1997 through 2007 and with a NOx emission limit of 0.46 lb/mmBtu thereafter. The eliminated provision requires Rockford units 1 and 2 to burn only Powder River Basin coal during 1997–2007. The designated representative is John McManus.

If significant, adverse comments are timely received on the permit modification, comments on the permit modification will be addressed in a subsequent notice of permit modification based on the draft permit modification that is published elsewhere in this **Federal Register** and that is identical to this direct final action.

Dated: August 11, 1998.

Brian J. McLean,

Director, Acid Rain Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 98–22338 Filed 8–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6147–8]

Acid Rain Program: Draft Permit Modification

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of draft permit modification.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is issuing for comment a draft permit modification revising the early election plan for the Rockport plant in Indiana in accordance with the Acid Rain Program regulations (40 CFR parts 72 and 76). Because the Agency does not anticipate receiving adverse comments, the permit modification is also being issued as a direct final action in the notice of permit modification published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**.

DATES: Comments on the draft permit modification, and any request for public hearing, must be received no later than September 18, 1998 or 30 days after the date of publication of a similar notice in a local newspaper, whichever is later.

ADDRESSES: *Administrative Record.* The administrative record for the permit, except information protected as confidential, may be viewed during normal operating hours at EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL, 60604.

Comments. Send comments, requests for public hearings, and requests to receive notices of future actions to EPA Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, Attn: Cecilia Mijares (address above). Submit comments in duplicate and identify the permit to which the comments apply, the commenter's name, address, and telephone number, and the commenter's interest in the matter and affiliation, if any, to the owners and operators of all units in the plan. All timely comments will be considered, except those pertaining to standard provisions under 40 CFR 72.9 or issues not relevant to the draft permit modification.

Hearings. To request a public hearing, state the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. EPA may schedule a hearing if EPA finds that it will contribute to the decision-making process by clarifying significant issues concerning the draft permit modification.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Cecilia Mijares (312) 886–0968.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: If no significant, adverse comments are timely received, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this draft permit modification, and the permit modification issued as a direct final action in the notice of permit modification published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register** will automatically become final on the date specified in that notice. If significant, adverse comments are timely received on the draft permit modification, the permit modification in the notice of permit modification will be withdrawn and public comment received based on this notice of draft permit modification will be addressed in a subsequent notice of permit modification. Because the Agency will not institute a second comment period on this notice of draft permit modification, any parties interested in commenting should do so during this comment period.

For further information, see the information provided in the notice of permit modification published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 11, 1998.

Brian J. McLean,

Director, Acid Rain Division,

Office of Atmospheric Programs, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 98–22339 Filed 8–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6148–5]

Science Advisory Board; Emergency Notification of a Public Advisory Committee Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that the Environmental Health Committee (EHC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on September 8–9, 1998, beginning no earlier than 8:30 a.m. and ending no later than 6:00 p.m. on each day. All times noted are Eastern Standard Time. The meeting is open to the public; however, seating will be on a first-come basis. The meeting will be held at the Madison Room at the Quality Hotel Courthouse Plaza which is located at 1200 N. Courthouse Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201. This meeting was originally scheduled for August 18–19 and was announced in the **Federal Register** August 5, 1998 (63 FR 41820–41821). The cancellation of the August 18–19, 1998 meeting was also announced in the **Federal Register**.

Purpose: The purpose of the meeting is to conduct a technical review of the Lead 403 Rule, focusing on the proposed standards that were developed by the EPA to prioritize abatement and hazard control activities under Title X of the Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act on September 8–9, 1998. Both sessions are open to the public.

Draft Charge Questions: The EHC has been asked to respond to the following, draft Charge questions which are subject to revision:

General

1. In each of the specific areas identified below, have we used the best available data? Have we used this data appropriately? Have we fairly characterized the variability, uncertainties and limitations of the data and our analyses?

2. Are there alternative approaches that would improve our ability to assess the relative risk impacts of candidate options for paint, dust, and soil hazard standards?

3. The approach employs risk assessment models that were primarily developed for use in site-specific or localized assessments. Has the use and application of the Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model (IEUBK) and empirical model in this context been sufficiently explained and justified? Is our use of these tools to estimate nationwide impacts technically sound?

4. Are there any critical differences in environmental lead-blood lead

relationships found in local communities that should be considered in interpreting our results at the national level?

5. In view of the issues discussed and analyzed in sensitivity analyses contained in the two documents, in what specific areas should we focus (e.g., refine our approach, gather additional data, etc.) between now and the final rule? (The timing of the final rule will be dictated by a consent agreement. We should be in a position to present a firm schedule prior to the SAB meeting.)

Specific

1. The HUD National Survey, conducted in 1989–90, measured lead levels in paint, dust, and soil in 284 privately owned houses. Does our use of this data constitute a reasonable approach to estimating the national distribution of lead in paint, dust, and soil?

2. The approach employs conversion factors to combine data from studies that used different sample collection techniques. Is this appropriate? Is the method for developing these conversion factors technically sound?

3. IQ point deficits.

(a) the approach characterizes IQ decrements in the baseline blood-lead distribution, essentially implying that any blood-lead level above zero results in IQ effects. Have we provided a sufficient technical justification for this approach? Is this approach defensible and appropriate?

(b) the characterization of IQ point loss in the population includes the summation of fractional IQ points over the entire population of children. Have we provided a sufficient technical justification for this approach? Is this approach defensible and appropriate?

(c) one of the IQ-related endpoints is incidence of IQ less than 70. Should consideration be given to what the IQ score was, or would have been, prior to the decrement (i.e., should different consideration be given to cases where a small, or even fractional, point decrement causes the <70 occurrence vs. being <70 due to larger decrements)? If so, how might this be done?

4. Are the assumptions regarding duration, effectiveness, and costs of intervention activities reasonable?

5. Are the combinations of standards used in Chapter 6 of the risk analysis reasonably employed given the potential interrelationships between levels of lead in different media? Is additional data available on the interrelationship between lead levels in paint, dust, and soil prior to and after abatement?

6. The approach for estimating health effect and blood-lead concentration endpoints after interventions is based upon scaling projected declines in the distribution of children's blood-lead concentrations to the distribution reported in Phase 2 of the National Health and Human Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) III. Under this approach, data collected in the HUD National Survey are utilized to generate model-predicted distributions of blood-lead concentrations prior to and after the rule making. The difference between the pre section 403 and post section 403 model predicted distributions is used to estimate the decline in the distribution of children's blood-lead concentration. This decline is then mathematically applied to the distribution reported in NHANES III. Is this adjustment scientifically defensible in general, and in the specific case where the environmental data—from the HUD Survey—and the blood lead data—from NHANES III—were collected at different times (1989–90 vs. 1991–1994)?

Background: Under Title X of the Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is charged with promulgating standards to identify dangerous levels of lead, which includes hazards from lead-based paint, lead-contaminated dust, and lead-contaminated soil (Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) Section 403). The presence of these ''lead-based paint hazards'' triggers various requirements (e.g., abatement workers must be certified if lead-based paint or lead-based paint hazards are present in a residence.)

The Office Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substance's (OPPTS) approach is to promulgate standards that can be used to prioritize abatement and hazard control activities, rather than to attempt to define health threshold levels (i.e., to target the worst cases rather than to establish ''safe'' levels). While this will ultimately be a risk management decision, analyses of the prevalence of environmental lead levels in U.S. residences, incremental costs and benefits (estimated reductions in children's blood lead), and implementation/enforceability issues will be used to choose between various options for dust and soil lead levels. OPPTS seeks an SAB review of its technical approach to characterizing the incremental differences in costs and benefits between various candidate dust and soil lead levels.

For Further Information: Copies of the review document and any background materials for the review are *not available* from the SAB. Requests for copies of the background material may be directed to Mr. Dave Topping by telephone (202) 260–7737, by fax (202) 260–0770 or via E-mail at: topping.dave@epa.gov. Technical questions regarding the SAB review of the TSCA Section 403 Rule may also be directed to Mr. Dave Topping. Members of the public desiring additional information about the meeting, including an agenda, should contact Ms. Wanda Fields, Management Assistant, EHC, Science Advisory Board (1400), US EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Washington DC 20460, by telephone (202) 260–5510 by fax (202) 260–7118; or via E-mail at: fields.wanda@epa.gov.

Providing Oral or Written Comments at SAB Meetings: Anyone wishing to make an oral presentation at the meeting must contact Ms. Roslyn Edson, Acting Designated Federal Officer for the EHC, *in writing*, no later than 5:00 pm Eastern Time on September 1, 1998, by fax (202) 260–7118, or via E-mail: edson.roslyn@epa.gov The request should identify the name of the individual who will make the presentation and an outline of the issues to be addressed. At least 35 copies of any written comments to the Committee are to be given to Ms. Edson no later than the time of the presentation for distribution to the Committee and the interested public.

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. For conference call meetings, opportunities for oral comment will be limited to no more than five minutes per speaker and no more than fifteen minutes total. Written comments (at least 35 copies) received in the SAB Staff Office sufficiently prior to a meeting date, may be mailed to the relevant SAB committee or subcommittee prior to its meeting; comments received too close to the meeting date will normally be provided to the committee at its meeting. Written comments may be provided to the relevant committee or subcommittee up until the time of the meeting.

Information concerning the Science Advisory Board, its structure, function, and composition, may be found in The FY1997 Annual Report of the Staff Director which is available from the SAB Committee Evaluation and Support Staff (CESS) by contacting US EPA, Science Advisory Board (1400), Attention: CESS, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460 or via fax (202) 260–1889. Additional information

concerning the SAB can be found on the SAB Home Page at: http://www.epa.gov/sab.

Dated: August 12, 1998.

Patricia Thomas,

Acting Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 98–22318 Filed 8–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF–821; FRL–6019–6]

Rohm and Haas Company; Pesticide Tolerance Petition Filing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the filing of pesticide petitions proposing the establishment of a tolerance for residues of a certain pesticide chemical in or on various raw agricultural commodities.

DATES: Comments, identified by the docket control number [PF–821], must be received on or before September 18, 1998.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to Information and Records Integrity Branch, Public Information and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to Rm. 119, CM #2. 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by following the instructions under ''SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.'' No confidential business information should be submitted through e-mail.

Information submitted as a comments concerning this document may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). CBI should not be submitted through e-mail. Information marked as CBI will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 119 at the address given above, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Joseph Tavano, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location, telephone number, and e-mail address: Rm. 214, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202. (703) 305–6411; tavano.joe@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has received pesticide petitions as follows from Rohm and Haas Company, 100 Independence Mall West, Philadelphia, PA. 19106–2399, proposing pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), to amend 40 CFR 180.472 by establishing a tolerance for residues of tebufenozide [benzoic acid, 3,5-dimethyl-, 1–(1,1-dimethylethyl)-2–(4-ethylbenzoyl) hydrazide in or on various raw agricultural commodities. EPA has determined that these petitions contain data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2) of the FFDCA; however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data supports granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

The official record for this notice, as well as the public version, has been established for this notice of filing under docket control number PF–821 (including comments and data submitted electronically as described below). A public version of this record, including printed, paper versions of electronic comments, which does not include any information claimed as CBI, is available for inspection from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The official record is located at the address in ''ADDRESSES'' at the beginning of this document.

Electronic comments can be sent directly to EPA at:

opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov

Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comment and data will also be accepted on disks in Wordperfect 5.1/6.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number (PF–821) and appropriate petition number. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a.

List of Subjects

Environmental Protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: August 6, 1998.

Arnold E. Lane,

Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Summaries of Petitions

Petitioner summaries of the pesticide petitions are printed below as required by section 408(d)(3) of the FFDCA. The summaries of the petitions were prepared by the petitioner and represent the views of the petitioner. EPA is publishing the petition summaries verbatim without editing them in any way. The petition summary announces the availability of a description of the analytical methods available to EPA for the detection and measurement of the pesticide chemical residues or an explanation of why no such method is needed.

1. PP 7F4815

EPA has received a pesticide petition (PP 7F4815) from Rohm and Haas Company, 100 Independence Mall West, Philadelphia, PA 19106–2399, proposing pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), to amend 40 CFR Part 180 by establishing a tolerance for residues of tebufenozide [benzoic acid, 3,5-dimethyl-,1–(1,1-dimethylethyl)-2–(4-ethylbenzoyl) hydrazide] in or on the raw agricultural commodity the crop group pome fruit at 1.0 parts per million (ppm) and in or on apple pomace at 3.0 ppm; fat of cattle, goats, sheep and hogs at 0.25 ppm; liver of cattle, goats, sheep and hogs at 0.075 ppm; meat and meatby-products of cattle, goats, sheep and hogs at 0.05 ppm and milk at 0.05 ppm. EPA has determined that the petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2) of the FFDCA; however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data supports granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

A. Residue Chemistry

1. *Plant metabolism*. The metabolism of tebufenozide in plants (grapes, apples, rice and sugar beets) is adequately understood for the purposes of these tolerances. The metabolism of tebufenozide in all crops was similar and involves oxidation of the alkyl substituents of the aromatic rings primarily at the benzylic positions. The extent of metabolism and degree of