

that a conference call for the Occurrence and Contaminant Selection Working Group of the National Drinking Water Advisory Council established under the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. S300f *et seq.*), will be held on June 23 and 24, 1997, from 1:00 p.m. until 4:00 p.m. EDT, each day. The conference call is open to the public, but due to availability, conference lines will be limited and access will be granted on a first-come first-served basis.

The purpose of this call is to review progress on the development of the first Drinking Water Candidate List since the last meeting of the Working Group on April 3-4, 1997. The Working Group members will analyze the results of the criteria developed, and relevant issues and facts, and draft proposed position paper for deliberation by the advisory council. Therefore, statements will be taken from the public as time allows.

For more information, please contact, Evelyn Washington, Designated Federal Officer, Occurrence and Contaminant Selection Working Group, U.S. EPA, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (4607), 401 M Street SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. The telephone number is 202-260-3029, fax 202-260-3762, and e-mail address washington.evelyn@epamail.epa.gov.

Dated: June 4, 1997.

Charlene E. Shaw,

Designated Federal Officer, National Drinking Water Advisory Council.

[FR Doc. 97-15407 Filed 6-11-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5839-9]

National Drinking Water Advisory Council, Small Systems Working Group; Notice of Open Meeting

Under section 10(a)(2) of Public Law 92-423, "The Federal Advisory Committee Act," notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Small Systems Working Group of the National Drinking Water Advisory Council established under the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. S300f *et seq.*), will be held on June 30 and July 1, 1997 from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm, at the Loews L'Enfant Plaza Hotel, 480 L'Enfant Plaza, Washington, DC 20024. The meeting is open to the public, but due to past experience, seating will be limited.

The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss final recommendations for the National

Drinking Water Advisory Council regarding implementation of the capacity development and affordability provisions of the 1996 Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments. The meeting is open to the public to observe. The working group members are meeting to develop final recommendations based upon issues considered at previous meetings. Statements will be taken from the public at this meeting, as time allows.

For more information, please contact, Peter E. Shanaghan, Designated Federal Officer, Small Systems Working Group, U.S. EPA, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (4606), 401 M Street SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. The telephone number is 202-260-5813 and the email address shanaghan.peter@epamail.epa.gov.

Dated: May 29, 1997.

Charlene Shaw,

Designated Federal Officer, National Drinking Water Advisory Council.

[FR Doc. 97-15408 Filed 6-11-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5839-4]

Science Advisory Board Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meeting, June and July 1997

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92-463, notice is hereby given that the Science Advisory Board's (SAB's) Environmental Engineering Committee (EEC) will conduct a public meeting from Monday June 30, 1997 through Thursday July 3, 1997. The meeting will be held in conference rooms 120-126 at the Environmental Protection Agency's Andrew W. Breidenback Environmental Research Facility, 26 West Martin Luther King Boulevard, Cincinnati, Ohio. The Committee will convene at 8:30 a.m. on Monday June 30 and adjourn no later than 3 p.m. Thursday July 3. The Committee may begin earlier and end later otherwise as needed for the work.

Purpose of the Meeting

On June 30-July 1 the EEC will review the Pollution Prevention Research Strategy and the Waste Research Strategy developed by research coordination teams in EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD). On July 2, the EEC will review the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT) TRI Relative Risk-Based Environmental Indicators Project and conduct a

consultation on a proposed approach for developing the TRI Relative Risk-Based Chronic Ecological Indicator. (An SAB consultation is a discussion of an issue in its early stages which generates neither consensus advice nor a written report, but which may be helpful to the Agency in identifying areas that should be addressed in its further development of the topic.) July 3 is intended to be a day of writing and report preparation.

During the meeting, the Committee also expects to review and possibly approve four reports prepared by the EEC or its subcommittees: (A) the research program and strategic directions of the National Risk Management Research Laboratory (NRMRL); (B) Superfund's draft proposed national guidance on field filtration of ground water samples taken for metals analysis from monitoring wells for Superfund site assessment; © the use of toxicity weighting in the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Analysis Sector Facility Indexing Project; and (D) the Office of Solid Waste's proposed plan for a Congressionally required study of surface impoundments.

Review of the Pollution Prevention Research Strategy

Copies of the review documents for the Pollution Prevention Research Strategy review can be obtained from Jonathan Herrmann of the NRMRL in EPA/ORD (phone 513/569-7839 or fax 513/569-7680). The current draft charge for the pollution prevention research strategy review is:

(A) Is the research strategy on target in describing the current state of pollution prevention, where it should be focused in the near term, and where it needs to be directed in the future (i.e., sustainable development)?

(B) Does the strategic review and program scoping provide a clear sense of priorities and role for ORD's pollution prevention research effort, and does it support the opportunities for pollution prevention research and development described in Chapter 3.0? Have any opportunities for ORD research in pollution prevention been missed and, if so, what are they?

© Are the four long-term goals consistent with the mission of the research strategy, and if thoroughly executed, will they effectively achieve the stated vision? If not, what improvements or changes are recommended?

(D) Are the prioritization criteria listed in Chapter 2.0 the of the research strategy thorough and will they permit rational and reasoned decision making on which projects should be pursued as

part of a more detailed research and development implementation plan? If not, what needs to be done?

(E) Are the research and development activities and project areas presented under each of the four long-term goals, generally understandable, and achievable? If not, what suggestions do you have for improvements?

(F) Are the project areas described under Long-Term Goal II (Technologies and Approaches) appropriate for the broad scope of the research strategy? If not, what changes do you recommend?

(G) Is the breadth and extent of Long-Term Goal IV (Social Science) sufficient to advance economic, social, and behavioral issues that enhance or limit the acceptance of pollution prevention?

(H) Overall, does the research strategy support the position stated in the ORD strategic plan that pollution prevention (along with new technology) is one of six high-priority research areas that should be pursued? Is it supportive of a risk-based approach or is a stronger argument needed?

Review of the Waste Research Strategy

Copies of the review documents for the Waste Research Strategy review can be obtained from Ben Blaney of the NRMRL in EPA/ORD (phone 513/569-7852; fax 513/569-7680). The current draft charge for the waste research strategy plan is:

(A) Has ORD clearly captured and presented the environmental problems associated with wastes?

(B) Has ORD identified the high priority topics (e.g. contaminated ground water) that need to be addressed? Has too much or too little emphasis been placed on one or another of the topic areas? Do any other major topic areas need to be added?

(C) Are the research activities proposed within each topic addressing the highest priority research needs? Has too much or too little emphasis been placed on one or another of the research activities? Do any other major research activities need to be added?

(D) Are the criteria and processes used to filter and select the highest priority research clear and reasonable?

(E) Are the future directions for research in the program clearly identified in the plan and are they reasonable and appropriate?

Review of the TRI Relative Risk-Based Environmental Indicators Project

Copies of the reference documents supporting this review can be obtained from the TSCA Nonconfidential Information Center, Room B-607, Northeast Mall, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, 12 noon to 4

p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays. Requests for documents should be sent in writing to fax number (202) 260-0569 or E-mail to oppt.ncic@epamail.epa.gov. Refer to Administrative Record Number AR181. Documents available are: (1) Toxics Release Inventory Relative Risk-Based Environmental Indicators Methodology (203 pages); (2) Toxics Release Inventory Relative Risk-Based Environmental Indicators Project: Interim Toxicity Weighting Summary Document (230 pages); and (3) Toxics Release Inventory Relative Risk-Based Environmental Indicators Project: Summary of Comments Received on the 1992 Draft Methodology and Responses to Comments (63 pages).

Acting upon the recommendations of the 1990 EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) report, *Reducing Risk*, (EPA-SAB-EC-90-021) OPPT has designed an indicator to assess the releases of TRI and other chemicals from a relative risk-based perspective. The TRI Environmental Indicators are numeric relative ranking values, based upon reported TRI multimedia emissions and weighting factors representing toxicity, exposure characteristics, and receptor populations using current EPA models and databases.

OPPT plans to use the TRI Environmental Indicators for relative risk-based trends analysis or for targeting and prioritization of chemicals and chemical facilities. This tool can effectively conserve Agency resources in project planning and analysis; it also has environmental justice applications. OPPT will maintain a high degree of flexibility in just how the TRI Environmental Indicators will be applied by the Agency, states, and the public. OPPT requests the SAB to assess the technical merits of the methodology in order to:

(A) Evaluate whether appropriate approaches have been selected to assess hazard, exposure and population parameters;

(B) Determine if these elements have been properly integrated within the methodology;

(C) Assess whether this screening-level tool will provide reasonable results for relative risk-based analyses;

(D) Consider whether the overall methodology accomplishes OPPT's objective to provide a measure of risk-related impacts pertaining to TRI chemical emissions; and

(E) Identify research needs that could influence future enhancements and improvements of the methodology.

Consultation on a Proposed Approach for Developing the TRI Relative Risk-Based Chronic Ecological Indicator

There are no additional documents for the consultation on OPPT's proposed approach for developing the TRI Relative Risk-Based Chronic Ecological Indicator. Regarding the consultation, OPPT is seeking input from the individual SAB members and consultants on:

(A) Whether to expand the ecological indicator beyond representing solely aquatic toxicity and, if so, how could this be accomplished? Which toxicological endpoints should be used for assigning hazard rankings and should similar scoring matrices be developed?

(B) OPPT proposes to eliminate the concept of receptor population in the ecological indicator. Is this appropriate and, if not, what would be alternative approaches?

For Further Information—After June 9, agendas and rosters can be obtained from the Subcommittee Secretary, Mrs. Dorothy Clark, (phone 202/260-8414; fax 202/260-7118; or Email CLARK.DOROTHY@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV). Members of the public desiring additional information about the meeting, including the complete charges, or who wish to attend either the conference call or face-to-face meeting should contact the Designated Federal Official for the Environmental Engineering Committee, Mrs. Kathleen Conway, (phone and voicemail 202/260-2558; fax 202/260-7118; or Email CONWAY.KATHLEEN@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV). Mail for Mrs. Clark and Mrs. Conway should be sent to the Science Advisory Board (1400), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460.

Members of the public who wish to make a brief oral presentation to the Committee must contact Mrs. Conway in writing (by letter or by fax—see previously stated information) no later than 12 noon Eastern Time, Monday, June 23, 1997 in order to be included on the agenda. Public comments will be limited to five minutes per speaker or organization. The request should identify the name of the individual who will make the presentation, the organization (if any) they will represent, any requirements for audio visual equipment (e.g., overhead projector, 35mm projector, chalkboard, etc), and at least 35 copies of an outline of the issues to be addressed or the presentation itself.

Providing Oral or Written Comments at SAB Meetings

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, for meetings, opportunities for oral comment will usually be limited to no more than five minutes per speaker and no more than thirty minutes total. Written comments (at least 35 copies) received in the SAB Staff Office sufficiently prior to a meeting date (usually one week before the meeting), may be mailed to the relevant SAB committee or subcommittee; 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 FY1996 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). Single copies of the SAB's Reducing Risk (EPA-SAB-EC-90-021) can also be obtained from CESS. Additional information concerning the SAB can be found on the SAB Home Page at: [HTTP://WWW.EPA/SCIENCE1/](http://WWW.EPA/SCIENCE1/)

Dated: June 3, 1997.

Donald G. Barnes,

Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 97-15368 Filed 6-11-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

June 5, 1997.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with

a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before July 14, 1997. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, Room 234, 1919 M St., NW., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to jboley@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collection(s) contact Judy Boley at 202-418-0214 or via internet at jboley@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval No.: 3060-0481.

Title: Application for Renewal of Private Radio Station License.

Form Number: FCC Form 452-R.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit; not-for-profit institutions; and state, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 2,700.

Estimate Hour Per Response: 10 minutes (.166).

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 448 hours.

Needs and Uses: Aviation Ground and Marine Coast Radio Station licensees are required to apply for renewal of their radio station authorization every five years. This form will be used for that purpose. The form is being revised to add spaces to collect the applicant's Internet or e-mail address and Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) to comply with the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996. The Wireless Telecommunications Bureau has developed a generic renewal application for electronic filing, FCC Form 900.

Once implemented, applicants for renewal of Aviation Ground and Marine Coast licenses will have the option to use FCC Form 452-R or electronically file for renewal using the FCC Form 900. The FCC staff will use the data to determine eligibility for a renewed radio station authorization, and to issue a radio station license. Data is also used by Compliance personnel in conjunction with field engineers for enforcement and interference resolution purposes.

OMB Approval No.: 3060-0368.

Title: Section 97.523, Question Pools.

Type of Review: Reinstatement without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

Respondents: Individuals or households.

Number of Respondents: 3.

Estimate Hour Per Response: 160.

Frequency of Response:

Recordkeeping requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 480 hours.

Needs and Uses: The recordkeeping requirement contained in Section 97.523 is necessary to permit question pools used in preparing amateur examinations to be maintained by Volunteer-Examiner Coordinators (VEC's). These question pools must be published and made available to the public before the questions are used in an examination. The information maintained by the VEC's is used to prepare amateur examinations. If this information was not maintained the amateur examination program would deteriorate and become outdated. These examinations would not adequately measure the qualifications of the applicants.

OMB Approval No.: 3060-0742.

Title: Telephone Number Portability (47 CFR Part 52, Subpart C, Sections 52.21-52.31).

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 237.

Estimate Hour Per Response: 4.75 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 1,125 hours.

Needs and Uses: In the *First Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration*, CC Docket 95-116, FCC 97-74, the Commission generally affirms and clarifies rules promulgated in the *First Report and Order* which implements the statutory requirements that local exchange carriers (LEC's) provide number portability as set forth in Section 251 of the