

## 2. Residual Risk Applications Subcommittee

The Residual Risk Applications Subcommittee (Subcommittee) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on Wednesday and Thursday, March 1–2, 2000 in the Main Auditorium of the US EPA, Office of Research and Development, Environmental Research Center, 86 T.W. Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711. The meeting will begin at 8:30 am and adjourn no later than 5:00 pm on each day.

**Purpose of the Meeting**—The purpose of meeting is to conduct a review of the methodology the Agency will use to conduct Residual Risk assessments. The Agency will present a case study risk assessment for the secondary lead smelters source category for review by the SAB.

In 1998, the SAB reviewed an Agency Report to Congress that described the approach that the Agency would use in assessing the “residual risk” in the context of the Clean Air Act. That document presented the Agency’s response to the mandate found in Section 112(f)(1) of the Act and described a strategy for addressing the risks remaining from the emission of Hazardous Air Pollutants once Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards have been implemented. Additional information and insight can be found on the SAB Website in the SAB’s review of that Report to Congress: <http://www.epa.gov/sab/ec9813.pdf>.

**Proposed Charge**—The Proposed Charge to the SAB is as follows:

(a) Is the methodology that the Agency applied in this risk assessment consistent with the risk assessment approach and methodology presented in the Report to Congress (EPA–453/R–99–001)? Are the assumptions used in this risk assessment consistent with current methods and practices?

(b) Model Inputs—Are the methods used to estimate emission rates, and the method used to estimate species at the stack appropriate and clearly described?

(c) Models—Does the risk assessment use appropriate currently available dispersion models both at the screening level and at the more refined level of analysis? Are the models applied correctly? Given the state of the science, does the risk assessment use an appropriate multipathway model? The assessment uses the IEM–2M model, with some modifications. Is the IEM–2M model appropriate for use in this regulatory context? With regard to the modification and application of the model, did the EPA appropriately

modify the model for use in this risk assessment, and did the Agency apply the model correctly? Is there another model or another approach, that is available at this time that EPA should consider?

(d) Choice of Receptors—The Agency identifies the home gardener as the appropriate receptor to estimate risks to the residential population and the farmer to embody high end risks. Are these receptors appropriate for this task?

(e) Ecological Risk Assessment—Given currently available methods, are the models used for the ecological assessment appropriate? Are they applied correctly? Are the ecological benchmarks appropriate?

(f) Uncertainty and variability assessment—Did the assessment use appropriate currently available methods to identify the variables and pathways to address in the uncertainty and variability assessment? Are the methods used to quantify variability and uncertainty acceptable? Are there other, more appropriate methods available for consideration?

(g) Results Presentation—Does the Agency’s document clearly present and interpret the risk results? Does it provide the appropriate level of information? Do the figures and tables adequately present the data? Do the formats provide for a clear understanding of the material?

**Availability of Review Materials**—Copies of the draft document may be obtained from Ms. Kelly Rimer, Emissions Standards Division (ESD), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS), MD–13, RTP, NC 27711, phone (919) 541–2962; or via e-mail at [rimer.kelly@epa.gov](mailto:rimer.kelly@epa.gov).

A limited number of telephone lines will be available to the public for listening to the proceedings. For details on participating in the meeting in this fashion, call Kelly Rimer one week prior before the meeting.

**Public Comments**—Any member of the public wishing to provide brief oral comments at the meeting must contact Dr. Donald Barnes, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), *in writing* no later than noon Eastern Time on Monday, February 21 at: USEPA Science Advisory Board (1400A), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20460; fax (202) 501–0323; or via e-mail at: [barnes.don@epa.gov](mailto:barnes.don@epa.gov). The request should identify the name of the individual who will make the presentation, the organization represented, and an outline of the issue(s) to be addressed.

## 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, each individual or group making an oral presentation will be limited to a total time of ten minutes (unless otherwise noted). 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, or mailed soon after receipt by the Agency. Written comments may be provided to the relevant committee or subcommittee up until the time of the meeting.

Additional information concerning the Science Advisory Board, its structure, function, and composition, may be found on the SAB Website (<http://www.epa.gov/sab>) and in the Annual Report of the Staff Director which is available from the SAB Publications Staff at (202) 564–4533 or via fax at (202) 501–0256.

## Meeting Access

Individuals requiring special accommodation at either meeting, including wheelchair access, should contact Dr. Barnes at least five business days prior to the respective meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Dated: January 27, 2000.

**Donald G. Barnes,**

*Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.*

[FR Doc. 00–2179 Filed 2–1–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–U**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6531–8]

## Board of Scientific Counselors, Executive Committee Meeting

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Cancellation of Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended (5 U.S.C., App. 2) notification is hereby given that the Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development (ORD), The Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC), Executive Committee Meeting, scheduled for

February 9–10, 2000 is hereby canceled. This meeting announcement was published in the **Federal Register** on January 25, 2000 at 65 FR 3959.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Shirley R. Hamilton, Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, NCERQA (MC 8701R), 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 564–6853.

Dated: January 27, 2000.

**Peter W. Preuss, Ph.D.,**

*Director, National Center for Environmental Research and Quality Assurance.*

[FR Doc. 00–2279 Filed 2–1–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–M**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**[FRL–6531–6]**

### **Technical Workshop to Peer Review Toxicology Testing Initiative on Styrene-Acrylonitrile Trimer**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is announcing a workshop to be conducted by the Eastern Research Group, Inc. (ERG), an EPA contractor, for the external scientific peer review of the proposed toxicology testing initiative and associated experimental protocols for styrene-acrylonitrile (SAN<sub>2</sub>) trimer, a contaminant at the Reich Farm Superfund site in Ocean County, New Jersey, which has migrated into the ground water. The peer review workshop is being organized to assist in conducting the most scientifically credible and relevant testing for carcinogenicity of the trimer, particularly during the perinatal period, and for chronic non-cancer health effects. The one-day workshop will be held in Toms River, New Jersey, on March 7, 2000, and will be open to members of the public as observers. It will be conducted in accordance with EPA's 1998 Peer Review Handbook. Stakeholders in the issue who have additional information which is relevant to the testing initiative are invited to submit written comments and/or make brief oral comments at the peer review workshop.

**DATES:** The workshop will be held on Tuesday, March 7, 2000, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Members of the public may attend as observers. There will be a 30-minute session at the commencement of the workshop in which observers will have the opportunity to make brief

comments relevant to the proposed testing initiative. Observers who wish to make such comments should register to do so with ERG by March 1, 2000. The time allotted for each comment will be limited based upon the number of persons requesting to make comments, but will be no more than five (5) minutes. Interested parties who wish to submit written comments for consideration by the peer reviewers should submit them so that ERG receives them on or before February 25, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held in the L. Manuel Hirshblond Meeting Room, at the Township of Dover Municipal Building, 33 Washington Street, Toms River, New Jersey 08753. Since seating capacity is limited, please contact Ms. Meg Vrablik of ERG, by telephone, at 781-674-7374; by facsimile, at 781-674-2906; or by E-mail, at mvrablik@erg.com, by March 1, 2000, to register to attend the workshop as an observer. Also please register with Ms. Vrablik to make brief comments at the workshop. Kindly send written comments to Ms. Vrablik at Eastern Research Group, Inc., 110 Hartwell Avenue, Lexington, MA 02421-3136, by February 25, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** To register and for logistical inquiries, contact Ms. Vrablik or Ms. Kate Schalk at Eastern Research Group at the above numbers. For information on documents cited in this notice, contact Dr. Dorothy Canter, US EPA, at 202-260-2230.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

Spent process streams from the manufacture of styrene acrylonitrile polymer by Union Carbide Corporation (UCC) were disposed of at the Reich Farm property in Ocean County, New Jersey. The waste contains SAN<sub>2</sub> trimer, a chemical mixture which has migrated from the Reich Farm property into groundwater. Levels of SAN<sub>2</sub> trimer measured in water drawn from groundwater wells have been in the parts per billion and lower. The site is on the National Priorities List (NPL) of hazardous waste sites, and remedial activities are currently underway.

Increased incidences of certain forms of cancer in children, specifically certain types of leukemia, neuroblastoma, and brain and central nervous system cancers, have been observed in Ocean County, Dover Township and Toms River. To develop scientific data on the toxicologic and carcinogenic potential of the SAN<sub>2</sub> trimer and to address concerns of citizens in the area about the toxicity of

this previously untested mixture, UCC undertook an initial round of toxicology experiments, which consisted of genotoxicity studies, an acute toxicity study in rats and a 14-day repeated dose study in rats. The results from these studies are now available.

The Interagency Workgroup for the Toxicity Testing of the SAN<sub>2</sub> Trimer was formed to provide guidance to UCC on the testing of the SAN<sub>2</sub> trimer. In late 1998, the National Toxicology Program (NTP) of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences joined the Workgroup based upon its commitment to perform rodent carcinogenicity studies which include perinatal exposures. The current governmental agencies represented on the Workgroup are the US Environmental Protection Agency, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, NTP, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, and the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services. Representatives of UCC and the consultant representing the Ocean County Department of Health also participate in the Workgroup.

The Workgroup has met four times since November 1998, evaluating the results of the studies previously performed by UCC, and reviewing additional studies proposed to be performed by the NTP and UCC. The Workgroup has developed a consensus testing strategy with associated experimental protocols. A key step in the finalization of this testing strategy will be the external peer review workshop on March 7, 2000. The Workgroup also formed a subgroup which developed a group of pharmacokinetics studies that will be conducted concurrently with the range finding studies of the NTP toxicity testing initiative.

Twelve independent scientists with expertise in general toxicology, carcinogenesis, developmental toxicology, neurotoxicology, pharmacokinetics, genetic toxicology, biostatistics, veterinary pathology, and analytical chemistry were selected by ERG from among the experts nominated by stakeholders for possible service on the peer review panel. In making the selections, ERG determined that the panel members had no real or perceived conflicts of interest. The panel will evaluate only those issues which are relevant to the toxicologic potential of the SAN<sub>2</sub> trimer.

Following the peer review workshop, ERG will prepare a summary report on the workshop which will present the panel's recommendations. This report will be available to dinterested parties