Product name: Tetraconazole Technical. Fungicide. Active ingredient: Tetraconazole: [1-[2,(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-3-(1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethoxy)propyl]-1*H*-1,2,4 triazole] at 97.0%. Proposed classification/Use: None. Tetraconazole Technical is intended for the formulation into end-use products for use on sugar beets, peanuts, and turf. Type registration: Conditional.

7. File Symbol: 60063–RE. Applicant: Sipcam Agro USA, Inc. Product name: Eminent 125SL Fungicide. Fungicide. Active ingredient: Tetraconazole: [1-[2,(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-3-(1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethoxy)propyl]-1*H*-1,2,4 triazole] at 11.6%. Proposed classification/Use: None. Eminent 125SL is intended for the control of Cercospora leaf spot and powdery mildew disease of sugar beets; early and late leaf spot, rust, web blotch, and southern blight of peanuts and dollar spot, copper spot, rust, Southern blight, brown patch, red thread, anthracnose, powdery mildew, etc. diseases of turf. Type registration: Conditional.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pest.

Dated: September 29, 1999.

Peter Caulkins,

Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 99–27394 Filed 10–19–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF–895; FRL–6386–9]

Notice of Filing a Pesticide Petition to Establish a Tolerance for Certain Pesticide Chemicals in or on Food

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the initial filing of a pesticide petition proposing the establishment of regulations for residues of certain pesticide chemicals in or on various food commodities.

DATES: Comments, identified by docket control number PF–895, must be received on or before November 19, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted by mail, electronically, or in person. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit I.C. of the ''SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION'' section. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number PF–895 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Indira Gairola, Minor Use Inert's, & Emergency Response Branch, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 308–6379; and e-mail address: gairola.indira@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be 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:

Categories	NAICS	Examples of potentially affected entities
Industry	111	Crop production
	112	Animal production
	311	Food manufacturing
	32532	Pesticide manufacturing

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether or not this action might apply to certain entities. 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 PF–895. 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 Mall2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, 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 PF–895 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 Mall2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, 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 5.1/6.1 or ASCII file format. All comments in electronic form must be identified by docket control number PF–895. 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 identified in the ''FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT'' section.

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 used.
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. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline in this notice.
7. 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. What Action is the Agency Taking?

EPA has received a pesticide petition as follows proposing the establishment and/or amendment of regulations for residues of certain pesticide chemical in or on various food commodities under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Comestic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a. EPA has determined that this petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2); however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data supports granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Agricultural commodities, Feed additives, Food additives, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: October 7, 1999.

James Jones,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Summary of Petition

The petitioner summary of the pesticide petition is printed below as required by section 408(d)(3) of the FFDCA. The summary of the petition was prepared by the petitioner and represents the views of the petitioner. EPA is publishing the petition summary verbatim without editing it in any way. The petition summary announces the availability of a description of the analytical methods available to EPA for the detection and measurement of the pesticide chemical residues or an explanation of why no such method is needed.

Monsanto Company

PP 1E4031

EPA has received a pesticide petition (PP 1E4031) from Monsanto Company, 700 14th St., NW., (1100), Washington, DC 20005 proposing, pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), to amend 40 CFR part 180 by establishing a tolerance for residues of 3-dichloroacetyl-5-(2-furanyl)-2,2-dimethyloxazolidine (furilazole in or on the raw agricultural commodity (RAC) field corn grain, forage, and fodder at < 0.01 parts per million (ppm). EPA has determined that the petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2) of the FFDCA; however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data supports granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

A. Residue Chemistry

1. *Plant metabolism*. The metabolism in corn was studied with radiolabeled furalizole in the green house and the field. Parent furilazole was not found in any of the corn samples. Furilazole is rapidly and extensively metabolized to a large number of highly polar metabolites characterized as weak organic acids or residues conjugated to natural sugars. No parent furilazole was found in the plants at all.

2. *Analytical method*. Monsanto has developed an analytical method using gas liquid chromatography with electron capture detection that has a verified limit of quantitation (LOQ) of 0.01 ppm for parent MON 13,900 in corn grain, forage, and fodder. This method has been validated by the Agency.

3. *Magnitude of residues*. Monsanto has conducted five residue field studies with furilazole applied pre-emergence to corn at rates up to 0.75 pound per acre. Analysis of corn forage, silage, fodder, and grain showed no residues with an analytical method that is validated at the lower limit of 0.01 ppm. Three residue field studies with furilazole applied pre-emergence to corn at exaggerated rates up to 26 times the proposed maximum use rate showed no measurable residues (< 0.01 ppm) in corn grain. Based on these results, it was concluded that the potential for measurable concentration of furilazole in processed commodities of corn was very low and that processing studies were not required.

B. Toxicological Profile

1. *Acute toxicity*—i. An acute oral toxicity study in the rat with an LD_{50} of 869 mg/kg. Toxicity Category III.

ii. An acute dermal toxicity study in the rabbit with an LD_{50} of > 5,000 mg/kg. Toxicity Category IV.

iii. An acute inhalation study in the rat with a 4–hour inhalation LC_{50} of 2.3 milligrams per liter (mg/L), the highest attainable concentration. Toxicity Category III.

iv. A rabbit eye irritation study in which furilazole is determined to be a mild eye irritant. Toxicity Category III.

v. A rabbit primary dermal irritation study indicating that furilazole is a negligible dermal irritant. Toxicity Category IV.

vi. A dermal sensitization study in guinea pigs indicating that furilazole does not produce delayed contact hypersensitivity.

2. *Genotoxicty*. Mutagenicity studies including *in vivo/in vitro* unscheduled DNA synthesis (UDS) in rat hepatocytes, gene mutation in cultured Chinese hamster ovary cells (CHO/HGPRT), and

in vivo micronucleus assay were negative. A *Salmonella typhimurium/mammalian* microsome mutagenicity assay, with and without metabolic activation, indicated that furilazole induced a reproducible mutagenic response, but only at a high and precipitating dose.

3. *Reproductive and developmental toxicity*—i. A rat developmental effects study with a no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL) for maternal toxicity of 10 milligrams/kilograms/day (mg/kg/day) and developmental toxicity of 10 mg/kg/day.

ii. A 2-generation reproduction study in rats fed diets containing 0, 15, 150, and 1,500 ppm furilazole. The NOAEL for systemic toxicity was 150 ppm (9 to 11 mg/kg/day) for both parents and offspring. There were no treatment-related effects on reproductive performance or offspring survival at any dose level; therefore, the NOAEL for reproductive toxicity was 1,500 ppm or 101 mg/kg/day.

4. *Subchronic toxicity*—i. A 90–day oral toxicity study in the rat with a NOAEL of 100 ppm, or 7 mg/kg/day.

ii. A 90–day oral toxicity study in the dog with a NOAEL of 15 mg/kg/day.

iii. A 21–day repeated dose dermal toxicity study in rats with a NOAEL > 1,000 mg/kg/day.

5. *Chronic toxicity*. A 24–month chronic feeding and oncogenicity study in the rat at doses of 0, 5, 100, 1,000, and 2,000 (females)/2,500 (males) ppm. The liver, stomach, and testes were the main target organs. Oncogenic effects were seen in the stomach and liver of females and in the stomach, liver, and testes of males. The NOAEL for oncogenic effects was 100 ppm (5.05 mg/kg/day for males and 6.03 mg/kg/day for females). The NOAEL for chronic toxicity was 5 ppm (0.26 mg/kg/day for males) and 100 ppm (6.03 mg/kg/day for females). An 18–month oncogenicity study in mice fed doses of 0, 5, 40, 400, 1,250, and 2,500 (males)/3,500 (females) ppm. The liver and the lung were the target organs. Oncogenic effects were observed in livers and lungs of both sexes. The NOAEL for chronic toxicity and for oncogenic effects was 40 ppm (5.93 mg/kg/day in males) and 400 ppm (92.0 mg/kg/day in females).

6. *Animal metabolism*. Because field trial residue data showed non-detectable residues of furilazole in corn, neither animal metabolism nor residue transfer studies with livestock were required. It is considered likely that metabolism will be similar to that of other dichloroacetamide safeners in mammals which are characterized by extensive metabolism and elimination of most of the residue from the body with very low levels of parent safener, if any, retained in the tissues. The major route of metabolism is typically glutathione conjugation followed by formation of an aldehyde intermediate which is then either oxidized to an oxamic acid or reduced to the corresponding alcohol.

7. *Metabolite toxicology*. The metabolism of furilazole is extensive and results in a large number of polar metabolites each of which is present in soil or corn plants in very low concentrations. These metabolites have not been identified as being of toxic concern.

Based on the available toxicity data, Monsanto believes the reference dose (RfD) for furilazole should be based on the NOAEL observed in the chronic rat study, 0.26 mg/kg/day for males or 6 mg/kg/day for females. Using an uncertainty factor of 100, the RfD would be 0.0026 mg/kg/day. For cancer risk assessment for furilazole, Monsanto believes that margin of exposure (MOE) assessment should be calculated using the oncogenic NOAEL of 5 mg/kg/day observed in the rat, which was the most sensitive species.

C. Aggregate Exposure

1. *Food*. Monsanto has used the Theoretical Maximum Residue Contribution (TMRC) as a conservative estimate of the potential dietary exposure for furilazole. This approach assumes that 100% of all RAC for which tolerances have been established for acetochlor, bear tolerance-level (0.01 ppm) residues of furilazole. This over-estimate of actual dietary exposure provides a quite conservative basis for risk assessment.

i. *Drinking water*. Furilazole is photolyzed rapidy with half-lives of 8 hours in water in the presence of humic acid, and 8 to 9 days in soil. The aerobic soil half-life is approximately 5 to 8 weeks. Furilazole is stable to hydrolysis, but its metabolites that have modifications to the dichloroacetyl group are susceptible to hydrolyis as a further step in degradation. In terrestrial field dissipation studies conducted with application rates of 0.75 to 0.8 pounds per acre in eight sites with a range of soil types, furilazole dissipated readily with an average DT_{50} of about 13 days. This low persistence in the environment combined with the low application rate (maximum of 0.4 pound per acre) indicates that furilazole is not likely to be present in ground water. Based on these considerations, Monsanto does not anticipate exposure to residues of furilazole in drinking water. EPA has not established a Maximum Concentration Level (MCL) or a health advisory level for residues of furilazole in drinking water.

2. *Non-dietary exposure*. Furilazole is used only as a safener or antidote to the effects of acetochlor herbicide on corn seed or seedlings. It is sold only as part of acetochlor herbicide end-use products which are classified as Restricted Use by EPA which means they are used only by certified applicators and are not available to the general public. Herbicide products containing furilazole are not registered for residential, home owner, or other non-crop uses. They are thus not used in parks, school grounds, public buildings, roadsides or rights-of-way or other public areas. Commercial cornfields are generally located well away from public areas where incidental contact could occur. Therefore, the general public is very unlikely to have any non-dietary exposure to furilazole.

D. Cumulative Effects

Monsanto has no reliable data or information to suggest that furilazole has toxic effects that arise from toxic mechanisms that are common to other substances. Therefore, a consideration of common toxic mechanism and cumulative effects with other substances is not appropriate for furilazole, and Monsanto is considering only the potential effects of furilazole in this aggregate exposure assessment.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population*—i. *Chronic risk*. The conservative estimate of aggregate chronic exposure is 3.0×10^{-6} mg/kg/day. This potential exposure represents only 0.12% of the RfD of 0.0026 mg/kg/day and provides a MOE of 1,666,667 when compared to the 5 mg/kg/day carcinogenic reference point. EPA generally has no concern for exposures below 100% of the RfD and there are adequate margins of safety for cancer. Monsanto concludes there is a reasonable certainty of no harm resulting from exposure to furilazole.

2. *Infants and children*. Employing the same conservative TMRC estimates of exposure used in the risk assessment for the general population, Monsanto has calculated that the aggregate exposures for nursing infants, non-nursing infants, children age 1-6 and children age 7-12 are less than 0.4% of the RfD for each group. EPA generally has no concern for exposures below 100% of the RfD.

Monsanto notes the developmental toxicity NOAEL for rats (10 mg/kg/day) is 38.5-fold higher than the NOAEL of 0.26 mg/kg/day in the chronic rat study on which the RfD is based. This

indicates that the RfD is adequate for assessing risk to children. Also, the developmental toxicity NOAEL of 10 mg/kg/day is the same as the NOAEL for maternal toxicity, indicating that offspring are not more sensitive than parents.

In the 2-generation rat reproduction study, the NOAEL for reproductive toxicity and offspring survival was 101 mg/kg/day. This is 388-fold higher than the NOAEL for chronic toxicity upon which the RfD is based. The NOAEL for pup toxicity was no higher than the NOAEL for parental toxicity, indicating there is no unique sensitivity for offspring to furilazole.

Monsanto believes that these data do not indicate an increased prenatal or postnatal sensitivity of children and infants to furilazole exposure and concludes that the 100-fold uncertainty factor used in the RfD is adequate to protect infants and children.

F. International Tolerances

The Codex Alimentarius Commission has not established a maximum residue level for furilazole.

[FR Doc. 99–27395 Filed 10–19–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6461–2]

Notice of Availability of Letter From EPA to the State of Minnesota Pursuant to Section 118 of the Clean Water Act and the Water Quality Guidance for the Great Lakes System

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that Region 5 of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposes to find that the State of Minnesota (Minnesota) has fulfilled its obligation under section 118(c) of the Clean Water Act and 40 CFR part 132 by adopting provisions in its water quality standards and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits program that EPA believes are consistent with section 118(c) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and 40 CFR part 132. The basis for EPA's belief and its proposed course of action are described in a September 28, 1999 letter from Region 5 to the State. EPA invites public comment on all aspects of that letter and on EPA's proposed course of action.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing by December 6, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be submitted to Joan M. Karnauskas, Chief, Standards and Applied Sciences Branch (WT–15J), Water Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard., Chicago, Illinois, 60604. In the alternative, EPA will accept comments electronically. Comments should be sent to the following Internet E-mail address: karnauskas.joan@epamail.epa.gov. Electronic comments must be submitted in an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. EPA will print electronic comments in hard-copy paper form for the official administrative record. EPA will attempt to clarify electronic comments if there is an apparent error in transmission. Comments provided electronically will be considered timely if they are submitted electronically by 11:59 p.m. (Eastern time) December 6, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joan M. Karnauskas, Standards and Applied Sciences Branch (WT–15J), Water Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, or telephone her at (312) 886–6090.

Copies of the September 28, 1999 letter described above are available upon request by contacting Ms. Karnauskas. The September 28, 1999 letter and materials submitted by Minnesota in support of its submission that EPA relied upon in preparing the letter (*i.e.*, the docket) are available for review by appointment at: EPA, Region 5, 77 W Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois (telephone 312–886–3717); and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 520 Lafayette Road N., St. Paul, Minnesota (telephone 651–296–3000). To access the docket material in Chicago, call Ms. Mary Willis at (312) 886–3717 between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (central time) (Monday–Friday); in Minnesota, call Mr. Gary Kimball at (651) 297–8221 between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (central time).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 23, 1995, EPA published the Final Water Quality Guidance for the Great Lakes System (Guidance) pursuant to section 118(c)(2) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1268(c)(2). (March 23, 1995, 60 FR 15366). The Guidance, which was codified at 40 CFR part 132, requires the Great Lakes States to adopt and submit to EPA for approval water quality criteria, methodologies, policies and procedures that are consistent with the Guidance. 40 CFR 132.4 and 132.5. EPA is required to approve of the State's submission within 90 days or notify the State that EPA has determined that all or part of the submission is inconsistent with the Clean Water Act or the Guidance and identify any necessary changes to obtain EPA approval. If the State fails to make the necessary changes within 90 days, EPA must publish a notice in the **Federal Register** identifying the approved and disapproved elements of the submission and a final rule identifying the provisions of Part 132 that shall apply for discharges within the State.

EPA reviewed the submission from Minnesota for consistency with the Guidance in accordance with 40 CFR part 131 and 132.5. Based on its review to date, EPA believes that Minnesota has adopted provisions that are consistent with the Guidance. The basis for EPA's belief is set forth in the September 28, 1999 letter. Today, EPA is soliciting public comment regarding all aspects of that letter and on EPA's belief that Minnesota has adopted provisions that are consistent with the Guidance.

EPA intends to review any information provided to it within the next 45 days before taking further action pursuant to section 118(c) of the Clean Water Act and 40 CFR part 132 on Minnesota's submission.

Elissa Speizman,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 99–27385 Filed 10–19–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

October 14, 1999.

Open Commission Meeting, Thursday, October 21, 1999

The Federal Communications Commission will hold an Open Meeting on the subjects listed below on Thursday, October 21, 1999, which is scheduled to commence at 9:30 a.m. in Room TW–C305, at 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C.

Item No.	Bureau	Subject
1	Common Carrier	TITLE: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service (CC Docket No. 96–45).