

extension until May 31, 1998. By letter dated May 21, 1998, the Governor requested to withdraw from the RFG program, and met the deadline set by the Administrator. However, the Governor requested that EPA not act on the request until the state had finished certain testing.

At the time of the opt out request, Maine did not rely on RFG as an element of any State Implementation Plan (SIP) or SIP revision that had been approved by the EPA. However, Maine did rely on RFG in a SIP submission that was pending before the Agency. Therefore, EPA's opt-out regulations required the State to indicate whether it would revise its pending SIP submission, and, if so, to describe the air quality measures, if any, that the State would use to replace RFG.

The Governor's May 21, 1998 petition did not identify any replacement measures for the Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) reductions benefits of the RFG program that the state relied upon in its pending 15% SIP. However, by letter dated October 13, 1998, the Governor requested that EPA approve the petition to opt-out of the RFG program and identified two possible state fuel alternatives to replace the VOC benefits associated with RFG. The letter also noted that Maine intended to initiate rulemaking to adopt an alternative fuel before the next ozone season. EPA responded by letter dated October 30, 1998, conditionally approving the opt-out request and setting an opt-out effective date of January 28, 1999, ninety days from the date of the conditional approval. EPA made the opt-out contingent on Maine and EPA agreeing on (1) identification of the replacement fuel measure or other measure which Maine would implement in order to provide VOC reductions equivalent to RFG, (2) a projected schedule for implementing the replacement measure, and (3) an explanation of how this action affects the state implementation plan. EPA stated that it may extend the opt-out effective date in order to allow EPA and Maine to reach agreement.

Maine scheduled a hearing for January 20, 1999 to consider the two alternative fuels proposals described in the October 13, 1998 letter. EPA offered comments on the two measures at this hearing and suggested another alternative that would provide the long-term VOC reductions that Maine needed to replace RFG. By letter dated January 22, 1999, EPA gave notice to the Governor that it had extended the effective date for Maine's withdrawal from the RFG program until March 10, 1999, in order to provide time for EPA

and the state to reach agreement on the conditions of the opt-out. On February 24, 1999, Maine's Board of Environmental Protection adopted the measure suggested by EPA.³ By letter dated March 5, 1999, EPA notified the Governor that all of the conditions of the opt-out had been satisfied, and that EPA would not extend the opt-out effective date any further.

II. Action

In today's notice, EPA is announcing that it has approved the petition submitted by the Governor of Maine to withdraw the Maine counties of Androscoggin, Cumberland, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Sagadahoc, and York from the RFG program. This notice is not itself a final agency action, but a public announcement of EPA's earlier approval of Maine's request to opt out of the RFG program. EPA's approval of Maine's petition was based on the May 21, 1998 and October 13, 1998 letters to the Administrator from the Governor of Maine, and on the regulatory provisions of 40 CFR 80.72. In accordance with the procedures set forth in § 80.72, the effective date for Maine's withdrawal is March 10, 1999. This opt-out effective date applies to retailers, wholesale purchaser-consumers, refiners, importers, and distributors. In a final rule published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**, EPA is amending § 80.70(j)(5) of the RFG regulations to reflect that these seven counties in Maine are no longer covered areas in the federal RFG program.

Dated: May 23, 2002.

Christine Todd Whitman,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 02-13978 Filed 6-3-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7223-9]

Technical Peer Review Workshop on the Draft Document Entitled A Review of the Reference Dose and Reference Concentration Processes

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

³ In a final rulemaking, EPA recently approved Maine's SIP revision request, including a state fuel control, which demonstrates how the State will achieve attainment in these seven counties without RFG [67 FR 10099, March 6, 2002]. As described in EPA's approval of Maine's SIP, the revision Maine ultimately submitted to EPA includes a State fuel control that is different from, and less restrictive than, the one adopted by the State on February 24, 1999.

SUMMARY: EPA is announcing a meeting, organized and convened by Versar, Inc., a contractor to EPA's Risk Assessment Forum, for external scientific peer review of the draft document entitled, *A Review of the Reference Dose and Reference Concentration Processes* (EPA/630/P-02/002A). The purpose of the meeting is to discuss technical issues associated with the Risk Assessment Forum Reference Dose/Reference Concentration (RfD/RfC) Technical Panel recommendations. The draft document is not a guidance document but an analysis and review of the current RfD/RfC process and a series of recommendations to improve the process. Final decisions on implementing any of the recommendations from the Technical Panel will be made by the Agency's Science Policy Council. The EPA also is announcing a 30-day public comment period for the draft document. EPA will consider the peer review advice and public comment submissions in revising the document.

DATES: The peer review meeting will be held from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 19, 2002. The 30-day public comment period begins June 4, 2002, and ends July 5, 2002. Technical comments should be in writing and must be postmarked by July 5, 2002.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Key Bridge Marriott, 1401 Lee Highway, Arlington, VA 22209. Versar, Inc., an EPA contractor, will convene and facilitate the workshop. To register to attend the workshop as an observer, visit www.versar.com/epa/rfdrefreview.htm, or contact Ms. Traci Bludis, Versar, Inc.; telephone: (703) 750-3000 extension 449; facsimile: 703-642-6954; e-mail bluditra@versar.com by 5 p.m. eastern daylight time, June 14, 2002. The draft document, *A Review of the Reference Dose and Reference Concentration Processes*, is available via the Internet on the Risk Assessment Forum Publications home page at <http://www.epa.gov/ncea/raf/rafpub.htm> under What's New. Copies are not available from Versar Inc.

Public comments may be mailed to the Technical Information Staff (8623D), NCEA-W, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20460, or delivered to the Technical Information Staff at 808 17th Street, NW, 5th Floor, Washington, DC 20006; telephone: 202-564-3261; facsimile: 202-565-0050.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information concerning the technical peer review workshop or the draft document, *A Review of the Reference Dose and Reference*

Concentration Processes, please contact Marilyn Brower, U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development (8601-D), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460; Telephone: (202) 564-3363; Fax: (202) 565-0062; e-mail: brower.marilyn@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The RfD/RfC Technical Panel (hereafter the Technical Panel) was established in response to a request from the Agency's 10X Food Quality Protection Act Task Force to the Science Policy Council and the Risk Assessment Forum. A draft toxicology report developed by the 10X Task Force raised a number of issues that relate to the derivation of the oral reference dose (RfD) and inhalation reference concentration (RfC). The Science Policy Council and the Risk Assessment Forum agreed that these issues should be examined on a broader scale than just for pesticides, with input from various program offices within the Agency and from the outside scientific/policy community. This charge was expanded by the Forum to include a more in-depth review of a number of issues related to the RfD/RfC process, in part because of several other Forum activities that were underway (e.g., development of the Framework for the Harmonization of Cancer and Noncancer Risk Assessment, revision of the Benchmark Dose Guidance Document, and revision of the Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment). In addition, the RfD/RfC derivation process had not been evaluated in detail for a number of years, and several scientific issues concerning children's health, e.g., neurotoxicity and immunotoxicity, have become increasingly important in risk assessment. These activities have prompted the need to re-examine the RfD/RfC process and to coordinate these efforts with other related activities. In particular, it was important that efforts continue to focus on moving toward the goal of harmonization of risk assessment approaches for all health endpoints and making efficient use of animal testing to achieve this goal.

The draft report entitled, *A Review of the Reference Dose and Reference Concentration Processes* is not a guidance document but represents an analysis of the current RfD/RfC processes. The draft report summarizes the review and deliberations of the Technical Panel and presents a number of recommendations to improve the RfD/RfC processes. The review further documents recommendations that should be considered in the implementation of changes in the current process and/or development of

needed guidance. The peer reviewers are being asked to review the recommendations of the Technical Panel and to provide comments regarding the scientific rationale for the recommendations. Comments from the external peer reviewers and the public will help inform the process.

Dated: May 28, 2002.

George W. Alapas,

Acting Director, National Center for Environmental Assessment.

[FR Doc. 02-13981 Filed 6-3-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

May 29, 2002.

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 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; the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and 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 5, 2002. 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 Judith Boley Herman, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1-C804, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington,

DC 20554 or via the Internet to jboleay@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collection(s), contact Judith Boley Herman at 202-418-0214 or via the Internet at jboleay@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control No.: 3060-1003.

Title: Telecommunications Carrier Emergency Contact Information.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Not-for-profit institutions, state, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 5,000.

Estimated Time Per Response: .166 hours (10 minutes).

Frequency of Response: On occasion and annual reporting requirements.

Total Annual Burden: 830 hours.

Total Annual Cost: N/A.

Needs and Uses: The Commission must be able to contact its licensees and permittees in a communications emergency. We will collect emergency contact information from telephone wireless, broadcast, cable and satellite companies. We will also collect emergency contact information for federal, state and local emergency management entities. This information is needed in the event of a communications disruption.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-13920 Filed 6-3-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket 98-67; DA 02-1006]

Telecommunications Relay Services Applications for State Certification and Renewal of Current Certification Accepted until October 1, 2002

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document announces that the Federal Communications Commission will accept applications for the renewal of state telecommunications relay services (TRS) program certification from July 26, 2002 until October 1, 2002. Current state certification expires July 26, 2003. The Commission's rules provide that states may apply for a renewal of their certified state TRS program one year prior to the expiration of their current certification.