ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF–852; FRL–6053–5]

Notice of Filing of a Pesticide Petition

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 the docket control number PF–852, must be received on or before February 19, 1999.

ADDRESSES: By mail submit written comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (7502C), Information Resources and Services Division, Office of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person bring comments to: Rm. 119, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Follow the instructions under ''SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.'' No confidential business information should be submitted through e-mail.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this document may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). CBI should not be submitted through e-mail. Information marked as CBI will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 119 at the address given above, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: James Tompkins, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location, telephone number, and e-mail address: Rm. 239, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202, (703)–305–5697; e-mail: tompkins.jim@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has received a pesticide petition as follows proposing the establishment and/or amendment of regulations for residues of certain pesticide chemicals 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 the 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.

The official record for this notice of filing, as well as the public version, has been established for this notice of filing under docket control number [PF–852] (including comments and data submitted electronically as described below). A public version of this record, including printed, paper versions of electronic comments, which does not include any information claimed as CBI, is available for inspection from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The official record is located at the address in ''ADDRESSES'' at the beginning of this document.

Electronic comments can be sent directly to EPA at:

opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov

Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comment and data will also be accepted on disks in Wordperfect 5.1/6.1 or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number [PF–852] and appropriate petition number. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

List of Subjects

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

Dated: December 23, 1998.

James Jones,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Summary of Petition

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 view 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.

Zeneca Ag. Products

PP 5F4554

EPA has received a pesticide petition (PP 5F4554) from Zeneca Ag. Products, 1800 Concord Pike, P. O. Box 15458, Wilmington, DE 19850-5458, proposing pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), to amend 40 CFR part 180 by establishing a tolerance for residues of sulfosate (the trimethylsulfonium salt of glyphosate, also known as glyphosate-trimesium in or on the raw agricultural commodity (RAC) wheat bran at 2.5 parts per million (ppm) (of which no more than 0.75 ppm is trimethylsulfonium (TMS)), wheat grain at 0.75 ppm (of which no more than 0.25 ppm is TMS), wheat forage at 35 ppm (of which no more than 30 ppm is TMS), wheat hay at 85 ppm (of which no more than 80 ppm is TMS), wheat shorts at 1.5 ppm (of which no more than 0.5 ppm is TMS), wheat straw at 1.0 ppm (of which no more than 0.5 ppm is TMS), the pome fruit group at 0.05 ppm; in cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse liver at 0.5 ppm, in cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse meat by-products, except liver at 2.5 ppm; to increase the tolerance in cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse meat from 0.2 to 0.4 ppm and in milk from 0.2 to 0.5 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 of sulfosate has been studied in corn, grapes, and soybeans. EPA has concluded that the nature of the residue is adequately understood and that the residues of concern are the parentions only *N*-(phosphonomethyl)-glycine anion (PMG) and trimethylsulfonium cation (TMS).

2. *Analytical method*. Gas chromatography/mass selective detector methods have been developed for PMG analysis in crops, animal tissues, milk, and eggs. Gas chromatography detection

methods have been developed for TMS in crops, animal tissues, milk, and eggs.

3. *Magnitude of residues in crops*— i. *Wheat.* A total of 15 field residue trials were conducted in 14 different states accounting for 77% of the total U.S. wheat acreage. These trials were located in Regions 2 (1 trial), 4 (1 trial), 5 (6 trials), 8 (3 trials), 10 (1 trial) and 11 (3 trials). Applications in the trials were consistent with the requested label directions for use. Analysis of the treated samples showed that the maximum PMG residue was 1.47 ppm in forage, 0.34 ppm in grain, and 0.38 ppm in straw. The maximum TMS residue was 25.1 ppm in forage, 0.21 ppm in grain and 0.4 ppm in straw. Residue data are not available for wheat hay, but can be estimated using the forage residue data and a dry-down factor of 3.

Wheat grain for processing was obtained and samples were processed into bran, middlings, shorts, flour and aspirated grain fractions. Analysis of the treated samples showed that residue of both TMS and PMG concentrated in bran and shorts. The appropriate concentration factors for bran are 3.1x (PMG), and 2.1x (TMS); and for shorts are 2.0x (PMG), and 1.8x (TMS). The residues in the wheat aspirated grain fraction are less than the tolerance already established for aspirated grain fractions, so no tolerance action is required.

ii. *Pome fruit group.* A total of 15 field residue trials (nine apple and six pear) were conducted in seven different States, accounting for 78 and 99% of the total U.S. apple, and pear production, respectively. Harvested fruit had residues of PMG and TMS that were <0.05 ppm in all samples. The residue data support the proposed tolerance of 0.05 ppm for pome fruit.

Apples were processed from a trial treated at an exagerrated rate. The samples were processed into wet pomace, dry pomace and juice. Analysis of the treated samples showed that residues of both TMS and PMG were <0.05 ppm in the RAC and all processed fractions. No tolerance action for apple processed products is required.

4. *Magnitude of residue in animals*— i. *Ruminants.* The maximum dietary burden in dairy cows results from a diet comprised of 20% aspirated grain fractions, 60% wheat forage, and 20% soybean seed/meal for a total dietary burden of 134 ppm. The maximum dietary burden in beef cows results from a diet comprised of 20% aspirated grain fractions, 25% wheat forage, 25% wheat hay, 10% wheat straw, and 20% soybean seed/meal for a total dietary burden of 122 ppm. Comparison to a ruminant feeding study at a dosing level of 300 ppm indicates that the appropriate tolerance levels would be 0.5 ppm in cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse liver; 2.5ppm in cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse meat by-products, except liver; 0.4 ppm in cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse meat; 0.5 ppm in milk; and 0.1 ppm in cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse fat. All of these tolerances exceed existing tolerances in 40 CFR 180.489, except fat.

ii. *Poultry.* The maximum poultry dietary burden results from a diet comprised of 80% wheat grain and 20% wheat milled by-products for a total dietary burden of 1.5 ppm. Comparison to a poultry feeding study at a dosing level of 5 ppm indicates that the appropriate tolerance levels would be below the established tolerances for poultry meat, meat by-products, fat, and eggs.

B. Toxicological Profile

1. *Acute toxicity.* Several acute toxicology studies have been conducted placing technical grade sulfosate in Toxicity Category III and IV.

2. *Genotoxicity.* Mutagenicity data includes two Ames tests with *Salmonella typhimurium*; a sex linked recessive lethal test with Drosophila melanoga; a forward mutation (mouse lymphoma) test; an *in vivo* bone marrow cytogenetics test in rats; a micronucleus assay in mice; an *in vitro* chromosomal aberration test in Chinese hamster ovary cells (CHO) (no aberrations were observed either with or without *S9* activation and there were no increases in sister chromatid exchanges); and a morphological transformation test in mice (all negative). A chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study was conducted in male and female rats fed dose levels of 0, 100, 500 and 1,000 ppm (0, 4.20, 21.2 or 41.8 milligram/kilogram/day (mg/kg/day) in males and 0, 5.4, 27.0 or 55.7 mg/kg/day in females). No carcinogenic effects were observed under the conditions of the study. The systemic no-observed adverse effect level (NOAEL) of 1,000 ppm (41.1/55.7 mg/kg/day for males and females, respectively) was based on decreased body weight gains (considered secondary to reduced food consumption) and increased incidences of chronic laryngeal and nasopharyngeal inflammation (males). A chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study was conducted in male and female mice fed dosage levels of 0, 100, 1,000, and 8,000 ppm (0, 11.7, 118 or 991 mg/kg/day in males and 0, 16, 159 or 1,341 mg/kg/day in females). No carcinogenic effects were observed under the conditions of the study at dose levels up to and including the 8,000 ppm highest dose tested (HDT) may have been excessive). The systemic NOAEL was 1,000 ppm based on decreases in body weight and feed consumption (both sexes) and increased incidences of duodenal epithelial hyperplasia (females only). Sulfosate is classified as a Group E carcinogen based on no evidence of carcinogenicity in rat, and mouse studies.

3. *Reproductive and developmental toxicity.* A developmental toxicity study in rats was conducted at doses of 0, 30, 100 and 333 mg/kg/day. The maternal (systemic) NOAEL was 100 mg/kg/day, based on decreased body weight gain and food consumption, and clinical signs (salivation, chromorhinorrhea, and lethargy) seen at 333 mg/kg/day. The reproductive NOAEL was 100 mg/kg/day, based on decreased mean pup weight. The decreased pup weight is a direct result of the maternal toxicity. A developmental toxicity study was conducted in rabbits at doses of 0, 10, 40 and 100 mg/kg/day with developmental and maternal toxicity NOAELs of 40 mg/kg/day based on the following: (i) Maternal effects: 6 of 17 dams died (2 of the 4 non-gravid dams); 4 of 11 dams aborted; clinical signs - higher incidence and earlier onset of diarrhea, anorexia, decreased body weight gain and food consumption; and (ii) Fetal effects: decreased litter sizes due to increased post-implantation loss, seen at 100 mg/kg/day HDT. The fetal effects were clearly a result of significant maternal toxicity. A 2-generation reproduction study in rats fed dosage rates of 0, 150, 800 and 2,000 ppm (equivalent to calculated doses of 0, 7.5, 40, and 100 mg/kg/day for males and females, based on a factor of 20). The maternal (systemic) NOAEL was 150 ppm (7.5 mg/kg/day), based on decreases in body weight and body weight gains accompanied by decreased food consumption, and reduced absolute and sometimes relative organ (thymus, heart, kidney & liver) weights seen at 800 and 2,000 ppm (40 and 100 mg/kg/day). The reproductive NOAEL was 150 ppm (7.5 mg/kg/day), based on decreased mean pup weights during lactation (after day 7) in the second litters at 800 ppm (40 mg/kg/day) and in all litters at 2,000 ppm (100 mg/kg/day), and decreased litter size in the F0a and F1b litters at 2,000 ppm (100 mg/kg/day). The statistically significant decreases in pup weights at the 800 ppm level were borderline biologically significant because at no time were either the body weights or body weight gains less than 90% of the control values and because the effect was not

apparent in all litters. Both the slight reductions in litter size at 2,000 ppm and the reductions in pup weights at 800 and 2,000 ppm appear to be secondary to the health of the dams. There was no evidence of altered intrauterine development, increased stillborns, or pup anomalies. The effects are a result of feed palatability leading to reduced food consumption and decreases in body weight gains in the dams.

4. *Subchronic toxicity*. Two subchronic 90 day feeding studies with dogs and a 1-year feeding study in dogs have been conducted. In the 1-year study dogs were fed 0, 2, 10 or 50 mg/kg/day. The NOAEL was determined to be 10 mg/kg/day based on decreases in lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) at 50 mg/kg/day. In the first 90 day study, dogs were fed dosage levels of 0, 2, 10 and 50 mg/kg/day. The NOAEL in this study was 10 mg/kg/day based on transient salivation, and increased frequency and earlier onset of emesis in both sexes at 50 mg/kg/day. A second 90 day feeding study with dogs dosed at 0, 10, 25 and 50 mg/kg/day was conducted to refine the threshold of effects. There was evidence of toxicity at the top dose of 50 mg/kg/day with a NOAEL of 25 mg/kg/day. Adverse effects from oral exposure to sulfosate occur at or above 50 mg/kg/day. These effects consist primarily of transient salivation, which is regarded as a pharmacological rather than toxicological effect, emesis and non-biologically significant hematological changes. Exposures at or below 25 mg/kg/day have not resulted in significant biological adverse effects. In addition, a comparison of data from the 90 day and 1-year studies indicates that there is no evidence for increased toxicity with time. The overall NOAEL in the dog is 25 mg/kg/day.

5. *Chronic toxicity*. A chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study was conducted in male and female rats fed dose levels of 0, 100, 500 and 1,000 ppm (0, 4.20, 21.2 or 41.8 mg/kg/day in males, and 0, 5.4, 27.0 or 55.7 mg/kg day in females). No carcinogenic effects were observed under the conditions of the study. The systemic NOAEL of 1,000 ppm (41.1/55.7 mg/kg/day for males, and females, respectively) was based on decreased body weight gains (considered secondary to reduced food consumption) and increased incidences of chronic laryngeal and nasopharyngeal inflammation (males). A chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study was conducted in male and female mice fed dosage levels of 0, 100, 1,000 and 8,000 ppm (0, 11.7, 118 or 991 mg/kg/day in males and 0, 16,159 or 1,341 mg/kg/day in females). No carcinogenic effects were observed under the conditions of the study at dose levels up to and including the 8,000 ppm (HDT may have been excessive). The systemic NOAEL was 1,000 ppm based on decreases in body weight and feed consumption (both sexes) and increased incidences of duodenal epithelial hyperplasia (females only). Sulfosate is classified as a Group E carcinogen based on no evidence of carcinogenicity in rat and mouse studies.

6. *Animal metabolism*. The metabolism of sulfosate has been studied in animals. The residues of concern for sulfosate in meat, milk, and eggs are the parent ions PMG and TMS only.

7. *Metabolite toxicology*. There are no metabolites of toxicological concern. Only the parent ions, PMG and TMS are of toxicological concern.

8. *Endocrine disruption*. Current data suggest that sulfosate is not an endocrine disruptor.

C. Aggregate Exposure

1. *Dietary exposure*— i.*Food*. For the purposes of assessing the potential dietary exposure, Zeneca has utilized the tolerance level for all existing and pending tolerances; and the proposed maximum permissible levels of 0.75 ppm for wheat grain; 2.5 ppm for wheat bran; 1.5 ppm for wheat shorts; 0.05 ppm for the pome fruit group; 0.5 ppm for cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse liver; 2.5 ppm for cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse meat by-products, except liver; 0.4 ppm for cattle, goat, hog, sheep, and horse meat; 0.5 ppm in milk, and 100% crop treated acreage for all commodities. Assuming that 100% of foods, meat, eggs, and milk products will contain sulfosate residues and those residues will be at the level of the tolerance results in an over estimate of human exposure. This is a very conservative approach to exposure assessment.

ii. *Chronic exposure*. For all existing tolerances and pending tolerances; and the proposed maximum permissible levels proposed in this notice of filing, the potential exposure for the U.S. population is 0.018 milligram/kilogram body weight/day (mg/kg/bwt/day) (7.4% of reference dose (RfD)). Potential exposure for children's population subgroups range from 0.015 mg/kg bwt/day (6.1% of RfD) for nursing infants (<1 year old) to 0.076 mg/kg bwt/day (30.5%) for non-nursing infants. The chronic dietary risk due to food does not exceed the level of concern (100%).

iii. *Acute exposure*. The exposure to the most sensitive population subgroup, in this instance non-nursing infants, was 23.2% of the acute RfD. The acute dietary risk due to food does not exceed the level of concern (100%).

2. *Drinking water*. Results from computer modeling indicate that sulfosate in groundwater will not contribute significant residues in drinking water as a result of sulfosate use at the recommended maximum annual application rate (4.00 lbs. a.i. acre $^{-1}$). The computer model uses conservative numbers, therefore it is unlikely that groundwater concentrations would exceed the estimated concentration of 0.00224 parts per billion (ppb), and sulfosate should not pose a threat to ground water.

The surface water estimates are based on an exposure modeling procedure called GENEEC (Generic Expected Environmental Concentration). The assumptions of 1 application of 4.00 lbs. a.i. acre $^{-1}$ resulted in calculated estimated maximum concentrations of 64 ppb (acute, based on the highest 56 day value) and 43 ppb (chronic, average). GENEEC modeling procedures assumed that sulfosate was applied to a 10-hectare field that drained into a 1-hectare pond, 2-meters deep with no outlet.

As a conservative assumption, because sulfosate residues in ground water are expected to be insignificant compared to surface water, it has been assumed that 100% of drinking water consumed was derived from surface water in all drinking water exposure and risk calculations.

To calculate the maximum acceptable acute and chronic exposures to sulfosate in drinking water, the dietary food exposure (acute or chronic) was subtracted from the appropriate (acute or chronic) RfD. DWLOCs were then calculated using the maximum acceptable acute or chronic exposure, default body weights (70 kg - adult, 10 kg - child), and drinking water consumption figures (2 liters - adult, 1 liter - child).

The maximum concentration of sulfosate in surface water is 64 ppb. The acute DWLOCs for sulfosate in surface water were all greater than 7700 ppb. The estimated average concentration of sulfosate in surface water is 43 ppb which is much less than the calculated levels of concern (>1,700) in drinking water as a contribution to chronic aggregate exposure. Therefore, for current and proposed uses of sulfosate, Zeneca concludes with reasonable certainty that residues of sulfosate in drinking water would not result in unacceptable levels of aggregate human health risk.

3. *Non-dietary exposure*. Sulfosate is currently not registered for use on any residential non-food sites. Therefore,

residential exposure to sulfosate residues will be through dietary exposure only.

D. Cumulative Effects

There is no information to indicate that toxic effects produced by sulfosate are cumulative with those of any other chemical compound.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population*— i. *Acute risk*. Since there are no residential uses for sulfosate, the acute aggregate exposure only includes food and water. Using the conservative assumptions of 100% of all crops treated and assuming all residues are at the tolerance level for all established and proposed tolerances, the aggregate exposure to sulfosate will utilize 17.3% of the acute RfD for the US population. The estimated peak concentrations of sulfosate in surface and ground water are less than DWLOCs for sulfosate in drinking water as a contribution to acute aggregate exposure. Residues of sulfosate in drinking water do not contribute significantly to the aggregate acute human health risk considering the present uses and uses proposed in this action.

ii. *Chronic risk*. Using the conservative exposure assumptions described above, the aggregate exposure to sulfosate from food will utilize 7.4% of the chronic RfD for the US population. The estimated average concentrations of sulfosate in surface and ground water are less than DWLOCs for sulfosate in drinking water as a contribution to chronic aggregate exposure. Residues of sulfosate in drinking water do not contribute significantly to the aggregate chronic human health risk considering the present uses and uses proposed in this action.

2. *Infants and children*. The database on sulfosate relative to pre- and post-natal toxicity is complete. Because the developmental and reproductive effects occurred in the presence of parental (systemic) toxicity, these data do not suggest an increased pre- or post-natal sensitivity of children and infants to sulfosate exposure. Therefore, Zeneca concludes, upon the basis of reliable data, that a 100-fold uncertainty factor is adequate to protect the safety of infants and children and an additional safety factor is unwarranted.

i. *Acute risk*. Using the conservative exposure assumptions described above, the aggregate exposure to sulfosate from food will utilize 23.2% of the acute RfD for the most highly exposed group, non-nursing infants. The estimated peak concentrations of sulfosate in surface and ground water are less than DWLOCs for sulfosate in drinking water as a contribution to acute aggregate exposure. Residues of sulfosate in drinking water do not contribute significantly to the aggregate acute human health risk considering the present uses and uses proposed in this action.

ii. *Chronic risk*. Using the conservative exposure assumptions described above, we conclude that the percent of the RfD that will be utilized by aggregate exposure to residues of sulfosate is 30.5% for non-nursing infants, the most highly exposed group. The estimated average concentrations of sulfosate in surface and ground water are less than DWLOCs for sulfosate in drinking water as a contribution to chronic aggregate exposure. Residues of sulfosate in drinking water do not contribute significantly to the aggregate chronic human health risk considering the present uses and uses proposed in this action.

F. International Tolerances

There are no Codex Maximum Residue Levels established for sulfosate.

[FR Doc. 99–1120 Filed 1–19–99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6219–7]

Proposed Amendment to CERCLA Administrative De Micromis Settlement; Waste, Inc.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 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 amendment to an administrative de micormis settlement concerning the Waste, Inc. Superfund site in Michigan City, Indiana, which will add National Tea Company as a settling party. The amended settlement is designed to resolve fully National Tea Company'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, 42 U.S.C. 6973. For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the amended settlement. The Agency will consider all comments received and may modify or withdraw its consent to the amended settlement if comments received disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the amended settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. The Agency's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at

Michigan City Public Library, 100 E. 4th Street, Michigan City, Indiana

and

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 Records Center, 77 West Jackson Boulevard (7–HJ), Chicago, IL 60604, TEL: (312) 886–0900, Mon-Fri: 7:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m.

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 February 19, 1999.

ADDRESSES: The proposed settlement and additional background information relating to the settlement are available for public inspection at:

Michigan City Public Library, 100 E. 4th Street, Michigan City, Indiana

La Porte County Health Department, 104 Brinckmann Avenue, Michigan City, Indiana

Bethany Baptist Church, 215 Miller Street, Michigan City, Indiana

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 Records Center, 77 West Jackson Boulevard (7–HJ), Chicago, IL 60604, TEL: (312) 886–0900, Mon-Fri: 7:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m.

A copy of the proposed settlement may be obtained from John Tielsch, Assistant Regional Counsel, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604, Mail Code C–14J, 312/353–7447.

Comments should reference the Waste, Inc. site, Michigan City, Indiana, and EPA Docket No. V–W–98–C–438 and should be addressed to: Sonja Brooks, Regional Hearing Clerk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code R–19J, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John H. Tielsch, Assistant Regional Counsel, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604, Mail Code C–14J, 312/353–7447.

Wendy L. Carney,

Acting Director, Superfund Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 99–1126 Filed 1–19–99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–M