

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 PM₁₀ 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 (PM₁₀) 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 PM₁₀ and NO_x motor vehicle emissions budgets in the submitted Utah County PM₁₀ 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.