371293M, Pittsburgh, PA 15251. In addition, paragraph (b) of § 59.409 contains a sentence specifying that the exceedance fee payments should be by check or money order made payable to ''U.S. Environmental Protection Agency'' or ''US EPA.''

II. Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' and is therefore not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. Because EPA has made a ''good cause'' finding that this action is not subject to notice-and-comment requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute (see section I.A of this preamble), it is not subject to the regulatory flexibility provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*), or to sections 202 and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104–4). In addition, this action does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments or impose a significant intergovernmental mandate, as described in sections 203 and 204 of UMRA. This rule also does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of tribal governments, as specified by Executive Order 13084 (63 FR 27655, May 10, 1998). This rule will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

This technical correction action does not involve technical standards; thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. The rule also does not involve special consideration of environmental justice related issues as required by Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). In issuing this rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct, as required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996). The EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the ''Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings' issued under the Executive Order. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*). The EPA's compliance with these statutes and executive orders for the underlying rule is discussed in the September 11, 1998 (63 FR 48848) **Federal Register** document.

The Congressional Review Act (CRA) (5 U.S.C. 801, *et seq.*), as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. Section 808 allows the issuing agency to make a rule effective sooner than otherwise provided by the CRA if the agency makes a good cause finding that notice and public procedure is impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest. This determination must be supported by a brief statement (5 U.S.C. 808(2)). As stated in section I.A of this preamble, EPA has made such a good cause finding, including the reasons therefor, and established an effective date of February 16, 2000. The EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 59

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Architectural coatings, Consumer and commercial products, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: February 10, 2000

Robert Perciasepe,

Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, subpart D of part 59 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 59—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 59 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401, *et seq.*

Subpart D—National Volatile Organic Compound Emission Standards for Architectural Coatings

2. Amend § 59.403 by revising paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 59.403 Exceedance fees.

(d) The exceedance fee shall be submitted to EPA by March 1 following the calendar year in which the coatings are manufactured or imported and shall be sent to the address provided in § 59.409(b).

3. Amend § 59.409 by revising the section heading; designating the existing paragraph as paragraph (a) and revising the first sentence of the paragraph; and adding a new paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 59.409 Addresses of EPA Offices.

(a) Except for exceedance fee payments, each manufacturer and importer of any architectural coating subject to the provisions of this subpart shall submit all requests, reports, submittals, and other communications to the Administrator pursuant to this regulation to the Regional Office of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency that serves the State or Territory in which the corporate headquarters of the manufacturer or importer resides. * * *

(b) Each manufacturer and importer who uses the exceedance fee provisions of § 59.403 shall submit the exceedance fee payment required by § 59.408(d) to the following address: Environmental Protection Agency, AIM Exceedance Fees, Post Office Box 371293M, Pittsburgh, PA 15251. This address is for the fee payment only; the exceedance fee report required by § 59.408(d) is to be submitted to the appropriate EPA Regional Office listed in paragraph (a) of this section. The exceedance fee payment in the form of a check or money order must be made payable to ''U.S. Environmental Protection Agency'' or ''US EPA.''

[FR Doc. 00–3828 Filed 2–15–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[OPP–300969; FRL–6490–5]

RIN 2070–AB78

Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes time-limited tolerances for combined residues of imidacloprid and its metabolites containing the 6–chloropyridinyl moiety, all expressed as parent in or on sweet corn grain, sweet corn forage and sweet corn fodder. This action is in response to EPA's granting of an emergency exemption under section 18 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) authorizing use of the pesticide on sweet corn seed. This regulation establishes a maximum permissible level for residues of imidacloprid in this food commodity. The tolerance will expire and is revoked on December 31, 2001.

DATES: This regulation is effective February 16, 2000. Objections and requests for hearings, identified by docket control number OPP–300969, must be received by EPA on or before April 17, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Written objections and hearing requests may be submitted by mail, in person, or by courier. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit VII. of the ''SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.'' To ensure proper receipt by EPA, your objections and hearing requests must identify docket control number OPP–300969 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Andrew Ertman, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Bldg., 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 308–9367; and e-mail address: ertman.andrew@EPA.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be potentially 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 codes	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 OPP–300969. The official record consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, 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 (CM 2), 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., 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.

II. Background and Statutory Findings

EPA, on its own initiative, in accordance with sections 408(l)(6) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a, is establishing tolerances for combined residues of the insecticide imidacloprid and its metabolites containing the 6–chloropyridinyl moiety, all expressed as parent, in or on sweet corn grain at 0.05 ppm, sweet corn forage at 0.1 ppm, and sweet corn fodder at 0.2 ppm. These tolerances will expire and are revoked on December 31, 2001. EPA will publish a document in the **Federal Register** to remove the revoked tolerances from the Code of Federal Regulations.

Section 408(l)(6) of the FFDCA requires EPA to establish a time-limited tolerance or exemption from the requirement for a tolerance for pesticide chemical residues in food that will result from the use of a pesticide under an emergency exemption granted by EPA under section 18 of FIFRA. Such tolerances can be established without providing notice or period for public comment. EPA does not intend for its actions on section 18 related tolerances to set binding precedents for the application of section 408 and the new safety standard to other tolerances and exemptions.

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of the FFDCA allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the tolerance is ''safe.'' Section 408(b)(2)(A)(ii) defines ''safe'' to mean that ''there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information.'' This includes exposure through drinking water and in residential settings, but does not include occupational exposure. Section 408(b)(2)(C) requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to ''ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue. . . .''

Section 18 of the FIFRA authorizes EPA to exempt any Federal or State agency from any provision of FIFRA, if EPA determines that ''emergency conditions exist which require such exemption.'' This provision was not amended by the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA). EPA has established regulations governing such emergency exemptions in 40 CFR part 166.

III. Emergency Exemption for Imidacloprid on Sweet Corn Seed and FFDCA Tolerances

The applicants requested this use of imidacloprid to control flea beetles on sweet corn due to both the direct damage caused by the flea beetles

feeding on the corn (severely damged or killed corn seedlings) and the more important problem of the flea beetles vectoring the bacterium *Erwinia stewartii*, which causes Stewart's bacterial wilt disease in sweet corn. Without the use of imidacloprid, sweet corn growers would experience severe yield and economic losses. EPA has authorized under FIFRA section 18 the use of imidacloprid on sweet corn seed in Minnesota and Idaho. The corn seed will be authorized to planted in States where the corn flea beetle is creating an emergency situation. After having reviewed the submission, EPA concurs that emergency conditions exist for these States.

As part of its assessment of this emergency exemption, EPA assessed the potential risks presented by residues of imidacloprid in or on sweet corn grain, forage, and fodder. In doing so, EPA considered the safety standard in FFDCA section 408(b)(2), and EPA decided that the necessary tolerances under FFDCA section 408(l)(6) would be consistent with the safety standard and with FIFRA section 18. Consistent with the need to move quickly on the emergency exemption in order to address an urgent non-routine situation and to ensure that the resulting food is safe and lawful, EPA is issuing these tolerances without notice and opportunity for public comment as provided in section 408(l)(6). Although these tolerances will expire and are revoked on December 31, 2001, under FFDCA section 408(l)(5), residues of the pesticide not in excess of the amounts specified in the tolerances remaining in or on sweet corn grain, forage, and fodder after that date will not be unlawful, provided the pesticide is applied in a manner that was lawful under FIFRA, and the residues do not exceed a level that was authorized by this tolerance at the time of that application. EPA will take action to revoke this tolerance earlier if any experience with, scientific data on, or other relevant information on this pesticide indicate that the residues are not safe.

Because these tolerances are being approved under emergency conditions, EPA has not made any decisions about whether imidacloprid meets EPA's registration requirements for use on sweet corn seed or whether permanent tolerances for this use would be appropriate. Under these circumstances, EPA does not believe that these tolerances serve as a basis for registration of imidacloprid by a State for special local needs under FIFRA section 24(c). Nor do these tolerances serve as the basis for any State other than Minnesota and Idaho to use this pesticide on this crop under section 18 of FIFRA without following all provisions of EPA's regulations implementing section 18 as identified in 40 CFR part 166. For additional information regarding the emergency exemption for imidacloprid, contact the Agency's Registration Division at the address provided under ''FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.''

IV. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

EPA performs a number of analyses to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide residues. For further discussion of the regulatory requirements of section 408 and a complete description of the risk assessment process, see the final rule on Bifenthrin Pesticide Tolerances (62 FR 62961, November 26, 1997) (FRL–5754–7).

Consistent with section 408(b)(2)(D), EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action. EPA has sufficient data to assess the hazards of imidacloprid and to make a determination on aggregate exposure, consistent with section 408(b)(2), for a time-limited tolerance for combined residues of imidacloprid and its metabolites containing the 6–chloropyridinyl moiety, all expressed as parent on sweet corn grain at 0.05 part per million (ppm), sweet corn forage at 0.1 ppm, and sweet corn fodder at 0.2 ppm. EPA's assessment of the dietary exposures and risks associated with establishing the tolerance follows.

A. Toxicological Profile

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered its validity, completeness, and reliability as well as the relationship of the results of the studies to human risk. EPA has also considered available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers, including infants and children. The nature of the toxic effects caused by imidacloprid are discussed in this unit.

B. Toxicological Endpoint

Only acute and chronic dietary endpoints were defined. The 10X FQPA factor was reduced to 3X for acute and chronic exposure, and applies to all population subgroups.

1. *Acute toxicity*. The acute Reference Dose (RfD) is 0.42 milligrams/kilograms/body weight/day (mg/kg bwt/day) based on a lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) of 42 mg/kg bwt/day based on decreased motor activity in female rats. An additional 3X FQPA factor was incorporated for all population subgroups to account for neurotoxicity, structure-activity concerns and lack of a no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL). The acute population adjusted dose (aPAD), which is the RfD/3 was calculated to be 0.14 mg/kg bwt/day. Acceptable acute dietary exposure (food plus water) of 100% or less of the aPAD is required for all population subgroups.

2. *Short- and intermediate-term toxicity.* Dermal and inhalation short- and intermediate-term risk assessments are not required for imidacloprid as dermal and inhalation exposure endpoints were not identified due to the demonstrated absence of toxicity, however, because imidacloprid is registered for use on turf, home gardens and pets, EPA has identified potential short-term oral exposures to children for these uses.

A short-term oral endpoint was not identified for imidacloprid. According to current OPP policy, if an oral endpoint is needed for short-term risk assessment (for incorporation of food, water, or oral hand-to-mouth type exposures into an aggregate risk assessment), the acute oral endpoint (LOAEL = 42 mg/kg bwt/day) will be used to incorporate the oral component into aggregate risk.

3. *Chronic toxicity*. EPA has established the RfD for imidacloprid at 0.057 mg/kg/day. This RfD is based on increased number of thyroid lesions at the LOAEL of 16.9/24.9 mg/kg bwt/day (males & females, respectively). An additional 3X FQPA factor was used for all population subgroups. The chronic population adjusted dose (cPAD), which is the RfD/3 was calculated to be 0.019 mg/kg bwt/day. Acceptable chronic dietary exposure (food plus water) of 100% or less of the cPAD is required for all population subgroups.

4. *Carcinogenicity*. Imidacloprid has been classified by the Agency as a Group E chemical, no evidence of carcinogenicity for humans, thus, a cancer risk assessment is not required.

C. Exposures and Risks

1. *From food and feed uses.* Tolerances, some time-limited, are currently established (40 CFR 180.472) for the combined residues of the insecticide imidacloprid and its metabolites containing the 6–chloropyridinyl moiety, all expressed as parent, in or on a variety of raw agricultural and animal commodities at levels ranging from 0.02 ppm in eggs to 15 ppm in raisins, waste. Risk assessments were conducted by EPA to

assess dietary exposures and risks from imidacloprid as follows:

i. *Acute exposure and risk.* Acute dietary risk assessments are performed for a food-use pesticide if a toxicological study has indicated the possibility of an effect of concern occurring as a result of a 1–day or single exposure.

In conducting the acute dietary (food) risk assessment, EPA used the Theoretical Maximum Residue Contribution (TMRC) which assumes tolerance level residues and 100% crop-treated (Tier 1). The analysis evaluates individual food consumption as reported by respondents in the USDA Continuing Surveys of Food Intake by Individuals conducted in 1989 through 1992. The model accumulates exposure to the chemical for each commodity and expresses risk as a function of dietary exposure. Resulting exposure values (at the 95th percentile) and percentage of aPAD utilized ranged from 22% for the United States (U.S.) population to 44% for children 1–6 years old.

ii. *Chronic exposure and risk.* In conducting the chronic dietary (food only) risk assessment, EPA used: (1) Tolerance level residues for imidacloprid; and, (2) percent crop-treated (PCT) information for some of these crops. The analysis evaluates individual food consumption as reported by respondents in the USDA Continuing Surveys of Food Intake by Individuals conducted in 1989 through 1992. The percentages of cPAD consumed for the general population and subgroups of interest ranged from 9.2% for nursing infants 1 year old to 48.5% for children 1–6 years old.

Section 408(b)(2)(E) authorizes EPA to use available data and information on the anticipated residue levels of pesticide residues in food and the actual levels of pesticide chemicals that have been measured in food. If EPA relies on such information, EPA must require that data be provided 5 years after the tolerance is established, modified, or left in effect, demonstrating that the levels in food are not above the levels anticipated. Following the initial data submission, EPA is authorized to require similar data on a time frame it deems appropriate. As required by section 408(b)(2)(E), EPA will issue a data call-in for information relating to anticipated residues to be submitted no later than 5 years from the date of issuance of this tolerance.

Section 408(b)(2)(F) states that the Agency may use data on the actual percent of food treated for assessing chronic dietary risk only if the Agency can make the following findings: Condition 1, that the data used are reliable and provide a valid basis to show what percentage of the food derived from such crop is likely to contain such pesticide residue; Condition 2, that the exposure estimate does not underestimate exposure for any significant subpopulation group; and Condition 3, if data are available on pesticide use and food consumption in a particular area, the exposure estimate does not understate exposure for the population in such area. In addition, the Agency must provide for periodic evaluation of any estimates used. To provide for the periodic evaluation of the estimate of PCT as required by section 408(b)(2)(F), EPA may require registrants to submit data on PCT.

The Agency used PCT information as follows.

The Agency believes that the three conditions listed above have been met. With respect to Condition 1, PCT estimates are derived from Federal and private market survey data, which are reliable and have a valid basis. EPA uses a weighted average PCT for chronic dietary exposure estimates. This weighted average PCT figure is derived by averaging State-level data for a period of up to 10 years, and weighting for the more robust and recent data. A weighted average of the PCT reasonably represents a person's dietary exposure over a lifetime, and is unlikely to underestimate exposure to an individual because of the fact that pesticide use patterns (both regionally and nationally) tend to change continuously over time, such that an individual is unlikely to be exposed to more than the average PCT over a lifetime. For acute dietary exposure estimates, EPA uses an estimated maximum PCT. The exposure estimates resulting from this approach reasonably represent the highest levels to which an individual could be exposed, and are unlikely to underestimate an individual's acute dietary exposure. The Agency is reasonably certain that the percentage of the food treated is not likely to be an underestimated. As to Conditions 2 and 3, regional consumption information and consumption information for significant subpopulations is taken into account through EPA's computer-based model for evaluating the exposure of significant subpopulations including several regional groups. Use of this consumption information in EPA's risk assessment process ensures that EPA's exposure estimate does not understate exposure for any significant subpopulation group and allows the Agency to be reasonably certain that no regional population is exposed to residue levels higher than those estimated by the Agency. Other than the data available through national food consumption surveys, EPA does not have available information on the regional consumption of food to which imidacloprid may be applied in a particular area.

2. *From drinking water.* There is no established Maximum Contaminant Level for residues of imidacloprid in drinking water. No health advisory levels for imidacloprid in drinking water have been established.

Imidacloprid is persistent, water soluble, and fairly mobile. Thus, residues of imidacloprid may be transported to both surface and ground waters. As a condition of registration, the Agency is requiring the submission of the results of two prospective ground water monitoring studies. Results from these studies are not yet available.

i. *Acute exposure and risk.* Estimated concentrations of imidacloprid in surface and ground water used for the acute exposure analysis were 4.1 and 1.1 µg/L (ppb), respectively. These estimated concentrations of imidacloprid in surface and ground water were based upon an application rate of 0.5 lbs ai/A/year.

For purposes of risk assessment, the estimated maximum concentration for imidacloprid in surface and ground waters (which is 4.1 µg/L) should be used for comparison to the back-calculated human health drinking water levels of concern (DWLOCs) for the acute endpoint. The DWLOCs ranged from 780 µg/L for children 1–6 years old to 3,900 µg/L for the U.S. population. These figures are well above the drinking water estimate concentration (DWEC) of 4.1 µg/L.

ii. *Chronic exposure and risk.* Estimated concentrations of imidacloprid in surface and ground water for chronic exposure analysis were 0.1 and 1.1 µg/L (ppb), respectively. These estimated concentrations of imidacloprid in surface and ground water were based upon an application rate of 0.5 lbs ai/A/year.

For purposes of chronic risk assessment, the estimated maximum concentration for imidacloprid in ground waters (which is 1.1 µg/L) should be used for comparison to the back-calculated human health DWLOCs for the chronic (non-cancer) endpoint. The DWLOCs ranged from 98 µg/L for children 1–6 years old to 490 µg/L for Non-hispanic males (other than black or white). These figures are well above the DWEC of 1.1 µg/L.

3. *From non-dietary exposure.* Imidacloprid is currently registered for use on the following residential non-food sites: ornamentals (e.g., flowering and foliage plants, ground covers, turf,

lawns, et al.), tobacco, golf courses, walkways, recreational areas, household or domestic dwellings (indoor/outdoor), and cats/dogs.

i. *Acute exposure and risk.* Occupational/residential exposure risk assessments (namely, short-term dermal, intermediate-term dermal, long-term dermal, and inhalation) are not required owing to the demonstrated absence of dermal and inhalation toxicity.

ii. *Chronic exposure and risk.* Occupational/residential exposure risk assessments (namely, short-term dermal, intermediate-term dermal, long-term dermal, and inhalation) are not required owing to the demonstrated absence of dermal and inhalation toxicity.

iii. *Short- and intermediate-term exposure and risk.* Short- and intermediate-term oral exposure are not expected for adult population subgroups. However, since imidacloprid is registered for use on turf, home gardens and pets, EPA has identified potential short-term oral exposures to children for these uses. Thus, a residential short-term risk assessment via the oral route is required. See section III(E)(4) for a full discussion of this exposure and risk.

4. *Cumulative exposure to substances with a common mechanism of toxicity.* Section 408(b)(2)(D)(v) requires that, when considering whether to establish, modify, or revoke a tolerance, the Agency consider ''available information'' concerning the cumulative effects of a particular pesticide's residues and ''other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity.''

EPA does not have, at this time, available data to determine whether imidacloprid has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances or how to include this pesticide in a cumulative risk assessment. Unlike other pesticides for which EPA has followed a cumulative risk approach based on a common mechanism of toxicity, imidacloprid does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has not assumed that imidacloprid has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances. For more information regarding EPA's efforts to determine which chemicals have a common mechanism of toxicity and to evaluate the cumulative effects of such chemicals, see the final rule for Bifenthrin Pesticide Tolerances (62 FR 62961, November 26, 1997).

D. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety for U.S. Population

1. *Acute risk.* EPA has determined that the acute exposure to imidacloprid from food will utilize 22% of the aPAD (95th percentile) for the most highly exposed population subgroup (U.S. population - all seasons). Despite the potential for exposure to imidacloprid in drinking water, the Agency does not expect the aggregate exposure to exceed 100% of the aPAD. The DWLOC calculated for the U.S. population was 3900 µg/L, which is well above the DWEC of 4.1 µg/L.

2. *Chronic risk.* In conducting the chronic dietary (food only) risk assessment, EPA used: (1) tolerance level residues for imidacloprid; and, (2) PCT information for some of these crops. The analysis evaluates individual food consumption as reported by respondents in the USDA Continuing Surveys of Food Intake by Individuals conducted in 1989 through 1992. The percentage of cPAD consumed for the U.S. population was 22%. The major identifiable subgroup with the highest aggregate exposure is discussed below. EPA generally has no concern for exposures below 100% of the cPAD because the cPAD represents the level at or below which daily aggregate dietary exposure over a lifetime will not pose appreciable risks to human health. Despite the potential for exposure to imidacloprid in drinking water, the Agency does not expect the aggregate exposure to exceed 100% of the cPAD. The DWLOC calculated for the U.S. population was well above the DWEC of 1.1 µg/L.

3. *Short- and intermediate-term risk.* Short- and intermediate-term aggregate exposure takes into account chronic dietary food and water (considered to be a background exposure level) plus indoor and outdoor residential exposure.

Dermal and inhalation short- and intermediate term risk assessments are not required for imidacloprid as dermal and inhalation exposure endpoints were not identified due to the demonstrated absence of toxicity. Short- and intermediate-term oral exposure are not expected for adult population subgroups. A discussion of short and intermediate term oral exposure and risk for children 1–6 can be found in section III(E)(4).

4. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* Imidacloprid has been classified as a Group E chemical, no evidence of carcinogenicity for humans, thus, a cancer risk assessment is not required.

5. *Determination of safety.* Based on these risk assessments, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to imidacloprid residues.

E. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety for Infants and Children

1. *Safety factor for infants and children—* i. *In general.* In assessing the potential for additional sensitivity of infants and children to residues of imidacloprid, EPA considered data from developmental toxicity studies in the rat and rabbit and a 2–generation reproduction study in the rat. The developmental toxicity studies are designed to evaluate adverse effects on the developing organism resulting from maternal pesticide exposure during gestation. Reproduction studies provide information relating to effects from exposure to the pesticide on the reproductive capability of mating animals and data on systemic toxicity.

FFDCA section 408 provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold margin of safety for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for prenatal and postnatal toxicity and the completeness of the data base unless EPA determines that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. Margins of safety are incorporated into EPA risk assessments either directly through use of a margin of exposure (MOE) analysis or through using uncertainty (safety) factors in calculating a dose level that poses no appreciable risk to humans. EPA believes that reliable data support using the standard MOE and uncertainty factor (usually 100 for combined interspecies and intraspecies variability) and not the additional tenfold MOE/uncertainty factor when EPA has a complete data base under existing guidelines and when the severity of the effect in infants or children or the potency or unusual toxic properties of a compound do not raise concerns regarding the adequacy of the standard MOE/safety factor.

ii. *Developmental toxicity studies.* In a developmental toxicity study with Sprague-Dawley rats, groups of pregnant animals (25/group) received oral administration of imidacloprid (94.2%) at 0, 10, 30, or 100 mg/kg bwt/day during gestation days 6 through 16. Maternal toxicity was manifested as decreased body weight gain at all dose levels and reduced food consumption at 100 mg/kg bwt/day. No treatment-related effects were seen in any of the reproductive parameters (i.e., Cesarean section evaluation). At 100 mg/kg bwt/day, developmental toxicity manifested as wavy ribs (fetus =7/149 in treated vs. 2/158 in controls and litters, 4/25 vs. 1/25). For maternal toxicity, the LOAEL was 10 mg/kg bwt/day lowest dose tested (LDT) based on decreased body weight gain; a NOAEL was not

established. For developmental toxicity, the NOAEL was 30 mg/kg bwt/day and the LOAEL was 100 mg/kg bwt/day based on increased wavy ribs.

In a developmental toxicity study with Chinchilla rabbits, groups of 16 pregnant does were given oral doses of imidacloprid (94.2%) at 0, 8, 24 or 72 mg/kg bwt/day during gestation days 6 through 18. For maternal toxicity, the NOAEL was 24 mg/kg bwt/day and the LOAEL was 72 mg/kg bwt/day based on mortality, decreased body weight gain, increased resorptions, and increased abortions. For developmental toxicity, the NOAEL was 24 mg/kg bwt/day and the LOAEL was 72 mg/kg bwt/day based on decreased fetal body weight, increased resorptions, and increased skeletal abnormalities.

iii. *Reproductive toxicity study*. In a 2–generation reproductive toxicity study, imidacloprid (95.3%) was administered to Wistar/Han rats at dietary levels of 0, 100, 250, or 700 ppm (0, 7.3, 18.3, or 52.0 mg/kg bwt/day for males and 0, 8.0, 20.5, or 57.4 mg/kg bwt/day for females). For parental/systemic/reproductive toxicity, the NOAEL was 250 ppm (18.3 mg/kg bwt/day) and the LOAEL was 750 ppm (52 mg/kg bwt/day), based on decreases in body weight in both sexes in both generations. Based on these factors, the Agency determined that the review be revised to indicate the parental/systemic/reproductive NOAEL and LOAEL to be 250 and 700 ppm, respectively, based upon the body weight decrements observed in both sexes in both generations.

iv. *Prenatal and postnatal sensitivity*. The developmental toxicity data demonstrated no increased sensitivity of rats or rabbits to in utero exposure to imidacloprid. In addition, the multi-generation reproductive toxicity study data did not identify any increased sensitivity of rats to in utero or postnatal exposure. Parental NOAELs were lower or equivalent to developmental or offspring NOAELs.

v. *Conclusion*. There is a need for a developmental neurotoxicity study for assessment of potential alterations of functional development. However, the Agency has determined that this data gap does not preclude the establishment/continuance of tolerances. The 10X safety factor to account for enhanced sensitivity of infants and children (as required by FQPA) was reduced to 3X and the factor applies to all population subgroups.

2. *Acute risk*. Using the conservative TMRC exposure assumptions described above, and taking into account the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data, EPA has estimated the acute exposure to imidacloprid from food for the most highly exposed population subgroup (Children 1–6 years) will utilize 44% of the aPAD. It was determined that an acceptable acute dietary exposure (food plus water) of 100% or less of the aPAD is needed to protect the safety of all population subgroups. Despite the potential for exposure to imidacloprid in drinking water, EPA does not expect the aggregate exposure to exceed 100% of the aPAD for children 1–6 years old. The maximum concentration of imidacloprid in surface and ground water for acute exposure is very small (4.1 µg/L) compared to the DWEC of 780 µg/L.

3. *Chronic risk*. Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit, EPA has concluded that aggregate exposure to imidacloprid from food will utilize 48% of the cPAD for infants and children. EPA generally has no concern for exposures below 100% of the cPAD because the cPAD represents the level at or below which daily aggregate dietary exposure over a lifetime will not pose appreciable risks to human health. Despite the potential for exposure to imidacloprid in drinking water, EPA does not expect the aggregate exposure to exceed 100% of the cPAD for children 1–6 years old. The maximum concentration of imidacloprid in surface and ground water for acute exposure is very small (1.1 µg/L) compared to the DWEC of 98 µg/L.

4. *Short- or intermediate-term risk*. As noted earlier in this document, dermal and inhalation short- and intermediate term risk assessments are not required for imidacloprid as dermal and inhalation exposure endpoints were not identified due to the demonstrated absence of toxicity. Short- and intermediate-term oral exposure are not expected for adult population subgroups. However, since imidacloprid is registered for use on turf, home gardens and pets, EPA has identified potential short-term oral exposures to children for these uses.

A short-term oral endpoint was not identified for imidacloprid. According to current OPP policy, if an oral endpoint is needed for short-term risk assessment (for incorporation of food, water, or oral hand-to-mouth type exposures into an aggregate risk assessment), the acute oral endpoint (LOAEL = 42 mg/kg bwt/day) will be used to incorporate the oral component into aggregate risk.

The margin of exposure for chronic dietary exposure (food only) and residential exposure (hand-to-mouth from turf, garden, and pet uses) for children age 1–6 was calculated to be 302. The safe level for imidacloprid is 300.

Potential short-term exposure from drinking water is at a level below the Agency's level of concern with the DWLOC (10 µg/L) being greater than the DWEC of 1.1 µg/L.

The Agency concludes the short-term aggregate risk to the highest exposed population subgroup (children, 1 to 6 years old) from home garden, turf, and pet uses of imidacloprid does not exceed EPA's level of concern.

5. *Determination of safety*. Based on these risk assessments, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to imidacloprid residues.

V. Other Considerations

A. Metabolism in Plants and Animals

The nature of imidacloprid residues in plants and in animals is adequately understood. The residue of concern is imidacloprid and its metabolites containing the 6–chloropyridinyl moiety, all expressed as parent, as specified in 40 CFR 180.472.

B. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

Adequate enforcement methodology is available to enforce the tolerance expression. The method may be requested from: Calvin Furlow, PIRIB, IRSD (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Bldg., 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 305–5229; e-mail address: furlow.calvin@EPA.gov.

C. Magnitude of Residues

Crop field trials on field corn seed treatment (with the same use rate as on sweet corn seeds) have been submitted), and residues of imidacloprid are not expected to exceed 0.05 ppm in corn grain, 0.1 ppm in forage, and 0.2 ppm in fodder. The Agency has translated these residue results to sweet corn, and thus, residues of imidacloprid are not expected to exceed 0.05 ppm in sweet corn grain, 0.1 ppm in forage, and 0.2 ppm in fodder with its use on sweet corn seed.

D. International Residue Limits

There are no CODEX, Canadian, or Mexican Maximum Residue Limits (MRL) for imidacloprid on sweet corn. Thus, harmonization is not an issue for these time limited tolerances.

E. Rotational Crop Restrictions

The rotational crop restrictions follow the original section 3 labels.

VI. Conclusion

Therefore, the tolerance is established for the combined residues of imidacloprid and its metabolites containing the 6–chloropyridinyl moiety, all expressed as parent on sweet corn grain at 0.05 ppm, sweet corn forage at 0.1 ppm, and sweet corn fodder at 0.2 ppm.

VII. Objections and Hearing Requests

Under section 408(g) of the FFDCA, as amended by the FQPA, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. The EPA procedural regulations which govern the submission of objections and requests for hearings appear in 40 CFR part 178. Although the procedures in those regulations require some modification to reflect the amendments made to the FFDCA by the FQPA of 1996, EPA will continue to use those procedures, with appropriate adjustments, until the necessary modifications can be made. The new section 408(g) provides essentially the same process for persons to ''object'' to a regulation for an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance issued by EPA under new section 408(d), as was provided in the old FFDCA sections 408 and 409. However, the period for filing objections is now 60 days, rather than 30 days.

A. What Do I Need to Do to File an Objection or Request a Hearing?

You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in this unit and in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket control number OPP–300969 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All requests must be in writing, and must be mailed or delivered to the Hearing Clerk on or before April 17, 2000.

1. *Filing the request.* Your objection must specify the specific provisions in the regulation that you object to, and the grounds for the objections (40 CFR 178.25). If a hearing is requested, the objections must include a statement of the factual issues(s) on which a hearing is requested, the requestor's contentions on such issues, and a summary of any evidence relied upon by the objector (40 CFR 178.27). Information submitted in connection with an objection or hearing request may be claimed confidential 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. A copy of the information that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice.

Mail your written request to: Office of the Hearing Clerk (1900), Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Bldg., 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460. You may also deliver your request to the Office of the Hearing Clerk in Rm. M3708, Waterside Mall, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. The Office of the Hearing Clerk is open from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Office of the Hearing Clerk is (202) 260–4865.

2. *Tolerance fee payment.* If you file an objection or request a hearing, you must also pay the fee prescribed by 40 CFR 180.33(i) or request a waiver of that fee pursuant to 40 CFR 180.33(m). You must mail the fee to: EPA Headquarters Accounting Operations Branch, Office of Pesticide Programs, P.O. Box 360277M, Pittsburgh, PA 15251. Please identify the fee submission by labeling it ''Tolerance Petition Fees.''

EPA is authorized to waive any fee requirement ''when in the judgement of the Administrator such a waiver or refund is equitable and not contrary to the purpose of this subsection.'' For additional information regarding the waiver of these fees, you may contact James Tompkins by phone at (703) 305–5697, by e-mail at tompkins.jim@EPA.gov, or by mailing a request for information to Mr. Tompkins at Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Bldg., 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460.

If you would like to request a waiver of the tolerance objection fees, you must mail your request for such a waiver to: James Hollins, Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Bldg., 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460.

3. *Copies for the Docket.* In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in Unit VII.A., you should also send a copy of your request to the PIRIB for its inclusion in the official record that is described in Unit I.B.2. Mail your copies, identified by the docket control number OPP–300969, to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch, Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Bldg., 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460.

In person or by courier, bring a copy to the location of the PIRIB described in Unit I.B.2. You may also send an electronic copy of your request via e-mail to: opp-docket@EPA.gov. Please use an ASCII file format and avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Copies of electronic objections and hearing requests will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 6.1/8.0 file format or ASCII file format. Do not include any CBI in your electronic copy. You may also submit an electronic copy of your request at many Federal Depository Libraries.

B. When Will the Agency Grant a Request for a Hearing?

A request for a hearing will be granted if the Administrator determines that the material submitted shows the following: There is a genuine and substantial issue of fact; there is a reasonable possibility that available evidence identified by the requestor would, if established resolve one or more of such issues in favor of the requestor, taking into account uncontested claims or facts to the contrary; and resolution of the factual issues(s) in the manner sought by the requestor would be adequate to justify the action requested (40 CFR 178.32).

VIII. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

This final rule establishes time limited tolerances under FFDCA section 408. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled *Regulatory Planning and Review* (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). This final rule does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, or impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Public Law 104–4). Nor does it require any prior consultation as specified by Executive Order 13084, entitled *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments* (63 FR 27655, May 19, 1998); special considerations as required by Executive Order 12898, entitled *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994); or require OMB review or any Agency action under Executive Order 13045, entitled *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks* (62 FR 19885, April 23,

1997). This action does not involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of 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). Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a FIFRA section 18 petition under FFDCA section 408, such as the tolerances in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) do not apply. In addition, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132, entitled *Federalism* (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure ''meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications.'' ''Policies that have federalism implications'' is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have ''substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.'' This final rule directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers and food retailers, not States. This action does not alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of FFDCA section 408(n)(4).

IX. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of this final rule in the **Federal Register**. This final rule is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

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

Dated: February 8, 2000.

James Jones,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR chapter I is amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

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

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

2. In § 180.472, by alphabetically adding the following commodities to the table in paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 180.472 Imidacloprid; tolerances for residues.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

Commodity	Parts per million	Expiration/ revocation date
* * *	* * *	*
Sweet corn, fodder	0.2	12/31/01
Sweet corn, forage	0.1	12/31/01
Sweet corn, grain	0.05	12/31/01
* * *	* * *	*

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 00–3493 Filed 2–15–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

Tolerances and Exemptions from Tolerances for Pesticide Chemicals in Food

CFR Correction

In Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, parts 150-189, revised as of July 1, 1999, page 434, § 180.438(a) table is corrected by adding ''0.4'' under the heading ''parts per million'' for the entry ''Brassica, head and stem subgroup''.

[FR Doc. 00–55504 Filed 2–15–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 51

[CC Docket Nos. 98–147, 98–11, 98–26, 98–32, 98–78, 98–91, FCC 99–413]

Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, we determine that US West may not avoid the obligations placed on incumbent LECs under section 251(c) of the Act in connection with the provision of advanced services. We find that when xDSL-based advanced services both originate and terminate ''within a telephone exchange,'' and provide subscribers with the capability of communicating with other subscribers in that same exchange, they are properly classified as ''telephone exchange service.'' We also find that xDSL-based advanced services constitute ''exchange access'' when they provide subscribers with the ability to communicate across exchange boundaries for the purposes of originating or terminating telephone toll services.

DATES: Effective December 23, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher Libertelli, Attorney Advisor, Common Carrier Bureau, Policy and Program Planning Division, 202–418–1580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the *Order on Remand* in CC Docket 98–147, 98–11, 98–26, 98–78, 98–91, FCC 99–413, adopted on December 23, 1999 and released on December 23, 1999. The complete text of the *Order on Remand* is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Courtyard Level, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services (ITS Inc.), CY–B400, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C.

Synopsis of the Order on Remand

I. Introduction

1. We conclude that advanced services are telecommunications services. The Commission has repeatedly held that specific packet-switched services are ''basic services,'' that is to say, pure transmission services. xDSL and packet switching are simply transmission technologies. We