

information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

The ICR provides a detailed explanation of this estimate, which is only briefly summarized in this notice. The annual public burden for this ICR is estimated to be 24,753 hours. The following is a summary of the estimates taken from the ICR:

*Respondents/affected entities:* All exporters of unregistered pesticides.

*Estimated total number of potential respondents:* 2,500.

*Frequency of response:* Annual or per-shipment.

*Estimated total/average number of responses for each respondent:* 1–2.

*Estimated total annual burden hours:* 24,753.

*Estimated total annual burden costs:* \$2,134,400.

#### VI. Are There Changes in the Estimates from the Last Approval?

The total annual respondent burden cost for this ICR is estimated to be \$2,134,400, an increase of \$232,000 over the present ICR. This slight increase in respondent burden cost is due to adjustments in labor rates.

#### VII. What is the Next Step in the Process for this ICR?

EPA will consider the comments received and amend the ICR as appropriate. The final ICR package will then be submitted to OMB for review and approval pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.12. EPA will issue another **Federal Register** notice pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.5(a)(1)(iv) to announce the submission of the ICR to OMB and the opportunity to submit additional comments to OMB. If you have any questions about this ICR or the approval process, please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

#### List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: April 7, 2005.

**Susan B. Hazen,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.*  
[FR Doc. 05–7588 Filed 4–19–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–S**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7901–3]

### Notice of Request for Proposals for Projects To Be Funded from the Water Quality Cooperative Agreement Allocation (CFDA 66.463—Water Quality Cooperative Agreements); Correction

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

**ACTION:** Notice; correction.

**SUMMARY:** EPA Region 6 published in the **Federal Register** of March 30, 2005, a notice soliciting proposals funded from the Regional Water Quality Cooperative Agreement allocation. This document is being issued to add and clarify several requirements that must be included in competitive funding announcements according to EPA Order 5700.7, Environmental Results under EPA Assistance Agreements. Additionally, a clarification on how past performance will be evaluated is included. Due to this correction notice, the deadline for submittal of all proposals is May 31, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Terry Mendiola by telephone at 214–665–7144 or by e-mail at [mendiola.teresita@epa.gov](mailto:mendiola.teresita@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** EPA Region 6 published a notice in the **Federal Register** of March 30, 2005, (FR 05–6300) soliciting proposals for projects to be funded from the Regional Water Quality Cooperative Agreement Allocation. According to EPA Order 5700.7, all competitive funding announcements must include (1) a concise discussion of any expected outputs and outcomes in Section I and (2) ranking criteria for evaluating the applicant's plan for tracking and measuring its progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes.

This correction adds a discussion of the difference between an output and outcome which will be added to Section I and reference to the outputs/outcomes for each priority area is added.

The language in the fourth ranking criteria of Section V regarding the quality of the evaluation component to assess or measure the environmental outcome(s) is corrected to reflect Order 5700.7 more accurately. A discussion for inclusion of this plan will be added in the Environmental Results and Outcomes Section of the proposal format.

This correction also clarifies the criteria for applicant's past performance. Applicant's past performance will be

evaluated. Therefore, the words “if applicable” in the Past Performance criteria in Section V.1. will be deleted. Applicants will have to include any information on performance of past EPA projects similar in scope and relevance to the proposed project under the *Describe Applicant's Capability to Perform Work*: section of the proposal format. Applicants that do not have any relevant past performance will receive a neutral score for this factor. That means applicants will receive a possible 2.5 points out of 5. EPA Region 6 will also evaluate this criteria based on any existing information that is available based on past experience with the applicant.

Due to this correction notice, the date that the proposals must be submitted to EPA Region 6 has been extended. This extension also extends the date that EPA will identify initial selections.

#### Corrections

In notice FR 03–6300 published on March 30, 2005, (FR 05–6300) make the following corrections.

On page 16267, third column, under **DATES** caption, first sentence, correct the May 16, 2005 date with May 31, 2005.

On page 16267, third column, under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**, under “Dates” caption, first sentence, correct the May 16, 2005 date with May 31, 2005.

On page 16267, third column, under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**, under “Dates” caption, second sentence, correct the June 28, 2005 date with July 14, 2005.

On page 16268, in the first column, under High Priority Areas for Funding Consideration, second paragraph, add at the end of the second sentence the following:

The expected outputs/outcomes are included in the threshold eligibility criteria in Section III.3. for each priority area topic.

EPA defines “outputs” as an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work products related to an environmental goal or objective, that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during an assistance agreement funding period.

Outcomes are defined as the result, effect, or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related or programmatic in nature, must be quantitative, and may not necessarily

be achievable with an assistance agreement funding period.”

On page 16269, second column, after the fourth bullet of the “Watershed—Based Permitting” caption, add the following:

- Successful completion of the project should result in the development of a new NPDES permitting issuance strategy that maximizes the use of resources to achieve environmental results and better protect entire watersheds.

On page 16269, second column, after the eighth bullet of the “Water Quality Trading” caption, add the following:

- Successful completion of the project should result in the development of a water quality trading process which will aid in complying with discharge limitations while improving and preserving water quality.

On page 16269, third column, after the first bullet of the “Cross-Program Training on Water Quality Modeling” caption, add the following:

- Successful completion of this training program should result in new avenues for Region 6 States to better coordinate resources and investigate innovative resolutions to water quality issues and development of TMDLs, especially at the watershed level, in support of State and National goals to reduce impaired waters in those States.

On page 16270, in the second column, under the proposal format, add at the end of *Environmental Results and Outcomes*: the following:

“This section should also include a plan to track and measure progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes.”

On page 16270, in the second column, under the proposal format, add at the end of *Describe Applicant's Capability To Perform Work*: the following:

“This section should also include information on performance of past EPA Region 6 projects similar in scope and relevance to the proposed project.”

On page 16270, second column, under “3. Submission Dates and Times” caption, first sentence correct the May 16, 2005 date with May 31, 2005.

On page 16270, in the third column, under Section V. Application Review Information, 1. Criteria, fourth bullet, delete “and the quality of the evaluation component to assess or measure the environmental outcome(s)” and replace with “including the adequacy of the applicant’s plan to track and measure progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes.”

On page 16271, first column, second bullet, delete “if applicable.” under past performance criteria. Therefore, this

criteria should read “Applicant’s past performance. (5)”.

Dated: April 11, 2005.

**Miguel I. Flores,**

*Director, Water Quality Protection Division, Region 6.*

[FR Doc. 05-7802 Filed 4-19-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL -7901-5]

### **Science Advisory Board Staff Office; Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC); Consultation on Ozone Health Assessment Plan**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Science Advisory Board (SAB) Staff Office announces a public meeting of the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee’s (CASAC) Ozone Review Panel (Panel) to conduct a consultation on EPA’s draft Ozone Health Assessment Plan: Scope and Methods for Exposure Analysis and Risk Assessment (April 2005).

**DATES:** May 5, 2005. The meeting will be held Thursday, May 5, 2005, from 3 to 5 p.m. (eastern time).

**Location:** The meeting will take place at the Hilton Raleigh-Durham Airport at Research Triangle Park, 4810 Page Road, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Any member of the public who wishes to obtain the teleconference call-in numbers and access codes; would like to submit written or brief oral comments (five minutes or less); or wants further information concerning this meeting, must contact Mr. Fred Butterfield, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), EPA Science Advisory Board (1400F), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460; via telephone/voice mail: (202) 343-9994; fax: (202) 233-0643; or e-mail at: [butterfield.fred@epa.gov](mailto:butterfield.fred@epa.gov). General information concerning the CASAC or the EPA Science Advisory Board can be found on the EPA Web site at: <http://www.epa.gov/sab>.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background:** Under section 108 of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act), the Agency is required to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for each pollutant for which EPA has issued criteria, including ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). Section 109(d) of the CAA

subsequently requires periodic review and, if appropriate, revision of existing air quality criteria and standards to reflect advances in scientific knowledge on the effects of the pollutant on public health and welfare. The Agency revised the NAAQS for O<sub>3</sub> in July 1997. EPA’s Office of Research and Development (ORD) has recently released a draft updated air quality criteria document for O<sub>3</sub> (draft Ozone AQCD). The CASAC Ozone Review Panel will convene to conduct a peer review on this draft Ozone AQCD on May 4-5, 2005. EPA’s Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS), within the Office of Air and Radiation (OAR), is in the process of developing a draft updated Staff Paper for O<sub>3</sub> as part of its review of the O<sub>3</sub> NAAQS. This draft Staff Paper will evaluate the policy implications of the key scientific and technical information contained in the draft Ozone AQCD and identify critical elements that EPA believes should be considered in the review of the O<sub>3</sub> NAAQS. The O<sub>3</sub> Staff Paper is intended to “bridge the gap” between the scientific review contained in the Ozone AQCD and the public health and welfare policy judgments required of the EPA Administrator in reviewing the O<sub>3</sub> NAAQS. Key components of this O<sub>3</sub> Staff Paper include a quantitative population exposure analysis and health risk assessment. OAQPS has developed a draft Ozone Health Assessment Plan which includes a discussion of the scope, approaches, and methods that staff is planning to use in conducting the population exposure analysis and health risk assessment.

EPA is soliciting advice and recommendations from the CASAC by means of a consultation on the draft Ozone Health Assessment Plan. The CASAC, which is comprised of seven members appointed by the EPA Administrator, was established under section 109(d)(2) of the CAA (42 U.S.C. 7409) as an independent scientific advisory committee, in part to provide advice, information and recommendations on the scientific and technical aspects of issues related to air quality criteria and NAAQS under sections 108 and 109 of the Act. The CASAC is a Federal advisory committee chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), as amended, 5 U.S.C., App. The CASAC Ozone Review Panel will comply with the provisions of FACA and all appropriate SAB Staff Office procedural policies.

**Technical Contact:** Any questions concerning the draft Ozone Health Assessment Plan should be directed to Mr. Harvey Richmond, OAQPS, at