proposed ICR utilizes assumptions that are the same as the previous ICR.

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.

In addition to this information, you may obtain a copy of the draft ICR supporting statement as provided above.

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: For new catalyst manufacturers the average hourly burden per year per respondent is about 5 hours for the reporting required by the policy and the associated recordkeeping. The reporting is mandatory. The frequency of response is estimated to be 1 report per year for a new product line and 2 reports per year on manufacturing and warranty card information. There are 12 entities in the country covered by the requirements. Total burden for all new catalyst manufacturers is about 60 hours per year. There are annual operating and maintenance costs of about $60 per manufacturer. There are annualized purchased service costs of $35,700 per respondent. There are no annualized capital costs. Startup costs have been completed.

For parties who recondition used catalysts, the average annual hourly reporting burden is 631 hours per respondent. The reporting is mandatory. The frequency of response is 2 reports per year based on about 8,900 tests of used catalysts per respondent. Total burden for all 8 respondents is about 5,048 hours. There are annual operation and maintenance costs of about $200 per respondent. There are annualized capital costs of about $38,244 per respondent.

For parties who install aftermarket catalysts there is no reporting burden. The average annual recordkeeping burden is about 3.5 hours per respondent. There are no annualized operation and maintenance costs or annualized capital costs. 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: June 23, 1998.

Sylvia K. Lowrance,

Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance.

[FR Doc. 98–20903 Filed 8–4–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPTS–40032; FRL–6021–8]

Toxics Data Reporting Committee of the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology; Notice of Public Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, EPA is providing notice of a 2-day meeting of the Toxics Data Reporting (TDR) Committee of the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT). This will be the seventh meeting of the TDR Committee, whose mission is to provide advice to EPA regarding the Agency's Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) Program.

DATES: The public meeting will take place on August 27 through 28, 1998, from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. Written and electronic comments in response to this notice should be received by August 14, 1998.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at L'Enfant Plaza, SW., Washington, DC, (202) 484–1000.

All comments should be sent in triplicate to: OPPT Document Control Officer (7407), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Rm. G–099, East Tower, Washington, DC 20460. Each comment must bear the docket control number OPPTS–40032.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically to: oppt.ncic@epa.gov. Follow the instructions under Unit II. of this document.

No Confidential Business Information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail. All comments which contain information claimed as CBI must be clearly marked as such. Three sanitized copies of any comments containing information claimed as CBI must also be submitted and will be placed in the public record for this action. Persons submitting information on any portion of which they believe is entitled to treatment as CBI by EPA must assert a business confidentiality claim in accordance with 40 CFR 2.203(b) for each such portion. This claim must be made at the time that the information is submitted to EPA. If a submitter does not assert a confidentiality claim at the time of submission, EPA will consider this as a waiver of any confidentiality claim and the information may be made available to the public by EPA without further notice to the submitter.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cassandra Vail, telephone: (202) 260–0675, fax number: (202) 401–8142, e-mail: vail.cassandra@epa.gov or Michelle Price, telephone: (202) 260–3372, fax number: (202) 401–8142, e-mail: price.michelle@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

At the 2-day meeting, the TDR Committee will review and discuss drafts of their reports to EPA.

Information on availability of meeting summaries from previous TDR Committee meetings will be available on the TRI Home Page. The address of the TRI Home Page is http://www.epa.gov/opptintr/tri. This information can be found under the heading ''TRI Stakeholder Dialogue.'' In addition, the agenda for the August 27 through 28 TDR Committee meeting will also be available at this same site prior to the meeting. Oral presentations or statements by interested parties will be limited to 5 minutes. Interested parties are encouraged to contact Cassandra Vail, to schedule presentations before the Committee.

II. Public Record and Electronic Submissions

The official record for this notice, as well as the public version, has been established for this action under docket control number OPPTS–40032 (including comments and data submitted electronically as described below). A public version of this record, including printed, paper versions of electronic comments, which does not include any information claimed as CBI, is available for inspection from 12 noon to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays in the official record. The official record is located in the TSCA Nonconfidential Information Center, Rm. NE B–607, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC.

Electronic comments can be sent directly to EPA at:

oppt.ncic@epa.gov

Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1/6.1 or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number OPPTS–40032. Electronic comments on this action may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection.

Dated: July 29, 1998.

Cassandra Vail,

Designated Federal Official, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics.

[FR Doc. 98–20907 Filed 8–4–98; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6136–4]

Science Advisory Board; Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meetings

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that several committees of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on the dates and times described below. All times noted are Eastern Daylight Time. All meetings are open to the public. Due to limited space, seating at meetings will be on a first-come basis. For further information concerning specific meetings, please contact the individuals listed below. Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating EPA office and are not available from the SAB Office.

1. Environmental Health Committee (EHC)

The Environmental Health Committee (EHC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on Tuesday, August 18 and Wednesday, August 19, 1998, beginning no earlier than 8:30 a.m. and ending no later than 5:30 p.m. on each day. All times noted are Eastern Standard Time. The meeting will be held at the Madison Room at the Quality Hotel Courthouse Plaza, 1200 N. Courthouse Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Purpose

The purpose of the meeting is to conduct a technical review of the Lead 403 Rule, focusing on the proposed standards that were developed by the EPA to prioritize abatement and hazard control activities under Title X of the Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act on August 18–19, 1998. The review is scheduled for August 18 and the Committee plans to begin preparation of a working draft on August 19. Both sessions are open to the public.

Draft Charge Questions

The EHC has been asked to respond to the following draft Charge questions which are subject to revision:

General Questions

(a) In each of the specific areas identified below, have we used the best available data? Have we used this data appropriately? Have we fairly characterized the variability, uncertainties and limitations of the data and our analyses?

(b) Are there alternative approaches that would improve our ability to assess the relative risk impacts of candidate options for paint, dust, and soil hazard standards?

(c) The approach employs risk assessment models that were primarily developed for use in site-specific or localized assessments. Has the use and application of the Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model (IEUBK) and empirical model in this context been sufficiently explained and justified? Is our use of these tools to estimate nationwide impacts technically sound?

(d) Are there any critical differences in environmental lead-blood lead relationships found in local communities that should be considered in interpreting our results at the national level?

(e) In view of the issues discussed and analyzed in sensitivity analyses contained in the two documents, in what specific areas should we focus (e.g., refine our approach, gather additional data, etc.) between now and the final rule? (The timing of the final rule will be dictated by a consent agreement. We should be in a position to present a firm schedule prior to the SAB meeting.)

Specific Questions

(a) The HUD National Survey, conducted in 1989–90, measured lead levels in paint, dust, and soil in 284 privately owned houses. Does our use of this data constitute a reasonable approach to estimating the national distribution of lead in paint, dust, and soil?

(b) The approach employs conversion factors to combine data from studies that used different sample collection techniques. Is this appropriate? Is the method for developing these conversion factors technically sound?

(c) IQ point deficits.

(1) The approach characterizes IQ decrements in the baseline blood-lead distribution, essentially implying that any blood-lead level above zero results in IQ effects. Have we provided a sufficient technical justification for this approach? Is this approach defensible and appropriate?

(2) The characterization of IQ point loss in the population includes the summation of fractional IQ points over the entire population of children. Have we provided a sufficient technical justification for this approach? Is this approach defensible and appropriate?

(3) One of the IQ-related endpoints is incidence of IQ less than 70. Should consideration be given to what the IQ score was, or would have been, prior to the decrement (i.e., should different consideration be given to cases where a small, or even fractional, point decrement causes the <70 occurrence vs. being <70 due to larger decrements)? If so, how might this be done?

(d) Are the assumptions regarding duration, effectiveness, and costs of intervention activities reasonable?

(e) Are the combinations of standards used in Chapter 6 of the risk analysis reasonably employed given the potential interrelationships between levels of lead in different media? Is additional data available on the interrelationship between lead levels in paint, dust, and soil prior to and after abatement?

(f) The approach for estimating health effect and blood-lead concentration endpoints after interventions is based upon scaling projected declines in the distribution of children's blood-lead concentrations to the distribution reported in Phase 2 of the National