Test samplers representative of these methods have been tested by the applicant in accordance with the test procedures specified in 40 CFR Part 53 (as amended on July 18, 1997). After reviewing the results of those tests and other information submitted by the applicant, EPA has determined, in accordance with Part 53, that these methods should be designated as reference methods. The information submitted by the applicant will be kept on file at EPA's National Exposure Research Laboratory, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711 and will be available for inspection to the extent consistent with 40 CFR Part 2 (EPA's regulations implementing the Freedom of Information Act).

As designated reference methods, these methods are acceptable for use by states and other air monitoring agencies under the requirements of 40 CFR Part 58, Ambient Air Quality Surveillance. For such purposes, each method must be used in strict accordance with the operation or instruction manual associated with the method, the specifications and limitations (*e.g.*, sample period or flow rate) specified in the applicable designation method description (see identifications of the methods above), and the specifications and requirements set forth in Appendixes J or M to 40 CFR Part 50. Use of the method should also be in general accordance with the guidance and recommendations of applicable sections of the ''Quality Assurance Guidance Document 2.12'' and ''Quality Assurance Guidance Document 2.10.'' Vendor modifications of a designated reference or equivalent method used for purposes of Part 58 are permitted only with prior approval of the EPA, as provided in Part 53. Provisions concerning modification of such methods by users are specified under Section 2.8 of Appendix C to 40 CFR Part 58 (Modifications of Methods by Users).

In general, a method designation applies to any sampler or analyzer which is identical to the sampler or analyzer described in the application for designation. In some cases, similar samplers or analyzers manufactured prior to the designation may be upgraded (*e.g.*, by minor modification or by substitution of the approved operation or instruction manual) so as to be identical to the designated method and thus achieve designated status at a modest cost. The manufacturer should be consulted to determine the feasibility of such upgrading.

Part 53 requires that sellers of designated reference or equivalent method analyzers or samplers comply with certain conditions. These conditions are given in 40 CFR 53.9 and are summarized below:

(a) A copy of the approved operation or instruction manual must accompany the sampler or analyzer when it is delivered to the ultimate purchaser.

(b) The sampler or analyzer must not generate any unreasonable hazard to operators or to the environment.

(c) The sampler or analyzer must function within the limits of the applicable performance specifications given in Parts 50 and 53 for at least one year after delivery when maintained and operated in accordance with the operation or instruction manual.

(d) Any sampler or analyzer offered for sale as part of a reference or equivalent method must bear a label or sticker indicating that it has been designated as part of a reference or equivalent method in accordance with Part 53 and showing its designated method identification number.

(e) If such an analyzer has two or more selectable ranges, the label or sticker must be placed in close proximity to the range selector and indicate which range or ranges have been included in the reference or equivalent method designation.

(f) An applicant who offers samplers or analyzers for sale as part of a reference or equivalent method is required to maintain a list of ultimate purchasers of such samplers or analyzers and to notify them within 30 days if a reference or equivalent method designation applicable to the method has been canceled or if adjustment of the sampler or analyzer is necessary under 40 CFR 53.11(b) to avoid a cancellation.

(g) An applicant who modifies a sampler or analyzer previously designated as part of a reference or equivalent method is not permitted to sell the sampler or analyzer (as modified) as part of a reference or equivalent method (although it may be sold without such representation), nor to attach a label or sticker to the sampler or analyzer (as modified) under the provisions described above, until the applicant has received notice under 40 CFR 53.14(c) that the original designation or a new designation applies to the method as modified, or until the applicant has applied for and received notice under 40 CFR 53.8(b) of a new reference or equivalent method determination for the sampler or analyzer as modified.

(h) An applicant who offers $PM_{2.5}$ samplers for sale as part of a reference or equivalent method is required to maintain the manufacturing facility in which the sampler is manufactured as an ISO 9001-certified facility.

(i) An applicant who offers $PM_{2.5}$ samplers for sale as part of a reference or equivalent method is required to submit annually a properly completed Product Manufacturing Checklist, as specified in Part 53.

Aside from occasional breakdowns or malfunctions, consistent or repeated noncompliance with any of these conditions should be reported to: Director, Human Exposure and Atmospheric Sciences Division (MD–77), National Exposure Research Laboratory, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711.

Designation of these reference methods is intended to assist the States in establishing and operating their air quality surveillance systems under 40 CFR Part 58. Questions concerning the commercial availability or technical aspects of these methods should be directed to the applicant.

Henry L. Longest II,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 99–15979 Filed 6–22–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6365–7]

Clean Air Act Advisory Committee Mobile Sources Technical Review Subcommittee Notification of Public Advisory Subcommittee Open Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that the Mobile Sources Technical Review Subcommittee of the Clean Air Act Advisory Committee will meet on: Wednesday, July 14, 1999 from 9:00 am to 3:15 pm, Eastern Standard Time (registration starts at 8:30 am) at: Marriott Hotel—Key Bridge, 1401 Lee Highway, Arlington, VA 22209, Ph: (703) 524–6400; FAX: (703) 524–8964.

This is an open meeting and seating is on a first-come basis. During this meeting, the subcommittee will hear progress reports from its workgroups, updates and announcements on activities of general interest such as the Clean Air Act Advisory Committee, the Tier 2 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the Diesel Fuel Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the National Research Council's review of the MOBILE model, and discuss other current issues in the mobile source program including tentative presentations on DOE work on fuels, a

review of in-use emissions from heavy-duty diesel vehicles, and current programs to measure emissions from in-use heavy-duty vehicle emissions.

The preliminary agenda and draft minutes from the previous meeting are available from the subcommittee's website at: http://transaq.ce.gatech.edu/epatac

Subcommittee members and interested parties requesting further technical information should contact: Mr. John T. White, Alternate Designated Federal Officer, Assessment and Modeling Division, U.S. EPA, 2000 Traverwood Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48105., Ph: 734/214–4353, Fax: 734/214–4821, email: white.johnt@epa.gov.

Subcommittee members and interested parties requesting administrative or logistics information should contact: Ms. Jennifer Criss, FACA Management Officer, Assessment and Modeling Division, U.S. EPA, 2000 Traverwood Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48105, FACA Helpline: 734/214–4518, Ph: 734/214–4029, Fax: 734/214–4821, email: criss.jennifer@epa.gov.

Individuals or organizations wishing to provide comments to the subcommittee should submit them to Mr. John T. White, Alternate Designated Officer, at the address above by July 7, 1999.

The Mobile Sources Technical Review Subcommittee expects that public statements presented at its meetings will not be repetitive of previously submitted oral or written statements.

Michael Shields,

Acting Director, Office of Mobile Sources.

[FR Doc. 99–15982 Filed 6–22–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6365–4]

Science Advisory Board; Notice of Public Meetings

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, the Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis (the Council) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will hold a public meeting on Tuesday, July 13, 1999, from 9:30 am to 5:00 pm, Eastern time and Wednesday, July 14, 1999, from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm. The Meeting will take place in the Conference Room of the Office of Children's Health Protection (Room W911), United States Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW, Washington DC 20460. The meeting is open to the public, however, seating is on a first come basis. Materials that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the responsible EPA Program office and are not available from the SAB. All times noted are Eastern Time.

The Council will review a draft Prospective Study: Report to Congress, prepared by the Agency as part of implementing Section 812 of the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990. The Council will address the following charge questions provided by the Agency:

Charge #1: Are the input data used for each component of the analysis sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended analytical purpose? If not, does the Council recommend the Agency consider using alternative data or assumptions for the first prospective analysis?

Charge #2: Are the models, and the methodologies they employ, used for each component of the analysis sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended analytical purpose? If not, does the Council recommend the Agency consider using alternative models or methodologies for the first prospective analysis?

Charge #3: Are the analytical results developed using these data and methodologies sufficiently valid and reliable for the intended analytical purpose, and are the characterizations of the analytical methods and results sufficiently accurate and appropriate for the intended expository purpose?

While the above charge questions define the general scope of the advice requested from the Council, a number of specific additional questions are presented below for which the Agency is interested in obtaining particular advice from the Council. In addition, further specific questions and issues may be presented for consideration to the Council during the discussions scheduled to take place on July 13–14, 1999. The supplemental charge questions are listed below, and detailed background information pertaining to each of these specific supplemental charge questions is included in an attachment to this memorandum.

Charge #4: Unquantified/Unmonetized Benefit and Disbenefit Categories.

(4a) Does the Council endorse the recommendation of HEES members that EPA strive to provide estimates of changes in some additional health and welfare effects in order to provide information on the potential relative importance of currently unquantified or unmonetized endpoints?

(4b) Does the Council concur with the simplistic approaches for providing screening-level estimates proposed by EPA for each endpoint and for inclusion of these calculations in the 812 report as illustrative calculations presented in an appendix?

(4c) Does the Council have specific suggestions for additional benefit or disbenefit categories not listed by EPA? If so, does the Council have specific suggestions for methods for developing screening level estimates of these categories?

Charge #5: Value of Avoided Chronic Bronchitis.

(5a) Does the Council concur with EPA's proposed continued use of the adjusted WTP value from Viscusi et al.—i.e. $260,000 per incidence (1990$)—to support the primary benefit estimate?

(5b) If the Council does not concur with EPA's proposed use of the Viscusi, et al. value in the primary estimate, does the Council recommend using an unadjusted value based on the cost-of-illness method, or is an adjustment based on empirical evidence relating COI to WTP appropriate? (In previous reviews, the Council has recommended that ''there is not a sufficient empirical basis for making these adjustments at this time,'' but suggested that EPA ''include some illustrative calculations to show the sensitivity of total benefits to the range of possible adjustments to cost-of-illness estimates.'' SAB, EPA–SAB–COUNCIL–ADV–98–003, September 9, 1998 page 9).

(5c) If the Council does not concur with EPA's proposed use of the Viscusi, et al. value to determine the primary benefit estimate, does the council recommend using the Viscusi et al. value in a sensitivity analysis to illustrate potential differences between COI and WTP?

Charge #6: Value of Avoided Visibility Degradation.

(6a) Does the Council concur with EPA's proposed use of the WTP value from McClelland et al. (1993)—i.e, $14 per household per deciview improvement (1990$)—to support the primary benefit estimate? If not, should EPA treat residential/urban visibility improvements as a screening level benefit category to be reported in an appendix, or does the Council have a specific recommendation for an alternative estimate of the value for this endpoint?

(6b) Does the Council concur with EPA's proposed use of the WTP values from Chestnut and Rowe (1990)—i.e. $4.91 to $13.51 per household per deciview improvement (1990$) for households living outside of the region where a Class I area is located and $7.98 to $16.82 per household per deciview