ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that the following Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval: Information Collection Request for the Underground Injection Control Program (OMB Control No. 2040–0042; EPA ICR No. 0370.16), expiring June 30, 1998. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden and cost; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before June 26, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Sandy Farmer at EPA by phone at (202) 260–2740, by E-mail at farmer.sandy@epamail.epa.gov, or download off the Internet at http://www.epa.gov/icr and refer to EPA ICR No. 370.16.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Information Collection Request for the Underground Injection Control Program (OMB Control No. 2040–0042; EPA ICR No. 370.16), expiring June 30, 1998. This is a request for extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program under the Safe Drinking Water Act established a Federal and State regulatory system to protect underground sources of drinking water from contamination by injected fluids. Owners and operators of underground injection wells must obtain permits, conduct environmental monitoring, maintain records, and report results to EPA or the State primacy Agency. States must report to EPA on permittee compliance and related information. The information is reported using standardized forms, and the regulations are codified at 40 CFR parts 144 through 148. The data is used to ensure the safety of underground sources of drinking water. 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. 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. The **Federal Register** document required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on February 19, 1998 (63 FR 8449). One comment was received by EPA.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 2.59 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: Entities potentially affected by this action are owners and operators of underground injection wells and their States' Agencies including Puerto Rico, the U.S. Trust Territories, Indian Tribes, and Alaska's Native Villages.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 53,268.

Frequency of Response: Operators of Class I, III and some Class V wells must report monitoring results quarterly; Class II operators report annually.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 1,135,273 hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Cost Burden: $27,648,934.

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 following addresses. Please refer to EPA ICR No 2040–0042 and OMB Control No. 370.16 in any correspondence.

Ms. Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, OPPE Regulatory Information Division (2137), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460;

and

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: May 20, 1998.

Richard T. Westlund,

Acting Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 98–13990 Filed 5–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6102–7]

Science Advisory Board, Environmental Health Committee; Notification of Public Meeting, June 9–10, 1998

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92–463, notification is hereby given that the Environmental Health Committee (EHC) (henceforth, the ''Committee'') of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on Tuesday June 9 and Wednesday June 10, 1998, beginning no earlier than 8:30 am and ending no later than 5:00 pm on each day. The meeting will be held in the Main Auditorium, U.S. EPA, Environmental Research Center, Route 54 and Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711. The meeting is open to the public, however, due to limited space, seating will be on a first-come basis.

The purpose of the meeting is for the Committee to review: (a) Case studies on the application of the Inhalation Reference Concentrations (RfC) Methods; and (b) the Acute Reference Exposure Methodology (ARE). Both the RfC Methods and the ARE Methods were developed by the U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development (ORD), National Center for Environmental Assessment (NCEA).

Charge for the RfC Methods Case Studies Review

The Methodology document provides the general conceptual framework for evaluation of inhalation toxicity, as well as the specifics and operational procedures for this evaluation. The procedures of the methodology will continue to develop as the state-of-science changes. The general charge to the Committee is to conduct a review on the utility of the conceptual framework through examination of case studies of chemicals across various types of agents (particle versus gas category) and data base (human versus laboratory animal; incomplete or comprehensively complete). The Committee is also charged to comment on specific aspects

of this framework, notably, consistency in the conceptual approach regarding: hazard identification; designation of effect levels; choice of critical effect; choice of principal study; duration and dosimetry adjustment; response modeling; application of UF; and characterization of uncertainty (confidence statements).

The Committee has also been asked to comment on the level of documentation used to support RfC estimates. In addition, the Committee has been asked to respond to the following specific questions: (a) Overall, are the concepts and applications of the RfC methodology clearly articulated in the documentation provided for the case studies? Do the decisions and choices in these files attain the Agency's goal of being ''transparent, clear, and reasonable''? If not, what are specific examples within these files that could be instituted to better attain this goal?; (b) In derivation of the RfC in the specific case studies, (1) are the study summaries presented in sufficient detail for reader evaluation?, (2) are the designations of the critical effect and effects levels (NOAEL/LOAEL/BMC) based on rationales that are clear and reasonable?, (3) of the studies presented in either the IRIS Summary or Toxicological Review of each chemical, has the Principal study/ies been selected in a consistent and rational manner? Does this choice reflect consideration on the current knowledge of potential human response?, (4) have the underlying assumptions of the duration and dosimetry adjustments been presented clearly?, (5) are the rationales presented for use of uncertainty factors clear, reasonable and consistent?, (6) do the confidence statements reflect the strengths and limitations (e.g., relevancy to humans, comprehensiveness of the data base) of the RfC assessment in a manner consistent with the Agency's goals?; and (c) In the IRIS Summaries for the specific cases, numerous studies are included under the heading ''Supporting/Additional Studies'' that are meant to provide further support for designation of the critical effect (e.g., mechanistic data, human data) or for the effect level chosen in the Principal study, or to establish the completeness of the data base. Is the depth of presentation in this section sufficiently comprehensive to provide information supportive of the decisions made in the assessment (such as uncertainty factors and confidence levels)?

Charge for the Acute Reference Exposure Methods Review

The Committee has been asked to respond to the following Charge questions for the Acute Reference Exposure Methodology review: (a) The ARE methodology recommends three approaches for deriving ARE values and describes the types and amount of data that should be used to support each approach. Are these approaches appropriate for deriving acute exposure values? Are the recommendations for types and amount of data appropriate?; (b) The ARE methodology recommends using dosimetric adjustments to derive human equivalent concentrations from animal exposures. The ARE methodology departs from the RfC methodology by recommending default dosimetric adjustment factors of one for all categories of gases. For particulates, the same adjustments used for developing RfCs are recommended. Does the documentation provide sufficient rationale for these recommendations? If not, please comment on the elements that are lacking. Are the recommended dosimetric adjustments applicable to acute exposure scenarios? If not, please recommend dosimetric adjustments that are more applicable to acute exposures; (c) The categorical regression option of the ARE methodology involves assigning ordinal severity categories to effect data from toxicity studies that use a variety of species, exposure concentrations and exposure durations. Regression analysis is then used to relate the severity of response to exposure concentration and duration for the entire array of data. For determining the severity category of acute health effects, the ARE methodology document recommends using toxicological judgment rather than a well-defined scheme as schemes are unlikely to be applicable to a variety of toxic endpoints. Is the expert system for categorizing severity sufficient? If not, how can it be improved?; (d) The ARE methodology recommends using severe effect data, including lethality, for the categorical regression approach, but advises against using lethality and other nonsensitive endpoints when using No-Observed-Adverse-Effect Level (NOAEL) and benchmark concentration approaches. The categorical regression model uses severe effect data to determine the slopes of the probability curves for each severity, the intercepts for the curves and the distance between the various severity curves. Is the guidance offered for including lethal and severe effect data for ARE derivation sufficient? Can the Committee suggest ways in which severe effect data could be better utilized?; (e) CatReg software allows individual data and data reported as group information to be combined in a single analysis. The *CatReg Software User Manual* offers three alternatives for placing group and individual data on ''equal footing'': the use of a scaling factor, g; converting individual data to group data; and estimating individual responses from group information. No alternative is described as preferred. Does the Committee have an opinion as to which alternative may be preferable?; (f) In categorical regression, the rules of probability constrain the probability curves for the various severities to be parallel. Although parallelism is a mathematical constraint, it implies the biological interpretation that similar mechanisms of action and kinetics are active in all severity categories. Does the Committee view this as a limitation to the categorical regression approach? If so, how should the use of categorical regression be constrained?; and (g) Of the approaches recommended for ARE derivation, categorical regression is the only approach for which duration extrapolation is not required. The NOAEL and benchmark dose/concentration methods (BMC) approaches can only be applied to exposure durations for which data are available. AREs for other exposure durations must be derived by duration extrapolations. AREs for other exposure durations must be derived by duration extrapolations. For extrapolation from short duration values to longer durations, a concentration x time adjustment is recommended. For extrapolations from long durations to shorter durations, use of the same concentration identified at the longer duration is recommended. These are conservative duration adjustments. Are these duration adjustments appropriate for the approaches to which they are applied? Can the Committee suggest other adjustments that may be more appropriate?

Background for RfC Methods Case Studies Review

The Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990 require sources to demonstrate negligible risk and lack of residual risk (after implementation of control technology) based on health risk estimates. Inhalation Reference Concentrations (RfCs) are developed as dose-response estimates for noncancer effects. The RfC is an estimate (with uncertainty spanning perhaps an order of magnitude) of a daily inhalation exposure to the human population (including sensitive subgroups) that is

likely to be without an appreciable risk of deleterious noncancer effects during a lifetime. It is anticipated that RfCs will be used for CAAA regulatory activities as a part of the determination of negligible and residual risk for noncancer health effects of air toxics. Additionally, Regional, State and local air pollution control offices utilize RfC values in risk management programs.

The inhalation RfC methodology was developed according to the oral reference dose (RfD) paradigm with an added emphasis on portal-of-entry considerations of comparative toxicity and inhalation dosimetry for particles and gases. Extrapolation modeling was added in which factors are derived for adjustment of exposure concentrations that account for dosimetric differences between experimental animal species and humans. The methodology is considered to be a ''living'' document. Previous versions have undergone external peer review, including an expert peer review in October 1987 and a Science Advisory Board review in 1990 (EPA-SAB-EC–91–008). The current version of the methodology *(Methods for Derivation of Inhalation Reference Concentrations and Application of Inhalation Dosimetry, EPA/600/8–90/066F, October 1994)* represents the Agency's response to comments made at the 1990 SAB review including revisions to allow flexibility in the methods employed for dosimetry adjustments that reflect the state-of-the-science such as substitution of ''optimal'' approaches (e.g., PB-PK) when validated models are available. The current version of the Methodology and a category scheme for gases was reviewed by two additional external workgroups in August and September 1993. Revisions are already underway in the dosimetry adjustments to allow for contemporary mechanistic data to inform the choice of alternative dose metrics across noncancer and cancer toxicities where appropriate.

At its review of the inhalation methodology, the SAB requested the opportunity to review case studies using the methods to demonstrate the application of the dosimetric adjustments and to illustrate the methodology applied to chemicals representative of the typical range of data available including those with human occupational or clinical information and those with databases considered to be insufficient for quantitative dose-response estimation (''not-verifiable''). The review requested by the SAB is not intended to be a review of the RfC methods themselves but rather one of the conceptual framework of the approach as applied to representative data. The accompanying documents and related references (Jarabek, 1994; 1995a,b) provide definitions of uncertainty factors and details on the RfC derivation procedures. Case studies will be presented in one of four groups: (1) Particle case studies, (2) category 1 gas case studies, (3) category 3 gas case studies, and (4) not-verifiable case studies.

Another concern that had been voiced in a 1990 EHC report to the Agency (EPA–SAB–EHC–90–005) regarding the RfD Methodology was the reliance on the NOAEL/LOAEL approach for designation of the effect levels used in the derivation. Since that time, the Agency has advocated the use of the benchmark dose/concentration (BMD/C) approach as preferred or at least complimentary to the NOAEL/LOAEL approach *(The Use of the Benchmark Dose Approach in Health Risk Assessment, EPA/630/R–94/007, February 1995)* when the data allow. Some of the case studies to be reviewed (MDI, phosphoric acid, antimony trioxide, carbon disulfide) present BMC analyses.

Background documentation describing the derivation of the RfC for each of the chemical files has been provided. In some cases this is embodied by the IRIS Summary (i.e., on-line IRIS file) alone. The newer files (1997 and 1998) are accompanied by a Toxicological Review from which the actual on-line IRIS assessments are derived in addition to the summary sheet. The complete IRIS file for the compounds reviewed (and any other compound on IRIS) is available at http://www.epa.gov/iris. The differences in level of documentation reflect changes made during a pilot program of the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) process which will be described at the meeting and is reviewed in Mills and Foureman (1998).

Background for Acute Reference Exposure Methods Review

Risk assessment for acute inhalation exposures has been hampered by the lack of acute toxicity values on which to base an evaluation of exposure. In an effort to provide toxicity values for acute noncancer risk assessment for inhalation exposures, the U.S. EPA National Center for Environmental Assessment has developed a methodology for Agency use to perform dose-response assessments for noncancer effects due to acute inhalation exposures. The methodology describes how to derive chemical-specific acute exposure benchmarks called acute reference exposures (AREs). These estimates, applicable to single continuous exposures for up to 24 hours, will have wide applicability in assessing potential health risks due to short-term exposures to airborne chemicals in the environment. As they are developed and reviewed, AREs will be available to the public in chemical-specific files found in U.S. EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) database.

The methodology document, *Methods for Exposure-Response Analysis for Acute Inhalation Exposure to Chemicals, Development of Acute Reference Exposure,* has undergone both internal and external peer review and was revised accordingly. The supplementary documents, *CatReg Software Documentation* and *CatReg Software User Manual,* were developed subsequent to the external peer review and have undergone internal peer review and revision.

For Further Information

Copies of the review document and any background materials for the review (with the exception of the SAB reports) are not available from the SAB. Copies of SAB prepared reports mentioned in this FR Notice may be obtained from the SAB's Committee Evaluation and Support Staff at (202) 260–4126, or via fax at (202) 260–1889. Please provide the SAB report number when making a request.

Requests for individual copies of the background material for the RfC Methods Case Studies review should be directed to Ms. Annie Jarabek by telephone (919) 541–4847, by fax (919) 541–1818 or via Email at: jarabek.annie@epa.gov. Technical questions about the RfC Methods Case Studies review should also be directed to Ms. Annie Jarabek, National Center for Environmental Assessment-RTP, Mail Drop 52, U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711.

Requests for individual copies of the background material for the Acute Reference Exposure review should be directed to Dr. Judy Strickland by telephone (919) 541–4930, by fax (919) 541–0245 or via Email at: strickland.judy@epa.gov. Technical questions about the Acute Reference Exposure Methods should also be directed to Dr. Judy Strickland, National Center for Environmental Assessment-RTP, Mail Drop 52, U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711.

Members of the public desiring additional information about the meeting, including an agenda, should contact Ms. Mary Winston, Committee Operations Staff, Science Advisory Board (1400), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street,

SW, Washington DC 20460, by telephone (202) 260–4126; fax (202) 260–7118; or via Email at: winston.mary@epa.gov

Anyone wishing to make an oral presentation at the meeting must contact Ms. Roslyn Edson, Acting Designated Federal Officer for the EHC, in writing, no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on June 4, 1998, by fax (202) 260–7118, or via Email at: edson.roslyn@epa.gov The request should identify the name of the individual who will make the presentation and an outline of the issues to be addressed. At least 35 copies of any written comments to the Committee are to be given to Ms. Edson no later than the time of the presentation for distribution to the Committee and the interested public. For questions concerning the review, Ms. Edson can be contacted at (202) 260–3823.

Providing Oral or Written Comments at SAB Meetings

The Science Advisory Board expects that public statements presented at its meetings will not repeat previously submitted oral or written statements. In general, each individual or group making an oral presentation will be limited to a total time of ten minutes. This time may be reduced at the discretion of the SAB, depending on meeting circumstances. Oral presentations at teleconferences will normally be limited to three minutes per speaker or organization. Written comments (at least 35 copies) received in the SAB Staff Office sufficiently prior to a meeting date, may be mailed to the relevant SAB committee or subcommittee prior to its meeting; comments received too close to the meeting date will normally be provided to the committee at its meeting. Written comments, which may be of any length, may be provided to the relevant committee or subcommittee up until the time of the meeting.

Individuals requiring special accommodation, including wheelchair access, should contact Ms. Edson at least five business days prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Dated: May 15, 1998.

Donald G. Barnes,

Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 98–13993 Filed 5–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6102–5]

Changes to the May 8, 1998 Federal Register Notice Regarding Salt River Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Tentative Approval; Address Correction to Public Hearing Location; Date Changes to Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; correction.

SUMMARY: EPA's tentative approval of an alternative liner system design and use of an alternative daily cover material for the Salt River Municipal Solid Waste Landfill was published in the May 8, 1998, **Federal Register** (63 FR 25476–25479). The following information is an update to the May 8, 1998, **Federal Register** document.

Address Correction: the address for the public hearing was incorrect and printed as 1005 E. Osborne Road. The correct address is 10005 Osborne Road.

Public Hearing Date: has been rescheduled from June 10, 1998, to July 29, 1998.

Public Comment Period: has been extended from June 10, 1998, to August 5, 1998.

Please note that public hearing is scheduled for July 29, 1998, from 5–7 pm at Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation, Community Development Conference Room, 10005 E. Osborne Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85256. For further information, contact Steve Parker at (602) 850–8024. At the hearing, EPA may limit oral testimony to five minutes per speaker, depending on the number of commentors. The hearing may adjourn earlier than 7:00 pm if all of the speakers deliver their comments before that hour. Representatives of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the Salt River MSWLF will be present at the public hearing.

Copies of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community's applications for site-specific flexibility are available for inspection and copying at: Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation Administration Building, 10005 E. Osborne Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85256. Contact: Lonita Jim, Tribal Secretary (602) 850–8000, or the US EPA Region 9 Library, 75 Hawthorne Street 13th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, telephone (415) 744–1510, from 9 am to 5 pm Monday through Friday.

All comments on the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community's applications for approval of site-specific flexibility must be received by August 5, 1998. Written comments should be sent to Ms. Susanna Trujillo, Mail Code WST–7, US EPA Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105.

Dated: May 15, 1998.

Lawrence J. Bowerman,

Acting Director, Waste Management Division.

[FR Doc. 98–13991 Filed 5–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

May 19, 1998.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before July 27, 1998. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, Room 234, 1919 M St., N.W., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to jboley@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the