

metabolized very quickly and eliminated from the body by fecal and urinary routes.

7. *Metabolite toxicology.* IR5878 is extensively metabolized and quickly cleared from the body. Low dose single administration was 5 mg/kg bw and high was 1,000 mg/kg bw, and repeated doses at low dose was 5 mg/kg bw. Single low and high dose, as well as repeated low dose excretion was mainly via feces. Radioactivity was almost completely excreted via urine by 24 hours post dose and via feces by 48 hours post dosing. Excretion patterns following the three dose administrations were not markedly different, and there was no difference due to sex. Metabolites included at least 9 compounds. Metabolic profiles were almost the same following single oral low and high administration, and repeated oral administration, although the amounts of some compounds were different especially between low and high doses. The metabolic profiles for males and females were the same. Identical metabolites were found both in urine and feces. The identity of metabolites found showed that IR5878 was metabolized mainly by O-demethylation yielding compound C₆, N-demethylation yielding compound C₅, O and N-demethylations yielding compound C₄ and hydrolytic cleavage of the sulfamoylurea linkage yielding compounds C₃, C₈ and C₉.

8. *Endocrine disruption.* Orthosulfamuron did not have any effects on endocrine organs or tissues except in the rat at very high doses. In addition, there were no indications of effects on fetal developmental in either rats or rabbits, or on reproductive performance in rats. Therefore, at doses likely to be encountered, orthosulfamuron is not likely to be an endocrine disruptor.

C. Aggregate Exposure

1. *Dietary exposure.* The chronic reference dose (cRfD) and the acute reference dose (aRfD) of 0.05 mg/kg bw and 1.65 mg/kg bw, respectively, were used to assess chronic and acute dietary exposure. ISAGRO has conducted Tier 1 chronic and acute risk assessments which indicate that the highest chronic and acute exposure estimates never exceed 0.13% and 0.01% (at the 95th percentile of exposure) for the chronic and acute RfDs, respectively.

i. *Food.* The chronic reference dose (cRfD) and the acute reference dose (aRfD) of 0.05 mg/kg bw and 1.65 mg/kg bw, respectively, were used to assess chronic and acute dietary exposure. ISAGRO has conducted Tier 1 chronic and acute risk assessments which

indicate that the highest chronic and acute exposure estimates never exceed 0.13% and 0.01% (at the 95th percentile of exposure) for the chronic and acute RfDs, respectively.

ii. *Drinking water.* For drinking water, the FIRST model (FQPA Index Reservoir Screening Tool) was used to conservatively estimate concentrations of orthosulfamuron in surface water. The chronic and acute drinking water estimated concentrations (DWECS) estimated with the FIRST model were 0.35 ppb (chronic) and 4.8 ppb (acute). These compare very favorably to the lowest drinking water level of comparison (DWLOC) values of 500 ppb (chronic) and 16,498 ppb (acute).

2. Non-dietary exposure.

Orthosulfamuron is currently not registered for use on any residential non-food site. Therefore, residential exposure to orthosulfamuron residues will be through dietary exposure only.

D. Cumulative Effects

There is no information currently available to indicate that toxic effects produced by orthosulfamuron are cumulative with those of any other compound.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population.* Based on the conservative exposure assumptions described above and on the completeness of the toxicology database, it can be concluded that total aggregate exposure from food and water to the U.S. population and all evaluated population subgroups from orthosulfamuron from all proposed uses will be well below the chronic and acute RfDs. EPA generally has no concerns for estimated exposures below 100% of the RfD, since the RfD represents the level at or below which daily aggregate exposure will not pose an appreciable risk to human health. Thus, ISAGRO believes it can be concluded that there is reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to orthosulfamuron residues.

2. *Infants and children.* In assessing the potential for additional sensitivity of infants and children to residues of orthosulfamuron, the data from developmental toxicity studies in both the rat and rabbit and a two generation reproduction study in rats have been considered. The developmental toxicity studies evaluate potential adverse effects on the developing animal resulting from pesticide exposure to the mother during prenatal development. The reproduction study evaluates effects from exposure to the pesticide on the reproductive capability of mating

animals through two generations, as well as any observed systemic toxicity.

Since none of the studies indicate the offspring to be more sensitive and all effects were secondary to severe maternal toxicity, ISAGRO believes that infants and children are protected and that an additional uncertainty factor for infants and children is not warranted.

F. International Tolerances

No CODEX maximum residue levels (MRL's) have been established for residues of orthosulfamuron on any crops at this time.

[FR Doc. 05-14606 Filed 7-26-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPP-2005-0079; FRL-7706-4]

Notice of Availability Regarding Activity-Based Reentry Restrictions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: To enhance transparency in the EPA's decision making, this notice announces the availability of its guidance, comments from interested parties, its response to stakeholder input, and several other documents related to the use of activity-based reentry restrictions. Based on consideration of the extensive stakeholder input, the EPA intends to continue with its case-by-case consideration in setting worker field reentry restrictions described in its 2001 guidance document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard Dumas, Special Review and Reregistration Division (7508C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 308-8015; fax number: (703) 308-8005; e-mail address: dumas.richard@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

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 this unit could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether this action might apply to certain entities. If you have any

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 Copies of this Document and Other Related Information?

1. *Docket.* EPA has established an official public docket for this action under docket identification number OPP-2005-0079. The official public docket consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received, and other information related to this action. Although a part of the official docket, the public docket does not include Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. The official public docket is the collection of materials that is available for public viewing at the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1801 S. Bell St., Arlington, VA. This docket facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The docket telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

2. *Electronic access.* You may access this **Federal Register** document electronically through the EPA Internet under the "**Federal Register**" listings at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/>.

An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, EPA Dockets. You may use EPA Dockets at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket/> to view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the docket facility identified in Unit I.B.1. Once in the system, select "search," then key in the appropriate docket ID number.

II. Background

A. What Action is the Agency Taking?

Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), EPA (the Agency) is required to ensure that pesticides do not cause unreasonable adverse effects to the environment. Data are presented to the Agency regarding the safety of the pesticide and it is the Agency's responsibility to determine if a pesticide can be used consistent with the FIFRA standard. The Agency makes its safety determination based on the risks and

benefits associated with the use of the pesticide. Using the best available data and information, the Agency conducts risk assessments for farmworkers exposed to pesticides from contact with treated surfaces while performing various tasks in the field. Risk assessments involved combining data on the hazard of the chemical, estimates of exposure for the tasks actually performed in the field for a particular crop and safety factors to account for extrapolating animal data to humans and differences among people. When a risk of concern is identified, the Agency considers ways to reduce exposure to pesticide residues by farmworkers. One of the measures used to mitigate the exposure of workers to pesticide residues is to restrict entry to areas recently treated with pesticides. These restricted entry intervals (REIs) take into account the types of activities conducted by farmworkers that cause them to come into contact with treated surfaces, high contact with treated plant surfaces vs. low contact with treated plant surfaces. The Agency determines when it is safe for workers to enter a treated area to conduct these activities.

In a few 1999 chemical decisions, the Agency set more than one REI for some crops. That is, it set one REI for higher contact activities and a shorter REI for all other activities for the same crop. Among other things, this approach created some confusion and concerns that allowing reentry during a REI erodes the effectiveness of over a decade of worker protection training. To address these concerns, a workgroup was formed to address implementation issues associated with REIs. This workgroup included risk-management, worker protection, and enforcement staff from EPA headquarters, EPA Regional offices and states. This effort contributed to a guidance document for Agency risk managers. The document dated September 6, 2001, provides guidance for Agency risk managers to consider in making activity-based reentry decisions, provides an alternative to setting more than one REI for a single crop by employing exceptions and prohibitions to REI on product labels, and encourages using the approach sparingly.

Several stakeholder groups have expressed concern and raised issues about the approach described in the guidance document. Over the past few years, the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) has actively sought input from interested parties to understand the range of perspectives on the approach and to get ideas for improving the overall approach. The Agency received input from state officials responsible for

the implementation of pesticide labeling and the Worker Protection Standard (WPS), the pesticide industry who developed much of the activity-based worker exposure data in support of its registrations, advocacy groups who focus on worker protection issues, and grower groups who seek the maximum flexibility in the use of crop protection chemicals. Because of its broad stakeholder outreach, the Agency believes that at this time, it is unlikely that the public would provide significant new information if a formal public comment period were open on this matter.

Based on consideration of extensive stakeholder input, the Agency intends to continue its current practice of considering the use of activity-based reentry restrictions on a case-by-case basis. In reaching this conclusion, the Agency shares the concerns raised by some stakeholders regarding the enforceability and the potential reduction in the effectiveness of worker training programs that may result from the use of activity-based reentry labeling. However, the Agency believes there are circumstances when the use of such labeling is warranted because of a clear agronomic need and alternative approaches for balancing risks and benefits are less effective.

This notice announces the opening of a special docket describing the Agency's general approach for considering specific fieldworker activity information in setting restricted entry intervals. A docket has been established that includes the program's general approach and supporting documentation including written comments, the Agency response and other related documents. As mentioned above, based on its consideration of the extensive stakeholder input, the Agency intends to continue its case-by-case consideration in making reentry decisions, as described in its 2001 guidance document. The approach described in the guidance is non-binding and the Agency remains open to alternative approaches for addressing worker reentry risk concerns.

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

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, 7 U.S.C. 136, *et seq.*

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, pesticides and pests.

Dated: July 21, 2005.

James Jones,

Director, Office of Pesticides Programs.

[FR Doc. 05-14851 Filed 7-26-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7944-5]

Proposed CERCLA Administrative Cost Recovery Settlement; Shawn Callister, Plain City Drum Site, Weber County, Utah

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Administrative order on consent; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 122(h)(1) 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 Order On Consent (AOC) for recovery of certain past response costs concerning the Plain City Drum Site in Weber County, Utah, with Mr. Shawn Callister, Respondent. The settlement requires Mr. Callister to pay \$10,000.00 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for partial payment of past response costs incurred by EPA. The AOC includes a covenant not to sue or to take judicial or administrative action against the Respondent pursuant to sections 106 and 107(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607(a). This covenant not to sue is conditioned upon the veracity and completeness of the Financial Information provided to EPA by Mr. Callister. The covenant not to sue extends only to Mr. Callister and does not extend to any other person.

In response to the release or threatened release of hazardous substances at or from the Site, EPA undertook response actions at the Site pursuant to section 104 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9604, including emergency removal actions to overpack and properly dispose of twenty eight (28) 55-gallon drums containing flammable liquids. At the time of removal the drums were in poor condition. Some were bulging and some had rusting holes. On-site air monitoring showed the drums were releasing hazardous constituents in the air. The drums were located adjacent to a residence with horse corrals and were approximately 3.5 miles from the Harold's Crane Waterfowl Management Area.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before August 26, 2005.

ADDRESSES: The proposed settlement is available for public inspection at the Superfund Records Center, EPA Region 8, 999 18th Street, Suite 300, Denver, CO 80202-2466, (303) 312-6473.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Katherine Letson Bradford, (8ENF-L), EPA Senior Enforcement Attorney, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, 999 18th Street, Denver, CO 80202-2466, (303) 312-6641.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of 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 the Superfund Records Center, EPA Region 8, 999 18th Street, Suite 300, Denver, CO 80202-2466, (303) 312-6473.

Dated: July 11, 2005.

Eddie A. Sierra,

Acting Assistant Regional Administrator, Office of Enforcement, Compliance and Environmental Justice.

[FR Doc. 05-14899 Filed 7-26-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7940-5]

Notice of Proposed Administrative Settlement Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as Amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (PRC Patterson Superfund Removal Site)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice, request for public comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Section 122(i) 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 Order on Consent ("AOC, Region 9 Docket No. 2005-0005) pursuant to Section 122(h) of CERCLA concerning the PRC PATTERSON SUPERFUND REMOVAL SITE (the "Site"), located in Patterson, California. The respondent to the AOC

is the Ramos Environmental Services ("Ramos"). Through the proposed AOC, Ramos will reimburse the United States \$70,000 in response costs incurred at the Site. The AOC provides Ramos with a covenant not to sue and contribution protection for the removal action at the Site. This AOC follows three previous administrative settlements, and will be the last enforcement action regarding this Site. Ramos is the last remaining viable party that is potentially responsible for federal costs at the Site, and is resolving its liability after EPA determined its financial strength and ability to make a reimbursement payment. In total, EPA will have recovered \$570,001 for this Site, leaving an unrecovered balance of approximately \$200,000.

For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this Notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the proposed AOC. The Agency's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at EPA'S Region IX offices, located at 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before 30 days following the date of publication of the Notice.

ADDRESSES: The proposed AOC may be obtained from Judith Winchell, Docket Clerk, telephone (415) 972-3124. Comments regarding the proposed Agreement should be addressed to Judith Winchell (SFD-7) at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105, and should reference the PRC Patterson Superfund Removal Site, Patterson, California, and USEPA Docket No. 2005-0005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: J. Andrew Helmlinger, Office of Regional Counsel, (415) 972-3904, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

Dated: July 19, 2005.

Kay Lawrence,

Acting Director Superfund Division.

[FR Doc. 05-14897 Filed 7-26-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission, Comments Requested

July 15, 2005.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden