## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[FRL–6317–3]**

## Science Advisory Board; Notice of Public Meetings

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that two Subcommittees of the Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on the dates and times described below. All times noted are Eastern Time and 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 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.

### Background

The Air Quality Models Subcommittee (AQMS) and the Health and Ecological Effects Subcommittee (HEES) (both part of the Science Advisory Board's (SAB) Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis), will each hold public meetings on the dates and times described below. For further information concerning the specific meetings described in this section, please contact the individuals listed below. These public meetings are a follow-up to earlier Council, AQMS and HEES public meetings held on January 22 & 23, 1998 (AQMS), January 29 & 30, 1998 (HEES) and February 5 & 6, 1998 (Council) (See 62 FR 67363, Wednesday, December 24, 1997) pertaining to the ongoing review of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) Section 812 Prospective Study of Costs and Benefits. (See also earlier meetings pertaining to the Prospective Study as announced in 62 FR 10045, Wednesday, March 5, 1997; 62 FR 19320, April 21, 1997; and 62 FR 32605, June 16, 1997).

Consistent with the apparent Congressional intent behind Section 812 of the 1990 CAAA, and with the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) judgments regarding the potential utility of a comprehensive economic assessment of the Clean Air Act, the four fundamental goals of the first Prospective Study to be submitted to Congress are stated succinctly as follows:

(a) To facilitate greater understanding of the value of America's overall investment in clean air, particularly the value of the additional requirements established by the 1990-CAAA (CAAA–90);

(b) To facilitate greater understanding of where future investments in air pollution control might yield the greatest reduction in adverse human health and/or environmental effects for the resources expended;

(c) To help evaluate the significance of potential new and emerging information pertaining to the benefits and costs of air pollution control;

(d) To help identify areas of economic and scientific research where additional effort might improve the comprehensiveness of and/or decrease the uncertainty associated with future estimates of the benefits and costs of air pollution control.

Pursuant to the above four goals, the Agency has embarked on and engaged the Council and its subcommittees in review of the Prospective Study activities. These activities involve a number of component studies, such as analytical design, scenario development, emissions profiles, air quality modeling, physical effects modeling, direct cost estimation, sector studies, air toxics analysis, economic valuation, comparison of benefits and costs, and report generation. Working drafts of relevant portions of these components, along with focused charges have been presented to the Council and its two subcommittees, the Air Quality Models Subcommittee (AQMS) and the Health and Ecological Effects Subcommittee (HEES). For the most recent reviews, the Council, AQMS and HEES prepared the following Advisories: (a) Prospective Study I: Advisory by the Air Quality Models Subcommittee on the Air Quality Models and Emissions Estimates Initial Studies, EPA–SAB–COUNCIL–ADV–98–02, September 9, 1998; (b) Advisory on the CAAA of 1990 Section 812 Prospective Study: Overview of Air Quality and Emissions Estimates Modeling, Health and Ecological Valuation Issues Initial Studies, EPA–SAB–COUNCIL–ADV–98–003, September 9, 1998; and (c) An SAB Advisory on the Health and Ecological Effects Initial Studies of the Section 812 Prospective Study: Report to Congress, EPA–SAB–COUNCIL–ADV–99–005, February 10, 1999. (See below for how to obtain copies of these reports from the SAB).

Upcoming meetings are described below. Other meetings, including a meeting of the full Council are in the planning stage and will take place this spring or summer. These meetings will be announced in a subsequent **Federal Register** Notice.

The draft document that presents, compiles and documents the results and methodologies used for the first draft of the Prospective Study: Report to Congress, including the Appendices to the draft, which are the subject of these reviews will be available upon request from the originating EPA office (See below for how to obtain copies from the EPA Program Office).

*1. Health and Ecological Effects Subcommittee (HEES)*

The Health and Ecological Effects Subcommittee (HEES) of the Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis will review the draft Prospective Study: Report to Congress, with a focus on the health and ecological aspects of the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) Section 812 Prospective Study data, emissions modeling assumptions, methodology, results and documentation of human health effects, ecological effects, and assessment of impact on stratospheric ozone. Specific review materials include: Draft Appendix D: Human Health Effects; Draft Appendix E: Ecological Effects; and Draft Appendix G: Stratospheric Ozone Assessment. The HEES will meet on Tuesday, April 20, 1999, from 9:30 am to 5:00 pm and Wednesday, April 21, 1999 from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm. The meeting will take place in the Latham Hotel, 3000 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20007; tel. (202) 726–5000.

The draft charge to the HEES is as follows:

It is respectfully requested that the Council—and its subsidiary HEES—review the forthcoming materials and provide advice to the Agency pursuant to the following general charge questions, consistent with the review responsibilities of the Council as defined in section 812 of the CAAA90:1.

(a) Are the input data used for each component of the analysis sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended analytical purpose?

(b) Are the models, and the methodologies they employ, used for each component of the analysis sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended analytical purpose?

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

While the above charge defines the general scope of the advice requested from the Council and the HEES, a number of specific questions are presented below for which the Agency is particularly interested in obtaining

advice from the Council and HEES. In addition, further specific questions and issues may be presented for consideration to the Council and HEES during the discussions scheduled to take place on April 20–21, 1999.

(d) In response to the emergence of new information and analysis EPA has recently re-evaluated the literature and developed a new approach to estimating reductions in mortality resulting from decreased ozone concentrations. EPA proposes to use a Monte-Carlo based meta-analysis of the literature relating ozone concentrations and mortality, and requests comment on the following four issues:

(1) *Soundness of Approach*—Reviewers should address the suitability of the study authors' meta-analysis technique, and evaluate the method against other possible meta-analysis techniques.

(2) *Study Selection Criteria*—Reviewers should consider the appropriateness and comprehensiveness of the nine study selection criteria used in the meta-analysis, and/or suggest alternative or additional criteria where appropriate. In particular, EPA requests comments on the use of European studies to characterize US concentration-response functions.

(3) *Treatment of Uncertainty*—Reviewers should specifically address any concerns or problems associated with the authors' treatment of uncertainty surrounding reported ozone regression coefficients.

(4) *Interpretation of Results*—EPA seeks guidance on interpreting the meta-analysis results relative to the Pope PM study; i.e., the appropriateness of using these results to estimate the share of mortality attributable to ozone exposure, versus mortality incremental to the results of the Pope study.

(e) HEES encouraged EPA to evaluate a wide range of threshold assumptions in the PM mortality analysis. In response to HEES' comments on this issue, EPA performed a sensitivity analysis of thresholds below and above the annual PM2.5 standard of 15 μg/$m^3$. EPA requests guidance from the HEES on the following points:

(1) Clarification of the HEES analytic basis for rejecting use of the lowest observed effects level as estimated in the underlying health effects literature;

(2) Clarification of the analytic basis for any threshold greater than the 15 μg/$m^3$ level;

(3) Suggestions for an analytically defensible approach to developing concentration-response functions that correctly adjust for the threshold assumption. In particular, EPA requests advice on whether introducing a threshold implies changes to the functional form and slope of the C–R function that is derived from the underlying studies.

(f) Regarding assessment of the benefits of reductions in air toxics, EPA requests guidance and clarification from the HEES as to how in-depth review of high-risk HAPs can be used to generate estimates of avoided health impacts due to reductions in HAP exposure, given the scarcity of HAP monitoring data and HEES significant concerns about the reliability of HAP concentration estimates generated by the ASPEN model.

(g) In response to HEES recommendations, EPA is developing a qualitative characterization of regional variation in C–R functions. EPA requests guidance on specific studies that document the extent of regional variation.

(h) EPA requests HEES review of the proposed method to estimate changes in health risks among Canadians and Mexicans that would result from CAAA controls. EPA requests HEES comments on the validity and defensibility of the assumptions and methods proposed for estimating these effects and on the suitability of the approach.

(i) In response to HEES suggestions, EPA plans to: incorporate the revised Pope data; reduce PM-related neonatal mortality to an illustrative calculation; incorporate the most current research on CO-related health effects, chronic bronchitis incidence, and ozone-related emergency room visits for asthma; develop a summary table of uncertainties; and present non-monetized health benefit results relative to national incidence rates. EPA requests HEES review of these changes in the review material submitted to ensure they adequately reflect concerns expressed in previous HEES meetings.

(j) EPA requests SAB review of our ecological assessment framework. In particular, EPA has incorporated in the 812 report extensive discussion of: major stressors from air emissions subject to control under the CAAA and a broad range of possible impacts on ecosystem structure and function. EPA also requests review of our clarification of the selection process for identifying those elements of ecological impacts that we find suitable for quantification and monetization, based on the level of understanding of the effect and the ability to develop a defensible causal link between changes in air pollution emissions and specific ecological impacts.

(k) EPA requests review of other modifications incorporated in the ecological evaluation approach, including the following:

(1) Qualitative characterization of interaction between air toxics and acidification in aquatic systems;

(2) Quantitative accounting for lag times in the acidification analysis and qualitative characterization in other parts of the analysis;

(3) Quantitative consideration of nitrogen saturation of terrestrial ecosystems;

(4) Use of the PnET II model in place of the deSteiguer study for estimating the impacts of ozone exposure on commercial forest stands;

(5) The criteria for selection of case study estuaries and the treatment of case study results in the analysis of the impacts of nitrogen deposition;

(6) The rationale for considering the recreational fishing impacts of nitrogen deposition in a qualitative manner only.

*2. Air Quality Models Subcommittee (AQMS)*

The Air Quality Models Subcommittee (AQMS) of the Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis will meet Tuesday, May 4, 1999, from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm and Wednesday, May 5, 1999 from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm. The meeting will take place in the Science Advisory Board Conference Room M3709, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20460.

In this meeting, the AQMS will review the draft Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) Section 812 Prospective Study: Report to Congress with a focus on the data, emissions modeling assumptions, methodology, results and documentation. Specific review materials include: Draft Appendix A: Scenario Development and Emissions Modeling; Draft Appendix C: Air Quality Modeling; Memorandum ''Use of a Homology Mapping Technique to Estimate Ozone and Particulate Matter; Concentrations for Unmonitored Areas,'' from Sharon G. Douglas, Robert K. Iwamiya, and Hans P. Deuel, dated: 26 March 1999; Excerpt from Draft Human Health Effects Appendix D describing VNA method. In previous public meetings of the Council (See 61 FR 54196, Thursday, October 17, 1996, and 62 FR 10045, Wednesday, March 5, 1997 for further information), the Council advised the Agency staff that the Subcommittee should review the emissions modeling information before proceeding to conduct any model runs. The May 5, 1997 public teleconference (See 62 FR 19320, Monday, April 21, 1997) of the AQMS was conducted for this purpose and produced a letter report (EPA–SAB–

COUNCIL–LTR–97–012, dated September 9, 1997, see below for ordering information).

The charge to the AQMS is as follows:

It is respectfully requested that the Council —and its subsidiary AQMS— review the forthcoming materials and provide advice to the Agency pursuant to the following general charge questions, consistent with the review responsibilities of the Council as defined in section 812 of the CAAA90:1

(a) Are the input data used for each component of the analysis sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended analytical purpose?

(b) Are the models, and the methodologies they employ, used for each component of the analysis sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended analytical purpose?

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

While the above charge defines the general scope of the advice requested from the Council and the AQMS, several specific questions are presented below for which the Agency is particularly interested in obtaining advice from the Council and AQMS. In addition, further specific questions and issues may be presented for consideration to the Council and AQMS during the discussions scheduled to take place on May 4–5, 1999.

(d) Do the revisions made to the particulate matter emissions inventories—as described in the draft Report to Congress Emissions Appendix—adequately address the concerns raised by the Council and the AQMS during the January–February 1998 review meetings? If not, are there further adjustments which the Council and AQMS would recommend be made in future assessments; and do residual potential errors in the inventories warrant—in the judgment of the Council and AQMS—inclusion in EPA's pending report specific caveats regarding the magnitude and direction of potential biases which might be introduced through reliance on these inventories?

(e) The Project Team has used an expanded array of air quality model-derived adjustment factors to estimate changes relative to baseline air quality concentrations. Specifically, rather than a single adjustment factor applied in the Retrospective Study to estimate concentration changes across the entire range of initial ambient concentrations for a given pollutant, ten separate adjustment factors were calculated and applied based on decile midpoints generated by the relevant air quality model. Do the Council and AQMS consider this methodological change to reflect an improvement in the validity and reliability of projected concentration changes relative to the previous, single adjustment factor approach?

(f) The Project Team has used an alternative spatial interpolation method to estimate baseline air quality concentrations in locations which do not have adequate local monitoring data. In the Retrospective Study, complete representation of initial air quality conditions in the 48 contiguous states for each pollutant was obtained by simple spatial interpolation to each unmonitored or undermonitored location from the closest relevant, sufficiently operated monitor. Based on advice from the AQMS and Council pursuant to the January–February 1998 review meetings, the Project Team sought to develop an enhanced methodology based on a ''space-time continuum'' concept described by the AQMS. The ''homology mapping technique'' subsequently developed by the Project Team proved promising in initial validation tests; however the Project Team concluded that additional development and validation work should be completed before using the tool in the context of the section 812 studies. As an alternative, an enhanced version of the traditional spatial interpolation method was developed which relies on inverse distance-weighted interpolation from multiple surrounding monitors. This technique is referred to as ''Voronoi Neighbor Averaging (VNA)''. The Project Team requests advice from the Council and AQMS on the following two sub-questions:

(1) Do the Council and AQMS consider the homology mapping technique a reasonable adaptation of the space-time continuum concept previously advanced? If so, what specific additional development, testing, and validation steps do the Council and AQMS recommend be undertaken by the Project Team to facilitate potential use of this technique in future assessments?

(2) Do the Council and AQMS consider the change to the VNA approach to reflect an improvement in the validity and reliability of projected initial air quality concentration estimates relative to the previous, single monitor spatial interpolation method?

*3. Air Quality Models Subcommittee: (AQMS)—Teleconference*

The Air Quality Models Subcommittee (AQMS) of the Council will conduct a public teleconference on Thursday, June 3, 1999, from 11:00 am to 1:00 pm, Eastern Time, to review status of revisions to the draft Prospective Study: Report to Congress, as well as to conduct edits to its own draft report in review of the prospective study at the previously scheduled meeting on May 4 and 5, 1999 (see above). Please contact one of the SAB Staff contacts listed below to see if these drafts are available to the public at that time. This Teleconference will be hosted out of the Science Advisory Board Conference Room (Room M3709), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC 20460.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:**

(a) *Contacting Program Office Staff and Obtaining Review Materials*—To obtain copies of the draft documents pertaining to the CAA Section 812 Prospective Study, please contact Ms. Catrice Jefferson, Office Manager, Office of Policy Analysis and Review (OPAR), (Mail Code 6103), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460. Tel. (202) 260–5580; FAX (202) 260–9766, or via e-mail at <jefferson.catrice@epa.gov>. To discuss technical aspects of the draft document pertaining to the CAAA–90 Section 812 Prospective Study: Report to Congress, please contact Mr. James DeMocker, Office of Policy Analysis and Review (OPAR) (Mail Code 6103), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460. Tel. (202) 260–8980; FAX (202) 260–9766, or via e-mail at: <democker.jim@epa.gov>.

(b) *Contacting SAB Staff and Obtaining Meeting Information*—To obtain copies of the meeting agendas or rosters of participants, please contact Ms. Diana L. Pozun, Management Assistant to the Council, AQMS and HEES, Science Advisory Board (1400), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC 20460; at Tel. (202) 260–8432; FAX (202) 260–7118; or via e-mail: <pozun.diana@epa.gov>. To discuss technical or logistical aspects of the AQMS and HEES subcommittee review process or to submit written comments, please contact Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian (Tel. (202) 260–2560; or via e-mail: <kooyoomjian.jack@epa.gov>), and/or Dr. Angela Nugent (Tel. (202) 260–4126; or via e-mail: <nugent.angela@epa.gov>), Designated Federal Officers to the Council, AQMS and HEES, Science Advisory Board

(1400), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC 20460, FAX (202) 260–7118. To obtain information concerning the teleconference and how to participate in the SAB Conference Room or to call in, please contact Ms. Pozun.

(c) *Providing Public Comments to the SAB*—To request time to provide brief public comments at the meetings, please contact Ms. Diana L. Pozun *in writing* by mail, FAX or E-Mail at the addresses given above no later than one week prior to each of the meetings. Please be sure to specify which meeting(s) you wish to attend and provide comments, a summary of the issue you intend to present, your name and address (incl. phone, fax and e-mail) and the organization (if any) you will represent. Written comments should be submitted to Dr. Kooyoomjian at the above address prior to the meeting date.

(d) *Obtaining Copies of SAB Reports*—Copies of SAB prepared *final* reports mentioned in this **Federal Register** Notice may be obtained immediately from the SAB Home Page (www.epa.gov/sab)or by mail/fax from the SAB's Committee Evaluation and Support Staff at Tel. (202) 260–4126, or FAX (202) 260–1889. Please provide the SAB report number when making your request. *Draft* reports in progress can be obtained from Ms. Pozun once the Committee or Subcommittee Chair has released the draft.

**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 face-to-face meetings will be usually limited to ten minutes per speaker. At teleconference meetings, speakers 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 committees or its respective subcommittees prior to its meeting; comments received too close to the meeting date will normally be provided to the Council and its subcommittees at the meeting. Written comments may be provided up until the time of the meeting.

**Meeting Access**

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

Dated: March 24, 1999.

**Donald G. Barnes,**

**Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.**

[FR Doc. 99–7771 Filed 3–29–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–U**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

March 22, 1999.

**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 April 29, 1999. 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 1–C804, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554 or via the Internet to jboley@fcc.gov.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For additional information or copies of the information collection(s), contact Judy Boley at 202–418–0214 or via the Internet at jboley@fcc.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 3060–0020.

*Title:* Application for Ground Station Authorization in the Aviation Services.

*Form Number:* FCC Form 406.

*Type of Review:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Respondents:* Individuals or households, business or other for-profit, not-for-profit institutions, state, local or tribal government.

*Number of Respondents:* 1,600.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 1 hour.

*Frequency of Response:* On occasion reporting requirement.

*Total Annual Burden:* 1,600 hours.

*Total Annual Cost:* $126,880.

*Needs and Uses:* FCC rules require that applicants file the FCC Form 406 to apply for a new, modification, renewal with modification or for an assignment of authorization for a Ground station. FCC Form 406 also allows for a purpose of renewal for those licenses who did not receive the FCC's computer-generated renewal application (FCC Form 452R). This collection has been revised to delete the fee payment blocks (i.e., Fee Type Code, FCC Multiple, and Fee Due). The FCC Form 159, Fee Remittance Advice, is required with any payment to the FCC and the FCC Form 159 duplicates this information. A block has been added to the form for the applicant's e-mail address.

The information will be used by the Commission to determine whether the applicant is qualified to be licensed. Without such information the Commission could not determine whether to issue the licenses to the applicants and therefore fulfill its statutory responsibilities in accordance with the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. It will also be used to update the database and provide for proper use of the frequency spectrum, as well as for Compliance personnel in conjunction with field engineers for enforcement and interference resolution purposes.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Magalie Roman Salas,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99–7765 Filed 3–29–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Federal Advisory Committee; Notice of Public Meeting

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public