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