Application for Registration of Pesticide-Producing Establishments (EPA Form 3540–8), the Notification of Registration of Pesticide-Producing Establishments (EPA Form 3540–8A), and the Pesticides Report for Pesticide-Producing Establishments (EPA Form 3540–16).

Application for Registration of Pesticide-Producing Establishments information, collected on EPA Form 3540–8, is a one-time requirement for all pesticide-producing establishments. The reporting of pesticide production information collected on the Pesticides Report for Pesticide-Producing Establishments, EPA Form 3540–16, is required within 30 days of receipt of the Notification of Registration of Pesticide-Producing Establishments (EPA Form 3540–8A); and then annually thereafter, on or before March 1. The information is entered and stored in EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA)/Office of Compliance (OC) Section Seven Tracking System (SSTS), a computerized data processing and record-keeping system.

The Office of Compliance/OECA collects the establishment and pesticide production information for compliance oversight and risk assessment. The information is used by EPA Regional pesticide enforcement and compliance staffs, OECA, and the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) within the Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances (OPPTS), as well as the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), other Federal agencies, States under Cooperative Enforcement Agreements, and the public.

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 01/05/99 (64 FR 499), and no comments were received.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and record keeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to be an average of 18 minutes for a one time response for the Application for Registration of Pesticide-Producing Establishments (EPA Form 3540–8), and 1 hour and 26 minutes for the annual yearly response for the Pesticides Report for Pesticide-Producing Establishments (EPA Form 3540–16). There is no public burden associated with the Notification of Registration of Pesticide-Producing Establishments (EPA Form 3540–8A) because EPA completes this form. 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. The burden associated with this ICR is described below:

Respondents/Affected Entities: Pesticide producing establishments.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 13,262.

Frequency of Response: One time and yearly.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 18,173 hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Cost Burden: $0

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. 0160.06 and OMB Control No. 2070–0078 in any correspondence.

Ms. Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Policy, Office of Regulatory Management, 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: March 8, 1999.

Richard T. Westlund,

Acting Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 99–6509 Filed 3–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6311–4]

Formation of a Task Force on Innovative Approaches to Environmental Protection and a Public Meeting on draft recommendations for innovative actions by the Agency

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of formation of the Task Force on Innovative Approaches to Environmental Protection and notice of a public meeting on draft recommendations for innovative actions by the Environmental Protection Agency.

SUMMARY: On January 28, 1999, Administrator Browner formed a Task Force on Innovative Approaches to Environmental Protection to assess the Agency's progress on reinvention activities designed to achieve improved environmental protection at lower cost, with greater efficiency, and with less burden on the regulated community. The Task Force will review the effectiveness of innovative activities designed to achieve compliance with environmental requirements and to encourage broader environmental stewardship. The Task Force will submit recommendations to the Administrator on May 15, 1999 that include practical actions that can be implemented over the next 12 to 18 months to further our progress toward compliance and stewardship. Involvement from EPA's State partners, the regulated community, the environmental community and the public, as well as EPA staff will be essential to identifying the best opportunities for successful action with the greatest environmental benefit. In order to obtain this input, EPA program offices and regional offices are holding a series of focus group sessions to develop a broad range of ideas. In addition, input received in recent stakeholder meetings conducted by the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assistance will be integrated into the input that the Task Force considers in developing draft recommendations for public comment, before preparing final recommendations to submit to the Administrator. There are two opportunities for comment in this process. The Office of Reinvention has established a web site at *http://www.epa.gov/reinvent/taskforce.* Users may provide comment directly at the web site with initial suggestions as well as comments on draft recommendations when they are available. The Office of

Reinvention is also convening a one-day public meeting of stakeholders and State Partners to discuss draft recommendations, with a time allotted for public comments.

DATES: The public meeting will be on April 15, 1999 from 9 AM until 4:30 PM in room 6208 of the Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20004. The Ariel Rios Building is located at the Federal Triangle Metro stop. If you plan to attend, please inform one of the contacts listed below, as seating is limited.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cynthia Nolt (telephone 202–260–9642) or Patricia Cohn (202–260–9643) of the Office of Reinvention (MC1801), U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW, Washington, DC 20460. Also see http://www.epa.gov/reinvent/taskforce.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Scope and Objectives of the Innovations Task Force: EPA's leadership, at the direction of Vice President Gore and with the support of the National Partnership for Reinventing Government (NPR), has formed the Task Force on Innovative Approaches to Environmental Protection to take stock of EPA's reinvention work and find new approaches to improve environmental compliance and performance. The Task Force is charged with developing a set of proposals that can be promptly implemented to improve or expand the Agency's reinvention activities with input from employees, EPA's state partners and stakeholders.

Innovative efforts are underway in all parts of EPA—the media-based program offices, the regional offices, and the cross-cutting offices—and state environmental programs. Through various reinvention initiatives, the Agency has streamlined regulatory requirements, tested innovative regulatory approaches through programs such as Project XL and the Common Sense Initiative, initiated voluntary programs to encourage environmental improvement, and launched new programs and policies to assist businesses in complying with environmental laws.

It is now time to take stock of these efforts: to identify ''what's working'' and to integrate successful approaches more broadly into day-to-day operations. The task force will look for specific, concrete and readily implementable ideas, focusing on innovative ways to:

- achieve the baseline of regulatory compliance, and
- encourage environmental improvements beyond that baseline.

The Task Force is soliciting feedback on these topics from EPA staff, state partners and external stakeholders in March and April 1999. The task force, chaired by Deputy Administrator Peter Robertson, will submit its final report to the Administrator by May 15.

Key Issues and Questions

I. Achieving the Compliance Baseline.

Full compliance with environmental laws is the baseline standard of environmental performance. A wide variety of EPA activities, in addition to enforcement actions, address this issue. These activities include:

1. *New approaches in regulatory requirements.* EPA is testing regulatory approaches that establish clear standards, while providing flexibility in how those standards are achieved. In one program, the Agency has consolidated scattered rules that apply to a single industry into a clearer and more understandable package. We are also writing new regulations in ''plain language'' to reduce confusion about what is expected of regulated parties. These efforts should promote improved compliance. Are there additional steps that EPA can take to make regulatory requirements easier to understand and comply with?

2. *Results-oriented permitting and reporting.* Unnecessarily complicated permit conditions and reporting requirements can be sources of non-compliance. EPA has carried out a number of pilots to test simplified or consolidated environmental reporting and has experimented with many approaches for getting better results from permits, such as watershed trading. Can EPA use this experience to make broader changes that will reduce the frequency of non-compliance associated with complex permit and reporting requirements?

3. *Compliance assistance.* EPA and other regulators are using a number of innovative approaches to help regulated parties comply, ranging from compliance assistance centers, to compliance manuals, to onsite technical assistance and hotlines. Should EPA expand the use of these strategies? What is EPA's role versus the role of state agencies in providing compliance assistance? Based on the experience of the past five years, are there ways that compliance assistance strategies can be adjusted to get the maximum benefit? Are there new strategies that should be adopted?

II. Encouraging Environmental Stewardship:

The work of the the Task Force also includes identifying incentives to stimulate environmentally beneficial behavior beyond what is legally required. Included in this effort may be reductions in emissions below the levels required by regulations and permits, helping to solve environmental problems that are not regulated by EPA, such as energy or water use, or actions which support broadly desirable goals such as sustainability. There are an increasing number of companies and communities which are demonstrating leadership through pollution prevention, product stewardship, providing others with guidance about environmental responsibilities, and developing other creative ways to achieve environmental results.

1. *Encouraging top performance.* Some companies consistently perform well above required levels environmentally—not only meeting the compliance baseline, but going well beyond it in addressing environmental issues. Is EPA doing enough to reward and encourage this kind of outstanding environmental performance? What specific opportunities are there to employ other incentive approaches to promote these objectives? What types of incentives are likely to be most effective?

2. *Encouraging voluntary improvements.* An increasing number of companies are interested in improving their environmental performance beyond minimum regulatory requirements—e.g., by participating in targeted voluntary programs. Similarly, communities are working to solve local environmental problems such as habitat loss, traffic congestion, and loss of open space. There is widespread interest in actions individuals can take to reduce their impact on the environment. Are there additional steps EPA should be taking to encourage improvement by these parties? Are there unaddressed problems, or problems not fully addressed by regulatory approaches, that present promising opportunities for using voluntary approaches? Is there a particular industry or set of pollution sources that presents opportunities? Should EPA develop more comprehensive strategies for encouraging continuous improvement by companies and communities?

3. *Integrating environmental and business decisions.* New business tools have been developed that incorporate environmental considerations into traditional business systems. For example, some companies now use

robust accounting systems that track environmental costs and benefits thereby providing information necessary for the organization to achieve greater economic efficiencies and improved environmental performance. Are there additional opportunities to accelerate the adoption of these new practices in related areas such as capital budgeting, design, materials management, underwriting, and finance?

Dated: March 11, 1999.

Jay Benforado,

Acting Associate Administrator, Office of Reinvention.

[FR Doc. 99–6513 Filed 3–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6311–6]

Notice of Oxygenate Use in Gasoline Panel Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On November 30, 1998, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Carol M. Browner announced the creation of a blue-ribbon panel of leading experts from the public health and scientific communities, automotive fuels industry, water utilities, and local and State government to review the important issues posed by the use of MTBE and other oxygenates in gasoline. EPA created the panel to gain a better understanding of the public health concerns raised by the discovery of MTBE in some water supplies. The panel will be chaired by Mr. Daniel Greenbaum, President of the Health Effects Institute (HEI) of Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Mr. Robert Perciasepe, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, US EPA.

This notice announces the time and place for the third meeting of the panel.

DATES: The blue-ribbon panel reviewing the use of oxygenates in gasoline will conduct its third meeting on Thursday and Friday, March 25 and 26, 1999, in Sacramento, CA beginning at 8:30 a.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held from 8:30 a.m. to possibly 8:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 25th and from 8:30 a.m.–12:00 p.m. on Friday, March 26th at the Sacramento Convention Center, 1030 15th Street, Room 202, Sacramento, CA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen Smith at U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air and Radiation, 401 M Street, SW (6406J), Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 564–9674, or John Brophy at (202) 564–9068. Information can also be found at www.epa.gov/oms/consumer/fuels/oxypanel/blueribb.htm.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is the third in a series of meetings at locations around the country to hear from regional and national experts on the facts concerning oxygenate use in fuel. While in Sacramento, the panel will focus on understanding oxygenate and water issues in California. A number of presenters have been invited to offer a variety of perspectives regarding oxygenate issues. The panel will also be accepting written public comment submissions. Written submissions can be mailed to US EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Mail Code 6406J (Attn: Blue-Ribbon Panel), Washington, DC 20460. Panel members will be provided with copies of all written submissions.

Dated: March 12, 1999.

Margo T. Oge,

Director, Office of Mobile Sources.

[FR Doc. 99–6619 Filed 3–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6311–1]

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 two Committees of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on the dates and times described below. All times noted are Eastern Time. All meetings are open to the public, however, seating is limited and available on a first come basis. Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) office and are *not* available from the SAB Office. Public drafts of SAB reports are available to the Agency and the public from the SAB office. Details on availability are noted below.

1. Ecological Processes and Effects Committee

The Ecological Processes and Effects Committee (EPEC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will hold a public meeting on April 6–7, 1999 in Washington, DC. The meeting will be held in Room 1103 West Tower of the EPA Waterside Mall Complex, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460, beginning at 8:30 am and ending no later than 5:30 pm on each day. The purpose of the meeting is to offer advice to the Agency on the following topics: (a) review of a proposed methodology for establishing sediment guidelines for metals mixtures; (b) review of a Biotic Ligand Model (BLM) for establishing aquatic life criteria for metals; and (c) review of a proposed approach for setting Ecological Soil Screening Levels (Eco-SSLs) for use at Superfund sites.

Background (a) Bioavailability and Toxicity of Metals in Surface Waters and Sediments: The Office of Water and the Office of Research and Development have been working over the past several years to refine Agency approaches to developing criteria and guidance for metals levels that are protective of benthic organisms, aquatic life in the water column, and wildlife that consume aquatic organisms. A focus of this recent work has been on improving the understanding of factors that influence metals bioavailability, and thus toxicity, in the environment. The Office of Water is asking the SAB to review its integrated approach to assessing bioavailability and toxicity of metals in surface waters and sediments by evaluating proposed modifications to the approaches used to develop sediment metals guidelines and aquatic life criteria for metals. The Charge to the Committee is as follows:

Overall Charge

Does the integrated metals methodology improve our ability to make both protective and predictive assessments of toxicity due to copper, silver and other selected metals in the water column and sediment?

Biotic Ligand Model Questions:

(1) Does the BLM improve our ability to predict toxicity to water column organisms due to metals (copper and silver) in comparison to the currently applied dissolved metal concentration criterion?

(2) Is the scientific and theoretical foundation of the model sound?

(3) In comparison to the current Water Effects Ration (WER) adjustment for aquatic life criteria, will the application of the BLM as a site-specific adjustment reduce uncertainty associated with metals bioavailability and toxicity?

(4) Are the data presented for the validation of the BLM sufficient to support the incorporation of the BLM directly into copper and silver criteria documents?

Equilibrium Sediment Guidelines for Metals Mixtures Questions

(1) By incorporating the fraction organic carbon into the bioavailability