List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Chemicals, Premanufacture notices.

Dated: July 31, 2003.

Sandra R. Wilkins,

Acting Director, Information Management Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics.

[FR Doc. 03–20016 Filed 8–5–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7540–9]

Notice of Tentative Approval and Solicitation of Request for a Public Hearing for Public Water System Supervision Program Revision for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of tentative approval and Solicitation of Requests for a Public Hearing.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given in accordance with the provision of section 1413 of the Safe Drinking Water Act as amended, and the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations Implementation that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is revising its approved Public Water System Supervision Program. Pennsylvania has adopted a Lead and Copper Rule (LCR) to control lead and copper in drinking water, Lead and Copper Rule Minor Revisions (LCRMR) to streamline and reduce reporting burden, a Public Notification (PN) Rule for public water systems to notify their customers when they violate EPA or state drinking water standards, and a Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) Rule that requires water suppliers to provide annual reports on the quality of the drinking water supplied to their customers. This revision also includes minor revisions to other drinking water rules.

EPA has determined that these revisions are no less stringent than the corresponding Federal regulations aside from two minor inconsistencies in the Lead and Copper regulations. The two items concern the requirement to include the location of each site where samples are taken and the criteria under which each site was selected for the system's sampling pool as part of the results reported to the State in the LCR. EPA does not believe that these minor inconsistencies affect compliance with the Federal regulations. They are being addressed through program implementation while the Department of Environmental Protection corrects the deficiencies in its regulations. Therefore, EPA is taking action to tentatively approve these program revisions. All interested parties are invited to submit written comments on this determination and may request a public hearing.

DATES: Comments or a request for a public hearing must be submitted by September 5, 2003. This determination shall become effective on September 5, 2003 if no timely and appropriate request for a hearing is received and the Regional Administrator does not elect on his own to hold a hearing, and if no comments are received which cause EPA to modify its tentative approval.

ADDRESSES: Comments or a request for a public hearing must be submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103–2029. All documents relating to this determination are available for inspection between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the following offices:

- Drinking Water Branch, Water Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103–2029.
- Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Water Supply and Wastewater Management, 11th Floor Rachael Carson State Office Building Harrisburg, 400 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA 17105–8467.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nick Tymchenko, Drinking Water Branch at the Philadelphia address given above; telephone (215) 814–2022 or fax (215) 814–2318.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: All interested parties are invited to submit written comments on this determination and may request a public hearing. All comments will be considered, and, if necessary, EPA will issue a response. Frivolous or insubstantial requests for a hearing may be denied by the Regional Administrator. However, if a substantial request for a public hearing is made by September 5, 2003, a public hearing will be held. A request for public hearing shall include the following: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the individual, organization, or other entity requesting a hearing; (2) a brief statement of the requesting person's interest in the Regional Administrator's determination and of information that the requesting person intends to submit at such a hearing; and (3) the signature of the individual making the request; or, if the request is made on behalf of an organization or other entity, the signature of a responsible official of the organization or other entity.

Dated: July 28, 2003.

Thomas Voltaggio,

Acting Regional Administrator, EPA, Region III.

[FR Doc. 03–20018 Filed 8–5–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Notice of Delegation of Authority—Processing Complaints Under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act

SUMMARY: The amendments to section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. 794d, which took effect in 2001 provide that each federal agency must ensure that the electronic and information technology it develops, procures, maintains, or uses is accessible to individuals with disabilities who are federal employees or applicants, or members of the public seeking information or services from the agency. Section 508 authorizes individuals to file administrative complaints and civil actions against an agency, limited to the alleged failure to procure accessible technology. The statute requires federal agencies to process section 508 complaints according to the same complaint procedures used to process section 504 complaints. *See* 29 U.S.C. 794d(f)(2).

Notice is hereby given that by Order dated July 22, 2003, the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) delegated to the Director of the EEOC's Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO), without authority to redelegate, authority for processing all section 508 complaints against the EEOC. Pursuant to this delegation, the Director of the OEO shall process all section 508 complaints by applicants, employees, or members of the public, against the EEOC, pursuant to the compliance procedures set forth in 29 CFR 1615.170(d)–(m). These are the same procedures which the EEOC uses to process section 504 complaints against the EEOC by members of the public. The Order provided that the EEOC will not utilize the Federal sector equal employment opportunity administrative complaint procedures, 29 CFR part 1614, to process any section 508 complaints against EEOC, even if filed by an EEOC applicant or employee. The Order explained that as distinguished from the EEOC's authority to process section 501 claims under part 1614, the EEOC does not have authority to interpret and enforce section 508

under part 1614. The Order further provided that if a section 501 complaint filed against the EEOC in the part 1614 process includes a separate section 508 claim, OEO will process the section 501 claim through the part 1614 process, and will separately process the section 508 claim pursuant to the procedures set forth in 29 CFR 1615.170(d)–(m). By this Order, the EEOC did not alter any of its existing procedures for processing complaints under section 501 or section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE. The delegation of authority became effective on July 22, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carol R. Miaskoff, Assistant Legal Counsel, at 202–663–4689.

Dated: July 22, 2003.

Cari M. Dominguez,

Chair.

[FR Doc. 03–19986 Filed 8–5–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6570–01–P

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

National Science and Technology Council Subcommittee on Research Business Models

ACTION: Request for information regarding National Science and Technology Council/Committee on Science/Subcommittee on Research Business Models.

SUMMARY: The Subcommittee on Research Business Models is undertaking a review of policies, procedures, and plans relating to the business relationship between federal agencies and research performers with the goal of improving the performance and management of federally sponsored basic and applied scientific and engineering research. As part of that effort, the Subcommittee will hold a series of regional workshops in the Fall of 2003 to solicit input and feedback from the research performer community. This notice is intended to collect data that will assist the Subcommittee in setting agendas for those regional workshops.

DATES: Submit comments on or before September 22, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Due to potential delays in OSTP's receipt and processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, we encourage respondents to submit comments electronically to ensure timely receipt. We cannot guarantee that comments sent via surface mail will be received before the comment closing date.

Electronic comments may be submitted to: nstc_rbm@ostp.eop.gov. Please include in the subject line the words ''NSTC Research Business Models Comments'' and a reference to the relevant items, enumerated below as A–J. Please put the full body of your comments in the text of the electronic message and as an attachment. Be certain to include your name, title, organization, postal address, telephone number, and E-mail address in the text of the message.

Comments may be mailed to Michael J. Holland; Office of Science & Technology Policy; 1650 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20502. But again, we strongly encourage respondents to submit comments electronically.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information regarding this Notice, please call Michael Holland, Office of Science & Technology Policy, (202) 456–6069 (direct) and e-mail: *mholland@ostp.eop.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This notice requests data and specific examples from the general public and all interested parties regarding the activities of the Subcommittee on Research Business Models chartered under the Committee on Science of the National Science and Technology Council. The Committee on Science realizes that much has changed about the practice of scientific research over the last several years. The purpose of the Subcommittee on Research Business Models is to advise and assist the Committee on Science and the NSTC on policies, procedures, and plans relating to business models to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of the Federal research and development enterprise in a manner cognizant of currently available resources. The Subcommittee will

- Facilitate a strong, coordinated effort across federal agencies to identify and address important policy implications arising from the changing nature of basic and applied research.
- Examine the concomitant influence these changes have had or should have on business models and business practices for the conduct of basic and applied research sponsored by the Federal government and carried out by academic, industrial, and government entities.
- Review the challenges to improved performance and mechanisms for more transparent accountability of the research enterprise.

The membership of the Subcommittee includes representatives from fifteen Federal departments and agencies that support or are engaged in research activities. The Subcommittee on Research Business Models will consult and coordinate with other ongoing, relevant efforts including, but not limited to, those of the Interagency Electronic Grants Committee (IAEGC) and the CFO Grants Management Council (GMC) Public Law 106–107 Workgroups.

Request for Information

In order to assist the public in its response, the Subcommittee has identified the following areas in which they would like to receive comments, including how changes in these areas have impacted research costs. However, the Subcommittee welcomes comments and suggestions in other areas that may not be included in the following questions.

A. *Accountability.* What constitutes accountability for the Federally-supported research enterprise? How can performers best demonstrate results or return on Federal research investments? Please suggest mechanisms whereby research managers can more transparently demonstrate responsible use of public resources.

B. *Inconsistency of policies and practices among Federal agencies.* Can you identify specific Federal policies and practices that if simplified would improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the research enterprise? Can the impact of inconsistent policies and practices among Federal agencies on the research environment be quantified? Among the variations in policies and practices, which practices appear to be the best? Why?

C. *Inconsistency of policies and practices among universities.* Can you identify specific university policies and practices that if simplified would improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the research enterprise?

D. *State and Institutional requirements.* What is the prevalence and impact of state and institutional requirements that are added to Federal requirements for research funding?

E. *Regulatory requirements.* Is there a more efficient approach to meeting the intent of the current suite of administrative requirements and regulations? Please provide examples.

F. *Research support.* How can public funding mechanisms and policies encourage or discourage innovative approaches to research? Does the current process for research funding