clay loam, and 14 hours with sandy loam soil.

4. *Non-dietary exposure*. In addition to agricultural uses, fosetyl-Al is registered on ornamentals and turf under the brand names CHIPCO Aliette WDG, and Aliette HG. CHIPCO Aliette WDG is sold to professional applicators only, which includes lawn care operators (LCO). All residential uses of CHIPCO Aliette WDG are applied by an LCO. Typically, LCOs use fungicides for ornamentals and turf on an as needed basis only in part because of high cost, variable performance, and little residual control. In 1994, LCOs made an estimated 206,200 acre treatments in total for all fungicides representing less than 1% of the available acreage of 32,740,000 assuming each acre was treated once (Kline & Company, Inc.). CHIPCO Aliette WDG is estimated to have been used on less than 3% of the acres treated with commercial landscapes (turf and ornamentals) constituting the majority of the use by LCOs. Therefore, fosetyl-Al is used by LCOs on less than 0.03% of the total available acres. Aliette HG is not currently being sold but plans are to introduce this product on the market in 1998 on a limited geographical scale. The product will be available to the home consumer in single dose packages for residential use on turf and ornamentals. Available market research information indicates that a total of 1.7 million pounds fungicide (active ingredient) are sold annually for use by the home owner. Since Aliette HG will just be entering the market, only very small quantities of the product are expected to be sold. The maximum amount expected to be sold for the next few years is approximately 1% of the total 1.7 million pounds of fungicide products available to the home owner for residential use on turf and ornamentals. This use of the product is therefore expected to have a negligible impact on the aggregate exposure for fosetyl-Al.

5. *Conclusion*. Considering that fosetyl-Al is applied by LCOs on about 0.03% of available lawn acres (the majority being commercial landscapes), the likelihood of post application exposure occurring, particularly in a residential situation, is extremely low. The use of fosetyl-Al by the homeowner constitutes a minor use of the product since only small quantities are expected to be sold in 1998. Other applications by professional operators, e.g. golf courses, nurseries, sod farms, present only very limited exposure to a limited population of adults but do not pose any exposure to small children. Thus, the ornamental and turf uses are not expected to add significantly to the aggregate exposure for fosetyl-Al, and only dietary exposure has been taken into consideration for risk assessment purposes.

D. Cumulative Effects

Effects associated with fosetyl-Al are unlikely to be cumulative with any other compound. The formation of calculi and bladder tumors in rats is the only significant toxicological effect observed with fosetyl-Al. These effects were observed in rat only at a dose which not only exceeds estimated human exposure by several orders of magnitude but is in excess of the OPP dose limit for carcinogenicity studies. Therefore, an aggregate assessment based on common mechanisms of toxicity is not appropriate as exposure to humans will be well below the levels producing calculi and bladder tumors in rats. Further, considering the rapid elimination of fosetyl-Al in the rat metabolism study, any effects associated with fosetyl-Al are unlikely to be cumulative with any other compound. Based on these reasons, only the potential risks of fosetyl-Al are considered in the exposure assessment.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population*. Based upon all available data, EPA has established an RfD of 3.0 mg/kg/day using a 100 fold safety factor to account for inter- and intra-species differences and a NOEL of 250 mg/kg bwt/day from a 2-year feeding study in dogs. A chronic dietary risk assessment using established and proposed tolerance residue levels, 1987 food consumption data, and 100% crop treated results in utilization of 2.2, 4.5, 3.9, and 2.3% of the RfD for the whole U.S. population, non-nursing infants less than 1-year old, children aged 1 to 6-years, and children aged 7 to 12-years, respectively. Thus, the dietary exposure for fosetyl-Al is well below the RfD of 3.0 mg/kg/day and is negligible for all segments of the population including infants and children.

2. *Infants and children—Adequate margin of safety*. In assessing the potential for additional sensitivity of infants and children to residues of fosetyl-Al, the available developmental and reproductive toxicity studies and the potential for endocrine modulation were considered. Developmental toxicity studies in two species indicate that fosetyl-Al has no teratogenic potential at any dose level. Further, no adverse effects on fetal development were observed in rabbits at doses up to 500 mg/kg/day or in rats at doses up to 1,000 mg/kg/day. In a 3-generation rat reproduction study, no adverse effects on reproductive performance or pup survival were observed up to 24,000 ppm (equivalent to a dose well above EPA's limit dose of 1,000 mg/kg/day). Maternal and developmental NOELs and LELs were comparable in all studies indicating no increase in susceptibility of developing organisms. Further, fosetyl-Al has no endocrine-modulation characteristics as demonstrated by the lack of endocrine effects in developmental, reproductive, subchronic, and chronic studies. Since registration of fosetyl-Al in 1983, EPA has assessed the safety of this molecule several times and has concluded repeatedly that the level of dietary exposure is sufficiently low to provide ample margins of safety to guard against any potential adverse effects of fosetyl-Al. Considering the conservative exposure assumptions in setting the tolerances and the dietary risk assessment assuming 100% crop treated, less than 5% of the RfD is utilized for non-nursing infants less than 1-year old, children aged 1 to 6-years, and children aged 7 to 12-years. The probability of non-occupational sources of exposure to fosetyl-Al is negligible. Therefore, based upon the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data and the conservative exposure assessment, there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from exposure to the residues of fosetyl-Al and no additional uncertainty factor is warranted.

F. International Tolerances

There are presently no Codex maximum residue levels established for residues of fosetyl-Al on any crop.

[FR Doc. 98–17808 Filed 7–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6121–3]

Proposed CERCLA Administrative De Minimis Contributor Settlement With Mesa Oil, Inc.—Rocky Flats Industrial Park Site in Jefferson County, Colorado

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice and request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirements of section 122(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9622(i), notice is hereby given of a proposed administrative *de minimis*

settlement under section 122(g) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 622(g) with Mesa Oil, Inc. (''MESA''), concerning the Rocky Flats Industrial Park site located in the 17000 block of Colorado Highway 72, approximately 2 miles east of the intersection of Colorado Highways 93 and 72, in Jefferson County, Colorado (the ''Site''). The settlement, embodied in a proposed Administrative Order on Consent (''AOC''), is designed to resolve Mesa's liability at the Site through a covenant not to sue under sections 106 and 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607, and section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (''RCRA''), 42 U.S.C. 6973, subject to certain reopening provisions. The proposed AOC requires Mesa to pay a total of $2,000.00 in cash together with the approximately $50,000.00 of in-kind work contributed by Mesa to site investigation and remediation efforts at the Site, to address its liability to the United States related to past and future response actions at the Site.

Opportunity for comment

For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will consider all comments received and may modify or withdraw its consent to the settlement if comments received disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. The Agency's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at the EPA Superfund Record Center, 999 18th Street, 5th Floor, in Denver, CO. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area in accordance with section 7003(d) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6973(d).

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before August 6, 1998.

ADDRESSES: The proposed settlement and additional background information relating to the settlement are available for public inspection at the EPA Superfund Records Center, 999 18th Street, 5th Floor, in Denver, CO. Comments and requests for a copy of the proposed settlement should be addressed to Carol Pokorny, Enforcement Specialist (8ENF-T), Technical Enforcement Program, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202–2466, and should reference the Rocky Flats Industrial Park Site, Jefferson County, CO and EPA Docket No. CERCLA–VIII–98–13.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carol Pokorny, Enforcement Specialist (8ENF–T), Technical Enforcement Program, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202–2466, (303) 312–6970.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice of proposed administrative *de minimis* contributor settlement under section 122(g) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622(g): In accordance with section 122(i) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622(i), notification is hereby given that the terms of the AOC have been agreed to by Mesa. By the terms of the proposed AOC, Mesa will pay $2,000.00 cash to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for its release of 75 gallons of used oil containing hazardous substances. In addition to its cash payment, Mesa has contributed in-kind services valued at approximately $50,000.00 to the characterization and remediation of the Site. The in-kind services represent work Mesa has conducted in anticipation of this settlement and were not otherwise required by law. The total dollar amount which Mesa will pay to the Agency represents approximately 0.01538% of the estimated total cost of remediation. EPA estimates that the total response costs incurred and to be incurred at or in connection with the Site by the United States and by private parties to be approximately $13,000,000.00.

In exchange for payment and Mesa's remediation and investigatory work at the Site, EPA will provide Mesa with a covenant not to sue under sections 106 and 107(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607(a), and under section 7003 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended (also known as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act), which will resolve Mesa's liability at the Site. The settlement also provides Mesa with contribution protection. Under the terms of the AOC, the United States reserves the right to institute judicial or administrative proceedings against Mesa seeking to compel Mesa to perform response actions relating to the Site, and/or to reimburse the United States for additional costs of response, if information not contained in EPA's administrative site file as of the effective date of the AOC is discovered which indicates that Mesa contributed hazardous substances to the Site in an amount greater than 6,690 gallons or hazardous substances which are significantly more toxic or are of significantly greater hazardous effect than other hazardous substances at the Site.

Dated: June 16, 1998.

Carol Rushin,

Assistant Regional Administrator, Office of Enforcement, Compliance and Environmental Justice, Region VIII.

[FR Doc. 98–17964 Filed 7–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Farm Credit Administration Board; Regular Meeting; Sunshine Act

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), that the July 9, 1998 regular meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board) will not be held. The Board will hold a special meeting at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 14, 1998. An agenda for this meeting will be published at a later date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Floyd Fithian, Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, (703) 883–4025, TDD (703) 883–4444.

ADDRESS: Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102–5090.

Dated: July 1, 1998.

Floyd Fithian,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 98–18048 Filed 7–2–98; 11:33 am]

BILLING CODE 6705–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket No. 92–237; DA 98–1317]

North American Numbering Council; Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On July 1, 1998, the Commission released a public notice announcing the July 22–23,1998, meeting and agenda of the North American Numbering Council (NANC). The intended effect of this action is to make the public aware of the NANC's next meeting and its Agenda.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Simms, at (202) 418–2330 or via the Internet at lsimms@fcc.gov. The address is: Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 2000 M Street, NW, Suite 235, Washington, DC 20554. The fax number is: (202) 418–7314. The TTY number is: (202) 418–0484.