body weight per day (mg/kg/bwt/day) (17.6% of RfD). Potential exposure for children's population subgroups range from 0.02 mg/kg bwt/day (7.8% of RfD) for nursing infants (<1 year old) to 0.12 mg/kg bwt/day (47.8%) for children 1–6 years old. The chronic dietary risk due to food does not exceed the level of concern (100%).

b. *Acute exposure*. The exposure to the most sensitive population subgroup, non-nursing infants, is 23.5% of the acute RfD at the 95th percentile. The acute dietary risk due to food does not exceed the level of concern (100%).

ii. *Drinking water*. Results from computer modeling indicate that sulfosate in ground water will not contribute significant residues in drinking water as a result of sulfosate use at the recommended maximum annual application rate (8.00 lbs. active ingredient/acre). The computer model uses conservative numbers, therefore it is unlikely that ground water concentrations would exceed the estimated concentration of 0.014 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 Generic Expected Environmental Concentration (GENEEC). The assumptions of two applications of 4.00 lbs. active ingredient/acre resulted in calculated estimated maximum concentrations of 58 ppb (acute, based on the highest 56–day value) and 10 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. Drinking water levels of concern (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 58 ppb. The acute DWLOCs for sulfosate in surface water were all greater than 5,400 ppb. The estimated average concentration of sulfosate in surface water is 10 ppb which is much less than the calculated levels of concern (>1,300 ppb) 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.

2. *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 12.3% of the acute RfD at the 95th percentile for the U.S. 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 use 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 17.6% of the chronic RfD for the U.S. 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 data base on sulfosate relative to prenatal and postnatal toxicity is complete. Because the developmental and reproductive effects occurred in the presence of parental (systemic) toxicity, these data do not suggest an increased prenatal or postnatal 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 23.5% of the acute RfD at the 95th percentile for the most highly exposed group, children (1–6 years). 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 47.8% for children (1–6 years), 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. 00–17755 Filed 7–12–00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPP–00631; FRL–6393–5]

Final Test Guidelines; Notice of Availability

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: EPA has established a unified library for test guidelines issued by the Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances (OPPTS) for use in testing chemical substances to develop data for submission to EPA under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), or the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). These test guidelines represent

an Agency effort that began in 1991 to harmonize the test guidelines within OPPTS, as well as to harmonize the OPPTS test guidelines with those of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The process for developing and amending these test guidelines includes public participation and the extensive involvement of the scientific community, including peer review by the Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) and the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) and other expert scientific organizations. With this notice, EPA is announcing the availability of three final test guidelines for three health effects end points. These test guidelines (and their OPPTS guideline reference) are: Repeated Dose 28-Day Oral Toxicity Study in Rodents (OPPTS 870.3050), Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (OPPTS 870.3550), and Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study With the Reproduction/ Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (OPPTS 870.3650).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *For general information contact:*

Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) information contact: TSCA Hotline at TAIS/7408, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 554–1404; fax number: (202) 554–5603; e-mail address: TSCA-Hotline@epa.gov.

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) information contact: Communications Services Branch (7506C), Field and External Affairs Division, Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 305–5017; fax number: (703) 305–5558.

For technical information contact: Chemical Control Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (7405), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 260–8130; e-mail address: ccd.citb@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Does this Action Apply to Me?

This action is directed to the public in general. Although this action may be of particular interest to those persons who are or may be required to conduct testing of chemical substances under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), or the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), the Agency has not attempted to describe all the specific entities that may be affected by this action. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the technical person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

II. How Can I Get Additional Information, Including Copies of this Document or Other Related Documents?

A. 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/.

You may also obtain copies of test guidelines from the EPA Internet Home Page and the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO). From the EPA Internet Home Page select ''Information Resources/Test Methods/OPPTS Harmonized Test Guidelines'' at http://www.epa.gov/OPPTS_Harmonized. Paper copies and disks of the guidelines are available from GPO, Washington, DC 20402, or by calling (202) 512–0132.

B. In Person

The Agency has established an official record for this proposed guideline under docket control number OPP–00631. 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, Rm. 119, Crystal Mall ×2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The Public Information and Records Integrity Branch telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

III. What Action is EPA taking?

EPA is announcing the availability of three final health effects test guidelines. These guidelines are: Repeated Dose 28-Day Oral Toxicity Study in Rodents (OPPTS 870.3050), Reproduction/ Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (OPPTS 870.3550), and Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study with the Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (OPPTS 870.3650). These guidelines are being made available today in order to establish a set of harmonized guidelines for use in test rules and other actions under TSCA. After establishment of these guidelines today, the Agency will then establish new TSCA test guidelines in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), but in the format specified for the CFR. TSCA test guidelines for the three endpoints are not now in existence but are needed for planned regulatory actions.

In publishing these harmonized test guidelines, EPA recognizes concerns have been expressed about animal testing. EPA is committed to avoiding unnecessary or duplicative animal testing. As part of this commitment, the Agency plays a important role in the federal Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods (ICCVAM) (http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/home.htm) whose goals are: (1) To encourage the reduction of the number of animals used in testing; (2) to seek opportunities to replace test methods requiring animals with alternative test methods when acceptable alternative methods are available; and (3) to refine existing test methods to optimize animal use when there is no substitute for animal testing. Further, where testing is needed to develop scientifically adequate data, the Agency is committed to reducing the number of animals used for testing, including, whenever possible, by incorporating *in vitro* (non-animal) test methods or other alternative approaches that have been scientifically validated and have received regulatory acceptance. EPA considers these goals and commitments to be important considerations in developing health effects data; however, they must be balanced with the essential need to conduct scientifically sound chemical hazard/risk assessments in support of the Agency's mission. By using the test guidelines cited in today's notice, EPA believes that fewer animals will be used when it is necessary to conduct screening level testing to fill such data needs and these guidelines will yield scientifically sound data.

IV. How Were these Test Guidelines Developed?

These guidelines were adapted from the series of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Testing of Chemicals. The OECD guidelines which were adapted and are being announced for publication today are: OECD Guideline 407 (Repeated Dose 28-day Oral Toxicity in Rodents) for OPPTS 870.3050, OECD Guideline 421 (Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test) for OPPTS 870.3550, and OECD Guideline 422 (Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study With the Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test) for OPPTS 870.3650. EPA has retained the OECD guideline names. EPA scientists reviewed the OECD guidelines and reformatted them to the OPPTS harmonized guideline format with only minor editorial changes.

The OECD test guidelines were developed initially under the OECD Chemicals Testing Programme and are updated under the OECD Updating Programme for Test Guidelines and the OECD Test Guidelines Programme. The OECD test guideline process involves the use of multi-national panels of scientific and technical experts who develop guideline drafts which are submitted to a review panel. The review process is concluded by the endorsement of the guidelines by the OECD Chemicals Group and the OECD Environment Committee prior to the formal submission to the OECD Council. The OECD Council then adopts the guidelines and publishes them in the official OECD Guidelines for Testing of Chemicals.

V. Are there Any Applicable Voluntary Consensus Standards that EPA Should Consider?

This notice of availability does not involve a proposed regulatory action that would require the Agency to consider voluntary consensus

standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104–113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note). Section 12(d) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, business practices, etc.) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA requires EPA to provide an explanation to Congress, through OMB, when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards when the NTTAA directs the Agency to do so.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Chemical testing, Test guideline.

Dated: June 22, 2000.

Susan H. Wayland,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 00–17754 Filed 7–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[WT Docket No. 97–82; DA 00–1531]

Deadline for Final Ex Parte and Other Presentations on Proposed Revisions to Broadband Personal Communications Services (PCS) Rules Extended to July 17, 2000

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document extends the period for final *ex parte* and other presentations on issues raised in this proceeding pertaining to proposed revisions to portions of the broadband Personal Communications Services C and F block rules.

DATES: Final *ex parte* presentations are due July 17, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Audrey Bashkin, Attorney, Auctions and Industry Analysis Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, at (202) 418–0660.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This a summary of a public notice, WT Docket No. 97–82, DA 00–1531, released July 7, 2000. The complete text of the public notice is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room CY–A257, Washington, D.C. 20554, and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., (ITS, Inc.), 1231 20th Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, (202) 857–3800. It is also available on the Commission's website at *http://www.fcc.gov/wtb/auctions.*

1. On June 7, 2000, the Commission released a *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (''FNPRM''), 65 FR 37092 (June 13, 2000), in the above-referenced proceeding. The *FNPRM* seeks comment on proposed revisions to portions of the broadband Personal Communications Services (''PCS'') C and F block rules. The *FPRM* established comment and reply comment deadlines for June 22, 2000 and June 30, 2000, respectively. The *FNPRM* also established 7 p.m., July 12, 2000 as the time and date after which *ex parte* and other presentations would be prohibited.

2. In order to provide interested parties additional time to make *ex parte* presentations, the period for final *ex parte* and other presentations on issues raised in the *FNPRM* is extended until 7 p.m. on July 17, 2000.

3. Pursuant to § 1.1200(a) of the Commission's rules, presentations on issues in the *FNPRM* will be prohibited after 7 p.m., July 17, 2000. 47 CFR 1.1200(a). In all other respects, parties are required to follow the procedures previously outlined in the *FNPRM.*

Federal Communications Commission.

Louis J. Sigalos,

Deputy Chief, Auctions and Industry Analysis Division.

[FR Doc. 00–17671 Filed 7–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket Nos. 96–98, 99–68; FCC 00–227]

Reciprocal Compensation; Inter-Carrier Compensation for ISP-Bound Traffic

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On March 24, 2000, the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated certain provisions of the Commission's Reciprocal Compensation Ruling regarding ISP-bound traffic, and remanded the matter to the Commission. The Commission seeks comment on the issues identified by the court in its decision, including the jurisdictional nature of ISP-bound traffic, the scope of the reciprocal compensation requirement, and the relevance of the concepts of ''termination,'' ''telephone exchange service,'' ''exchange access service,'' and ''information access.'' The Commission also seeks comment on any ex parte presentations filed after the close of the reply period on April 27, 1999, and on any new or innovative inter-carrier compensation arrangements for ISP-bound traffic that may have been considered or entered into during the pendency of this proceeding.