New York Avenue N.W., 2nd Floor Conference Room Washington, D.C. 20006. This meeting is open to the public. Due to limited space, seating at the meeting will be on a first-come basis. Written comments should be sent to: N. Phillip Ross, Office of Strategic Planning and Environmental Data, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 2161, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: N. Phillip Ross, Designated Federal Official, Direct Line (202) 260–0250, General Line (202) 260–5244, FAX (202) 260–8550.

Dated: February 27, 1997.

N. Phillip Ross,

Designated Federal Official.

[FR Doc. 97–5418 Filed 3–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[FRL–5698–9]

Science Advisory Board; Notice of Public Teleconferences

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that two Committees of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will conduct public teleconference meetings on the dates noted below. The meetings are all open to the public. All times noted are Eastern Time.

1. Executive Committee

The Science Advisory Board's (SAB) Executive Committee, will conduct a public teleconference meeting on Monday, March 17, 1997, between the hours of 12:00 and 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time. The meeting will be coordinated through a conference call connection in Room 2103 of the Mall at the Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. The public is welcome to attend the meeting physically or through a telephonic link. Additional instructions about how to participate in the conference call can be obtained by calling Ms. Priscilla Tillery-Gadsen at 202–260–4126 by March 12.

In this meeting the Executive Committee plans to review the report from its *Integrated Human Exposure Committee*—Review of the Agency's Exposure Factors Handbook. If time permits, the Committee may discuss other issues.

Any member of the public wishing further information concerning the meeting or who wishes to submit comments should contact Dr. Donald G. Barnes, Designated Federal Official for the Executive Committee, Science Advisory Board (1400), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC 20460; telephone (202) 260–4126; FAX (202) 260–9232; or via the INTERNET at barnes.don@epamail.epa.gov. Copies of the review document are available from the same source.

2. Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis

The Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis (ACCACA, or the ''Council'') of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) plans to hold four public teleconferences on the dates and times described below. All meetings are open to the public, however, the number of available phone lines is limited. For further information concerning the specific meetings described in this notice, 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. These teleconferences are a follow-up to earlier Council discussions held on November 7 and 8, 1996 concerning the 1990 Clean Air Act (CAA) Section 812 Retrospective and Prospective Studies (See 61 FR, 54196, Thursday, October 17, 1996).

The Council has allocated four dates for public teleconferences to deal with both the Retrospective and the Prospective Studies. The dates, times, and anticipated topical issues to be discussed are listed as follows:

(a) *Friday, March 14, 1997 (11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.): Prospective Study and Retrospective Study:* The major topic planned for this teleconference is review of the Prospective Study emissions modeling assumptions, methodology, results and documentation. The Council will provide advice to the Agency on the validity and utility of the emissions modeling data within the purposes of the current Prospective Study. It is also planned that logistical and scheduling aspects of both the Prospective and Retrospective Studies will be briefly discussed during this public teleconference. Some discussion may occur on select Retrospective Study issues at this teleconference. However, the preferred plan is to keep these topics separate, with this teleconference being reserved primarily to deal with the Prospective Study.

(b) *Wednesday, March 19, 1997 (11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.): Prospective Study and Retrospective Study:* The major topics for this teleconference are to complete review of the Prospective Study emissions modeling assumptions, methodology, results and documentation (if more time is needed after the discussions of March 14), and to begin closure review on the Retrospective Study issues. The timing of which specific issues are to be discussed at each teleconference will be planned at this or the previous (March 14, 1997) teleconference, and will be driven by the schedule of availability of the Lead Discussants and other Council participants. The Council identified a number of Retrospective Study issue areas, some of which are listed here as follows: valuation of bronchitis and heart disease; presentation of baseline (''but for'' issues, that is, but for the presence of the 1990 Clean Air Act), choice of study for estimating PM-related mortality (includes physical effects); costs (operations and maintenance costs, cost-of-clean, etc.); ecological effects; valuing changes in intelligence quotient (IQ) issues; presentation of life years lost calculations (life years remaining issue); methodological effects; morbidity effects by age; and research needs. Other related issues are planned to be discussed as time permits.

(c) *Friday, March 21, 1997 (11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.): Retrospective Study:* The major topic of this teleconference is to continue closure review on the Retrospective Study issue areas identified above. Specific issue areas will be scheduled to match the availability of the Lead Discussants and other interested Council participants.

(d) *Wednesday, March 26, 1997 (11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.): Retrospective Study:* The major topic of this teleconference is to continue closure review on the Retrospective Study issue areas identified above. If all the issue areas have been discussed in the earlier teleconferences, the Council members may elect to cancel this session. However, this time is being reserved for the Council just in case they need additional discussions to facilitate closure on the Retrospective Study.

After the teleconference sessions are complete, the Agency plans to revise the Retrospective Study Report to Congress and re-issue it to the entire Council and the public for one final closure review prior to submitting the document for Executive Branch review and subsequent submission to Congress.

Please contact the SAB staff (see below) to determine the logistics and details of the individual public teleconference meetings, or if the later planned meetings will be necessary.

Purpose of the Teleconferences

The specific topic of the Prospective Study review is the draft emissions modeling assumptions, methodology,

results and documentation for this study. The Council is being asked by the Agency to review the emissions modeling data (including input, model configurations, and output data) to be used for the first CAA Section 812 prospective analysis and make recommendations to the Administrator on the validity and utility of the emissions modeling data within this analytical context. Specific questions include the following:

(1) Are the regulatory assumptions and other design features of the Pre-Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) and Post-CAAA scenarios reasonable and appropriate, given the purposes of the present study?

(2) Are the input data used to configure the emissions models sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended analytical purpose?

(3) Are the emissions models, and the methodologies they employ, sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended analytical purpose?

(4) If the answers to any of the three questions above is negative, what specific alternative assumptions, data or methodologies does the Council recommend the Agency consider using for the prospective analysis?

(5) If the answers to questions (1), (2), and (3) are positive, are the emissions inventories for the Pre-CAAA and Post-CAAA scenarios developed by this modeling exercise sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended purpose?

(6) If the answer to question (5) is negative, what specific improvements does the Council recommend the Agency consider?

The draft documents that present, compile and document the results and methodologies used for the Prospective Study emissions modeling, as well as the Retrospective Study Appendices and select text edits which are the subject of these reviews are available from the originating EPA office. The review materials and supporting documentation for the Prospective Study include the following:

Review Materials

(1) U.S. EPA, Office of Air and Radiation, *Air Emissions Estimates from Electric Power Generation for the CAAA Section 812 Prospective Study,* February 1997,

(2) E.H. Pechan & Associates, Inc., *Emission Projections for the Clean Air Act Section 812 Prospective Analysis,* January 31, 1997,

Supporting Documents

(3) U.S. EPA, Office of Air and Radiation, *Analyzing Electric Power Generation Under the CAAA,* July, 1996,

(4) U.S. EPA, *Natural Gas Supply Assumptions in the Clean Air Power Initiative,* U.S. EPA White Paper, July 31, 1996,

(5) U.S. EPA, *Coal Supply Assumptions in the Clean Air Power Initiative,* U.S. EPA White Paper, July 31, 1996,

(6) ICF Kaiser, Inc., *The 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) and the Increasing Competitiveness of Powder Run River Basin (PRB) Coals,* Memorandum from Charles Mann and Theodore Breton, ICF Kaiser, Inc. to Sam Napolitano, U.S. EPA, Office of Air and Radiation, October 15, 1996.

In addition to the above review materials and supporting documents, it is anticipated that briefing slides or bullet point documents will be circulated to the SAB's Council and made available to the public approximately ten days prior to the first public review teleconference on March 14, 1997. The intent behind the distribution of these briefing materials is to present summaries of the analytical context of the emissions modeling step, key scenario design features, emissions modeling methodologies, and emissions modeling results in order to facilitate the Agency's presentations during the teleconference, and to help focus the Council's subsequent review discussions.

Once the Agency, considering the advice of the Council, determines that the emissions inventories are sufficiently valid and reliable, the Agency will configure and operate the air quality models to translate differences in emissions under the scenarios into differences in air quality conditions. On a parallel track, the costs of compliance with the regulatory programs and standards associated with each of the scenarios will also be developed. The methodological details and results of these subsequent analytical steps will be submitted for the SAB's Council to review at a later date.

To discuss technical aspects or obtain copies of the draft documents pertaining to the CAA Section 812 Prospective Study emissions estimates listed above, or the Appendices and select text edits for the Retrospective Study, as well as the anticipated briefing slides or bullet point documents, please contact Mr. James DeMocker, Office of Policy Analysis and Review (OAR) (MC 6103), US Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. Tel. (202) 260–8980; FAX (202) 260–9766, or via the Internet at: democker.jim@epamail.epa.gov. To obtain copies of the latest complete draft of the Retrospective Study Report to Congress dated October 1996 and entitled ''The Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act, 1970 to 1990,'' please contact Ms. Michelle Olawuyi, Secretary, Office of Economy and Environment (MC 2172), US Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. Tel. (202) 260–5488; FAX (202) 260–5732, or via the Internet at olawuyi.michelle@epamail. epa.gov.

To obtain copies of the teleconference agendas, please contact Mrs. Diana L. Pozun, Secretary to the Council at Tel. (202) 260–8414; FAX (202) 260–7118; or via the Internet: pozun.diana@epamail.epa.gov). To discuss technical or logistical aspects of the Council's review process, please contact Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian, Designated Federal Official, Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis (the ''Council''), Tel. (202) 260–2560; FAX (202) 260–7118; or via the Internet: kooyoomjian.jack @epamail.epa.gov). Members of the public who wish to physically be present at the teleconferences may do so at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Headquarters Building, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, Waterside Mall Room Number 2103. Members of the public who wish to obtain logging-on procedures should contact Mrs. Diana L. Pozun at least one week prior to the teleconference(s) of interest.

Public Speaking

To request time for public comments at the Council teleconferences, please contact Mrs. Diana L. Pozun in writing at the mail, FAX or E-Mail addresses given above no later than one week prior to each of the teleconferences.

Providing Oral or Written Comments at SAB Meetings

The Science Advisory Board (SAB) expects that public statements presented at its meetings will not be repetitive of previously submitted oral or written statements. In general, opportunities for oral comment at teleconference meetings will be usually limited to three minutes per speaker and no more than fifteen minutes total. Written comments (at least 35 copies) received in the SAB Staff Office sufficiently prior to a meeting date (usually one week prior to a meeting), may be mailed to the Council prior to its meeting; comments received too close to the meeting date will normally be provided to the Council at its meeting, except for teleconferences, where brief written materials may be FAXed to the participants, with more detailed or lengthy materials received too close to

the teleconference to be mailed to the Council or its appropriate subcommittee participants shortly after the teleconference. Written comments may be provided up until the time of the meeting.

Dated: February 24, 1997.

Donald G. Barnes,

Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 97–5309 Filed 3–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[PF–705; FRL–5585–6]

Bayer Corporation; Pesticide Tolerance Petition Filing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of Filing.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the filing of a pesticide petition proposing the establishment of a tolerance for residues of tebuconazole in or on grapes. This notice contains a summary of the petition that was prepared by the petitioner, Bayer Corporation.

DATES: Comments, identified by the docket control number PF–705 must be received on or before April 4, 1997.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway., Arlington, VA 22202.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: opp-docket@epamail.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 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number PF–705. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries. Additional information on electronic submissions can be found below in this document.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). No CBI should be submitted through e-mail. Information marked as CBI will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132 at the address given above from 8:30 a. m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Connie B. Welch, Product Manager (PM) 21, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location, telephone number, and e-mail address: Rm. 227, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, (703) 305–6226; e-mail: welch.connie@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has received a pesticide petition (PP) 6F4669 from Bayer Corp., P.O. Box 4913, 8400 Hawthorne Road, Kansas City, MO 64120–0013, proposing pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a, to amend 40 CFR 180.474 by establishing tolerances for residues of the fungicide tebuconazole in or on the agricultural commodity grapes at 5.0 ppm. The proposed analytical method for determining residues uses gas-liquid chromatography coupled with a thermionic detector. EPA has determined that the petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2); however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data supports granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

As required by section 408(d) of the FFDCA, as recently amended by the Food Quality Protection Act, (Pub. L. 104–170), Bayer included in the petition a summary of the petition and authorization for the summary to be published in the Federal Register in a notice of receipt of the petition. The summary represents the views of Bayer; EPA is in the process of evaluating the petition. As required by section 408(d)(3) EPA is including the summary as a part of this notice of filing. EPA may have made minor edits to the summary for the purpose of clarity.

I. Petition Summary

A. Residue Chemistry

1. *Nature of residue.* Bayer believes the nature of the residue in plants and animals is adequately understood. The residue of concern is the parent compound only, as specified in 40 CFR 180.474.

2. *Analytical method.* An enforcement method for plant commodities has been validated on various commodities. It has undergone successful EPA validation and has been submitted for inclusion in PAM II. The method should be adequate for grapes. The animal method has also been approved as an adequate enforcement method and will be submitted to FDA for inclusion in PAM II.

3. *Magnitude of residue.* Fifteen separate residue trials have been conducted and submitted to the EPA with tebuconazole on grapes. The EPA has determined that these data show that residues of tebuconazole, α-[2-(4-Chlorophenyl)ethyl]-α-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-*H*-1,2,4-triazole-1-ethanol, are not expected to exceed 5 ppm in grapes as a result of the proposed use. Processing data show that residue of tebuconazole do not concentrate in grape juice and that a tolerance is not required in or on raisins. In addition, since grapes are not normally rotated, the nature of residue in rotational crops is not of concern.

B. Toxicological Profile

The following mammalian toxicity studies have been conducted to support the tolerances of tebuconazole:

1. *Acute toxicity.* i. Rat acute oral study with an LD_{50} of >5,000 milligrams/kilogram (mg)/(kg) (male) and 3,933 mg/kg (female).

ii. Rabbit acute dermal of LD_{50} of >5,000 mg/kg.

iii. Rat acute inhalation of LC_{50} of >0.371 mg/liter(l).

iv. Primary eye irritation study in the rabbit which showed mild irritation reversible by day 7.

v. Primary dermal irritation study which showed no skin irritation.

vi. Primary dermal sensitization study which showed no sensitization.

2. *Genotoxicity.* i. An Ames mutagenesis study in *Salmonella* showed no mutagenicity with or without metabolic activation.

ii. A micronucleus mutagenesis assay study in mice showed no genotoxicity.

iii. A sister chromatid exchange mutagenesis study using CHO cells was negative at dose levels 4 to 30 micrograms/milliliter (μg/mL) without activation or 15 to 120 μg/mL with activation.

iv. An unscheduled DNA synthesis (UDS) study was negative for UDS in rat hepatocytes.

3. *Reproductive and developmental toxicity.* i. A rat oral developmental toxicity study with a maternal no