under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

## List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq. Dated: December 14, 1999.

## John P. DeVillars,

Regional Administrator, Region I. [FR Doc. 99–33155 Filed 12–21–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[OPP-300959; FRL-6399-6]

#### RIN 2070-AB78

Azinphos-Methyl; Proposed Revocation and Lowering of Certain Tolerances; Tolerance Actions

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes to revise the tolerances for azinphosmethyl by revoking certain tolerances and modifying certain other tolerances for residues of the insectide azinphosmethyl (40 CFR 180.154). This proposed revision is in compliance with a Memorandum of Understanding between the EPA and registrants of azinphos-methyl. The regulatory actions proposed in this document are part of the Agency's reregistration program under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), and the tolerance reassessment requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA). DATES: Comments, identified by docket control number OPP-300959, must be received on or February 22, 2000. **ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted by mail, electronically, or in person. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit I. of the "SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION" section of this document. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number OPP-300959 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Barry O'Keefe, Special Review and Reregistration Division (7508C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: 703–308–8041; e-mail address: okeefe.barry@epa.gov.
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected categories and entities may include, but are not limited to the following:

Cat- egories	NAICS	Examples of Potentially Affected Entities
Industry	111 112 311 32532	Crop production Animal production Food manufacturing Pesticide manufacturing

This listing is not exhaustive, but is a guide to entities likely to be regulated by this action. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes will assist you in determining whether this action applies to you. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed in the "FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT" section.

- B. How Can I Get Additional Information, Including Copies of this Document and Other Related Documents?
- 1. Electronically. You may obtain electronic copies of this document, and certain other related documents that might be available electronically, from the EPA Internet Home Page at http://www.epa.gov/. To access this document, on the Home Page select "Laws and Regulations" and then look up the entry for this document under the "Federal Register--Environmental Documents." You can also go directly to the Federal Register listings at http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/.
- 2. In person. The Agency has established an official record for this action under docket control number OPP–300959. The official record consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received during an applicable comment period, and other information related to this action, including any information claimed as Confidential Business Information (CBI). This official

record includes the documents that are physically located in the docket, as well as the documents that are referenced in those documents. The public version of the official record does not include any information claimed as CBI. The public version of the official record, which includes printed, paper versions of any electronic comments submitted during an applicable comment period, is available for inspection in the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

# C. How and to Whom Do I Submit Comments?

You may submit comments through the mail, in person, or electronically. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number OPP–300959 in the subject line on the first page of your response

- 1. By mail. Submit your comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460.
- 2. In person or by courier. Deliver your comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA. The PIRIB is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305–5805
- 3. Electronically. You may submit your comments electronically by e-mail to: "opp-docket@epa.gov," or you can submit a computer disk as described above. Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. Avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Electronic submissions will be accepted in WordPerfect 6.1/8.0 or ASCII file format. All comments in electronic form must be identified by docket control number OPP–300959. Electronic comments may also be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

# D. How Should I Handle CBI that I Want to Submit to the Agency?

Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be

CBI. You may claim information that you submit to EPA in response to this document as CBI by marking any part or all of that information as CBI. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes any information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public version of the official record. Information not marked confidential will be included in the public version of the official record without prior notice. If you have any questions about CBI or the procedures for claiming CBI, please consult the person listed under 'FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT."

E. What Should I Consider as I Prepare My Comments for EPA?

You may find the following suggestions helpful for preparing your comments:

- 1. Explain your views as clearly as possible.
- 2. Describe any assumptions that you
- 3. Provide copies of any technical information and/or data you used that support your views.
- 4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate that you provide.
- 5. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns.
- 6. Offer alternative ways to improve the proposed rule or collection activity.
- 7. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline in this document.
- 8. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, be sure to identify the docket control number assigned to this action in the subject line on the first page of your response. You may also provide the name, date, and Federal Register citation.

# II. Background

A. What Action is the Agency Taking?

In accordance with a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) of August 2, 1999, between registrants and EPA, the EPA is proposing to revoke and to modify certain tolerances for residues of the insecticide azinphos-methyl in 40 CFR 180.154. In particular, the EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerance on sugarcane, with a revocation/expiration date of June 30, 2000, since by agreement this use has been deleted from active labels, because of surface water vulnerability and to prevent

unreasonable risks to wildlife and contamination of water. EPA is setting the revocation/expiration date of June 30, 2000, in order to allow time for existing stocks in the hands of users to be used. The Agency believes that once cancellation of this use occurs, residues of azinphos-methyl will likely be nondetectable in all sugarcane commodities shortly after harvest. The MOA states that azinphos-methyl manufacturing-use products may not be reformulated for use on sugarcane, and end-use product labels intended for use in the 2000 growing season shall not have sugarcane listed as a use site in the directions for use section.

In the MOA, the registrants agreed to submit a petition requesting specific tolerance modifications to be effective January 1, 2000. Such a petition has been received by the Agency. Therefore, EPA is proposing to lower tolerances found in 40 CFR 180.154 for residues of the insecticide azinphos-methyl in or on apples, crabapples, pears, and quinces, each from 2.0 parts per million (ppm) to 1.5 ppm, in or on cranberries from 2.0 ppm to 0.5 ppm, and in or on grapes from 5.0 ppm to 4.0 ppm. The Agency intends to make these modifications effective upon publication of the final rule. These reductions in tolerances are based on the most recent data that more accurately reflect recent label changes and residue levels that are likely to be detected. Additionally, monitoring data for the years 1993-1998 indicate that the new lower tolerances are not likely to be exceeded. These data represent residues resulting from the use pattern allowed under old labels which allowed higher amounts of use than reflected in recent label changes. Little use of the older labeled products should be reflected in residues of commodities in the channels of trade.

In addition, this document also proposes to revoke tolerances found in 40 CFR 180.154 for residues of azinphos-methyl in or on commodities for which there are no registered uses; including: apricots; artichokes; barley, grain; barley, straw; beans (dry); gooseberries; grass, pasture (green); grass, pasture, hay; kiwifruit; oats, grain; oats, straw; peas, black-eyed; rye, grain; rye, straw; soybeans; wheat, grain; and wheat, straw. Additionally, in 40 CFR 180.154(b), the tolerance for pomegranates is proposed to be revoked, because there is no registered use. These revocations are for uses that have not been on active labels since January 1999. Additionally, the Agency believes that azinphos-methyl had not been used on these crops for some time. Consequently, no treated commodities covered by these tolerances are expected Cherries ...... Cherry

to be in the channels of trade. The Agency intends to make these modifications effective upon publication of the final rule.

This document also proposes to remove 40 CFR 180.531, and to revoke the three tolerances found in this section for residues of azinphos-methyl; which are as follows:

(1) Sugarcane bagasse, since this commodity is not considered a significant livestock feed item.

(2) Citrus pulp, dried, since an adequate orange processing study did not show concentration in dried orange pulp (in accordance with FFDCA section 408(a)(2), since residues in the processed food will not exceed the raw food tolerance).

(3) Soybean oil, since there are no active registrations with soybeans on the label.

Changes in commodity terminology and definitions are proposed to conform to current Agency practice. These proposed changes are in accordance with the revised Crop Group Regulation (40 CFR 180.41) and the updated Table I "Raw Agricultural and Processed Commodities and Feedstuffs Derived from Crops" (August, 1996) in the Residue Chemistry Test Guidelines: OPPTS 860.1000 (EPA 721-C-96-169). Table I contains data on both crops and livestock diets, and lists feed commodities considered significant in livestock diets. Significant feedstuffs account for more than 99 percent of the available annual tonnage (on a drymatter basis) of feedstuffs used in the domestic production of more than 95 percent of beef and dairy cattle, poultry, swine, milk, and eggs. The EPA has devised criteria to include or exclude feedstuffs from Table I and set tolerances for significant feedstuffs. Tolerances are not set for feedstuffs which are neither significant nor a human food. Pesticide residues on such feedstuffs are governed by tolerances on the commodity from which they are derived (62 FR 66020, December 17, 1997) (FRL-5753-1). These changes relate only to nomenclature and have no effect on the scope of the tolerance. The specific commodity terminology name changes proposed are listed in the following table:

ionowing table.				
Old Commodity Name	New Commodity Name			
Almonds	Almond Almond, hulls Apple Bean, snap Blackberry Blueberry Boysenberry			

Old Commodity Name	New Commodity Name
Citrus fruits	Fruit, citrus, group Crabapple Cranberry Cucumber Eggplant Filbert Grape Loganberry Melon
Nuts, pistachio Onions Parsley, leaves Parsley, roots Peaches Pears	Pistachio Onion Parsley, leaf Parsley, root Peach Pear Pecan
Peppers	Pepper Plum, prune  Potato Quince Raspberry Strawberry Tomato  Walnut
vvaii1ut5	vvairiut

Since the available data indicate that finite residues of azinphos-methyl are not expected in animal tissues or milk, in accordance with 40 CFR 180.6(a)(3) EPA is proposing to revoke tolerances found in 40 CFR 180.154 for cattle, fat; cattle, mbyp; cattle, meat; goat, fat; goat, mbyp; goat, meat; horse, fat; horse, mbyp; horse, meat; sheep, fat; sheep mbyp; and sheep, meat; and in 40 CFR 180.154a, the tolerance for milk. This proposal to revoke these 13 meat, milk, poultry and egg (MMPE) tolerances implements the Agency findings announced in the August 2, 1999 FR Notice (64 FR 41933) (FRL-6097-3) that, under 40 CFR 180.6 there is no reasonable expectation of finite residues for azinphos-methyl on the MMPE commodities and, therefore, these tolerances were considered reassessed and could be revoked, because they are not needed. These findings are based on feeding studies that used exaggerated amounts of azinphos-methyl (up to 11 times the dietary burden) and measurable residues still were not found. These studies were submitted after the tolerances were originally established.

This document also proposes to revoke the tolerance found in 40 CFR 180.154 for residues of azinphos-methyl in or on nectarines, in accordance with 40 CFR 180.1(h), since the tolerance on peaches covers nectarines.

This document also proposes to lower tolerances found in 40 CFR 180.154 for

residues of azinphos-methyl in or on almond and potato, each from 0.3 to 0.2 ppm, and in or on almond hulls from 10.3 to 5.0 ppm, since the available data indicate that these tolerances can be lowered to achieve compatibility with the corresponding Codex maximum residue limits (MRLs). These reductions in tolerances are based on the most recent data that more accurately reflect residue levels that are likely to be detected.

It is EPA's general practice to propose revocation of those tolerances for residues of pesticide active ingredients on crop uses for which there are no active registrations under FIFRA, unless any person in comments on the proposal demonstrates a need for the tolerance to cover residues in or on imported commodities or domestic commodities legally treated. EPA expects to determine whether any individuals or groups want to comment on these tolerance modifications. The regulatory actions proposed in this document are part of the Agency's reregistration program under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), and the tolerance reassessment requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

B. What is the Agency's Authority for Taking this Action?

A "tolerance" represents the maximum level for residues of pesticide chemicals legally allowed in or on raw agricultural commodities and processed foods. Section 408 of FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. 301 et seq., as amended by the FQPA of 1996, Public Law 104-170, authorizes the establishment of tolerances, exemptions from tolerance requirements, modifications in tolerances, and revocation of tolerances for residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities and processed foods, 21 U.S.C. 346(a). Without a tolerance or exemption, food containing pesticide residues is considered to be unsafe and therefore ''adulterated'' under section 402(a) of the FFDCA. If food containing pesticide residues is considered to be "adulterated," you may not distribute the product in interstate commerce (21 U.S.C. 331(a) and 342(a). For a food-use pesticide to be sold and distributed, the pesticide must not only have appropriate tolerances under the FFDCA, but also must be registered under section 3, section 5, or section 18 of FIFRA (7 U.S.C. et seq.). Food-use pesticides not registered in the United States have tolerances for residues of pesticides in or on commodities imported into the United States.

It is EPA's general practice to propose revocation of tolerances for residues of pesticide active ingredients on crop uses for which FIFRA registrations no longer exist. EPA has historically been concerned that retention of tolerances that are not necessary to cover residues in or on legally treated foods may encourage misuse of pesticides within the United States. Nonetheless, EPA will establish and maintain tolerances even when corresponding domestic uses are canceled if the tolerances, which EPA refers to as "import tolerances," are necessary to allow importation into the United States of food containing such pesticide residues. However, where there are no imported commodities that require these import tolerances, the Agency believes it is appropriate to revoke tolerances for unregistered pesticides in order to prevent potential misuse.

Furthermore, as a general matter, the Agency believes that retention of tolerances not needed to cover any imported food may result in unnecessary restriction on trade of pesticides and foods. Under section 408 of the FFDCA, a tolerance may only be established or maintained if EPA determines that the tolerance is safe based on a number of factors, including an assessment of the aggregate exposure to the pesticide and of the cumulative effects of such pesticide and other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity. In doing so, EPA must consider potential contributions to such exposure from all tolerances. If the cumulative risk is such that the tolerances in aggregate are not safe, then every one of these tolerances is potentially vulnerable to revocation. Furthermore, if unneeded tolerances are included in the aggregate and cumulative risk assessments, the estimated exposure to the pesticide would be inflated. Consequently, it may be more difficult for others to obtain needed tolerances or to register needed new uses. To avoid these traderestricting situations, the Agency is proposing to revoke tolerances for residues on crops for which FIFRA registrations no longer exist, unless someone expresses a need for such tolerances. Through this proposed rule, the Agency is inviting individuals who need these import tolerances to identify themselves and the tolerances that are needed to cover imported commodities.

Parties interested in retention of the tolerances should be aware that additional data may be needed to support retention. These parties should be aware that, under FFDCA section 408(f), if the Agency determines that additional information is reasonably

required to support the continuation of a tolerance, EPA may require that parties interested in maintaining the tolerances provide the necessary information. If the requisite information is not submitted, EPA may issue an order revoking the tolerances at issue.

Under section 408(d) of the FFDCA, the Agency may issue a final or proposed regulation establishing, modifying, or revoking a tolerance in response to a petition filed with the Agency that proposes the issuance of such regulation. On August 2, 1999, EPA and the registrants holding Section 3 registrations for azinphos-methyl signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which specifically states that the registrants shall submit to EPA a petition requesting many of the tolerance modifications detailed in this proposal; i.e. lowering tolerances on apples, crabapples, cranberries, grapes, pears, and quinces, and revoking the tolerance on sugarcane. Such a petition has been received by the Agency, dated September 22, 1999. Thus, the Agency is authorized by section 408(d) of the FFDCA to issue a proposed regulation in response to that petition. The MOA was made to help mitigate acute dietary, agricultural worker, and environmental risks. During phase five of the Tolerance Reassessment Advisory Committee (TRAC) process, the Agency invited the registrants, and any other affected or interested parties, to submit to the Agency additional risk mitigation thoughts or measures, since the acute dietary risk estimates from the revised human health risk assessment remained above the Agency's level of concern. The revised human health risk assessment may be found at http:// www.epa.gov/pesticides/op. In addition to the MOA, EPA is also proposing the revocation or lowering of other tolerances, as well as changes in commodity nomenclature for various reasons as described in Unit II of this document.

# F. What Is the Contribution to Tolerance Reassessment?

By law, EPA is required to reassess 66%, or about 6,400, of the tolerances in existence on August 2, 1996, by August 2002. EPA is also required to assess the remaining tolerances by August 2006. As of November 1, 1999, EPA has assessed over 3,400 tolerances. This document proposes to revoke 35 tolerances. Since 13 tolerances were previously counted as reassessed, 22 of the 35 revocations will be counted when the final rule is published. The 22 reassessments will be counted toward the August, 2002 review deadline of FFDCA section 408(q), as amended by

the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) of 1996.

## III. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

This proposed rule will revoke tolerances established under FFDCA section 408. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this type of action, i.e., a tolerance revocation for which extraordinary circumstances do not exist, from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled Regulatory Planning and Review (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). This action does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq., or impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Public Law 104-4). Nor does it require any prior consultation as specified by Executive Order 13084, entitled Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments (63 FR 27655, May 19,1998); special considerations as required by Executive Order 12898, entitled Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994); or require OMB review or any Agency action under Executive Order 13045, entitled Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). This action does not involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note). Pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the Agency previously assessed whether revocations of tolerances might significantly impact a substantial number of small entities and concluded that, as a general matter, these actions do not impose a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The factual basis and the Agency's certification under section 605(b) for tolerance revocations published on December 17, 1997 (62 FR 66020), and was provided to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration. Since no extraordinary circumstances exist as to the present revocation that would change EPA's previous analysis, the Agency is able to reference the general certification. Any comments about the Agency's determination should be submitted to EPA along with comments

on the proposal, and will be addressed prior to issuing a final rule.

In addition, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132, entitled Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have "substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government." This rule directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers and food retailers, not States. This action does not alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of FFDCA section 408(n)(4).

# IV. Consistency with International Obligations

The tolerance revocations in this proposal are not discriminatory and are designed to ensure that both domestically-produced and imported foods meet the food safety standards established by the FFDCA. The same food safety standards apply to domestically produced and imported foods.

EPA is working to ensure that the U.S. tolerance reassessment program under FOPA does not disrupt international trade. EPA considers Codex MRLs in setting U.S. tolerances and in reassessing them. MRLs are established by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, a committee within the Codex Alimentarius Commission, an international organization formed to promote the coordination of international food standards. It is EPA's policy to harmonize U.S. tolerances with Codex MRLs to the extent possible, provided that the MRLs achieve the level of protection required under FFDCA. EPA's effort to harmonize with Codex MRLs is summarized in the tolerance reassessment section of individual Reregistration Eligibility Decision documents. EPA is developing guidance concerning submissions for import tolerance support. This guidance

will be made available to interested

parties.

Codex MRLs exist for the following tolerances proposed for revocation in this document, i.e. apricot at 2.0 ppm, cereal grains at 0.2 ppm, kiwifruit at 4.0 ppm, and soy bean at 0.2 ppm.

Notwithstanding the existence of these MRLs, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerances because retention would increase the chances of misuse and may result in unnecessary restriction on trade of pesticides and foods as well as inhibiting the retention and approval of tolerances, as discussed in greater detail in Unit II.B., of this document.

## List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: December 16, 1999.

#### Jack E. Housenger,

Acting Director, Special Review and Reregistration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR part 180 be amended as follows:

# PART 180—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 180 would continue to read as follows:

**Authority:** 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

2. By revising § 180.154 to read as follows:

# § 180.154 O-Dimethyl S-[(4-oxo-1,2,3-benzotriazin-3(4H)-yl)methyl]phosphorodithioate; tolerances for residues.

(a) Tolerances are established for residues of the insecticide *O,O*-dimethyl *S*-[(4-oxo-1,2,3-benzotriazin-3(4*H*)-yl) methyl]phosphorodithioate in or on the following food commodities:

e e		
Commodity	Parts per million	Expiration/ Revocation Date
Alfalfa	2.0 5.0 0.2 5.0 1.5 2.0 2.0 5.0 2.0 2.0 2.0	
Cabbage Cauliflower Celery Cherry	2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0	
Fruit, citrus, group	2.0	

Commodity	Parts per million	Expiration/ Revocation Date
Clover Clover, hay Cottonseed Crabapple Cranberry Cucumber Eggplant Filbert Grape Loganberry Melon Onion Parsley, leaf Parsley, root Peach Pear Pecan Pepper Pistachio Plum, prune Potato Quince Raspberry Spinach Strawberry Sugarcane Tomato Walnut	2.0 5.0 0.5 2.0 0.5 2.0 0.3 4.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 3.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0	6/30/00
	1	

(b) Section 18 emergency exemptions. [Reserved]

(c) Tolerances with regional registrations. [Reserved]

(d) *Indirect or inadvertent residues*. [Reserved]

# §§ 180.154a and 180.531 [REMOVED]

3. By removing § 180.154a and § 180.531.

[FR Doc. 99–33161 Filed 12–21–99; 8:45 am]  $\tt BILLING$  CODE 6560–50–F

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

## 47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 99-339; FCC 99-353]

# Implementation of Video Description of Video Programming

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule, correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects the preamble to a proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** of December 1, 1999, regarding the adoption of limited requirements for television video description. This corrects paragraph 44 of the proposed rule.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Bash, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau (202) 418–2130.

## Correction

In the proposed rule 99–31116, page 67241, column 3, paragraph 44 set forth

certain instructions for filing comments on diskettes, and directed commenters to reference MM Docket No. 99–353. The document should have directed commenters to reference MM Docket No. 99–339. Therefore, the docket reference in paragraph 44, fifth sentence, to "99–353" is hereby deleted and replaced with the docket reference "99–339."

Dated: December 2, 1999.

#### Victoria Phillips,

 ${\it Chief, Legal \, Branch.}$ 

[FR Doc. 99–33101 Filed 12–21–99; 8:45 am]

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 99-292; FCC 99-389]

## Establishment of a Class A Television Service; Comments Suspended

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; comment date suspension.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces that the Commission, on its own motion, has suspended the filing of comments that were due December 21, 1999, in its rulemaking proceeding in MM Docket No. 99–292 concerning the Establishment of a Class A Television Service.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 14, 1999.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Brown, Video Services Division, Mass Media Bureau at (202) 418–1600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 29, 1999, the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rule Making, FCC 99-257, setting forth for public comment a wide-range of issues and concerns dealing with the establishment of a form of primary status for qualifying low power television stations and on the appropriate regulatory framework for a Class A television service. On November 29, 1999, however, the Community Broadcasters Protection Act of 1999 (CBPA) was signed into law. Among other things, the legislation directed that, within 120 days after enactment of the CBPA, the Commission shall, by rulemaking, set forth regulations establishing a Class A television service for licensees of low power television that satisfy certain statutorily-prescribed criteria. The Commission is currently assessing the impact of the CBPA,