

2000; OMB No. 2040-0208; expires 12/31/2003.

Short Term Extensions

EPA ICR No. 1826.01; Information Collection for Equipment Manufacturer Flexibility; in 40 CFR part 89, subpart K; OMB No. 2060-0369; on 11/29/2000 OMB extended the expiration date through 04/30/2001.

EPA ICR No. 1132.05; NSPS for Volatile Organic Liquid Storage Vessels; in 40 CFR part 60, subpart Kb; OMB No. 2060-0074; on 11/28/2000 OMB extended the expiration date through 02/28/2001.

EPA ICR No. 1414.03; Hazardous Organic NESHAP (HON); in 40 CFR part 60, subparts K, Kb, S, T, U, V, W, X, AAA, and 40 CFR part 63, subparts F, G, H, and I; OMB No. 2060-0282; on 11/28/2000 OMB extended the expiration date through 02/28/2001.

EPA ICR No. 0857.07; Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs): Manufacturing, Processing, and Distribution in Commerce Exemption; in 40 CFR part 750; OMB No. 2070-0021; on 11/22/2000 OMB extended the expiration date through 02/28/2001.

EPA ICR No. 1001.06; Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs): Exclusions, Exemptions, and Use Authorizations; in 40 CFR part 761; in 40 CFR part 60, subpart S; OMB No. 2070-0008; on 11/22/2000 OMB extended the expiration date through 02/28/2001.

EPA ICR No. 1683.02; NSPS for Primary Aluminum Reduction Plants, Recordkeeping and Reporting; in 40 CFR part 60, subpart S; OMB No. 2060-0031; on 11/22/2000 OMB extended the expiration date through 02/28/2001.

EPA ICR No. 1684.04; Compression Ignition Non-Road Engine Certification Application; in 40 CFR part 86 and 89; OMB No. 2060-0287; on 11/28/2000 OMB extended the expiration date through 02/28/2001.

EPA ICR No. 1695.06; Non-Road Spark-Ignition Engine at or Below 19 Kilowatts for Emission Certification and the Averaging, Banking, and Trading Program; in 40 CFR part 63, subpart R; OMB No. 2060-0338; on 11/28/2000 OMB extended the expiration date through 02/28/2001.

Dated: February 1, 2001.

Oscar Morales, Director,

Director, Collection Strategies Division.

[FR Doc. 01-3506 Filed 2-9-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6944-2]

Agency Information Collection Activities; EPA ICR No. 1503.04; Submission to OMB; Comment Request

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of submission to OMB.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that the following Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval: Data Acquisition for Registration (EPA ICR No. 1503.04; OMB No. 2070-0122). The ICR, which is abstracted below, describes the nature of the information collection activity and its expected burden and costs. The **Federal Register** document, required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on August 2, 2000 (65 FR 47491). EPA received no comments on this ICR during the 60-day comment period.

DATES: Additional comments may be submitted on or before March 14, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send your comments, referencing the proper ICR numbers to: Ms. Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Information, Collection Strategies Division (2822), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW., Washington, DC 20460; And send a copy of your comments to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sandy Farmer at EPA by phone on 202-260-2740, by e-mail:

farmer.sandy@epa.gov or access the ICR at <http://www.epa.gov/icr/icr.htm> and refer to EPA ICR No. 1503.04; OMB Control No. 2070-0122.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

ICR Title: Data Acquisition for Registration (EPA ICR 1503.04, OMB Control No. 2070-0122).

ICR Status: This is a request for extension of an existing approved collection that is currently scheduled to expire on March 31, 2001. EPA is asking OMB to approve this ICR for three years. Under 5 CFR 1320.10(e)(2), the Agency may continue to conduct or sponsor the

collection of information while the submission is pending at OMB.

Abstract: The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136) requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA, the Agency) to register pesticides prior to distribution and sale within the United States. FIFRA also requires applicants for pesticide registration to provide EPA with the data needed to assess whether the registration of a pesticide would cause unreasonable adverse effects on human health or the environment, and grants EPA the authority to require registrants to provide additional data to maintain an existing registration.

Burden Statement: The annual "respondent" burden for this ICR is estimated to range from 6,267 hours to 54,288 hours per response, depending on the type of DCI.

According to the PRA, "burden" means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information. The Agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information that is subject to approval under the PRA, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's information collections appear on the collection instruments or instructions, in the **Federal Register** notices for related rulemakings and ICR notices, and, if the collection is contained in a regulation, in a table of OMB approval numbers in 40 CFR part 9.

The following is a summary of the burden estimates taken from the ICR:
Respondents/affected entities: 20.

Estimated total number of potential respondents: 9.

Frequency of response: As needed.

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

Estimated total annual burden hours: 91,196.

Estimated total annual Non-labor burden costs: \$0.

Dated: February 1, 2001.

Oscar Morales,

Director, Collection Strategies Division.

[FR Doc. 01-3507 Filed 2-9-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6943-7]

Science Advisory Board; Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given that the Environmental Models Subcommittee (EMS) National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) Review Panel (hereafter, "NATA Review Panel") of the USEPA Science Advisory Board's (SAB) Executive Committee (EC) will meet on the dates and times noted below. All times noted are Eastern Standard Time. All meetings are open to the public; however, seating is limited and available on a first come basis.

Important Notice: Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating EPA office and are not available from the SAB Office—information concerning availability of documents from the relevant Program Office is included below.

1—EC/EMS NATA Review Panel Teleconference—February 21, 2001

The Agency is planning to conduct an initial, national-scale assessment of the potential health risks associated with inhalation exposures to 32 air toxics identified as priority pollutants by the Agency's Integrated Urban Air Toxics Strategy, plus diesel emissions. While a number of the elements of this assessment plan have already undergone scientific peer review, the entire assembly of these elements and application of the full assessment approach have not. Therefore, the Agency is asking the NATA Review Panel to comment on the appropriateness of the overall approach, including the data, models, and methods used, and the ways these elements have been integrated, as well as to suggest ways to improve these approaches for subsequent national-scale assessments.

As a first step in this review, the NATA Review Panel will conduct a public conference call on Wednesday February 21, 2001 from 11 am to 1 pm (Eastern Standard Time). The call will be hosted out of the EPA Science Advisory Board Conference Room (Room 6013), Ariel Rios Federal Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20004. Interested members of the public may attend in person or connect to the teleconference by phone. The purpose

of the call is to provide Panel Members with the opportunity to clarify the Charge questions (see below), request any supplemental materials from the Agency, ask questions on materials already received from the Agency, and discuss preparations for a public meeting of the NATA Review Panel on March 20-21, 2001 in Durham, NC (see below for details on the March meeting).

Providing Public Comments—The NATA Review Panel will not be accepting oral or written public comments at the conference call, since this is an information-gathering meeting. Public comments in both formats will be accepted at the meeting on 20-21, 2001 (see details below).

For Further Information—To obtain information concerning this teleconference, please contact Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) (see contact information below). To obtain information about how to participate in this teleconference, please contact Ms. Betty Fortune (see contact information below). A draft agenda for the teleconference will be posted on the SAB website (www.epa.gov/sab) approximately 10 days prior to the teleconference.

2—NATA Review Panel Meeting—March 20-21, 2001

The NATA Review Panel will meet on Tuesday and Wednesday, March 20-21, 2001 at the USEPA Environmental Research Center (ERC) Annex Building, Room S-23, 79 T.W. Alexander Drive, Durham, NC. The meeting will begin at 9 am and end no later than 5 pm each day.

Purpose of the Meeting—The NATA Review Panel will review and receive technical public comments on the EPA Document entitled "National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment for 1996", (EPA-453/R-01-003), dated January, 2001. The Panel will respond to questions in the Charge (see below) that has been negotiated with the Agency: The Panel is free to address additional questions, as it sees fit.

Charge Questions—Keeping in mind the stated goals and preliminary nature of this assessment, EPA asks the NATA Review Panel to generally comment on the appropriateness of the overall approach, including the data, models, and methods used, and the ways in which these elements have been integrated. Also, EPA solicits suggestions on ways to improve these approaches for subsequent national-scale assessments. Specifically:

1. Given the nature of the National Toxics Inventory (NTI) and the methods by which it was developed and reviewed, have available emissions data been appropriately adapted for use in this assessment? Can the Panel suggest improvements to EPA's application of the NTI for use in future initial national-scale assessments?

(a) Can the Panel suggest improvements to the treatment of compound classes (e.g., chromium and compounds), given the nature of the information available in the inventory?

(b) Can the Panel suggest improvements to the methods used to spatially distribute area and mobile source emissions?

(c) Can the Panel suggest improvements to the methods used to specify default point

source emission characteristics in lieu of missing emissions data?

2. Is the approach taken for the geographic aggregation of ambient and exposure concentrations generated by the ASPEN and HAPEM4 models appropriate in light of the limitations of the models and of the available emissions data?

3. Has available dose-response information (e.g., different sources of information, a different prioritization scheme) been appropriately used in this assessment? Can the Panel suggest methods that could improve upon the use of available dose-response information?

4. What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the overall conceptual approach to risk characterization used in this assessment? Given the underlying science and the intended purposes of the assessment, can the Panel suggest ways in which the risk characterization could be improved?

(a) Is the method used to aggregate cancer risks appropriate? The aggregation of carcinogenic risk within two categories, based on weight-of-evidence classifications, is of particular interest.

(b) Is the method used to aggregate non-cancer hazards appropriate? The summation of hazard quotients within target organs, the categorization of sums by ranges of uncertainty factors, and the inclusion of all target organs (as opposed to only the organs associated with the critical effect) are of particular interest.

5. Although EPA has concluded that available data are not sufficient to develop a reliable quantitative estimate of cancer unit risk for diesel emissions, it is clear that this pollutant class may be of significant concern in a number of urban settings. The risk characterization in this report includes a discussion of diesel particulate matter to help states and local areas frame the importance of this pollutant compared to the other air toxics. In the context of this assessment, is the discussion in this report regarding making risk comparisons among other air toxics appropriate? Can the Panel provide any suggestions that would improve upon this approach to comparing the toxic health effects of diesel particulate matter with other pollutants?

6. Given the limitations inherent in this preliminary assessment, have uncertainty and variability been appropriately characterized?

(a) Can the Panel suggest ways that the characterization of uncertainty and variability could be improved, made more transparent, or integrated more effectively into the risk characterization?

(b) Can the Panel suggest methods for quantifying individual as well as composite uncertainties associated with the emissions inventory, dispersion modeling, exposure modeling, dose-response assessment, quantitative risk estimates, and accumulation of risk across air toxics?

7. Have the results of the assessment been appropriately and clearly presented? Can the Panel suggest alternative methods or formats that could improve the presentation and communication of these results?

8. Does the Panel have suggestions for research priorities that would improve such air toxics assessments in the future?