

application would be evaluated for these projects in the future. Much work has already been done to advance the completion of the marketing plans for the CVP, Washoe Project, and SLCA/IP, pursuant to the Program's framework.

There is now a further need to consider the impact of electric utility industry restructuring on the way that we allocate power. Western seeks public input on six questions to help in this consideration.

Upon completion of this public process, Western will consult with the Department of Energy (DOE) prior to taking further action to complete pending power marketing plans.

While this public process was triggered by marketing proposals for CVP, Washoe Project, and SLCA/IP firm power, Western regards the issues addressed in this public process as relevant to all of our power allocation efforts. However, the conclusions we reach will be applied prospectively, and will not impact existing marketing plans and contracts.

As electric utility industry restructuring progresses over time, Western likely will evaluate the impact of industry change on a periodic basis to assure that our power marketing policy continues to be responsive to public needs.

Regulatory Procedure Requirements

Review Under Executive Order 12866

Western has an exemption from centralized regulatory review under Executive Order 12866; accordingly, no clearance of this notice by the Office of Management and Budget is required.

Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*) requires Federal agencies to perform a regulatory flexibility analysis if a final rule is likely to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities and there is a legal requirement to issue a general notice of proposed rulemaking. Western has determined that this action does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis since it is a rulemaking of particular applicability involving rates or services applicable to public property.

Environmental Compliance

DOE National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations categorically exclude marketing plans from NEPA documentation unless they involve new generation, new transmission, or a change in operations. Therefore, Western will not conduct further evaluation under NEPA. Considerable

environmental evaluation has already occurred under the Energy Planning and Management Program and during project-specific marketing plan development.

Scope of Issues

Public comment is requested on the following questions:

1. Should Western's power allocations system, including the term of firm power contract renewals, be modified to take into account changes in electricity markets that have occurred, and are expected to occur in the future, due to the enactment of California Assembly Bill 1890 and other State retail competition statutes? If so, please explain what modifications would be desirable. If not, please explain why the present system should be preserved.

2. To the extent a utility with an allocation of preference power loses load due to retail competition, should it receive the same allocation as it received previously or should its allocation be reduced proportionately?

3. Should Western allocate power directly to electricity end-users that are preference entities such as publicly-owned schools in States or localities that permit retail access? If so, how much power should be allocated for this purpose? Alternatively, should Western continue to allocate power primarily to its traditional customers such as municipal and cooperative utilities and Federal and State agencies?

4. In a retail choice environment, what additional steps, if any, should Western take to ensure that the full economic benefits of preference power are passed through to end-users served by the distribution utility that receives a power allocation from Western?

5. Should a distribution utility be permitted to transmit the economic benefits of preference power exclusively to industrial and/or commercial end users? Conversely, should a distribution utility be required to pass on the benefits of preference power exclusively to a certain class of customers such as residential or small business?

6. Should a distribution utility be required to offer retail access to its distribution customers as a condition of receiving a preference power allocation in the future?

Dated: November 20, 1998.

Michael S. Hacsakaylo,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 98-32009 Filed 11-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6195-3]

Stakeholder Meeting on the Draft Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) Implementation Guidance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Announcement of Stakeholder Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) rule published on August 19, 1998 in the **Federal Register** requires community water systems to provide to customers annual consumer confidence reports on the quality of the water delivered by the systems. Draft CCR implementation guidance has been developed based on input from an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Headquarters and Regional staff workgroup. On November 19 and 20, 1998, a CCR State-EPA workgroup meeting was held to obtain State comments on the draft implementation guidance. At this time, the EPA would like to obtain stakeholder comments on the draft guidance and will hold a public meeting to solicit comments and suggestions from parties who will be affected by or are otherwise interested in the Draft CCR Implementation Guidance. EPA will consider the comments and views expressed at the meeting in developing the final version of the implementation guidance. EPA encourages the full participation of all stakeholders throughout this process.

DATES: The stakeholder meeting regarding the Draft CCR Implementation Guidance will be held on December 18, 1998, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. ET., in Washington, DC.

ADDRESSES: The December 18, 1998 stakeholder meeting will be held in the Washington Information Center (WIC) Conference Room 3 North, U.S. EPA Headquarters, 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC.

To register for the meeting, please contact the EPA Safe Drinking Water Hotline at 1-800-426-4791, or Kathleen Williams of EPA's Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water at (202) 260-2589. Participants registering in advance will be mailed a packet of materials before the meeting. Interested parties who cannot attend the meeting in person may participate via conference call and should register with the Safe Drinking Water Hotline. Conference lines are limited and will be allocated on the basis of first-reserved, first served.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information on meeting logistics, please contact the Safe Drinking Water Hotline at 1-800-426-4791. For information on activities related to CCR implementation, contact: Kathleen Williams, U.S. EPA at (202) 260-2589 or e-mail at williams.kathleena@epamail.epa.gov.

Elizabeth R. Fellows,

Acting Director, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water.

[FR Doc. 98-31806 Filed 11-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6195-6]

National Drinking Water Advisory Council; Shallow Injection Wells (Class V)/Drinking Water Source Protection Program Integration 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 Shallow Injection Wells (Class V)/Drinking Water Source Protection Program Integration 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 January 7, 1999 from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm and January 8, 1999 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Denver, Colorado. The meeting is open to the public, but due to past experience, seating will be limited.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the proposed Class V well regulation (63 FR 40586); the Class V Study methodology and regulatory decision rationale for the remaining Class V well types; and source water assessment and protection as it relates to the Class V proposal. The meeting is open to the public to observe. Statements from the public will be taken at the end of the meeting if time allows.

The Designated Federal Officer for this meeting will be Connie Bosma, Chief of the Regulatory Implementation Branch. For more information, please contact Amber Moreen, U.S. EPA, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (4606), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. The telephone number is (202) 260-4891 and e-mail address is moreen.amber@epamail.epa.gov.

Dated: November 24, 1998.

Charlene Shaw,

Designated Federal Officer, National Drinking Water Advisory Council.

[FR Doc. 98-32007 Filed 11-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6196-2]

Science Advisory Board; Emergency Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meetings

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92-463, notice is hereby given that several 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, seating is limited and available on a first come basis. Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) office and are *not* available from the SAB Office. Public drafts of SAB reports are available to the Agency and the public from the SAB office. Details on availability are noted below.

1. Drinking Water Committee (DWC)

The Drinking Water Committee (DWC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will hold a public meeting beginning at 8:00 am Thursday, December 10, 1998 and ending not later than 5:30 pm Friday, December 11, 1998. The meeting will be held at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City Hotel, 2799 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202; telephone (703) 418-1234. At this meeting, the Committee will receive briefings on the status of various research efforts being conducted in support of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments (SDWA) of 1996 and conduct a review of the US EPA ORD comparative risk approach for balancing the chemical and microbial risks from drinking water.

Background

In accordance with the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), regulations have been promulgated or proposed by U.S. EPA to provide maximum control of exposures to pathogenic organisms in water while minimizing concomitant exposures to the disinfection byproducts (DBPs). The SDWA Amendments of 1996 additionally require the Agency to conduct cost-benefit analyses of the regulatory impacts in order to identify cost-

effective drinking water treatment options.

The National Center for Environmental Assessment-Cincinnati Office (NCEA-Cin) has developed a methodology for risk analysis and comparison that might assist the Agency in supporting its SDWA regulatory activities. The Agency's document Comparative Risk Framework Methodology and Case Study (Framework Document) presents a methodology for such comparisons that applies the prevention-effectiveness approach developed by the Centers for Disease Control for structuring and analyzing this complex risk trade-off problem. Prevention-effectiveness research combines tools of decision and economic analysis to look at the cost-effectiveness of different public health interventions and employs decision trees to explicitly and graphically structure the problem. The document consists of a Comparative Risk Framework Methodology (CRFM) and a Case Study. The application of this approach explicitly recognizes disinfection and treatment of drinking water to be a primary public health intervention and prevention measure designed to minimize the transmission of microbial pathogens in drinking water.

Charge

The Drinking Water Committee is requested to review the strategy proposed for structuring and analyzing this comparative risk/risk tradeoff problem, including the overall concept, the use of population-based probabilities for expressing both cancer and noncancer health risks and mechanisms for arriving at these numbers, and the pros and cons of the different common metrics/weights proposed for comparing qualitatively and quantitatively different health risks. Specific charge questions are available by contacting the Office of the Science Advisory Board at the address noted below. Charge questions are included for the following areas: overall approach; the comparative risk framework methodology; the case study; engineering and water treatment issues; risk characterization; microbial risks; chemical dose-response assessment; exposure; health conditions; the common health metric; the results of the methods application; and research needs.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Single copies of the background information for the review of the risk comparison framework can be obtained by contacting Dr. Glenn Rice, US EPA