Dismissals

The following submissions were dismissed:

Name	Case No.
Ideal Fuel Company	RF321–14143
Johnston Burane Company	RF304–14155
K-Mechanical Services, Inc.	RF272–94211
Munia A. Malik	VFA–0057
Olmsted County, MN	RF272–89078
R and G Services Ltd.	RF321–14154
Suffolk County, NY	RF272–86594

[FR Doc. 96–26598 Filed 10–16–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Issuance of Decisions and Orders; Week of February 19 Through February 23, 1996

During the week of February 19 through February 23, 1996, the decisions and orders summarized below were issued with respect to appeals, applications, petitions, or other requests filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy. The following summary also contains a list of submissions that were dismissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Copies of the full text of these decisions and orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room 1E–234, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585–0107, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., except federal holidays. They are also available in *Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines,* a commercially published loose leaf reporter system. Some decisions and orders are available on the Office of Hearings and Appeals World Wide Web site at http://www.oha.doe.gov.

Dated: October 7, 1996.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Decision List No. 960

Week of February 19 Through February 23, 1996

Appeals

Archie M. LeGrand, Jr., 2/20/96, VFA–0120

Archie M. LeGrand, Jr., filed an Appeal from a determination by the Department of Energy's FOIA/Privacy Act Division (FOIA Division). Mr. LeGrand sought records of investigations conducted regarding his suitability for a security clearance. The FOIA Division stated that a search of the records in the DOE's Office of Safeguards and Security and the Savannah River Operations Office was conducted and no records were found responsive to the request. In his Appeal, Mr. LeGrand argued that the DOE conducted an inadequate search for records. In considering the Appeal, the DOE found that because Mr. LeGrand's employment at the Savannah River Site ended over 25 years ago, any security clearance records maintained regarding Mr. LeGrand would no longer exist. Under these circumstances, the DOE concluded that a search of a microfiche index of all DOE and DOE contractor employees who had held security clearances in the past was an adequate search reasonably calculated to discover documents responsive to Mr. LeGrand's request. Accordingly, the Appeal was denied.

Eugene Maples, 2/23/96, VFA–0122

Eugene Maples (Maples) filed an Appeal from a determination issued to him by the Department of Energy's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) in response to a request for information submitted by him under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Maples sought a copy of a final report issued by the OIG which summarized an investigation into the misuse of oil overcharge funds by the State of South Carolina conducted by the Savannah River Site during 1993–94. The OIG issued a determination denying Maples request in its entirety pursuant to Exemption 7(A). The OIG stated that it had not reached a final resolution of the investigation; therefore, release could prematurely disclose enforcement efforts and interfere with its ongoing investigation. In considering the Appeal, the Office of Hearings and Appeals found that release of the final report could interfere with the investigation. The Office of Hearings and Appeals concluded that the OIG properly applied Exemption 7(A) to the responsive document. Therefore, the Department of Energy denied Maples' Appeal.

Refund Applications

George, Victor & Bernard Didinsky, 2/21/96, RJ272–6

This Supplemental Order modifies a supplemental crude oil overcharge refund granted to Fallsburg Bottling Works, Inc. The applicant submitted evidence that the corporation had been dissolved in 1988 and requested that the supplemental refund be issued to the successor partnership that had been formed by the three equal shareholders of the corporation. The request was approved and the DOE directed that a new refund check be issued to the partnership.

Texaco Inc./Chain Oil Co., 2/21/96, RR321–194

The Department of Energy issued a Decision and Order denying a Motion for Reconsideration filed by Chain Oil Co. (Chain) and its owner, Donald Foster in the Texaco refund proceeding. The Motion was denied because Mr. Foster had again failed to demonstrate that his acquisition of Chain included Chain's right to the refund.

Refund Applications

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decisions and Orders concerning refund applications, which are not summarized. Copies of the full texts of the Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Bemis Company, Inc.	RF272–17760 RF272–20188 RD272–17760 RD272–20188	02/21/96
Davis Trucking Company et al	RK272–2252	02/21/96
Syar Industries, Inc. et al	RF272–73595	02/21/96

Syar Industries, Inc. RD272–73599

Dismissals

The following submissions were dismissed:

Name	Case No.
Richland Operations Office	VSO–0053

[FR Doc. 96–26599 Filed 10–16–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPTS–42188; FRL–5571–2]

Endocrine Disruptors; Notice of Public Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: EPA is holding a public meeting with interested stakeholder groups to assist the Agency in forming a committee under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) to provide advice on the screening and testing of chemicals and pesticides for their potential to disrupt endocrine function in humans and wildlife. This is the second of such meetings. The first meeting was held May 15–16, 1996, in Washington DC. Persons who attended the first meeting or placed their names on a list to be kept informed of further developments will be notified of this meeting by letter, and will receive additional information regarding the formation of the committee and nominees for committee membership.

DATES: The public meeting will be held on October 31 and November 1, 1996, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in Washington, DC, at the Sheraton City Centre Hotel, 1143 New Hampshire Ave NW (3 blocks NE of the Foggy Bottom Metro station at New Hampshire Ave and M St. NW). Telephone: 202–775–0800.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Persons who want to attend this meeting should register with Donald Walker no later than October 24, 1996. Reservations will be accepted on a first-come basis. Persons with reservations should arrive at least 10 minutes prior to the meeting to ensure that their seat is not given to someone on the waiting list. Persons who do not have a reservation will be admitted to the meeting only if space is available.

To register or to obtain additional information (such as the summary of the May 15 and 16 meeting) please contact: Donald Walker, TASCON Corp; telephone: (301) 907–3844 x 247; fax: (301) 907–9655; e-mail: dwalker@tascon.com. For technical information, contact Anthony Maciorowski (202) 260–3048, e-mail: maciorowski.anthony@epamail.epa.gov or Gary Timm (202) 260–1859, e-mail: timm.gary@epamail.epa.gov at EPA.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A growing body of scientific research indicates that many man-made chemicals may interfere with the normal functioning of human and wildlife endocrine systems. These endocrine disruptors may cause a variety of problems with development, behavior, and reproduction. Although many chemicals have undergone extensive toxicological testing, it is unclear whether this testing has been adequate to detect the potential for these chemicals to disrupt endocrine functioning or what additional testing is needed for EPA to assess and characterize risk. Notwithstanding recognition that the scientific knowledge related to endocrine disruptors is still evolving, there is widespread agreement that the development of a screening and testing program is appropriate. Recent legislation (reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act and passage of the Food Quality Protection Act) has mandated that such a screening and testing program be developed by EPA. Further, underlying authority for EPA to consider implementation of such a program is found in the existing Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).

EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances is taking the lead for EPA on endocrine disruption screening and testing issues. EPA began its efforts to develop a screening and testing strategy by obtaining the views of stakeholders at a meeting on May 15–16, 1996 (61 FR 20814, May 8, 1996) (FRL–5369–8). At the May stakeholder's meeting participants generally agreed that government, industry, academia and public interest groups should work collaboratively to develop a screening and testing strategy. EPA has concluded that a FACA chartered committee would be the best means of providing assistance in developing such a strategy and proposes to establish the Endocrine Disrupter Screening and Testing Advisory Committee (EDSTAC). The purpose of EDSTAC will be to provide advice and counsel to the Agency on a strategy to screen and test endocrine disrupting chemicals in humans, fish, and wildlife. This strategy will be aimed at developing information and methods for reducing risk to human health and the environment. EPA expects the EDSTAC to take a consensus approach to reaching their findings and recommendations.

Subject to consideration by the members of the proposed EDSTAC, the goals of an EPA-led dialogue on screening and testing for endocrine disruption may be to:

1. Develop a flexible process to select and prioritize chemicals for screening, recognizing the need to obtain and use appropriate exposure information in setting appropriate priorities.
2. Develop a process for identifying new and existing screening tests and mechanisms for their validation.
3. Agree on a set of available, validated screening tests for early application.
4. Develop a process and criteria for deciding when additional tests, beyond screening tests, are needed and how any of these additional tests will be validated.

These goals are likely to be pursued sequentially. These goals will also be pursued in a manner that recognizes that the data that will be available as a result of the endocrine disrupter screening and testing program will be used to reduce risk to human health. It is anticipated that this overarching risk management goal will eventually require the development of approaches to: Synthesize exposure and hazard information; and incorporate synthesized exposure and hazard information into risk reduction and risk management decisions.

For the EDSTAC to be successful, the Committee will have to clearly communicate to the public areas of agreement and recommendations. In addition, as components of a screening and testing program are agreed upon and implemented, processes need to be developed to clearly communicate to