

effect of concern occurring as a result of a one day or single exposure. An acute dietary risk assessment was conducted for tralkoxydim based on the NOAEL of 30 mg/kg/day from the rat developmental study. The acute dietary analysis using the Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model (DEEM<sup>TM</sup>) computer program estimates that the distribution of single-day exposures utilizes 0.02% of acute RfD.

ii. *Chronic exposure and risk.* The RfD for Tralkoxydim is 0.005 mg/kg/day. This value is based on the systemic NOAEL of 0.5 mg/kg/day in the dog chronic feeding study with a 100-fold safety factor to account for interspecies extrapolation (10x) and intraspecies variability (10x).

2. *Food.* A DEEM<sup>TM</sup> chronic exposure analysis was conducted using tolerance levels for wheat and barley and assuming that 100% of the crop is treated to estimate dietary exposure for the general population and 22 subgroups. The chronic analysis showed that exposures from the tolerance level residues in or on wheat, and barley for children 1–6 years old (the subgroup with the highest exposure) would be 1.4% of the RfD. The exposure for the general U.S. population would be less than 1% of the RfD.

iii. A lifetime dietary carcinogenicity exposure analysis was conducted for tralkoxydim using the proposed tolerances along with the assumption of 100% of the crop treated and a  $Q^*$  of  $1.68 \times 10^{-2}$  (mg/kg/day)<sup>-1</sup>. A lifetime risk exposure analysis was also conducted using the DEEM<sup>TM</sup> computer analysis. The estimated cancer risk ( $5 \times 10^{-7}$ ) is less than the level that the Agency usually considers for negligible cancer risk estimates.

3. *Drinking water.* Drinking water estimated concentrations (DWECS) for surface water (parent tralkoxydim) were calculated by EPA's Pesticide Root Zone Model (PRIZM) computer models to be an average of 9.1 parts per billion (ppb). The DWECS for ground water based on the computer model screening concentration in ground water (SCI-GROW2) were calculated to be an average of .016 ppb.

4. *Non-dietary exposure.* There are no non-food uses of tralkoxydim currently registered under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended. No non-dietary exposures are expected for the general population.

#### D. Cumulative Effects

EPA does not have, at this time, available data to determine whether tralkoxydim has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances or how to include this pesticide in a cumulative

risk assessment. Tralkoxydim is structurally a cyclohexanedione. Unlike other pesticides for which EPA has followed a cumulative risk approach based on a common mechanism of toxicity, tralkoxydim does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of these tolerances action, therefore, EPA has not assumed that tralkoxydim has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances.

#### E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population — i. Acute risk.* The acute dietary analysis based on the NOAEL of 30 mg/kg/day from the rat developmental study using the DEEM<sup>TM</sup> computer program estimates that the distribution of single-day exposures utilizes 0.02% of acute RfD. The drinking water level of comparisons (DWLOCs) for acute exposure to tralkoxydim in drinking water calculated for females 13+ years old was 9,000 ppb. The estimated average concentration in surface water for tralkoxydim is 9 ppb. EPA's acute drinking water level of comparison is well above the estimated exposures for tralkoxydim in water for the subgroup of concern. For ground water, the estimated environmental concentrations (EEC's) using the SCI-GROW model were all less than 1 ppb.

ii. *Chronic risk.* A DEEM chronic exposure analysis showed that exposure from tolerance level residues in or on wheat, and barley for children 1–6 years old (the subgroup with the highest exposure) would be 1.4% of the RfD. The exposure for the general U.S. population would be less than 1% of the RfD. The DWLOCs for chronic exposure to tralkoxydim in drinking water calculated for U.S. population was 150 ppb and for children (1–6 years old) the DWLOC was 50 ppb. The estimated average concentration in surface water for tralkoxydim is 9 ppb. EPA's chronic drinking water level of concern is above the estimated exposures for tralkoxydim in water for the U.S. population and the subgroup of concern. Conservative model estimates (SCI-GROW) of the concentrations of tralkoxydim in ground water indicate that exposure will be minimal.

iii. *Cancer risk.* A DWLOC for cancer was calculated as 1 ppb. The estimated concentration in surface water and ground water for tralkoxydim for chronic exposure are 0.9 ppb (2.8 ppb (the 56-day concentration)/3) and 0.1 ppb, respectively. The model exposure estimates are less than the cancer DWLOC. EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will

result from aggregate exposure to tralkoxydim residues.

2. *Infants and children.* The Agency concluded that an extra safety factor to protect infants and children is not needed based on the following considerations: The toxicology data base is complete for the assessment of special sensitivity of infants and children; the developmental and reproductive toxicity data do not indicate increase susceptibility of rats or rabbits to in utero and/or postnatal exposure; the NOAEL used in deriving the RfD is based on changes in liver function and morphology in male adult dogs (not developmental or neurotoxic effects) after chronic exposure and thus are not relevant for enhanced sensitivity to infants and children; unrefined dietary exposure estimates (assuming all commodities contain tolerance level residues) overestimate dietary exposure; model data used for ground and surface source drinking water exposure assessments result in estimates considered to be upper-bound concentrations; there are no registered uses for tralkoxydim that could result in residential exposures. EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to children from aggregate exposure to tralkoxydim residues.

#### F. International Tolerances

There are no Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex) or Mexican Maximum Residue Levels (MRLs) for tralkoxydim at this time.

[FR Doc. 05–12076 Filed 6–21–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7926–1]

### Environmental Justice Strategic Plan Framework and Outline

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

**ACTION:** Public comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Environmental Justice seeks public comment on: (1) The draft “Framework for Integrating Environmental Justice”; and (2) “Environmental Justice Strategic Plan Outline,” which includes proposed Environmental Justice Priorities (EJ Priorities). These two draft documents will be the foundation for the Environmental Justice Strategic Plan for 2006–2011. EPA is drafting the Environmental Justice Strategic Plan to integrate its environmental justice

efforts into the Agency's planning and budgeting processes.

**DATES:** The Agency must receive written comments on or before July 15, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to Mr. Barry E. Hill, Director, Office of Environmental Justice, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Mail Code 2201A, Ariel Rios South Building, Room 2226, Washington, DC 20460-0001. You may also email comments to [hill.barry@epa.gov](mailto:hill.barry@epa.gov). Please identify e-mailed comments with the words "EJ Strategic Plan Comments" in the subject line

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Danny Gogal, Senior Environmental Protection Specialist, EPA Office of Environmental Justice, (202) 564-2576, [gogal.danny@epa.gov](mailto:gogal.danny@epa.gov) or Delleane McKenzie, Senior Program Analyst, EPA Office of Environmental Justice, (202) 564-6358, [mckenzie.delleane@epa.gov](mailto:mckenzie.delleane@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The draft Framework identifies the proposed key elements of the EJ Strategic Plan that will help the Agency track progress and benchmark its environmental justice objectives. The draft Framework also describes the proposed link between the Environmental Justice Action Plans of the Agency's 10 regional offices and the substantive program offices (e.g., Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response) and the priorities and targets established in the EJ Strategic Plan.

The draft Outline identifies the "mission" and "vision" that will guide the EJ Strategic Plan and identifies where specific Environmental Justice Strategic Targets will be included, once they are developed. The Outline also includes 12 potential EJ Priorities, which would help focus attention on critical human health and environmental issues faced by communities with disproportionate impacts (e.g., asthma reduction, healthy schools, safe drinking water). While we will continue to take action on a wide range of environmental justice issues, using a spectrum of strategies including cross-cutting approaches (e.g., community capacity building, grants, training), we would like to select 5-7 priorities for heightened attention. Therefore, in addition to providing comments on the overall Outline, we ask that you rank the potential priorities (1 = highest priority, 12 = lowest priority) and submit your ranking with your other comments. If you have additional suggested priorities, please include those as well.

The draft "Framework for Integrating Environmental Justice" and

"Environmental Justice Strategic Plan Outline," along with responses to anticipated questions, are available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/reports/ej.html>. A hardcopy of this document is available upon request.

Dated: June 16, 2005.

**Barry E. Hill,**

*Director, Office of Environmental Justice.*

[FR Doc. 05-12357 Filed 6-21-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Submitted for Review to the Office of Management and Budget

June 14, 2005.

**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 (PRA) 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 (a) 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; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) 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 Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments should be submitted on or before July 22, 2005. If you anticipate that you will be submitting PRA 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 Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments to Leslie F. Smith, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1-

A804, 445 12th Street, SW., DC 20554 or via the Internet to [Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov](mailto:Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov). If you would like to obtain or view a copy of this new or revised information collection, you may do so by visiting the FCC PRA Web page at: <http://www.fcc.gov/omd/prs>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For additional information or copies of the information collection(s), contact Leslie F. Smith at (202) 418-0217 or via the Internet at [Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov](mailto:Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 3060-XXXX.

*Title:* Rules and Regulations Implementing Minimum Customer Account Record Obligations on All Local and Interexchange Carrier (CARE), CG 02-386.

*Form Number:* N/A.

*Type of Review:* New collection.

*Respondents:* Business or other for-profit entities.

*Number of Respondents:* 1,778.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 0.75 to 6.70 hours.

*Frequency of Response:* Annual reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

*Total Annual Burden:* 44,576 hours.

*Total Annual Cost:* None.

*Privacy Impact Assessment:* No impact(s).

*Needs and Uses:* In the *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing Minimum Customer Account Record Exchange Obligations on All Local and Interexchange Carriers (2005 *Report and Order*), CG Docket No. 02-386, FCC 05-29, which was released on February 25, 2005, the Commission adopted rules governing the exchange of customer account information between local exchange carriers (LECs) and interexchange carriers (IXCs). The Commission concluded that mandatory, minimum standards are needed in light of record evidence demonstrating that information needed by carriers to execute customer requests and properly bill customers is not being consistently provided by all LECs and IXCs.

In the 2005 *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, as cited above, the Commission sought comment on whether to mandate the exchange of particular customer account information between two LECs when a customer switches local service providers. The Commission proposed to take this action in light of concerns reflected in the record regarding the need for more effective communications between LECs. Because the information exchanges proposed in the 2005 *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*