will be made available to interested parties.

Codex MRLs exist for the following tolerances proposed for revocation in this document, i.e. apricot at 2.0 ppm, cereal grains at 0.2 ppm, kiwifruit at 4.0 ppm, and soy bean at 0.2 ppm. Notwithstanding the existence of these MRLs, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerances because retention would increase the chances of misuse and may result in unnecessary restriction on trade of pesticides and foods as well as inhibiting the retention and approval of tolerances, as discussed in greater detail in Unit II.B., of this document.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: December 16, 1999.

Jack E. Housenger,

Acting Director, Special Review and Reregistration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR part 180 be amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 180 would continue to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

2. By revising § 180.154 to read as follows:

§ 180.154 O-Dimethyl S-[(4-oxo-1,2,3-benzotriazin-3(4H)-yl)methyl]phosphorodithioate; tolerances for residues.

(a) Tolerances are established for residues of the insecticide *O,O*-dimethyl *S*-[(4-oxo-1,2,3-benzotriazin-3(4*H*)-yl) methyl]phosphorodithioate in or on the following food commodities:

Commodity	Parts per million	Expiration/ Revocation Date
Alfalfa	2.0	
Alfalfa, hay	5.0	
Almond	0.2	
Almond, hulls	5.0	
Apple	1.5	
Bean, snap	2.0	
Birdfoot trefoil	2.0	
Birdfoot trefoil hay	5.0	
Blackberry	2.0	
Blueberry	5.0	
Boysenberry	2.0	
Broccoli	2.0	
Brussels sprout	2.0	
Cabbage	2.0	
Cauliflower	2.0	
Celery	2.0	
Cherry	2.0	
Fruit, citrus, group	2.0	
Clover	2.0	
Clover, hay	5.0	
Cottonseed	0.5	
Crabapple	2.0	
Cranberry	0.5	
Cucumber	2.0	
Eggplant	0.3	
Filbert	0.3	
Grape	4.0	
Loganberry	2.0	
Melon	2.0	
Onion	2.0	
Parsley, leaf	5.0	
Parsley, root	2.0	
Peach	2.0	
Pear	1.5	
Pecan	0.3	
Pepper	0.3	
Pistachio	0.3	
Plum, prune	2.0	
Potato	0.2	
Quince	1.5	
Raspberry	2.0	
Spinach	2.0	
Strawberry	2.0	
Sugarcane	0.3	6/30/00
Tomato	2.0	
Walnut	0.3	

(b) *Section 18 emergency exemptions.* [Reserved]

(c) *Tolerances with regional registrations.* [Reserved]

(d) *Indirect or inadvertent residues.* [Reserved]

§§ 180.154a and 180.531 [REMOVED]

3. By removing § 180.154a and § 180.531.

[FR Doc. 99–33161 Filed 12–21–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 99–339; FCC 99–353]

Implementation of Video Description of Video Programming

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule, correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects the preamble to a proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** of December 1, 1999, regarding the adoption of limited requirements for television video description. This corrects paragraph 44 of the proposed rule.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Bash, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau (202) 418–2130.

Correction

In the proposed rule 99–31116, page 67241, column 3, paragraph 44 set forth certain instructions for filing comments on diskettes, and directed commenters to reference MM Docket No. 99–353. The document should have directed commenters to reference MM Docket No. 99–339. Therefore, the docket reference in paragraph 44, fifth sentence, to ''99–353'' is hereby deleted and replaced with the docket reference ''99–339.''

Dated: December 2, 1999.

Victoria Phillips,

Chief, Legal Branch.

[FR Doc. 99–33101 Filed 12–21–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 99–292; FCC 99–389]

Establishment of a Class A Television Service; Comments Suspended

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; comment date suspension.

SUMMARY: This document announces that the Commission, on its own motion, has suspended the filing of comments that were due December 21, 1999, in its rulemaking proceeding in MM Docket No. 99–292 concerning the Establishment of a Class A Television Service.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 14, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Brown, Video Services Division, Mass Media Bureau at (202) 418–1600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 29, 1999, the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rule Making, FCC 99–257, setting forth for public comment a wide-range of issues and concerns dealing with the establishment of a form of primary status for qualifying low power television stations and on the appropriate regulatory framework for a Class A television service. On November 29, 1999, however, the Community Broadcasters Protection Act of 1999 (CBPA) was signed into law. Among other things, the legislation directed that, within 120 days after enactment of the CBPA, the Commission shall, by rulemaking, set forth regulations establishing a Class A television service for licensees of low power television that satisfy certain statutorily-prescribed criteria. The Commission is currently assessing the impact of the CBPA,

whose provisions are more narrowly focused than the matters in the instant rulemaking, and believes that suspension of the scheduled filing of comments would be more conducive to orderly rulemaking in the abbreviated proceeding mandated by the CBPA. The comment filing date IS SUSPENDED until further notice from the Commission.

Federal Communications Commission.

Magalie Roman Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–33102 Filed 12–21–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Parts 192 and 195

[Docket No. RSPA–99–6355; Notice 2]

Pipeline Safety: Enhanced Safety and Environmental Protection for Gas Transmission and Hazardous Liquid Pipelines in High-Consequence Areas

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice extending comment period and establishing Electronic Public Discussion Forum.

SUMMARY: This notice announces that the Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) will extend to January 17, 2000, the comment period following the public meeting on pipeline system integrity programs in high-consequence areas. This notice also announces that OPS is establishing an electronic public discussion forum on pipeline system integrity management. OPS requests comments that address how to provide additional safety and environmental protection for gas transmission pipelines and hazardous liquid pipelines in high-consequence areas through regulated integrity management programs.

DATES: No later than January 17, 2000, comments can be submitted over the Internet to the OPS integrity management site at http://ops.dot.gov/imp.htm. You may also submit written comments by mail or delivery directly to the Dockets Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590–0001. Comments may be submitted directly to the docket at the following Internet Web address: http://dms.dot gov. Click on ''Help & Information'' for instructions on how to file a document electronically. All comments should identify the docket and notice numbers stated in the heading of this notice. Anyone desiring confirmation of mailed comments must include a self-addressed stamped postcard.

ADDRESSES: The Dockets Facility is located on the plaza level, Room PL–401, of the U.S. Department of Transportation building, 400 7th St., SW, Washington, DC. It is open from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mike Israni (tel: 202–366–4571; E-mail: mike.israni@rspa.dot.gov). You can access additional information and participate in a discussion forum at the OPS pipeline system integrity management Internet site at http://ops.dot.gov/imp.htm.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 18–19, 1999, the Office of Pipeline Safety held a public meeting to discuss the need for additional safety and environmental regulations for pipelines in high-consequence areas (i.e., areas where a pipeline failure could have serious consequences for the public or the environment). The notice announcing the meeting was published on October 21, 1999, at 64 FR 56725. OPS wanted information on pipeline operators' system integrity management programs so that it could incorporate a process into the regulations for validating pipeline system integrity in high-consequences areas. OPS is committed to enhancing protection in these areas for several reasons. OPS and National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) investigations and analyses of major pipeline incidents have underscored the importance of protecting areas of high population density and environmentally sensitive areas. Congressional mandates have directed OPS to undertake various activities in these areas, including requiring periodic pipeline inspections in areas of high population density and in areas unusually sensitive to environmental damage.

Recent OPS initiatives have validated the importance of focusing pipeline resources and establishing higher levels of protection in areas where a pipeline accident could have serious consequences. OPS has seen a wide array of existing operator safety programs that identify, assess, and address all significant risks to the pipeline in an integrated manner. These operator-developed programs closely examine in-line inspection survey data, together with other surveillance and operating data, (e.g., expected population growth, land use, construction activity along the pipeline) and other information relevant to ensuring the integrity of the pipeline in high population areas and in environmentally sensitive areas.

Need for Extending Comment Period and Opening Electronic Discussion Forum

The November public meeting gathered information from government, industry, and public participants on integrity management programs and how to deal with integrity issues in high-consequence areas. The meeting provided a wealth of information on identifying high-consequence areas, testing and inspection technologies, and using risk data to manage pipeline system integrity. The meeting revealed the complexity inherent in requiring integrity management inspections and programs in high-consequence areas. Breakout sessions addressed the following issues:

- What are the key elements and characteristics of integrity management within companies?
  - —What are the characteristics of high-consequence areas?
  - —What are the minimum standards for integrity management programs?
  - —What elements should OPS review, evaluate, and inspect?
- What means are used to assemble and integrate information?
  - —What types of information need to be integrated to ensure pipeline system integrity?
  - —What are the key questions for OPS to ask during an inspection?

At the meeting, OPS announced that written comments on pipeline system integrity management issues would be accepted through December 20, 1999. The questions raised at the public meeting and subsequent discussions with the pipeline industry and regulators have shown that more time is needed to prepare and file comments. Therefore, we are extending the comment period to January 17, 2000. We are also setting up an electronic discussion forum so that we can get a free exchange of ideas on how to implement a pipeline system integrity management process into the pipeline safety regulations. This forum will be open until at least January 17, 2000. The transcript of the November 18–19, 1999, public meeting and public comments concerning issues raised at the meeting are available in the docket, which is accessible at the Dockets Facility or through the OPS pipeline system integrity management Internet site.