

affecting the quality of the human environment.

The FEA was written by staff in the Office of Hydropower Licensing, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Copies of the FEA can be obtained by calling the Commission's Public Reference room at (202) 208-1371.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-21682 Filed 8-12-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 4316-027 Colorado]

Galloway, Inc.; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

August 7, 1998.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) regulations, 18 CFR part 380 (Order 486, 52 F.R. 47897), the Commission's Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed the license surrender application for the Blue Valley Ranch Project, No. 4316-027. The Blue Valley Ranch Project is located on the Blue River in Grand County, Colorado. The license is being surrendered because the licensee has determined that it is not feasible to rehabilitate the project. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared, and the EA finds that surrendering the license would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Copies of the EA are available for review in the Commission's Reference and Information Center, Room 2A, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. For further information, please contact Ms. Hillary Berlin, at (202) 219-0038.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-21681 Filed 8-12-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Meeting on Midwest Electric Pricing Issues

August 7, 1998.

Take notice that members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) will meet with Midwest

state utility commission members and officials of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners to discuss pricing issues arising from circumstances that existed in electric power markets in the Midwest during the last week of June, 1998.

The meeting will be open to the public. State and federal commissioners and their representatives will participate in the discussion. In addition, the Commission expects to hear presentations from representatives of the Edison Electric Institute, the American Public Power Association, the Electric Power Supply Association, the Electricity Consumers Resource Council, and the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association. A transcript will be made of the proceedings.

The meeting will be held from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon (CDT) on August 14, 1998. The location of the meeting will be the Rosemont Convention Center, 5555 North River Road, Rosemont, Illinois 60018 (Phone: (847) 692-2220).

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-21684 Filed 8-12-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6144-1]

Science Advisory Board, Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meetings

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notification is hereby given that two committees of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on the dates and times described below. All times noted are Eastern Time. All meetings are open to the public, however, due to limited space, seating at meetings will be on a first-come basis. For further information concerning specific meetings, please contact the individuals listed below. Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating EPA office and are *not* available from the SAB Office.

1. Integrated Human Exposure Committee (IHEC)

The Integrated Human Exposure Committee (IHEC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on Thursday, September 3 and Friday

September 4, 1998, beginning no earlier than 9 am and ending no later than 5 pm on each day. The meeting will be held at the Sheraton City Centre Hotel at 1143 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20037. The hotel is Metro accessible. For directions, please call the hotel at 202-775-0800.

Purpose—The purpose of the meeting is to review the methodologies for the Basic Relative Burden Analysis Methodology (BRBA), the Enhanced Relative Burden Analysis Methodology (ERBA), and the Cumulative Outdoor Toxics Concentration and Exposure Methodology (COATCEM) for scientific merit.

Charge—The IHEC has been asked to respond to the following Charge questions presented in the document, Questions for the Science Advisory Board on the Title VI Relative Burden Analyses and the Cumulative Outdoor Air Toxics Concentration and Exposure Methodology, referred hereafter as "the review document." The following charge questions are from the review document which provides the necessary context for each question. Instructions for obtaining copies of the review document are provided below.

I. Regarding the Relative Burden Analyses

Charge Question #1: The Risk Screening Environmental Indicators (RSEI) toxicity weights that Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT) developed have been reviewed and commented upon by the SAB within the past year (EPA-SAB-EEC-98-007). OPPT has addressed the major concerns of the SAB as to having the weights ordered on a continuous scale directly related to their toxicity values rather than in order of magnitude "bins" and avoiding truncation of the value range. The use of these weights for the specific purpose of doing relative burden analyses in the way outlined in the review document has not been commented upon by the SAB. What are the strengths and weaknesses of this approach, which applies the toxicity weights to a number of chemicals released into the air, for the purpose of developing a burden measure?

Charge Question #2: The Basic Relative Burden Analysis (BRBA) method is relatively simple and may not consider important parameters such as relative proximity, weather, stack height. Please provide comment on the strengths, weaknesses, and utility of the "basic" method in estimating the distribution of burden to areas proximate to facilities with air emissions.

Charge Question #3: The Enhanced Relative Burden Analysis (ERBA) method was an extension of the BRBA by using the Industrial Source Complex—Long Term, Version 2 (ISCLT2), a standard air model, to model the toxicity-weighted air emissions from each facility. The toxicity-weighted air emissions are modeled as if they were one "pseudo-chemical," although stack and fugitive emissions were treated separately for each facility. This approach has been adopted in order to make more manageable the screening evaluation of potentially hundreds of chemicals and multiple sources. Please provide comment on the utility and limitations of modeling several chemicals simultaneously as one pseudo-chemical with the model. If individual chemical properties would make this modeling method problematic, which classes of air release chemicals are likely to need to be modeled separately? Within the relatively small geographic areas analyzed, will atmospheric degradation play a major factor in the analysis?

Charge Question #4: In the ERBA method, modeling of the air emissions was truncated at 2, 4, or 6 miles. For example, in the 4-mile run, burden was added to census blocks within 4 miles from each facility, but not beyond that, and correspondingly for the 2- and 6-mile runs. Computationally, the number of census blocks potentially affected increases dramatically with increasing radius from the facility and the burden values drop off as the radius increases. (For example, with 314 facilities in Louisiana, the total number of census block-facility combinations within 6 miles of any facility was over 300,000.) What are the strengths and weaknesses of limiting the modeling to a certain radius from the facility for the purpose of evaluating burden, and specifically, 2, 4, or 6 miles?

Charge Question #5: Please provide comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the ERBA methods for analyzing the relative burdens from airborne emissions from nearby facilities for one population subgroup versus another in populations proximate to fixed air emissions sources?

Charge Question #6: The average toxicity weighted concentration, or burden, for each census block has been calculated. Please provide comment on the strengths and weaknesses of additional information which can be derived from the BRBA and ERBA methods, such as ranking census blocks in the state or smaller geographic area by average burden value or comparing the average burden in blocks near one facility to those near another for the

purpose of identifying potential problem areas.

Charge Question #7: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the BRBA methodology for assessing relative impacts on population subgroups?

Charge Question #8: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the ERBA methodology assessing relative impacts on population subgroups?

Charge Question #9: Please provide comment on the appropriateness of the review document's interpretation of the Relative Burden Ratio, given the methodology and data used?

Charge Question #10: Please provide comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the ERBA method of estimating general risk and hazard numbers from concentration burdens and its utility for screening out *de minimis* burdens.

II. Regarding the Cumulative Outdoor Air Toxics Concentration and Exposure Methodology (COATCEM)

Charge Question #11: The ambient concentration modeling methodology associated with COATCEM is similar to that used in several previous studies conducted by EPA and reviewed by the SAB (e.g., EPA-SAB-IHEC-96-004; EPA-SAB-EEC-98-007). Are there any assumptions or input data involved in the COATCEM approach which would change the SAB's earlier judgements? Please provide comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the approach for assessing concentrations for the disparate impact analysis given the large number of sources and chemicals considered in the analysis?

Charge Question #12: Please provide comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the COATCEM method for: (1) evaluating the relative burdens from airborne emissions from nearby facilities for one group versus another in a population proximate to fixed air emissions sources, and (2) its utility in screening out *de minimis* burdens.

Charge Question #13: The BRBA, ERBA, and COATCEM approaches described in the review document may be applied to various geographic scales (e.g., national, regional, state, basin, county, place) and collections of sources. Given the inherent uncertainties described in the review document, please comment on how the results of the analysis relate to the resolution of the input data, the varying geographic scales, and numbers of sources being analyzed.

Charge Question #14: Overall, what are the other major uncertainties involved in using the BRBA, ERBA, and COATCEM methods? Are there situations where these methods would

have to be modified because the models or approaches used are not suitable? What research or improvements in the methodologies would be most helpful to focus upon in the next few years?

Background—Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended (Title VI) prohibits recipients of Federal financial assistance (such as state environmental departments) from discriminating on the basis of race, color, or national origin in their programs or activities. Title VI requires Federal agencies that provide financial assistance, including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), to ensure that recipients of Federal financial assistance do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Discrimination can result from policies and practices that are neutral on their face, but have the effect of discriminating. In addition to prohibiting intentional discrimination, EPA's Title VI regulations (40 CFR part 7) prohibit facially-neutral policies or practices that result in a disparate adverse impact, unless it is shown that they are justified and that there is no less discriminatory alternative.

Since 1993, EPA has received an increasing number of Title VI complaints that allege violations of EPA's discriminatory effects regulations from the issuance of pollution control permits by EPA recipients. EPA's Office of Civil Rights (OCR) currently has 15 open investigations, as well as 12 awaiting processing, of complaints which allege discriminatory effects of permitting decisions. On February 5, 1998, EPA released its Interim Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits (Title VI Interim Guidance) which is an internal guidance document that describes how OCR will process these types of complaints. Generally, Title VI complaints are subject to the following process: (1) initial finding of disparate impact, (2) presentation of rebuttal evidence, (3) identification of legitimate justifications, and (4) identification of less discriminatory alternatives. EPA is currently focused on developing sound methods for establishing the first element of this process—the initial finding of disparate impact. OCR is interested in developing tools that can be used repeatedly with some ease so that ultimately they may be used by recipients and others as a means of identifying potential Title VI disparate impacts in the context of individual permit decisions.

The investigation and resolution of Title VI complaints regarding potential discriminatory effects of environmental permitting decisions is precedent-setting and may have implications on

how recipient agencies implement their environmental permitting programs to ensure no person is discriminated against based on race, color, or national origin. As a result, the issue of how to measure disparate adverse impacts from permitted facilities has had high visibility in the news media, as well as generated interest and debate within the industrial, state/local government, and environmental justice communities.

For Further Information—Copies of the review document and relevant background materials are not available from the SAB Staff. Single copies of these documents may be obtained from Ms. Jahleezah Eskew by telephone (202) 260-0507, by fax (202) 260-4580 or via E-mail at: eskew.jahleezah@epa.gov. The review document can also be obtained from the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/sab>. Technical questions on these materials should be directed to Mr. Loren Hall by telephone at (202) 260-3931 or via E-mail at hall.loren@epa.gov.

Copies of SAB referenced reports (e.g., EPA-SAB-IHEC-98-004) may be obtained from the SAB staff at the address listed at the end of this notice.

The SAB has reserved a portion of its agenda in order to receive public comments on the scientific/technical issues associated with the disproportionate impact methodologies being reviewed by the IHEC. Comments on other matters reflect legitimate concerns but are not appropriate for this technical forum. Each individual speaker will be allotted five minutes for his/her presentation. Arrangements can be made for coordinated presentations from groups of speakers by contacting Ms. Roslyn Edson, Designated Federal Officer for the IHEC. Anyone wishing to make a brief oral presentation at the meeting must contact Ms. Edson, *in writing*, no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on August 25, 1998, at USEPA Science Advisory Board (1400), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460, by fax (202) 260-7118, or via E-mail at edson.roslyn@epa.gov to request time on the agenda. The request should identify the name of the individual who will make the presentation, the organization he/she will represent (if any), and an outline of the issues to be addressed. In the event that the number of requests exceed the time available for oral comments, requests will be granted on the time of receipt in the SAB Office. All written comments will be accepted and provided to the IHEC Panel.

Oral, as well as written, commenters are expected to send twenty (20) copies

of their written comments to Ms. Edson by August 26, so that they can be provided to and considered by individual IHEC Members and Consultants prior to the public meeting. In order to be most effective, oral public comments at the meeting should highlight, but not duplicate, written comments.

2. Executive Committee (EC)

The Science Advisory Board's (SAB) Executive Committee will conduct a public teleconference meeting on Friday, September 11, 1998, between the hours of 2 pm and 4 pm, Eastern Time. The meeting will be coordinated through a conference call connection in the Science Advisory Board Conference Room, Room 3709M, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20460. The public is welcome to attend the meeting physically or through a telephonic link. Additional instructions about how to participate in the conference call can be obtained by calling Ms. Priscilla Tillery-Gadson at (202) 260-4126 by September 4, 1998.

In this meeting the Executive Committee plans to review drafts from several of its Committees. These anticipated drafts include:

- (a) Environmental Economics Advisory Committee's Advisory of the Economic Research Topics
- (b) EC Models Subcommittee's Review of TRIM.FaTE Model
- (c) Drinking Water Committee's Review of National Containment Occurrence Database.
- (d) EC Residual Risk Subcommittee's Review of the Agency's Residual Risk Report to Congress.

For Further Information—Any member of the public wishing further information concerning the meeting or wishing to submit comments should contact Dr. Donald G. Barnes, Designated Federal Officer for the Executive Committee, Science Advisory Board (1400), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC 20460; telephone (202) 260-4126; FAX (202) 260-9232; and via E-Mail at: barnes.don@epa.gov. Copies of the relevant documents are available from the same source. Draft documents will also be available on the SAB Website (<http://www.epa.gov/sab>) at least one week prior to the meeting.

Providing Oral or Written Comments at SAB Meetings

The Science Advisory Board expects that public statements presented at its

meetings will not repeat 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. This time may be reduced at the discretion of the SAB, depending on meeting circumstances. Oral presentations at teleconferences will normally be limited to three minutes per speaker or organization. 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, which may of any length, may be provided to the relevant committee or subcommittee up until the time of the meeting.

The Science Advisory Board

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>.

Copies of SAB prepared final reports mentioned in this **Federal Register** Notice may be obtained immediately from the SAB Home Page or by mail/fax from the SAB's Committee Evaluation and Support Staff at (202) 260-4126, or via fax at (202) 260-1889. Please provide the SAB report number when making a request.

Meeting Access

Individuals requiring special accommodation at SAB meetings, including wheelchair access, should contact the appropriate DFO at least five business days prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Dated: August 8, 1998.

Donald G. Barnes,

Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 98-21705 Filed 8-12-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P