent laboratories would respond to the survey. These laboratories test MSDs to certify that they meet the current MSD standards located at 40 CFR 140.3. It would take each of them approximately 2 hours to complete the survey. The total burden on the U.S. Coast Guard accepted independent laboratories would be 14 hours, and the total cost would be \$420. There is no start up or capital cost associated with the surveys described above. 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.

Dated: March 19, 2003.

**Diane C. Regas,**

*Director, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds.*

[FR Doc. 03-7372 Filed 3-26-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7474-1]

### Proposed Consent Decree

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed consent decree; request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act, as amended,

42 U.S.C. 7413(g), notice is hereby given of a proposed partial consent decree, which the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on March 21, 2003, in a lawsuit filed by the Sierra Club under section 304(a) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7604(a), *Sierra Club v. Whitman*, No. 01-01537 (consolidated with cases 01548, 01558, 01569, 01582, and 01597) (D.D.C.).

**DATES:** Written comments on the proposed consent decree must be received by April 28, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to Apple Chapman, Air and Radiation Law Office (2344A), Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460. A copy of the proposed consent decree is available from Phyllis Cochran, (202) 564-7606.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Apple Chapman at (202) 564-5666.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This lawsuit concerns EPA's alleged failure to meet certain deadlines in the Clean Air Act ("CAA"). The proposed partial consent decree would fully settle four of the above-listed consolidated cases and partially settle two others.

Specifically, the consent decree provides that EPA shall: (1) Promulgate emission standards under CAA section 112(d), 42 U.S.C. 7412(d), for any twelve (12) of the remaining listed categories subject to CAA section 112(e)(1)(E), 42 U.S.C. 7412(e)(1)(E), on or before August 29, 2003 and for the remaining four (4) categories on or before February 27, 2004; (2) promulgate emission standards under CAA section 112(d), 42 U.S.C. 7412(d), for hazardous waste burning industrial boilers on or before June 15, 2005; (3) pursuant to CAA section 129(a)(5), 42 U.S.C. 7429(a)(5), promulgate revisions of the new source performance standards and emission guidelines for large municipal waste combustion units by April 28, 2006; (4) promulgate specified regulations under CAA section 112(d), 42 U.S.C. 7412 (d), pursuant to CAA sections 112(c)(3), 112(k), and 112(c)(6), 42 U.S.C. 7412 (c)(3), (k) and (c)(6) for certain categories of area sources by specified deadlines; (5) promulgate emission standards for "other categories of solid waste incineration units" under CAA section 129(a)(1)(E), 42 U.S.C. 7419(a)(1)(E), by November 30, 2005. Lastly, the consent decree provides that the parties stipulate to a dismissal of the claims in Case No. 01-1582 which alleged EPA's failure to submit the Report to Congress

under CAA section 112(s), 42 U.S.C. 7412(s).

For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the proposed consent decree from persons who are not named as parties or intervenors to the litigation in question. The EPA or the 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 Clean Air Act. Unless EPA or the Department of Justice determines, following the comment period, that consent is inappropriate, the consent decree will be final.

Dated: March 21, 2003.

**Lisa K. Friedman,**

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

[FR Doc. 03-7370 Filed 3-26-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7473-7]

### Notice of Request for Initial Proposals (IP) for Projects To Be Funded From the Water Quality Cooperative Agreement Allocation (CFDA 66.463—Water Quality Cooperative Agreements); Correction

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

**ACTION:** Notice; correction.

**SUMMARY:** EPA Region 6 published in the **Federal Register** of March 19, 2003, a notice soliciting Initial Proposals funded from the Regional Water Quality Cooperative Agreement allocation. Inadvertently, the minus was deleted from the points listed under applicant's past performance of the evaluation criteria. Applicant's past performance should be listed as a minus 3 points (-3).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Terry Mendiola by telephone at 214-665-7144 or by e-mail at [mendiola.teresita@epa.gov](mailto:mendiola.teresita@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** EPA Region 6 published a notice in the **Federal Register** of March 19, 2003, (53 FR 13303) soliciting Initial Proposals for projects to be funded from the Regional Water Quality Cooperative Agreement Allocation. Inadvertently, the minus was deleted from the points listed under applicant's past performance of the

evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria states that points will be taken away for poor past performance if knowledge of applicant's past performance is available to EPA. Therefore, applicant's past performance should be listed as a minus 3 points (-3). This correction adds the minus to indicate points will be taken away. In notice FR Doc. 03-6576 published on March 19, 2003, (53 FR 13303) make the following correction. On page 13305, in the third column, add a minus to (3 points) to read (-3 points) under applicant's past performance of the EPA IP Evaluation Criteria.

Dated: March 20, 2003.

**Miguel I. Flores,**

*Director, Water Quality Protection Division, Region 6.*

[FR Doc. 03-7371 Filed 3-26-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

March 19, 2003.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Communications Commission, 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(s), 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 April 28, 2003. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it