

would allow the registrants to plan production and distribution more precisely than they could if EPA left allocation to the workings of the free market. However, a mechanism that allocates production (imports) by registrant may reduce price competition, and may raise anti-trust statutes concerns. Another potential weakness with allocation by registrant, is that there will be less of the pesticide available in the market place, there is no assurance that those who have the greatest need for the pesticide will have access to it. Historically, those who have the greatest need for a specific pesticide are those who grow minor use crops, such as fruits, vegetables and nursery crops. To deal with the minor use concern, the pesticide could be allocated by crop or crop groups. This approach could help direct the pesticide where the economic benefits are greatest. It potentially would require significant effort by USDA and/or the user community. This approach is likely to be administratively more cumbersome and more difficult to enforce relative to allocation by registrant. Whether or not the apportioning is by registrant or crop, it can be allocated by any number of mechanisms including a free market, a predetermined allocation set by EPA, or prescription based on pest pressure or other criteria.

*Input on frequency and timing of reporting.* To verify that the cap is not exceeded, some reporting is necessary. The amount and frequency of reporting will depend on the allocation mechanism used. For example, if EPA does not make any allocation between registrants, a production (import) limit would require frequent reporting of production (import) volumes in order that EPA might notify all registrants when the limit has been reached. A system where each registrant has a predetermined quota would require significantly less reporting.

*Input on which 12-month period should be used.* A cap implemented on a calendar year basis may pose difficulties if the calendar year does not correspond to the production, distribution and use cycles of a particular pesticide. Distributors and users may have to purchase the pesticide out of season and store it until use. Manufacturers and distributors may have difficulty anticipating demand. EPA may have difficulty ascertaining whether the risk management goal of limiting the quantity used has been achieved in a particular growing season. Accordingly, EPA seeks input on what 12-month period should be used for the AZM cap. EPA also seeks input on

whether one time period could be suitable for all future caps. For simplicity, a specific time frame that can be used in all future cases would be desirable, but differing crop or production cycles may warrant setting time frames on a case-by-case basis.

*Input on potential impacts to the market.* As mentioned in the goals above, the Agency wants to minimize the impact on the market place. In particular, EPA wants to avoid structures that would significantly reduce price competition or that would increase barriers to new competitors entering the market.

*Input on what should be capped.* The current AZM cap is expressed in pounds of active ingredient imported because the present sources of technical grade AZM are overseas. EPA seeks comment on alternative approaches; for example, caps could be established for imports, production of technical or of end use products, or sales of end use product. EPA also seeks comment on whether, and how, AZM isomers should be addressed in the cap. Commenters should address how such alternatives would further, or detract from, the goals of having a mechanism that is easy to administer, verifiable, and timely.

*Input on other areas that would be helpful for developing an allocation mechanism that meets the goals described above.* The issues above represent some preliminary ideas on what types of things need to be considered before developing an allocation system that meets the broad goals mentioned in Unit II.A. Commenters are encouraged to identify other factors that they believe would be important to develop a fair and manageable allocation mechanism.

#### *B. What is the Agency's Authority for Taking this Action?*

FIFRA section 3(c)(5)(D) allows the Administrator to register a pesticide only upon finding that the pesticide when used in accordance with widespread and commonly recognized practice will not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment. In instances where a pesticide causes adverse effects that closely approach being unreasonable, and which would become unreasonable if the pesticide were more widely used, limitations to prevent the pesticide from becoming more widely used may be necessary to maintain registration. Measures which would limit the total quantity applied are therefore consistent with EPA's statutory authority. Special Review and Reregistration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

#### List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticide production caps

Dated: June 30, 2000.

Lois Rossi,

Director,

[FR Doc. 00-17355 Filed 7-7-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6732-5]

#### Scientific Peer-Review Meeting To Review Draft Document on Ecological Soil Screening Level Guidance

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of Peer-Review Panel Workshop.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing that Versar, Inc., an EPA contractor for external scientific peer review, will organize, convene, and conduct an external peer-review panel workshop to review the external review draft document titled, *Ecological Soil Screening Level Guidance*. The document was prepared by an EPA-lead multi-stakeholder process with participants from EPA (the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER), the Office of Research and Development (ORD), and the Regions), Environment Canada, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD), states, academia, industry, and consultants. The EPA will consider the peer-review advice and comments in revising the document.

**DATES:** The peer-review panel workshop will be held Wednesday, July 26, 2000, from 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. and Thursday, July 27, from 8:30 a.m. until Noon. Members of the public may attend as observers, and there will be a limited time for comments from the public.

**ADDRESSES:** The external peer-review panel workshop will be held at the Crystal City Marriott Hotel, 1999 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia. Versar, Inc., an EPA contractor, is organizing, convening, and conducting the peer-review workshop. To attend the workshop, please register by July 24, 2000, by calling Mr. Amanjit Paintal, Versar, Inc., 6850 Versar Center, Springfield, VA 22151 at 703-750-3000 extension 449, or send a facsimile to 703-642-6954. You can also register via email at paintama@versar.com. Space is

limited, and registrations will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. There will be a limited time for comments from the public during the workshop. Please let Versar, Inc., know if you wish to make comments.

The draft guidance document on ecological soil screening levels is available on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/risk/tooleco.htm>. A limited number of paper copies are available from Versar. If you are requesting a paper copy, please provide your name, mailing address, and the document title, *Ecological Soil Screening Level Guidance*. Copies are available from Versar, Inc. by calling Mr. Amanjit Paintal, Versar, Inc., 6850 Versar Center, Springfield, VA 22151 at 703-750-3000 extension 449, or send a facsimile to 703-642-6954. You can also request a copy by e-mail by writing to [paintama@versar.com](mailto:paintama@versar.com).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For workshop information, registration, and logistics, contact Mr. Amanjit Paintal, Versar, Inc., 6850 Versar Center, Springfield, VA 22151, at 703-750-3000 extension 449 or via email at [paintama@versar.com](mailto:paintama@versar.com).

For technical information, contact Steve Ells, OSWER, telephone: 703-603-8822, facsimile: 703-603-9100, e-mail: [ells.steve@epa.gov](mailto:ells.steve@epa.gov); or Randy Wentsel, ORD, telephone: 202-564-3214, facsimile: 202-565-0050, e-mail: [wentsel.randy@epa.gov](mailto:wentsel.randy@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The purpose of the document is to put forward procedures to develop scientifically sound, ecologically based, soil screening levels that are protective of the terrestrial environment for up to 24 chemicals of concern. As part of the process, methodologies and models that use site-specific exposure data to modify these screening levels are presented.

Although several different entities (Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, the Dutch National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, and the Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy) have developed sets of soil screening levels, benchmarks, or preliminary remediation goals for many contaminants, EPA has not embraced any specific approach for use nationally at all Superfund sites. Although some EPA Regional Offices, Federal agencies, states and contractors use one or more of these approaches, many do not and instead perform literature searches for toxicity data on each of the chemicals of potential concern and develop site-specific soil concentrations to be used as screening

levels for the site under investigation. This repetitious approach can be very costly and time-consuming.

In order to improve national consistency and to conserve resources, an effort was made to form a multi-stakeholder process to develop scientifically sound, ecologically-based, soil screening levels, and many have participated, e.g., EPA, DoD, DOE, states, industry, and consultants. This collaborative project is expected to result in a Superfund guidance document that includes generic ecological soil screening levels (Eco-SSLs) for up to 24 chemicals that are frequently of ecological concern at Superfund sites. These Eco-SSLs will be soil concentrations that are expected to be protective of the mammalian, avian, plant, and soil invertebrates communities that could be exposed to the chemicals of concern. These Eco-SSLs will be conservative in order to be confident that chemicals that could present an unacceptable risk are not screened out early in the risk assessment process. The process used to develop this first set of Eco-SSLs can also be used to develop additional screening levels for other chemicals.

The participants produced draft Eco-SSLs for mammals, birds, plants, and soil biota. The plant and soil biota values were developed from available plant and soil invertebrate toxicity test data. The mammal and bird benchmarks were back-calculated from a hazard quotient of 1.0 using animal toxicity data and a small number of generic food chain models. The lowest reasonable Eco-SSL for each chemical will then be used to screen chemicals found at sites. These generic (i.e., not site-specific) Eco-SSLs will be used during Step 2 of the Superfund Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) process (Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund; Process for Designing and Conducting Ecological Risk Assessments, 1997), when there often are only limited site-specific data available. These levels represent a set of screening ecotoxicity values that can be used routinely to identify those chemicals of potential concern (COPCs) in soils requiring further evaluation in a baseline ecological risk assessment; they are not national cleanup standards.

Dated: July 3, 2000.

**William H. Farland,**

*Director, National Center for Environmental Assessment.*

[FR Doc. 00-17350 Filed 7-7-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6732-6]

### Science Advisory Board; Notification of Change in Location of a Public Advisory Committee Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given of a change in location for the Science Advisory Board's (SAB's) Executive Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday, July 12-13, 2000. This meeting was previously noticed in 65 FR 39614, June 27, 2000. The only change from that previous notice is the meeting location. Both days of the meeting will now be held at the US Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Research Center (ERC), Highway 54 and T.W. Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC. On July 12, the meeting will be in ERC Classroom Two, and on July 13, the meeting will be in ERC Classroom One. The meeting will convene each day at 8:30 am and adjourn no later than 5:30 pm. All times noted are Eastern Daylight Time. The meeting is open to the public, however, seating is limited and available on a first come basis.

Dated: June 30, 2000.

**Donald G. Barnes,**

*Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.*

[FR Doc. 00-17336 Filed 7-7-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF-954; FRL-6594-5]

### Notice of Filing of Pesticide Petitions to Establish Tolerances for Certain Pesticide Chemicals in or on Food

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the initial filing of pesticide petitions 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-954, must be received on or before August 9, 2000.

**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.** To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is