Versar personnel will be required to sign nondisclosure agreements and will be briefed on appropriate security procedures before they are permitted access to TSCA CBI.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Confidential business information.

Dated: November 8, 1999.

Deborah A. Williams,

Acting Director, Information Management Division, Pollution Prevention and Toxics.

[FR Doc. 99–30616 Filed 11–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPTS–140282; FRL–6393–7]

Access to Confidential Business Information by Eastern Research Group

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: EPA has authorized its contractor, Eastern Research Group (ERG), of 14555 Avion Parkway, Suite 200, Chantilly, Virginia, for access to information which has been submitted to EPA under all sections of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). Some of the information may be claimed or determined to be confidential business information (CBI).

DATES: Access to the confidential data by ERG occurred as a result of an approved waiver dated October 13, 1999, which requested granting ERG immediate access to TSCA CBI. This waiver was necessary to allow ERG to perform engineering analyses including exposure and release assessments, and identification of pollution prevention opportunities in support of all aspects of EPA decision-making.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine Augustyniak, Associate Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E–545, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202) 554–1404, TDD: (202) 554–0551; e-mail: TSCA-Hotline@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Does this Notice Apply to Me?

This action is directed to the public in general. This action may, however, be of interest to ''those persons who are or may be required to conduct testing of chemical substances under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).'' Since other entities may also be interested, 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 person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

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

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/.

III. What Action is the Agency Taking?

Under contract number 68–W9–9085, ERG of 14555 Avion Parkway, Suite 200, Chantilly, VA, will assist the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPTS) in performing engineering analyses including exposure and release assessments, and identification of pollution prevention opportunities in support of all aspects of EPA decision-making under all sections of TSCA.

In accordance with 40 CFR 2.306(j), EPA has determined that under EPA contract number 68–W9–9085, ERG will require access to CBI submitted to EPA under all sections of TSCA to perform successfully the duties specified under the contract. ERG personnel will be given access to information submitted to EPA under all sections of TSCA. Some of the information may be claimed or determined to be CBI.

EPA is issuing this notice to inform all submitters of information under all sections of TSCA that EPA may provide ERG access to these CBI materials on a need-to-know basis only. All access to TSCA CBI under this contract will take place at EPA Headquarters and ERG's Chantilly, VA site.

ERG will be authorized access to TSCA CBI at their facility, provided they comply with the provisions of the EPA *TSCA Confidential Business Information Security Manual.*

Before access to TSCA CBI is authorized at ERG's site, EPA will perform the required inspection of its facility, and ensure that this facility is in compliance with the Manual.

Upon completing review of the CBI materials, ERG will return all transferred materials to EPA.

Clearance for access to TSCA CBI under this contract may continue until September 30, 2004.

ERG personnel will be required to sign nondisclosure agreements and will be briefed on appropriate security procedures before they are permitted access to TSCA CBI.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Confidential business information.

Dated: November 17, 1999.

Deborah A. Williams,

Acting Director, Information Management Division, Pollution Prevention and Toxics.

[FR Doc. 99–30617 Filed 11–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF–904; FRL–6396–4]

Notice of Filing a Pesticide Petition to Establish a Tolerance for Certain Pesticide Chemicals in or on Food

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 docket control number PF–904, must be received on or before December 27, 1999.

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 imperative that you identify docket control number PF–904 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Cynthia Giles-Parker, Fungicide Branch, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 305–7740; e-mail address: giles-parker.cynthia@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected categories and entities may include, but are not limited to:

Categories	NAICS	Examples of potentially affected entities
Industry	111	Crop production
	112	Animal production
	311	Food manufacturing
	32532	Pesticide manufacturing

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether or not this action might apply to certain entities. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under ''FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.''

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

1. *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/.

2. *In person.* The Agency has established an official record for this action under docket control number PF–904. 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 (PIRIB), 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 PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

C. How and to Whom Do I Submit Comments?

You may submit comments through the mail, in person, or electronically. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number PF–904 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

1. *By mail.* Submit your comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460.

2. *In person or by courier.* Deliver your comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA. The PIRIB is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

3. *Electronically.* You may submit your comments electronically by e-mail to: *''opp-docket@epa.gov*,'' or you can submit a computer disk as described above. Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. Avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Electronic submissions will be accepted in Wordperfect 6.1/8.0 or ASCII file format. All comments in electronic form must be identified by docket control number PF–904. Electronic comments may also be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

D. How Should I Handle CBI That I Want to Submit to the Agency?

Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. You may claim information that you submit to EPA in response to this document as CBI by marking any part or all of that information as CBI. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes any information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public version of the official record. Information not marked confidential will be included in the public version of the official record without prior notice. If you have any questions about CBI or the procedures for claiming CBI, please consult the person identified under ''FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.''

E. What Should I Consider as I Prepare My Comments for EPA?

You may find the following suggestions helpful for preparing your comments:

1. Explain your views as clearly as possible.

2. Describe any assumptions that you used.

3. Provide copies of any technical information and/or data you used that support your views.

4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate that you provide.

5. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns.

6. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline in this notice.

7. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, be sure to identify the docket control number assigned to this action in the subject line on the first page of your response. You may also provide the name, date, and **Federal Register** citation.

II. What Action is the Agency Taking?

EPA has received a pesticide petition as follows proposing the establishment and/or amendment of regulations for residues of a pesticide chemical 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 this 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.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Agricultural commodities, Feed additives, Food additives, Pesticides

and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 18, 1999.

James Jones,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Summary of Petition

The 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.

BASF Corporation

PP1F3955 and PP1H5610

Summary of Petition

EPA has received pesticide petitions (PP1F3955 and PP1H5610) from BASF Corporation, P.O. Box 13528, RTP, NC 27709–3528 proposing, pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), to amend 40 CFR part 180 by establishing a tolerance for residues of mepiquat chloride, N,N-dimethylpiperidinium chloride in or on the raw agricultural commodity grapes at 1.0 parts per million (ppm) and raisins at 5.0 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 mepiquat chloride in plants and animals is well understood. Based on a nature of the residue study in grapes and supported by similar studies in cotton, the residue of concern from mepiquat chloride use in grapes consists only of the parent compound.

2. *Analytical method*. An adequate analytical method for enforcement of the tolerances exists. The analytical method used for quantitative determinations was designed to measure mepiquat chloride residues present as the parent compound.

3. *Magnitude of residues*. Twenty-eight field trials were conducted in grape vineyards with treatments made at the maximum proposed label rate. Trials were established in eight states over a 2–year period. Ten varieties of grapes were studied in these trials. Sixty-four treated samples were obtained and analyzed. The number and geographical distribution of the grape residue studies exceeds the current requirements for grape tolerances on all grape varieties.

Grape samples from eight field trials were processed to either raisins and raisin waste or grape juice, wet pomace, and dry pomace. The processed fractions were analyzed for residues of mepiquat chloride to determine the effects of processing on residue levels. Drying the grapes to raisins concentrated the residues a maximum of 6 fold. Residues did not concentrate in grape juice.

B. Toxicological Profile

1. *Acute toxicity*. Based on the acute toxicity data, mepiquat chloride does not pose any acute toxicity risks. The acute toxicology studies place mepiquat chloride in toxicity category II for acute oral toxicity, category III for acute dermal, and toxicity category IV for acute inhalation toxicity, eye irritation and dermal irritation. Mepiquat chloride is not a skin sensitizer.

2. *Genotoxicty*. The carcinogenic potential of mepiquat chloride was evaluated by the OPP's Reference Dose (RfD)/Peer Review Committee on May 2, 1996. The Committee classified mepiquat chloride into Group E (evidence of noncarcinogenicity for humans), based on a lack of carcinogenicity in acceptable studies with two animal species, rat and mouse.

3. *Reproductive and developmental toxicity*. In a 2-generation reproductive toxicity study, Wistar rats were fed mepiquat chloride in their diets at concentrations of 0, 500, 1,500, or 5,000 ppm for 10 weeks (F_0) or 14 weeks (F_1) before mating, and during mating, gestation, and lactation. The F_0 parents were mated a second time 2 weeks after weaning the first litter. The doses corresponding to the dietary concentrations are 51.2 and 48.6, 153.1 and 146.6, and 499.3 and 574.5 milligrams/kilograms/day (mg/kg/day), respectively for F_0 and F_1 males and 54.0 and 53.3, 163.6 and 162.0, and 530.0 and 626.5 mg/kg/day, respectively for F_0 and F_1 females.

The lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) for systemic toxicity is 5,000 ppm (499 mg/kg/day) for male and female rats based on neurological impairment, decreased body weight and body weight gain in the adults, and retarded growth of F_0 and F_1 pups. The corresponding no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL) is 1,500 ppm (147 mg/kg/day). OPP's Reference Dose (RfD)/Peer Review Committee concluded on May 2, 1996, that, because of the retarded growth of the pups in the 5,000 ppm (499 mg/kg/day) group, the systemic NOAEL of 1,500 ppm (147 mg/kg/day) would also be regarded as the reproductive NOAEL.

4. *Subchronic toxicity*. The NOAEL is 58.4 mg/kg/day and the LOAEL is 95.3 mg/kg/day based on the combined results for two 1 year feeding studies and one 90–day feeding study in dogs. This endpoint is the same as that used for acute dietary and chronic RfD.

5. *Chronic toxicity*. On May 2, 1996, the OPP's Reference Dose (RfD)/Peer Review Committee recommended that the RfD for mepiquat chloride be established at 0.6 mg/kg/day. This value was based on the systemic NOAEL of 1,800 ppm (58.4 mg/kg/day) from the 1 year dog feeding study and the uncertainty factor (UF) of 100.

i. *Chronic feeding—Nonrodent*. In a chronic toxicity study, mepiquat chloride (99.5%) was administered to beagle dogs in the diet at dose levels of 0, 200, 600, or 1,800 ppm (0, 6.3, 19.9 or 58.4 mg/kg/day, respectively) for 12 months. There were no significant treatment-related effects. In order to establish a LOAEL, a second chronic toxicity study was conducted at dose levels of 0 or 6,000 ppm (170 mg/kg/day) for 12 months. Based on the results of the two chronic dog studies, the NOAEL is 1,800 ppm (58.4 mg/kg/day) and the LOAEL is 6,000 ppm (170 mg/kg/day).

ii. *Chronic feeding—Rats*. In a chronic feeding study, mepiquat chloride (58%) was administered for 24 months in the diet to Wistar rats at concentrations of 0, 290, 2,316, or 5,790 ppm (active ingredient), equivalent to doses of 0, 13, 106, 268 mg/kg/day for males and 0, 18, 146, or 371 mg/kg/day for females, respectively. The NOAEL is 2,316 ppm (105 mg/kg/day). The LOAEL is 5790 ppm (268 mg/kg/day).

6. *Animal metabolism*. In a metabolism study, mepiquat chloride, labeled with 14C (radiochemical purity: 98%), was administered to young adult Sprague-Dawley rats either intravenously or orally. Mepiquat chloride was absorbed rapidly from the stomach, distributed evenly in the intra- and extracellular compartments of the blood, demonstrated high bioavailability via the oral route, was excreted mostly in urine, and did not accumulate in tissues. Urine, feces, and bile samples from various treatments were used for studies of the metabolic fate of mepiquat chloride. In all cases, only the unchanged compound could be

detected. Therefore, there was no biotransformation of mepiquat chloride *in vivo*. The potential metabolites, such as 1-methylpiperidine or piperidine, were not detected.

7. *Endocrine disruption*. No specific tests have been conducted with mepiquat chloride to determine whether the chemical may have an endocrine like effect in humans. However, there were no significant findings in other relevant tests (developmental and reproductive toxicity tests) which would suggest that mepiquat chloride produces endocrine like effects.

C. Aggregate Exposure

1. *Dietary exposure*. The mepiquat chloride Registration Eligibility Decision (RED) indicates that EPA has found no dietary risks of concern for mepiquat chloride for the general U.S. population nor any subgroup. Pursuant to the requirements under the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, the Agency has determined that the use of mepiquat chloride will not pose dietary risks to infants and children due primarily to the chemical's low toxicity and its low usage rate.

i. *Food*—a. *Chronic dietary exposure*. A Dietary Risk Evaluation System (DRES) chronic exposure analysis was conducted by EPA for the RED. The analysis was performed using tolerance level residues (including those that have been revoked and the three expired grape and raisin temporary tolerances previously established for an Experimental Use Permit) and an assumption of 100 percent crop treated to estimate the Theoretical Maximum Residue Contribution (TMRC) for the general population and 22 subgroups. No Anticipated Residue (AR) information was used in this analysis. Existing tolerances result in a Theoretical Maximum Residue Contribution (TMRC) which represents less than 1% of the RfD for the U.S. general population and each of the 22 subgroups, including non-nursing infants (<1 year old).

The TMRC calculation results in a significant overestimate of human dietary exposure. The chronic analysis for mepiquat chloride is a worst case estimate of dietary exposure with all residues at tolerance level and 100% of the commodities assumed to be treated with mepiquat chloride. This analysis does not take into account that this use of mepiquat chloride on grapes is restricted to use on Concord and Niagara grapes only. Concord and Niagara grapes represent less than 10% of the total U.S. grape acreage (74,000 versus 763,850). Based on the risk estimates calculated in this analysis, it has been concluded that dietary exposure to mepiquat chloride does not pose any risk concerns.

b. *Acute dietary exposure*. The Margin of Exposure (MOE) is a ratio of the NOAEL to the exposure. Generally, the Agency concludes that there is no dietary concern when the acute dietary margins of exposure are greater than 100. The results of the acute analysis conducted for the RED indicate that mepiquat chloride in the diet represents no serious risk concern for acute exposure. All MOEs were well above the Agency's level of concern for acute dietary risk (ranging from a low of 3,893 for infants to a high of 29,200 for females 13+ years old).

ii. *Drinking water*. Neither a Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) nor a Hazard Advisory (HA) has been established for mepiquat chloride. According to the EPA's Pesticides in Ground Water Database, there have been no mepiquat chloride detections reported in monitoring wells. Based on its low application rate, relatively rapid degradation rate, and soil binding ability, the Agency does not expect mepiquat chloride to contaminate ground water or surface water. Consequently neither a chronic or acute drinking water assessment was not performed.

2. *Non-dietary exposure*. Mepiquat chloride has no residential or other non-occupational uses that might result in exposures to humans.

D. Cumulative Effects

EPA has addressed the issue of the potential risk from the cumulative effects of mepiquat chloride and other pesticides with a common mechanism of toxicity in the RED document. In assessing the potential risks, the Agency first considered structural similarities and common effects that exist between mepiquat chloride and other related compounds such as paraquat, diquat, and difenzoquat. The Agency then considered other compounds which could potentially result in neurotoxic effects similar to mepiquat chloride.

With one substance, difenzoquat, there appears to be similar neurotoxic effects. The Agency has concluded that the cumulative effects from the combined dietary exposure to mepiquat and difenzoquat would be virtually nil because the chronic dietary exposure for all population subgroups is less than 1% of the RfD for both difenzoquat and mepiquat chloride. The acute dietary MOE range for difenzoquat is 50,000 to 16,000 while the acute dietary MOE range for mepiquat chloride is 3,900 to 29,000.

In evaluating other chemicals with neurotoxic effects similar to mepiquat chloride, the Agency determined that it is unlikely that these other chemicals share a common mode/mechanism of toxicity with mepiquat chloride, or that cumulative risk assessment would be required. Although the mode/mechanism of toxicity of mepiquat chloride has not been well defined, the effects noted on the nervous system appear to be secondary to general systemic toxicity that occurs at high dose levels. Based on available data and structure-activity relationship analyses, mepiquat chloride would be considered to have minimal neurotoxic activity.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population*. In the mepiquat RED, EPA has determined that the established tolerances for mepiquat chloride meet the safety standards under the FQPA amendments to section 408(b)(2)(D) for the general population. In reaching this determination, EPA has considered the available information on the aggregate exposures (both acute and chronic) from the feed use on cotton, as well as the possibility of cumulative effects from mepiquat chloride and other chemicals with a similar mode/mechanism of toxicity. BASF does not believe that the limited use of mepiquat chloride on Concord and Niagara grapes alters these conclusions

Since there are no residential or lawn uses of mepiquat chloride, no dermal or inhalation exposure is expected in and around the home. No acute toxicity endpoints of concern have been identified for mepiquat chloride.

In assessing chronic dietary risk, EPA estimates that mepiquat chloride residues in food account for <1% of the RfD and residues in drinking water are not expected. Thus, the aggregate exposures from all sources of mepiquat chloride (in this case, only dietary is relevant) account for <1% of the RfD for the general population. Therefore, the Agency concludes that aggregate risks for the general population resulting from mepiquat chloride uses are not of concern.

In evaluating the potential for cumulative effects, EPA compared structural similarities and toxic effects seen in mepiquat chloride studies with other related compounds. With one substance, difenzoquat, there appears to be similar neurotoxic effects. However, the Agency has concluded that the cumulative effects from the combined dietary exposure to mepiquat chloride and difenzoquat would be virtually nil because the chronic dietary exposure for all population subgroups is less than

1% of the RfD for both difenzoquat and mepiquat chloride.

2. *Infants and children*. In the RED EPA has determined that the established tolerances for mepiquat chloride (including the previously established temporary tolerances for grapes) meet the safety standard under the FQPA amendment to section 408(b)(2)(C) for infants and children. The safety determination for infants and children considers the factors noted above for the general population, but also takes into account the possibility of increased dietary exposure due to the specific consumption patterns of infants and children, as well as the possibility of increased susceptibility to the toxic effects of mepiquat chloride residues in this population subgroup.

In the developmental studies, effects were seen in the fetuses only at the same or higher dose levels than effects on the mothers. In the reproduction study, no effects on reproductive performance were seen. Also, because the NOAELs from the developmental and reproduction studies were equal to or greater than the NOAEL used for establishing the reference dose, EPA concludes that it is unlikely that there is additional risk concern for immature or developing organisms. Finally, the Agency has no epidemiological information suggesting special sensitivity of infants and children to mepiquat chloride. Therefore, EPA finds that the uncertainty factor (100x) routinely used in RfD calculations is adequately protective of infants and children, and an additional uncertainty factor is not warranted for mepiquat chloride.

EPA estimates that mepiquat chloride residues in the diet of infants and children account for less than 1% of the RfD and residues in drinking water are not expected. Thus, the chronic aggregate exposure from all sources of mepiquat chloride account for less than 1% for infants and children. The acute dietary MOE for infants and children exposed to mepiquat chloride is 3,893. Therefore, the Agency concludes that aggregate risks for infants and children resulting from mepiquat chloride uses are not of concern.

F. International Tolerances

There are no Codex, Canadian, or Mexican tolerances established for mepiquat chloride on grapes. Thus, international harmonization is not an issue for these tolerances.

[FR Doc. 99–30615 Filed 11–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6480–5]

Sociodemographic Data Used for Identifying Potentially Highly Exposed Populations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of availability of a final document.

SUMMARY: The notice announces the availability of a final document, Sociodemographic Data Used for Identifying Potentially Highly Exposed Populations (EPA/600/R–99/060, July 1999), prepared by Versar, Inc. for the National Center for Environmental Assessment, within the Office of Research and Development of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This document assists assessors in identifying and enumerating potentially highly exposed populations. The document presents data relating to factors that potentially impact an individual or group's exposure to environmental contaminants based on activity patterns (how time is spent), microenvironments (locations where time is spent), and other sociodemographic data such as age, gender, race and economic status. Populations potentially more exposed to various chemicals of concern, relative to the general population, are also addressed.

ADDRESSES: The document is being made available electronically from the NCEA web site at *http://www.epa/ncea* under the What's New and Publications menus. Due to technical difficulties, certain tables and appendices could not be electronically reproduced. To obtain copies, please contact the National Center for Environmental Assessment's Technical Information Staff by phone (202–564–3261) or facsimile (202–565–0050). A limited number of paper copies also will be available from EPA's National Service Center for Environmental Publications on or about November 8, 1999. Interested parties may request a copy by telephoning 800–490–9198 and providing the document title and EPA number.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amina Wilkins, National Center for Environmental Assessment-Washington Office (8623D), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC (20460); telephone: 202–564–3256; facsimile: 202–565–0076; email: *wilkins.amina@epa.gov.*

Dated: November 9, 1999.

William H. Farland,

Director, National Center for Environmental Assessment.

[FR Doc. 99–30612 Filed 11–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6480–6]

Notice of Proposed Administrative Settlement Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Section 122(h) 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 settlement concerning the Aurum Etching Superfund Site, with Coltec Industries, Inc.

The settlement requires the settling parties to pay a total of $33,524.76 as payment of past response costs and $15,000 in future costs to the Hazardous Substances Superfund. The settlement includes a covenant not to sue pursuant to section 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9607.

For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the settlement. 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 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas, 75202–2733.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before December 27, 1999.

ADDRESSES: The proposed settlement and additional background information relating to the settlement are available for public inspection at 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas, 75202–2733. A copy of the proposed settlement may be obtained from Lydia Behn, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas, 75202–2733 at (214) 665–8419. Comments should reference the Aurum Etching Superfund