that we will consider information such as the pest risk assessment and risk management analysis prepared for the rulemaking that established the current program; fruit fly trapping data and pest survey data from the growing area; fruit cutting data from both the packinghouses in Mexico and the U.S. port-of-entry inspections; temperature data for the production areas in Mexico, the currently approved States, and any States that might be added; and the results of APHIS' most recent comprehensive review of the Mexican Hass avocado program. Copies of this information may be obtained by calling or writing to the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

We are asking the public for its comments and recommendations regarding the scope of our review and are soliciting any additional data or information that may have a bearing on our review of the Mexican Government's request. We wish to emphasize the preliminary nature of our review; we are not, at this time, proposing to make any changes to the provisions of the current Mexican avocado import program found in § 319.56–2ff. We would, therefore, ask that any comments focus on the scientific, technical, or other issues that commenters believe should be considered during our review of the Mexican Government's request.

If, after completing our review of the available data and any pertinent information submitted by the public, we conclude that there are sufficient data available to support Mexico's request, APHIS will prepare a proposed rule for public comment before making any final decision to approve additional States to receive Mexican Hass avocados or to expand the shipping season to include the months of October and March.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 150dd, 150ee, 150ff, 151–167, 450, 2803, and 2809; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a.

Done in Washington, DC, this 8th day of May 2000.

Bobby R. Acord,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 00–11835 Filed 5–10–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

20 CFR Part 217

RIN 3220–AB45

Application for Annuity or Lump Sum

AGENCY: Railroad Retirement Board.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Railroad Retirement Board hereby proposes to amend its regulations to enable a divorced spouse who remarries the employee within six months of the divorce to use the spouse application to qualify for a divorced spouse annuity for the period prior to the remarriage. This amendment will eliminate the necessity for the spouse to file a separate application for a short period of benefits.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 10, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be addressed to the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael C. Litt, General Attorney, Railroad Retirement Board, telephone (312) 751–4929, TTD (312) 751–4701.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 217.8 of the Board's regulations describes situations where the Board will accept an application filed for one type of annuity as an application for another type of annuity. An application may be effective for the period six months prior to the date of filing. This amendment will add a provision to enable a divorced spouse who remarries the employee within six months of the divorce to use the spouse application to qualify for a divorced spouse annuity for the period after the divorce and prior to the remarriage. In such cases the requirement that a claimant be married to the employee for a period of one year prior to application for a spouse annuity, as required by § 216.54 of this part, is waived.

The Board, with the concurrence of the Office of Management and Budget, has determined that this is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866; therefore, no regulatory impact analysis is required. There are no information collections associated with this rule.

List of Subjects in 20 CFR Part 217

Railroad employees, Railroad retirement.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Railroad Retirement Board proposes to amend chapter II of title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 217—APPLICATION FOR ANNUITY OR LUMP SUM

1. The authority citation for part 217 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 45 U.S.C. 231d and 45 U.S.C. 231f.

2. In subpart B, § 217.8, redesignate paragraphs (m) through (u) as (n) through (v), and add a new paragraph (m) to read as follows:

§ 217.8 When one application satisfies the filing requirement for other benefits.

* * * * *

(m) A divorced spouse annuity if the spouse claimant has remarried the employee during the six-month retroactive period of the spouse annuity application.

* * * * *

Dated: May 4, 2000.

By authority of the Board.

Beatrice Ezerski,

Secretary to the Board.

[FR Doc. 00–11855 Filed 5–10–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 25

[Docket No. 00N–0085]

National Environmental Policy Act; Food Contact Substance Notification System; Companion to Direct Final Rule

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is proposing to amend its regulations on environmental impact considerations as part of the agency's implementation of the FDA Modernization Act (FDAMA) of 1997. FDAMA amended the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the act) to establish a notification process for food contact substances (FCS); this process will be the primary method for authorizing new uses of food additives that are FCS, and it will largely replace the existing food additive petition process for such substances. The regulations will expand the existing categorical exclusions to include allowing a notification submitted under the act to become effective and will amend the list of those actions that require an environmental assessment (EA) to add allowing a notification under the act to become effective in cases where a categorical exclusion doesn't apply. This will allow notifiers of FCS to claim the categorical exclusions now available to sponsors of other requests for authorization of FCS. This proposed rule is a companion document to the direct final rule

published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.

DATES: Submit written comments on this proposed rule by July 25, 2000. If FDA receives no significant adverse comment on the provisions of these regulations within the specified comment period, the agency intends to publish a document confirming the effective date of the final rule in the **Federal Register** within 30 days after the comment period in the direct final rule ends. The direct final rule will be effective August 24, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments on this companion proposed rule to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mitchell A. Cheeseman, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–215), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202–418–3083.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

A. Rulemaking

This proposed rule is a companion to the direct final rule published in the final rules section of this issue of the **Federal Register**. The direct final rule and this companion proposed rule are substantively identical. FDA is publishing the direct final rule because the rule contains noncontroversial changes, and FDA anticipates that it will receive no significant adverse comments. If no significant adverse comment is received in response to the direct final rule, no further action will be taken related to this proposed rule. Instead, FDA will publish a confirmation document within 30 days after the comment period ends confirming that the direct final rule will go into effect on August 24, 2000. Additional information about FDA's direct final rulemaking procedures is set forth in a guidance published in the **Federal Register** of November 21, 1997 (62 FR 62466).

The comment period for this companion proposed rule runs concurrently with the direct final rule's comment period. Any comments received under this companion proposed rule will also be considered as comments regarding the direct final rule. If FDA receives any significant adverse comment regarding either this proposed rule or the direct final rule, FDA will publish a document withdrawing the direct final rule within 30 days after the comment period ends and will proceed to respond to all of the comments under this companion proposed rule using customary notice-and-comment procedures. A significant adverse comment is a comment that explains why the rule would be inappropriate, including challenges to the rule's underlying premise or approach, or would be ineffective or unacceptable without a change. In determining whether a significant adverse comment is sufficient to terminate a direct final rulemaking, FDA will consider whether the comment raises an issue serious enough to warrant a substantive response in a notice-and-comment process. Comments that are frivolous, insubstantial, or outside the scope of the rule will not be considered adverse under this procedure. For example, a comment recommending a rule change in addition to the rule will not be considered a significant adverse comment, unless the comment states why the rule would be ineffective without the additional change. In addition, if a significant adverse comment applies to an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and that provision can be severed from the remainder of the rule, FDA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of a significant adverse comment.

B. Background

In 1958, Congress amended the act to require premarket approval of food additives (sections 201(s), 402(a)(2)(C), and 409 of the act (21 U.S.C. 321(s), 342(a)(2)(C), and 348)). ''Food additive'' is defined in section 201(s) of the act as ''any substance the intended use of which results or may reasonably be expected to result, directly or indirectly, in its becoming a component or otherwise affecting the characteristics of any food,'' unless, among other reasons, such substance is generally recognized as safe by qualified experts or is prior sanctioned for its intended use. Under section 409 of the act as originally established, food additives require premarket approval by FDA and publication of a regulation authorizing their intended use. Subsequently, in 1995, FDA codified a process, the ''threshold of regulation'' process (21 CFR 170.39), by which certain food additives may be exempted from the requirement of a listing regulation if the substance is expected to migrate to food at only negligible levels (60 FR 36582, July 17, 1995).

More recently, FDAMA amended section 409 of the act to establish a premarket notification (PMN) process as the primary method for authorizing new uses of food additives that are FCS. FDA expects most new uses of FCS that previously would have been regulated by issuance of a listing regulation in response to a food additive petition or would have been exempted from the requirement of a regulation under the threshold of regulation process will be the subject of PMN's.

As part of the agency's process of implementing FDAMA's amendments to section 409 of the act, FDA convened a public meeting on March 12, 1999, to provide interested parties with an opportunity to comment on FDA's current thinking on administration of the PMN process. As a result of the March 12, 1999, public meeting, FDA received comments on the applicability of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321, *et seq.* (1998)), to the notification process for food contact substances. FDA has considered those comments in developing the direct final rule and this companion proposed rule. FDA has filed copies of the transcript of the meeting and the comments received from interested parties with the Dockets Management Branch (address above) (Docket No. 99N–0235). The transcript and comments are available for public review at the Dockets Management Branch.

II. Analysis of the Applicability of NEPA to the Notification Process

As part of implementing the FDAMA amendments on food contact substances, FDA has considered the applicability of NEPA to the PMN process. As discussed in more detail below, FDA has concluded that agency activities under section 409(h) of the act are subject to NEPA's procedural requirements. Furthermore, as also discussed below, FDA currently expects that most PMN's will be subject to a categorical exclusion (see 40 CFR 1508.4; §§ 25.30 and 25.32 (21 CFR 25.30 and 25.32)).

Congress enacted NEPA in 1969 to ensure that Federal Government agencies consider the environmental effects of proposed Federal actions. NEPA's purpose is to ensure that ''the Agency, in reaching its decision, will have available, and will carefully consider, detailed information concerning significant environmental impacts.'' *Robertson* v. *Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 349 (1989). NEPA requires agencies to ''include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on the environmental impact of the proposed

action * * *'' (see 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)). Regulations implementing NEPA define ''major Federal action'' as:

> * * * actions with effects that may be major and which are potentially subject to Federal control and responsibility. Major reinforces but does not have a meaning independent of significantly (40 CFR 1508.27). Actions include the circumstance where the responsible officials fail to act and that failure to act is reviewable by courts or administrative tribunals under the Administrative Procedure Act or other applicable law as Agency action (40 CFR 1508.18).

FDA has concluded that under the NEPA implementing regulations, NEPA applies to FDA's decision not to object to a PMN. Under section 409(h) of the act, if FDA does not object to an FCS notification within 120 days of filing, the notification becomes effective and the substance may legally be marketed for the notified use. As discussed in more detail below, under the relevant case law, FDA has concluded that this inaction constitutes final agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). As a final agency action, FDA's decision not to object is subject to NEPA's procedural requirements.

Under the APA, unless otherwise provided by statute, only ''final Agency action'' is subject to judicial review (5 U.S.C. 704). The Supreme Court recently held that to meet the finality requirement, agency action ''must mark the consummation of the Agency's decision making process it must not be of a merely tentative or interlocutory nature,'' and ''must be one by which rights or obligations have been determined, or from which legal consequences will flow.'' *Bennett* v. *Spear*, 520 U.S. 154, 177 (1997). Both conditions must be satisfied for agency action to be considered ''final.'' *Id.* Inaction under section 409(h) of the act meets both parts of this test. First, the consummation requirement is met because by operation of law, if FDA does not object, the agency can be considered to have reached its conclusion about the safety of the substance. Second, the determination of rights and obligations requirement is met because, under section 409(h)(2)(A) of the act, the notifier may now market the FCS for the notified use in the United States. This authorization for marketing is a ''direct and appreciable'' legal consequence of the agency's decision not to object. *Id.* at 178.

FDA currently believes that a notification for a food contact substance must contain either an EA or a claim of categorical exclusion. If the environmental component of a notification is missing or deficient under 21 CFR 25.40, the agency will not accept the notification for review. In cases where the agency does not accept a notification based on deficiencies in environmental information, FDA expects to inform the notifier in writing within 30 days of receipt of the submission.

In adopting procedures to implement NEPA, Federal agencies are directed to reduce paperwork (40 CFR 1500.4 and 1500.2(b)) and to reduce delay (40 CFR 1500.5) by using several means, including the use of categorical exclusions. A categorical exclusion is a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment and for which neither an EA nor an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required (40 CFR 1508.4).

FDA has identified a number of categorical exclusions in its environmental regulations in part 25 (21 CFR part 25), including some specified uses of certain food packaging materials when approval is sought through the food additive petition process or exemption through the threshold of regulation process. For example, when the substance is a component of a coating of a finished food-packaging material or is present in such material at not greater than 5 percent-by-weight, and is expected to remain with the finished food contact material through use by the consumer, neither an EA nor EIS is required to be submitted (§ 25.32(i)).

This companion proposed rule proposes to amend § 25.20(i) to add allowing a notification submitted under section 409(h) of the act to become effective to the list of those actions that require an EA. In addition this document will expand the existing categorical exclusions in § 25.32(i), (j), (k), (q), and (r) to include allowing a notification submitted under section 409(h) of the act to become effective. Any existing categorical exclusions for food additive petitions or threshold of regulation exemption requests for such food contact materials could logically be extended to cover PMN's for such materials because the effects on the environment of allowing marketing of the substances—regardless of the process of authorization—are comparable in either case. Based on FDA's experience, the agency anticipates that a majority of PMN's will be subject to a categorical exclusion.

III. Analysis of Economic impacts

A. Benefit-Cost Analysis

FDA has examined the economic implications of this companion proposed rule under Executive Order 12866. Executive Order 12866 directs agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, when regulation is necessary, to select the regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity). Executive Order 12866 classifies a rule as significant if it meets any one of a number of specified conditions, including: Having an annual effect on the economy of $100 million, adversely affecting a sector of the economy in a material way, adversely affecting competition, or adversely affecting jobs. A regulation is also considered significant if it raises novel legal or policy issues. FDA has determined that this companion proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4), requiring cost-benefit and other analyses, in section 1531(a) defines a significant rule as ''a Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million (adjusted annually for inflation) in any 1 year.'' FDA has determined that this companion proposed rule does not constitute a significant rule under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121) defines a major rule for the purpose of congressional review as having caused or being likely to cause one or more of the following: An annual effect on the economy of $100 million; a major increase in costs or prices; significant effects on competition, employment, productivity, or innovation; or significant effects on the ability of U.S.-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets. In accordance with the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, FDA has determined that this companion proposed rule is not a major rule for the purpose of congressional review.

The companion proposed rule allows firms using the new notification process for food contact substances to claim the same categorical exclusions from the requirement of an EA that are currently applicable for food additive petitions

and threshold of regulation exemption requests for the same uses. The rule therefore imposes no additional costs on producers or consumers.

B. Small Entity Analysis

FDA has examined the economic implications of this companion proposed rule as required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612). If a rule has a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the Regulatory Flexibility Act requires agencies to analyze regulatory options that would lessen the economic effect on the rule on small entities. The agency certifies that this companion proposed rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This companion proposed rule will permit notifiers under the new notification process for FCS to claim the same categorical exclusions from the requirement of an EA that are currently applicable for food additive petitions and threshold of regulation exemption requests for the same uses. The proposed rule will not result in any additional costs to any firm. Therefore, this proposed rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

IV. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

FDA tentatively concludes that this companion proposed rule contains no collection of information. Therefore, clearance by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 is not required.

V. Environmental Impact

The agency has determined under 21 CFR 25.30(h) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

VI. Comments

Interested persons may, by July 24, 2000, submit to the Dockets Management Branch (address above) written comments regarding this proposal. This comment period runs concurrently with the comment period for the direct final rule. Two copies of any comment are to be submitted, except that individuals may submit one copy. Comments are to be identified with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document. Received comments may be seen in the Dockets Management Branch between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday. All received comments will be considered as comments regarding the direct final rule and this proposed rule. In the event the direct final rule is withdrawn, all comments received will be considered comments on this proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 25

Environmental impact statements, Foreign relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, it is proposed that 21 CFR part 25 be amended as follows:

PART 25—ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 25 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321–393; 42 U.S.C. 262, 263b–264; 42 U.S.C. 4321, 4332; 40 CFR parts 1500–1508; E.O. 11514, 35 FR 4247, 3 CFR, 1971 Comp., p. 531–533 as amended by E.O. 11991, 42 FR 26967, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 123–124 and E.O. 12114, 44 FR 1957, 3 CFR, 1980 Comp., p. 356–360.

2. Section 25.20 is amended by revising paragraph (i) to read as follows:

§ 25.20 Actions requiring preparation of an environmental assessment.

* * * * *

(i) Approval of food additive petitions and color additive petitions, approval of requests for exemptions for investigational use of food additives, the granting of requests for exemption from regulation as a food additive under § 170.39 of this chapter, and allowing notifications submitted under 21 U.S.C. 348(h) to become effective, unless categorically excluded in § 25.32(b), (c), (i), (j), (k), (l), (o), (q), or (r).

* * * * *

3. Section 25.32 is amended by revising paragraphs (i), (j), (k), (q), and (r) to read as follows:

§ 25.32 Foods, food additives, and color additives.

* * * * *

(i) Approval of a food additive petition or GRAS affirmation petition, the granting of a request for exemption from regulation as a food additive under § 170.39 of this chapter, or allowing a notification submitted under 21 U.S.C. 348(h) to become effective, when the substance is present in finished food-packaging material at not greater than 5 percent-by-weight and is expected to remain with finished food-packaging material through use by consumers or when the substance is a component of a coating of a finished food-packaging material.

(j) Approval of a food additive petition or GRAS affirmation petition, the granting of a request for exemption from regulation as a food additive under § 170.39 of this chapter, or allowing a notification submitted under 21 U.S.C. 348(h) to become effective, when the substance is to be used as a component of a food-contact surface of permanent or semipermanent equipment or of another food-contact article intended for repeated use.

(k) Approval of a food additive petition, color additive petition, or GRAS affirmation petition, or allowing a notification submitted under 21 U.S.C. 348(h) to become effective, for substances added directly to food that are intended to remain in food through ingestion by consumers and that are not intended to replace macronutrients in food.

* * * * *

(q) Approval of a food additive petition, the granting of a request for exemption from regulation as a food additive under § 170.39 of this chapter, or allowing a notification submitted under 21 U.S.C. 348(h) to become effective for a substance registered by the Environmental Protection Agency under FIFRA for the same use requested in the petition, request for an exemption, or notification.

(r) Approval of a food additive petition, color additive, GRAS affirmation petition, or allowing a notification submitted under 21 U.S.C. 348(h) to become effective for a substance that occurs naturally in the environment, when the action does not alter significantly the concentration or distribution of the substance, its metabolites, or degradation products in the environment.

Dated: January 24, 2000.

Margaret M. Dotzel,

Acting Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 00–11750 Filed 5–10–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–F

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

22 CFR Part 706

RIN 3420–ZA00

Information Disclosure

AGENCY: Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule revises the Overseas Private Investment Corporation's (''OPIC'') Freedom of Information Act (''FOIA'') regulations by