Reserved

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–26038 Filed 10–5–00; 12:52 pm]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6883–4]

Clean Water Act Section 303(d): Availability of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: This document announces the availability for comment of the administrative record file for six TMDLs prepared by EPA Region 6 for waters listed in Louisiana's Mermentau and Vermilion/Teche river basins, under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA). EPA prepared these TMDLs in response to a Court Order dated October 1, 1999, in the lawsuit *Sierra Club, et al.* v. *Clifford et al.,* No. 96–0527, (E.D. La. Oct. 1, 1999). Under this court order, EPA is required to prepare TMDLs when needed for waters on the Louisiana 1998 section 303(d) list by December 31, 2007.

DATES: Comments on the six TMDLs must be submitted in writing to EPA on or before November 9, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the six TMDLs should be sent to Ellen Caldwell, Environmental Protection Specialist, Water Quality Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 6, 1445 Ross Ave., Dallas, TX 75202–2733. For further information, contact Ellen Caldwell at (214) 665–7513. The administrative record file for these TMDLs is available for public inspection at this address as well. Copies of the TMDLs and their respective calculations may be viewed at www.epa.gov/region6/water/tmdl.htm, or obtained by calling or writing Ms. Caldwell at the above address. Please contact Ms. Caldwell to schedule an inspection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Caldwell at (214) 665–7513.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 1996, two Louisiana environmental groups, the Sierra Club and Louisiana Environmental Action Network (plaintiffs), filed a lawsuit in Federal Court against the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), styled *Sierra Club, et al.* v. *Clifford et al.,* No. 96–0527, (E.D. La. Oct. 1, 1999). Among other claims, plaintiffs alleged that EPA failed to establish Louisiana TMDLs in a timely manner. Discussion of the court's order may be found at 65 FR 54032 (September 6, 2000).

EPA Seeks Comments on Six TMDLs

By this notice EPA is seeking comment on the following six TMDLs for waters located within the Mermentau and Vermilion/Teche basins:

Subsegment	Waterbody name	Pollutant
060212	Chatlin Lake Canal and Bayou DuLac.	Fecal Coliform.
060901	Bayou Petite Anse.	Fecal Coliform.
060701	Tete Bayou	Fecal Coliform.
060703	Bayou du Portage.	Fecal Coliform.
060909	Lake Peigneur ..	Fecal Coliform.
060911	Vermilion-Teche River Basin.	Fecal Coliform.

EPA requests that the public provide to EPA any water quality related data and information that may be relevant to the calculations for these TMDLs, or any other comments relevant to these TMDLs. EPA will review all data and information submitted during the public comment period and revise the six TMDLs where appropriate. EPA will then forward the TMDLs to the Court and the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ). LDEQ will incorporate the TMDLs into its current water quality management plan.

Dated: September 25, 2000.

Sam Becker,

Acting Director, Water Quality Protection Division, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 00–25930 Filed 10–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6883–7]

Science Advisory Board; Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meeting

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that the Natural Attenuation Subcommittee of the EPA Science Advisory Board's (SAB) Environmental Engineering Committee will conduct a public teleconference meeting on Wednesday October 25, 2000 from 1–3 p.m. Eastern Time. This activity began at the January 26th conference call meeting and included a face-to-face meeting August 14–15, 2000. Background, including the availability of review materials, will be found in previous notices (see 65 FR 1866–1867, January 12, 2000).

The meeting will be coordinated through a conference call connection in room 6450E Ariel Rios North (6th Floor), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC. The public is strongly encouraged to attend the meeting through a telephonic link, but may attend physically if arrangements are made with the SAB staff by noon Thursday October 19. Additional instructions about how to participate in the conference call can be obtained by calling Ms. Mary Winston at (202) 564–4538, and via e-mail at: winston.mary@epa.gov by noon Thursday, October 19.

Purpose of the Meeting: During this meeting the Subcommittee plans to consider approval of its draft report. If approved, the draft report will be forwarded to the Environmental Engineering Committee for consideration at a public face-to-face meeting planned for December.

Availability of the draft Subcommittee Report: The staff anticipates the draft report will be mailed to the Subcommittee the week of October 16; the draft will be made available to the public by Email the day after it is mailed to the Subcommittee. For email copies, please contact the Designated Federal Officer at conway.kathleen@epa.gov. A limited number of paper copies will be available from Ms. Mary Winston at (202) 564–4538, and via e-mail at: winston.mary@epa.gov.

For Further Information—Any member of the public wishing further information concerning either meeting or wishing to submit brief oral comments must contact Ms. Kathleen White Conway, Designated Federal Officer, Science Advisory Board (1400A), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone (202) 564–4559; FAX (202) 501–0582; or via e-mail at *conway.kathleen@epa.gov.* Requests for oral comments must be *in writing* (e-mail, fax or mail) and received by Ms. Conway no later than noon Eastern Time one week prior to the meeting.

Providing Oral or Written Comments at SAB Meetings

It is the policy of the Science Advisory Board to accept written public comments of any length, and to accommodate oral public comments whenever possible. The Science

Advisory Board expects that public statements presented at its meetings will not be repetitive of previously submitted oral or written statements. *Oral Comments:* In general, each individual or group requesting an oral presentation at a face-to-face meeting will be limited to a total time of ten minutes. For teleconference meetings, opportunities for oral comment will usually be limited to no more than three minutes per speaker and no more than fifteen minutes total. Deadlines for getting on the public speaker list for a meeting are given above. Speakers should bring at least 35 copies of their comments and presentation slides for distribution to the reviewers and public at the meeting. *Written Comments:* Although the SAB accepts written comments until the date of the meeting (unless otherwise stated), because this is a conference call meeting, any comments to be mailed to the Subcommittee in advance of the meeting should be received in the SAB Staff Office by noon Monday October 16. Copies in Email format will be accepted until the day before the meeting, although earlier submission is encouraged. Comments should be supplied to the appropriate DFO at the address/contact information noted above in the following formats: fifteen hard copies, one with original signature, and one electronic copy via e-mail (acceptable file format: WordPerfect, Word, or Rich Text files (in IBM–PC/Windows 95/98 format)).

General Information—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 FY2000 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. Committee rosters, draft Agendas and meeting calendars are also located on our website.

Meeting Access—Individuals requiring special accommodation at this meeting, including wheelchair access to the conference room, should contact Ms. Winston at least five business days prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Dated: October 3, 2000.

A. Robert Flaak,

Acting Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 00–25932 Filed 10–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6883–8]

Science Advisory Board; Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that a Committee of the US EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on the dates and times noted below. All times noted are Eastern Standard Time. The meeting is open to the public, however, seating is limited and available on a first come basis. *Important Notice:* Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating EPA office and are not available from the SAB Office—information concerning availability of documents from the relevant Program Office is included below.

The Dioxin Reassessment Review Committee (DRRC) of the US EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB), will meet on November 1 and 2, 2000, at the Ramada Plaza Hotel Pentagon, 4641 Kenmore Avenue, Alexandria, VA. The hotel telephone number is (703) 751–4510. The meeting will begin at 8:45 a.m. on November 1 and adjourn no later than 5 p.m. on November 2.

Purpose of the Meeting

In April 1991, EPA announced that it would conduct a scientific reassessment of the potential health risks of exposure to dioxin and related compounds. The reassessment led to the publication of a multi-volume document titled ''Exposure and Human Health Reassessment of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin (TCDD) and Related Compounds.'' The draft of this document was published in 1994. In 1995, this draft was reviewed by EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB), which issued a report (EPA–SAB–EC–95–021) with the following major findings: (a) There was no need for further SAB review of health and exposure sections (Chapters 1–7) as long as EPA updated these sections with any relevant new information before finalizing them; (b) EPA should develop a new chapter on toxicity equivalence factors (TEFs) to consolidate the discussion and scientific information on the use of TEFs for dioxin and related compounds; (c) the sections addressing Dose Response Modeling (Chapter 8) and the Risk Characterization document (Chapter 9) required revision and improvement; and (d) the revised chapters on Dose Response Modeling and Risk Characterization and the new chapter on TEFs should undergo external peer review and then be brought back to the SAB for another review.

EPA subsequently revised the document, and conducted an external peer review as recommended by the SAB (please see *http://www.epa.gov/ncea/pdfs/dioxin/final.pdf* for a copy of the peer review). The Agency has now requested that the SAB review the revised reassessment document.

Charge to the Committee

The Charge asks the DRRC to respond to specific questions in the following areas: (a) Cancer effects; (b) background and population exposures; (c) children's risk; (d) relative risks of breast feeding; (e) the risk characterization summary statement; and (f) dioxin sources. The complete set of 21 Charge Questions, sorted by category, follows:

Body Burdens

(Question 1) Did EPA adequately justify its use of body burden as a dose metric for inter-species scaling? Should the document present conclusions based on daily dose?

Use of Margin of Exposure Approach

There are two questions on EPA's proposed use of a margin of exposure (MOE) approach to evaluate dioxin-related health risks.

(Question 2) Has EPA's choice of the MOE approach to risk assessment adequately considered that background levels of the dioxins have dropped dramatically over the past decade, and are continuing to decline? How might the rationale be improved for EPA's decision not to calculate an RfD/RfC, and for the recommended MOE approach for conveying risk information? Is an MOE approach appropriate, as compared to the traditional RfD/RfC? Should the document present an RfD/RfC?''

(Question 3) The SAB commented that previous dose-response modeling was too limited to biochemical endpoints (CYPIA1, IA2, * * *). Are the calculations of a range of ED_{01} body burden for noncancer effects in rodents responsive and clearly presented? Please comment on the weight of evidence interpretation of the body burden data associated with a 1% response rate for non-cancer effects that is presented in Chapter 8, Appendix I and Figure 8–1 (where EPA considers that the data best support a range estimate for ED_{01} body burdens between 10 ng/kg to 50 ng/kg).

Mechanisms and Mode of Action

Two questions concern how the Integrated Summary addresses the