

*Affected Entities:* Entities potentially affected by this action are airport owners/operators.

*Title:* Survey of Airport Deicing Operations (Airline Questionnaire).

*Abstract:* EPA is developing wastewater discharge standards, called "effluent guidelines," for airports pursuant to the Agency's 2004 Effluent Guidelines Plan (69 FR 53719, September 2, 2004). The focus of the rulemaking is on wastewater discharges from aircraft and runway deicing operations. EPA will send survey questionnaires to a sample of air carriers to help the Agency compile a national assessment of deicing operations. The survey will include questions on the deicing technologies employed, amount of deicing chemicals used, pollution prevention techniques, and economic and financial information. Each air carrier receiving a questionnaire package would be asked to provide responses for a specified sample of locations at which the airline operates. Completion of this one-time survey will be mandatory pursuant to sec. 308 of the Clean Water Act.

EPA has prepared a separate draft questionnaire for airports. This questionnaire was announced at 70 FR 4117, January 28, 2005, with a comment deadline of March 29, 2005. EPA is hereby extending the comment deadline for the Airport Questionnaire to match the deadline for the Airline Questionnaire, namely May 16, 2005.

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 in 40 CFR are listed in 40 CFR part 9.

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.* The estimated burden for this survey is 24 hours per air carrier site (*i.e.* an air carrier's operational facility at a specific airport). The total number of air carrier sites is 300, producing an approximate total burden of 7,200 hours. 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 10, 2005.

**Mary T. Smith,**

*Acting Director, Office of Science and Technology.*

[FR Doc. 05-5324 Filed 3-16-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[Docket No. R10-OAR-2005-OR-0003; FRL-7885-1]

### Adequacy Status of the Medford-Ashland PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment and Maintenance Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes

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

**ACTION:** Notice of adequacy.

**SUMMARY:** In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that we have found the Medford-Ashland PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment and Maintenance Plan adequate for transportation conformity purposes. On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for conformity determinations until EPA has found them adequate. This affects future transportation conformity determinations prepared, reviewed and approved by the Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Oregon Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration.

**DATES:** This finding is effective April 1, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The finding is available at EPA's conformity Web site: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/transp.htm>, (once there, click on the "Transportation Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions"). You may also contact Wayne Elson, U.S. EPA, Region 10, Office of Air, Waste, and Toxics (AWT-107), 1200 Sixth Ave, Seattle WA 98101; (206) 553-1463 or [elson.wayne@epa.gov](mailto:elson.wayne@epa.gov).

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### Background

Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region 10 sent a letter to the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality on March 8, 2005, stating that the SIP is adequate for transportation conformity purposes.

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to SIPs. 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 is adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review and it also should not be used to prejudge our ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a SIP adequate for conformity, the SIP could later be disapproved. For the reader's ease, the motor vehicle emissions budget is 3,754 tons per year. This was the only budget included in the Plan.

We have described our process for determining the adequacy in SIPs in guidance dated May 14, 1999. This guidance in now is reflected in the amended transportation conformity rule, July 1, 2004 (69 FR 40004). We followed this process in making our adequacy determination.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: March 9, 2005.

**Ronald A. Kreizenbeck,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.*

[FR Doc. 05-5325 Filed 3-16-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**