

<0.01% of the RfD for each of the population subgroups: non-nursing infants < 1 year old, nursing infants < 1 year old, children 1-6 years old, and children 7-12 years old (DEEM analysis) assuming residues are present at tolerance levels and assuming 100% of crop treated, except stone fruit (12.8% of crop treated assumed).

5. *Blueberries*. The exposure to fenbuconazole from blueberries, will utilize < 0.01% of the RfD for each of the population subgroups, non-nursing infants < 1 year old, nursing infants < 1 year old, children 1-6 years old, and children 7-12 years old (DEEM analysis) assuming residues are present at tolerance levels and assuming 100% of crop treated, except stone fruit (12.8% of crop treated assumed).

Section 408 of the FFDCA provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold margin of safety for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for pre- and post-natal toxicity and the completeness of the database unless EPA determines that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. Margins of safety are incorporated into EPA risk assessments either directly through use of a margin of exposure (MOE) analysis or through using uncertainty (safety) factors in calculating a dose level that poses no appreciable risk to humans. In either case, EPA generally defines the level of appreciable risk as exposure that is greater than 1/100 of the NOAEL in the animal study appropriate to the particular risk assessment. This hundredfold uncertainty (safety) factor/MOE exposure (safety) is designed to account for combined inter- and intra-species variability. EPA believes that reliable data support using the standard hundredfold margin/factor but not the additional tenfold margin/factor when EPA has a complete data base under existing guidelines and when the severity of the effect in infants or children or the potency or unusual toxic properties of a compound do not raise concerns regarding the adequacy of the standard margin/factor.

The Agency FQPA Safety Factor Committee removed the additional 10x safety factor to account for sensitivity of infants and children. Rohm and Haas Company concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from exposure to fenbuconazole residues to the U.S. population or to infants and children.

#### G. International Tolerances

There are no Codex maximum residue limits (MRLs) for fenbuconazole, but the fenbuconazole database was evaluated by the WHO and FAO Expert Panels at

the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) in September, 1997. An ADI (RfD) of 0.03 mg/kg/day was proposed and accepted (Pesticide Residues in Food—WHO/FAO Report 1997; No. 145), and a total of 36 Codex MRLs, including MRLs for pecans, stone fruit, and bananas, have been submitted for review.

[FR Doc. 98-32426 Filed 12-4-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket No. 95-155]

### Toll Free Service Access Codes

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice; letter.

**SUMMARY:** The Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau, has issued a letter stating that 145 RespOrgs failed to report to Database Service Management, Inc., as required, that they gave notice to all of their subscribers having right of first refusal for set-aside 888 numbers. By December 11, 1998, these RespOrgs must explain why they failed to comply with this requirement and must describe their actions to remedy their non-compliance. RespOrgs that fail to submit explanations or that fail to provide satisfactory explanations will be subject to possible forfeiture penalties, decertification as RespOrgs, or fines, imprisonment, or both.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marty Schwimmer 202-418-2334.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Bureau's letter is attached.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Anna M. Gomez,**

*Chief, Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau.*

#### Attachment

November 24, 1998.

Mr. Michael Wade

*President, Database Service Management, Inc.*

6 Corporate Place  
Room PYA-1F286  
Piscataway, NJ 08854-4157

Re: RespOrg non-compliance with the set-aside 888 number right-of-first-refusal process—Requirement for specified RespOrgs to submit letters of explanation by December 11, 1998

Dear Mr. Wade: The Bureau's letter to you dated April 15, 1998, initiated the process for subscribers to exercise their right of first refusal to request 888 numbers that had been set aside for them. It required RespOrgs to give notice of this right to their subscribers. Further, among other things, it required

RespOrgs, for each set-aside 888 number, to submit to DSMI either the subscriber's request to accept or reject an 888 set-aside number, with documentation, or certification that the subscriber did not respond to the notice.

The Bureau's letter to you dated May 15, 1998, extended to August 21, 1998, the time for RespOrgs to give the required notice to their subscribers, although it provided that requests received from subscribers after that date must still be processed. It also explained that the certification that RespOrgs were required to provide for subscribers who did not respond must include contact information containing the subscriber's name, address, and phone number, as well as the date and means by which the RespOrg notified the subscriber.

The attachment to this letter summarizes the RespOrgs' compliance with this process, using information provided by your staff in response to the Bureau's request. For each of 179 RespOrgs, the attachment shows the total percentage of requests and certifications of no response reported to DSMI as of October 5, 1998, based on the RespOrg's initial count of set-aside 888 numbers as of July 1998. It indicates that only 34 RespOrgs reported subscriber notification results for all of their set-aside 888 numbers (100%). Of the remaining 145 RespOrgs, 93 reported results for some but not all of their set-aside 888 numbers (0.1% to 99.7%), and 52 did not report any results for their set-aside 888 numbers (0%).

The Commission is concerned that a RespOrg's failure to report that it gave notice to each of its set-aside 888 number subscribers may indicate that the RespOrg is operating in defiance of Commission orders, that it is warehousing set-aside 888 numbers or the corresponding 800 numbers, or that it has falsely indicated that it has identified subscribers for those numbers. The Commission stated last year that it may penalize RespOrgs that warehouse toll free numbers, by imposing forfeiture penalties on them or referring them to the Department of Justice to determine whether a fine, imprisonment, or both are warranted, or may decertify them as RespOrgs. It also stated that RespOrgs that falsely indicate they have identified subscribers for particular numbers may be criminally liable for false statements under Title 18 of the United States Code. The Commission stated as follows:

"We conclude that the Commission's exclusive jurisdiction over the portions of the North American Numbering Plan that pertain to the United States, found at section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act, as amended, authorizes the Commission to penalize RespOrgs that warehouse toll free numbers. We may impose a forfeiture penalty under section 503(b). In addition, if a person violates a provision of the Communications Act or a rule or regulation issued by the Commission under authority of the Communications Act, the Commission can refer the matter to the Department of Justice to determine whether a fine, imprisonment, or both are warranted under section 501 or section 502 of the Communications Act. We also may limit any RespOrg's allocation of toll free numbers or possibly decertify it as

a RespOrg under section 251(e)(1) or section 4(i). In addition, RespOrgs that falsely indicate that they have identified subscribers for particular numbers may be liable for false statements under Title 18 of the United States Code. . . ." (footnotes omitted).

Toll Free Service Access Codes, *Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, CC Docket No. 95-155, 12 F.C.C. Rcd. 11162 (1997).

In light of the above enforcement policy, the Bureau in this letter directs DSMI to forward a copy of this letter, with the attachment, to all RespOrgs. With this letter, the Bureau directs all RespOrgs that have reported less than 100% subscriber results to submit a letter to the Commission's Common Carrier Bureau, Network Services Division, by December 11, 1998, explaining why the process required by the Bureau was not completed as directed. Such RespOrgs must also describe any action they have taken or are now taking to remedy this apparent non-compliance with their legal obligations. The names of RespOrgs that fail to provide satisfactory explanation in their letters or that fail to submit letters altogether will be referred to the Bureau's Enforcement Division for action in accord with the Commission's enforcement policy.

Sincerely,

Anna M. Gomez,

Chief, Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

[FR Doc. 98-32458 Filed 12-4-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**FEDERAL REGISTER CITATION OF PREVIOUS NOTICE:** 63 FR 65209, November 25, 1998.

**PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED TIME AND DATE OF THE MEETING:** 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, December 2, 1998.

**CHANGE IN THE MEETING:** The following topic was added to the open portion of the meeting:

- Federal Home Loan Bank Presidents' 1999 Base Salary Caps.

The Board determined that agency business required its consideration of this matter on less than seven days notice to the public and that no earlier notice of this change in the subject matter of the meeting was possible.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Elaine L. Baker, Secretary to the Board, (202) 408-2837.

**William W. Ginsberg,**  
Managing Director.

[FR Doc. 98-32523 Filed 12-3-98; 1:01 pm]

BILLING CODE 6725-01-P

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Request for Comments on a New Information Collection Activity in Support of the Access Certificates for Electronic Certificates (ACES) Program

**AGENCY:** Federal Technology Service, GSA.

**ACTION:** Notice of request for approval of a new information collection entitled Access Certificates for Electronic Services (ACES).

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Federal Technology Service (FTS) is publishing a summary of a proposed new information collection activity for public and agency comment. The proposed information collection activity is designed to support a new FTS program entitled Access Certificates for Electronic Services (ACES). The ACES Program is intended to facilitate and promote secure electronic communications between on-line automated information technology application systems authorized by law to participate in the ACES Program and users who elect to participate in the program, through the implementation and operation of digital signature certificate technologies. Individual digital signature certificates will be issued at no cost to individuals based upon their presentation of verifiable proof of identity to an authorized ACES Registration Authority. Business Representative digital signature certificates will be issued to individuals based upon their presentation of verifiable proof of identity and verifiable proof of authority from the claimed entity to an authorized ACES Registration Authority. If authorized by law, a fee may be charged for issuance of a Business Representative certificate.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before February 5, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Address all comments concerning this notice to Stanley Choffrey, General Services Administration, Federal Technology Service, Office of Information Security, Room 5060, 7th and D Streets, SW., Washington, DC 20407, or e-mail to stanley.choffrey@gsa.gov.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stanley Choffrey, General Services Administration, Federal Technology Service, Office of Information Security at (202) 708-7943, or by e-mail to stanley.choffrey@gsa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## A. Purpose

The purpose of this notice is to consult with and solicit comments from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information under the ACES Program in order to:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of GSA, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond.

Comments relating to any additional aspects and features of the ACES Program are also welcomed, and will be carefully considered.

## B. Annual Reporting Burden

*Respondents:* 1,000,000; *annual responses:* 1,000,000; *average hours per response:* .15; *burden hours:* 250,000.

## Copy of Proposal

A copy of this proposal may be obtained by contacting Stanley Choffrey at the above address.

Dated: November 30, 1998.

**Ida M. Ustad,**

Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy.

[FR Doc. 98-32381 Filed 12-4-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-61-M

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Administration for Children and Families

#### Request for Public Comment Concerning the Impact of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 on Adjudicated Juvenile Delinquents Whose Foster Care Placements are Funded Through Title IV-E of the Social Security Act

**AGENCY:** Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services.

**ACTION:** Notice of request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The Children's Bureau, in the Administration on Children, Youth and Families, administers the title IV-E