

meeting to insure that appropriate arrangements are made.

### 3. Meeting Change Notice— Environmental Engineering Committee and Its Subcommittees

Notice is hereby given of changes to three meetings of the Science Advisory Board's Environmental Engineering Committee and its Subcommittees. The original meetings were announced in 65 FR 1866, dated Wednesday, January 12, 2000. For further information, please contact Ms. Kathleen Conway, Designated Federal Officer for the Environmental Engineering Committee at (202) 564-4559 or via e-mail at (Conway.Kathleen@epa.gov). The changes follow.

(a) The Technology Evaluation Subcommittee will *not* meet February 23-25, 2000. Instead, it will meet March 6-8, 2000 as part of the week-long Environmental Engineering Committee meeting. There has been no change in the purpose or location for that meeting; only the dates have changed.

The following information from the previous announcement is provided again here for your convenience, "The Environmental Engineering Committee of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet Monday through Friday, March 6-10, 2000 in room 6450 of in the Ariel Rios Building North, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20004 (adjacent to the escalator to the Federal Triangle Metro Station on 12th Street NW). The meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m. on Monday and end no later than 4:00 p.m. on Friday."

(b) The Natural Attenuation Research Subcommittee of the Science Advisory Board's (SAB) Environmental Engineering Committee (EEC) will conduct a public teleconference meeting Thursday February 24, 2000 between the hours of 3:00 p.m.—5:00 p.m (Eastern Standard Time) as announced. However, *the purpose of this conference call has been changed*. The Subcommittee will not hear the preliminary reactions of individual reviewers to the written materials. Instead, the Subcommittee will discuss the charge and plan the review in light a forthcoming report from the National Research Council.

(c) The Natural Attenuation Research Subcommittee will *not* meet March 6-8, 2000. The Subcommittee plans to reschedule its review of the Agency's Natural Attenuation research program until May. When dates for that meeting have been determined, it will be announced in the **Federal Register**.

### General Information on Providing Oral or Written Comments at SAB Meetings

The Science Advisory Board expects that public statements presented at its meetings will not be repetitive of 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 (unless otherwise noted). Written comments (at least 35 copies) should be received in the SAB Staff Office one week before the meeting so that they can be mailed to the relevant SAB committee or subcommittee for study. Written comments may be provided to the relevant committee or subcommittee up until the time of the meeting.

Additional information concerning the Science Advisory Board, its structure, function, and composition, may be found on the SAB Website (<http://www.epa.gov/sab>) and in the Annual Report of the Staff Director which is available from the SAB Publications Staff at (202) 564-4533 or via fax at (202) 501-0256.

Dated: February 8, 2000.

**Donald G. Barnes,**

Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 00-3487 Filed 2-14-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6537-6]

#### Superfund Probabilistic Risk Assessment to Characterize Uncertainty and Variability

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability with request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has developed and is requesting public comment on a draft guidance entitled "Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund Volume 3 Part A: Process for Conducting Probabilistic Risk Assessment (RAGS 3A)." It is available electronically on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/pubs.htm#r>. RAGS 3A addresses the technical and policy issues associated with the use of probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) in the EPA hazardous waste sites cleanup program, commonly known as Superfund. PRA, if applied appropriately, can better characterize uncertainty and variability in the risk estimates than the traditional point estimate approach. The guidance presents a recommended tiered process

for conducting both human health and ecological PRA using Monte Carlo analysis, with emphasis on applying sensitivity analysis to identify important sources of variability and uncertainty in risk estimates, applying frequency distributions to characterize variability in exposure, and quantifying uncertainty in the mean contaminant concentration. The draft RAGS 3A should not be used or cited until it is finalized. RAGS 3A provides guidance to EPA staff and also to the public and to the regulated community on how EPA generally intends that the PRA be implemented to evaluate risk at more complex Superfund sites addressed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). The guidance is designed to describe EPA's national policy on the use of PRA. PRA is not expected to be relevant at every site. The document does not substitute for EPA's statutes or regulations, nor is it a regulation itself. Thus, it cannot impose legally-binding requirements on EPA, States, or the regulated community. EPA may change this guidance in the future, as appropriate.

Further, Executive Order 13132, entitled "Federalism" (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations and regulatory policies that have "substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government."

RAGS 3A does not have federalism implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132. As explained above, RAGS 3A does not impose legally-binding requirements on the States. It is a technical risk assessment guidance which discusses a statistical risk assessment approach that may be used at more complex Superfund sites. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to RAGS 3A.

**DATES:** You may submit comments until April 21, 2000. Comments received after

that date will be considered to the extent feasible; however, EPA will not delay finalizing the guidance in order to accommodate late comments.

**ADDRESSES:** You are invited to submit written comments to: EPA, Superfund Docket RAGS 3A-2, Mail Code 5202G, Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20460. For cost savings the draft RAGS 3A document is available electronically on the Internet and EPA plans to print the document only after it is finalized. The Superfund Docket containing the RAGS 3A document and public comments is physically located at 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway, Crystal Gateway I Building street level, Arlington, Virginia. The docket is available for inspection between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. Appointments to review the docket can be made by calling (703) 603-9232. The public may copy a maximum of 266 pages from the docket free of charge, however a charge of 15 cents will be incurred for each additional page, plus a \$25.00 administrative fee.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** S. Steven Chang, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (5204G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20460, at (703) 603-9017, by E-Mail at Chang.Steven@epa.gov, or the RCRA/Superfund Hotline at (800) 424-9346 (in the Washington, DC metropolitan area, (703) 412-9810). The Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) Hotline number is (800) 553-7672 (in the Washington, DC metropolitan area, (703) 412-3323).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Introduction**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) responds to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances under the authority of CERCLA. Regulations governing such responses are found in the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan or NCP. The process for remedy selection in the NCP generally involves performance of a remedial investigation to identify the nature and extent of contamination at National Priorities List sites. In general, sampling results and site observations obtained in the field are used in the baseline risk assessment to identify specific contaminants and exposure pathways of concern and to determine whether remedial action is warranted.

Today's **Federal Register** notice introduces a draft guidance on use of a

tool which could evaluate the uncertainty and variability associated with risk estimates developed as part of the baseline risk assessment for hazardous waste sites. The RAGS 3A document builds upon basic concepts of risk assessment outlined in the RAGS Volume 1 (U.S. EPA, 1989),<sup>1</sup> the "Guiding Principles for Monte Carlo Analysis" and the "Policy for Use of Probabilistic Analysis in Risk Assessment" (U.S. EPA, 1997).<sup>2</sup> PRA is not a requirement, and will not be appropriate at many sites. The guidance focuses on Monte Carlo analysis as a method of quantifying uncertainty and variability in risk. Primarily targeted toward the risk assessors, it is intended to be most accessible to those readers who are familiar with risk assessment and basic statistic concepts. The development of a PRA could involve significant investment of time by the risk assessor and risk manager to determine the extent and scope of the assessment. A tiered approach to PRA is advocated, beginning with evaluating the results of a point estimate approach. Important considerations include the time required to perform the PRA, the additional resources involved in developing the PRA, the available data on exposure that will be used in the assessment, and the value added by conducting the PRA.

**Background**

Probabilistic risk analysis, as exemplified by Monte Carlo analysis, has been in use since 1946. However, the application of PRA to human health and ecological risk assessment is a more recent application. As a result, the Agency believes that those using PRA analysis would benefit from development of additional guidance.

In 1997, the EPA announced the "Policy for Use of Probabilistic Analysis in Risk Assessment at the U.S. EPA" (U.S. EPA, 1997), indicating the Agency's interest in probabilistic analysis in human health and ecological risk assessment. This 1997 policy states that "It is the policy of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency that such probabilistic analysis techniques as Monte Carlo analysis, given adequate supporting data and credible assumptions, can be viable statistical tools for analyzing variability and

uncertainty in risk assessments. As such, and provided that the conditions described below are met, risk assessments using Monte Carlo analysis or other probabilistic techniques will be evaluated and utilized in a manner that is consistent with other risk assessments submitted to the Agency for review or consideration. It is not the intent of this policy to recommend that probabilistic analysis be conducted for all risk assessments supporting risk management decisions. Such analysis should be a part of a tiered approach to risk assessment that progresses from simpler (e.g., deterministic) to more complex (e.g., probabilistic) analyses as the risk management situation requires. Use of Monte Carlo or other such techniques in risk assessments shall not be cause, per se, for rejection of the risk assessment by the Agency. For human health risk assessments, the application of Monte Carlo and other probabilistic techniques has been limited to exposure assessments in the majority of cases. The current (1997) policy, Conditions for Acceptance and associated guiding principles are not intended to apply to dose response evaluations for human health risk assessment until this application of probabilistic analysis has been studied further. In the case of ecological risk assessment, however, this policy applies to all aspects including stressor and dose-response assessment."

Based on this (1997) Policy the Superfund program is developing guidance for implementation of PRA to better characterize variability and uncertainty in fate and transport, and exposure assessment for human health and ecological risk assessments, and dose-response assessment for ecological risk assessments.

**Goals**

EPA welcomes feedback on today's draft RAGS 3A document. EPA will review public comments received on the draft RAGS 3A document and, where appropriate, incorporate changes responsive to those comments.

EPA is seeking public comment at this time in order to ensure hearing the widest range of views and obtaining all information relevant to the development of policy, not because doing so is a legal requirement. EPA does, however, expect to respond to the principal comments received on the draft RAGS 3A document as a matter of public information.

<sup>1</sup>U.S. EPA, 1989, Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Volume 1: Human Health Evaluation Manual, Part A, Interim Final. EPA/540/1-89/002. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC. NTIS PB90-155581.

<sup>2</sup>U.S. EPA, 1997, "Guiding Principles for Monte Carlo Analysis." EPA/630/R-97/001. Office of Research and Development Risk Assessment Forum, Washington, DC.

Dated: February 9, 2000.

**Stephen Luftig,**

*Office Director, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response.*

[FR Doc. 00-3492 Filed 2-14-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-6536-5]

**Notice of Proposed Purchaser Agreement Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as Amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice; request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9601-9675, notice is hereby given that a proposed purchaser agreement ("Purchaser Agreement") associated with the Metro Container Corporation Site in Trainer, Pennsylvania was executed by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Justice and is now subject to public comment, after which the United States may modify or withdraw its consent if comments received disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the Purchaser Agreement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. The Purchaser Agreement would resolve certain potential EPA claims under section 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9607, against Trainer Industries, L.L.C. ("Purchaser"). The settlement would require the Purchaser to, among other things, pay the sum of \$15,000 to the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund, provide an irrevocable right of access to EPA, and record notice of the agreement in the local land records.

For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the proposed Purchaser Agreement. The Agency's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before March 16, 2000.

**Availability**

The proposed Purchaser Agreement and additional background information relating to the proposed Purchaser Agreement are available for public inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103. A copy of the proposed Purchaser Agreement may be obtained from Suzanne Canning, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Regional Docket Clerk (3RC00), 1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103. Comments should reference the "Metro Container Corporation Site Prospective Purchaser Agreement" and "EPA Docket No. CERC-PPA-99-06," and should be forwarded to Suzanne Canning at the above address or through electronic mail at "canning.suzanne@epa.gov."

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Andrew S. Goldman (3RC41), Sr. Assistant Regional Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103, Phone: (215) 814-2487.

Dated: February 1, 2000.

**Bradley M. Campbell,**

*Regional Administrator, Region III.*

[FR Doc. 00-3486 Filed 2-14-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

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

February 7, 2000.

**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 March 16, 2000. 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, 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 No.: 3060-0859.

*Title:* Suggested Guidelines for Petitions for Ruling under Section 253 of the Communications Act.

*Form No.:* Not applicable.

*Type of Review:* Extension to a currently approved collection.

*Respondents:* Business or other for-profit.

*Number of Respondents:* 80.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 63 to 125 hours per response.

*Frequency of Response:* On occasion reporting requirement.

*Total Annual Burden:* 6,280 hours.

*Total Annual Cost:* Not applicable.

*Needs and Uses:* Section 253 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 253, added by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, requires the Commission, with certain important exceptions, to preempt the enforcement of any state or local statute or regulation, or other state or local legal requirement (to the extent necessary) that prohibits or has the effect of prohibiting the ability of any entity to provide any interstate or intrastate telecommunications service. The Commission's consideration of preemption begins with the filing of a petition by an aggrieved party. The petition is placed on public notice and commented on by others. The Commission's decision is based on the public record, generally composed of the petition and comments. The Commission has considered a number of preemption items since the passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and believes it in the public interest to inform the public of the information necessary to support its full