Dated: July 26, 1999.

**Janet L. Andersen,**

*Director, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.*

[FR Doc. 99–19911 Filed 8–3–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–F**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[OPP–50859; FRL–6078–8]**

### Issuance of Experimental Use Permits

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** EPA has granted experimental use permits (EUPs) to the following pesticide applicants. An EUP permits use of a pesticide for experimental or research purposes only in accordance with the limitations in the permit.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** By mail: Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division (7511C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460.

In person or by telephone: Contact the designated person at the following address at the office location, telephone number, or e-mail address cited in each experimental use permit: 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### I. General Information

*A. Does This Notice Apply to Me?*

This notice is directed to the public in general. Although this action may be of particular interest to those persons who conduct or sponsor research on pesticides, the Agency has not attempted to describe all the specific entities that may be affected by this action. If you have any questions regarding the information in this notice, consult the designated contact person listed for the individual EUP.

*B. How Can I Get Additional Information or Copies of This Document or Other Documents?*

You may obtain electronic copies of this document from the EPA Internet Home Page at http://www.epa.gov/. 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/.

### II. EUPs

EPA has issued the following EUPs:

*275–EUP–82*. Amendment/Extension. Abbott Laboratories, 1401 Sheridan Road, North Chicago, IL 60064. This experimental use permit allows the use of 94 pounds of the biochemical plant regulator aminoethoxyvinylglycine on 854 acres of food commodities of the stone fruit crop group to evaluate its potential to improve harvest management. The program is authorized only in the States of Alabama, California, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington. The experimental use permit is effective from May 13, 1999 to April 1, 2001. A tolerance has been established for residues of the active ingredient in or on food commodities of the stone fruit crop group. (Denise Greenway; Rm. 902W43, Crystal Mall #2; telephone: 703–308–8263; e-mail address: greenway.denise@epa.gov)

*67384–EUP–2*. Issuance. American Cocoa Research Institute, 7900 Westpark Drive, Suite A–320, McLean, VA 22102. This experimental use permit allows the use of 180 pounds of the insecticide Trilogy 90EC on 6,300 (64 kg) bags of stored cocoa beans to evaluate the control of stored product insect pests. The program is authorized only in the States of Massachusetts and Virigina. The experimental use permit is effective from June 1, 1999 to June 1, 2000. (Alan Reynolds; Rm. 910, Crystal Mall #2; telephone: 703–605–0515; e-mail address: reynolds.alan@epa.gov)

*67384–EUP–3*. Issuance. American Cocoa Research Institute, 7900 Westpark Drive, Suite A–320, McLean, VA 22102. This experimental use permit allows the use of 103.25 pounds of the insecticide Dipel 2X on 6,300 (64 kg) bags of stored cocoa beans to evaluate the control of warehouse moths. The program is authorized only in the States of Massachusetts and Virginia. The experimental use permit is effective from June 1, 1999 to June 1, 2000. (Alan Reynolds; Rm. 910, Crystal Mall #2; telephone: 703–605–0515; e-mail address: reynolds.alan@epa.gov)

*71927–EUP–1*. Issuance. Arcadis, Geraghty Miller, 14497 N. Dale Mabry Highway, Suite 240, Tampa, FL 33624. This experimental use permit allows the use of 8 pounds of the fungicide *Verticillium dahliae* isolate WCS 850 on 500 acres of elm trees to evaluate the control of dutch elm disease. The program is authorized only in the States of Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. The experimental use permit is effective from April 15, 1999 to June 1, 2001. (Sharlene R. Matten; Rm. 910W51, Crystal Mall #2; telephone: 703–605–0514; e-mail address: matten.sharlene@epa.gov)

*66550–EUP–1*. Issuance. Bird Shield Repellent Corporation, P.O. Box 785, Pullman, Washington 99163. This experimental use permit allows the use of 14.31 pounds of the repellent methyl anthranilate on 50 acres of corn grown for seed for planting and sunflower grown for seed for planting to evaluate the control of the compound on blackbirds and to collect residue data to support exemptions from tolerance on these commodities. The program is authorized only in the States of Colorado and North Dakota. The experimental use permit is effective from July 15, 1999 to January 15, 2000. (Judy Loranger; Rm. 910W24, Crystal Mall #2; telephone: 703–308–8056; e-mail address: loranger.judy@epa.gov)

Persons wishing to review these EUPs are referred to the designated contact person. Inquires concerning these permits should be directed to the persons cited above. It is suggested that interested persons call before visiting the EPA office, so that the appropriate file may be made available for inspection purposes from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

**Authority**: 7 U.S.C. 136.

### List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Experimental use permits.

Dated: July 26, 1999.

**Janet L. Andersen,**

*Director, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.*

[FR Doc. 99–19912 Filed 8–3–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–F**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[OPP–00616; FRL–6093–2]**

### Pesticides; Policy Issues Related to the Food Quality Protection Act

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** To assure that EPA's policies related to implementing the Food Quality Protection Act are transparent and open to public participation, EPA is

soliciting comments on two draft science policy papers entitled ''Guidance for the Conduct of Bridging Studies for Use in Acute Dietary Probabilistic Risk Assessments'' and ''Guidance for the Conduct of Residue Decline Studies for Use in Acute Dietary Probabilistic Risk Assessments.'' This notice is the eleventh in a series concerning science policy documents related to FQPA and developed through the Tolerance Reassessment Advisory Committee.

**DATES:** Comments for these draft science policy papers, identified by docket control number OPP–00616, must be received on or before October 4, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted by mail, electronically, or in person. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit I.C. of the ''SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION'' section. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number OPP–00616 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kathleen Martin, Environmental Protection Agency (7509C), 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 308–2857; fax: (703) 305–5147; e-mail: martin.kathleen@epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## I. General Information

### *A. Does this Action Apply to Me?*

You may be potentially affected by this action if you manufacture or formulate pesticides. Potentially affected categories and entities may include, but are not limited to:

| Categories | NAICS | Examples of potentially affected entities |
|---|---|---|
| Pesticide Producers | 32532 | Pesticide manufacturers<br>Pesticide formulators |

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 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 affects certain entities. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed in the ''FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT'' section.

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

1. *Electronically*. You may obtain electronic copies of this document and the two draft science policy papers from the Office of Pesticide Programs Home Page at http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/. On the Office of Pesticide Programs Home Page select ''TRAC'' and then look up the entry for this document. You can also go directly to the listings at the EPA Home Page at http://www.epa.gov/. On the Home Page select ''Laws and Regulations'' and then look up the entry for this document under **''Federal Register** -- Environmental Documents.'' You can go directly to the **Federal Register** listings http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/.

2. *Fax on demand*. You may request to receive a faxed copy of the draft science policy papers, as well as supporting information, by using a faxphone to call (202) 401–0527. Select item 6040 for the paper entitled ''Guidance for the Conduct of Bridging Studies for Use in Acute Dietary Probabilistic Risk Assessments'' and select item 6041 for the paper entitled ''Guidance for the Conduct of Residue Decline Studies for Use in Acute Dietary Probabilistic Risk Assessments.'' You may also follow the automated menu.

3. *In person*. The Agency has established an official record for this action under docket control number OPP–00616. 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, 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.

### *C. How and to Whom Do I Submit Comments?*

You may submit comments through the mail, in person, or electronically. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number OPP–00616 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

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

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

3. *Electronically*. You may submit your comments electronically by e-mail to: opp-docket@epa.gov, or you can submit a computer disk as described above. Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. Avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Electronic submissions will be accepted in WordPerfect 5.1/6.1 or ASCII file format. All comments in electronic form must be identified by docket control number OPP–00616. Electronic comments may also be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

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

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

CBI or the procedures for claiming CBI, please consult the person identified in the ''FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT'' section.

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

EPA invites you to provide your views on the various draft science policy papers, new approaches we have not considered, the potential impacts of the various options (including possible unintended consequences), and any data or information that you would like the Agency to consider. You may find the following suggestions helpful for preparing your comments:

1. Explain your views as clearly as possible.
2. Describe any assumptions that you used.
3. Provide solid technical information and/or data to support your views.
4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate.
5. Indicate what you support, as well as what you disagree with.
6. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns.
7. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline in this notice.
8. At the beginning of your comments (e.g., as part of the ''Subject'' heading), be sure to properly identify the document you are commenting on. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number OPP–00616 in the subject line on the first page of your response. You may also provide the name, date, and **Federal Register** citation.

## II. Background for the Tolerance Reassessment Advisory Committee (TRAC)

On August 3, 1996, the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA) was signed into law. Effective upon signature, the FQPA significantly amended the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA). Among other changes, FQPA established a stringent health-based standard (''a reasonable certainty of no harm'') for pesticide residues in foods to assure protection from unacceptable pesticide exposure; provided heightened health protections for infants and children from pesticide risks; required expedited review of new, safer pesticides; created incentives for the development and maintenance of effective crop protection tools for farmers; required reassessment of existing tolerances over a 10-year period; and required periodic re-evaluation of pesticide registrations and tolerances to ensure that scientific data supporting pesticide registrations will remain up-to-date in the future.

Subsequently, the Agency established the Food Safety Advisory Committee (FSAC) as a subcommittee of the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) to assist in soliciting input from stakeholders and to provide input to EPA on some of the broad policy choices facing the Agency and on strategic direction for the Office of Pesticide Programs. The Agency has used the interim approaches developed through discussions with FSAC to make regulatory decisions that met FQPA's standard, but that could be revisited if additional information became available or as the science evolved. As EPA's approach to implementing the scientific provisions of FQPA has evolved, the Agency has sought independent review and public participation, often through presentation of many of the science policy issues to the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP), a group of independent, outside experts who provide peer review and scientific advice to OPP.

In addition, as directed by Vice President Albert Gore, EPA has been working with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and another subcommittee of NACEPT, the Tolerance Reassessment Advisory Committee (TRAC), chaired by the EPA Deputy Administrator and the USDA Deputy Secretary, to address FQPA issues and implementation. TRAC comprises more than 50 representatives of affected user, producer, consumer, public health, environmental, states and other interested groups. The TRAC has met six times as a full committee from May 27 through April 29, 1999.

The Agency has been working with the TRAC to ensure that its science policies, risk assessments of individual pesticides, and process for decision making are transparent and open to public participation. An important product of these consultations with TRAC is the development of a framework for addressing key science policy issues. The Agency decided that the FQPA implementation process and related policies would benefit from initiating notice and comment on the major science policy issues.

The TRAC identified nine science policy issue areas they believe were key to implementation of FQPA and tolerance reassessment. The framework calls for EPA to provide one or more documents for comment on each of the nine issues by announcing their availability in the **Federal Register**. In accordance with the framework described in a separate notice published in the **Federal Register** of October 29, 1998 (63 FR 58038) (FRL–6041–5), EPA has been issuing a series of draft documents concerning nine science policy issues identified by the TRAC related to the implementation of FQPA. This notice announces the availability of two draft science policy papers as identified in the ''SUMMARY'' section.

## III. Summary of ''Guidance for the Conduct of Bridging Studies for Use in Acute Dietary Probabilistic Risk Assessment Assessments'' and ''Guidance for the Conduct of Residue Decline Studies for Use in Acute Dietary Probabilistic Risk Assessments''

These documents provide additional guidance to registrants, other test sponsors, interested parties, and data reviewers on the extent and quality of ''bridging data'' and ''residue decline data'' needed to support the use of typical application rates in acute dietary probabilistic exposure and risk assessments. Bridging data (generally from side-by-side field trials) are used to establish a relationship among residues from field trials conducted at the maximum application scenario (e.g., maximum application rate, highest application frequency, and shortest pre-harvest interval) and residues which would result from more typical application rates. Residue decline data are used to establish a relationship between pesticide residue levels at the time of application or those following the minimum pre-harvest interval to the pesticide residue levels which follow a range of typical harvest times. This guidance provides information on how risk-mitigation activities (e.g., lowered use rates) can be considered in OPP risk assessments and used to adjust tolerance levels. Additional specific desirable elements in an assessment and details (as well as illustrative examples) are described. By following this guidance, registrants and other sponsors may generate pesticide-specific data that can be used by the Agency to produce highly refined, acute dietary probabilistic exposure and risk assessments. While the data developed in accordance with this guidance are preferred, EPA will also consider other data or information as long as they would provide a scientifically sound basis for estimating residues at typical application rates for risk mitigation purposes.

## IV. Questions/Issues for Comment

While comments are invited on any aspect of the draft science policy papers,

OPP is particularly interested in comments on the following questions and issues. Due to the similarity in methods and techniques between the companion papers describing bridging studies and residue decline studies, the following questions relate to both papers.

1. Is the guidance provided in these draft documents clear and complete? If not, why not and what additional guidance is needed?

2. Are the residue studies described in these documents adequate for generating refined acute dietary probabilistic exposure and risk assessments? If not, why not and how should they be modified?

3. OPP has proposed that between one and three field trials be conducted, that at least three application rates and/or five pre-harvest intervals (PHI) be tested, and that three composite samples be collected at each application rate or PHI. Do these recommendations appear to be reasonable and sufficient to establish a rate vs. residue or PHI vs. residue relationship? Are data available which indicate that these guidelines are adequate for the purposes intended? Explain.

4. OPP has stated that it believes that the field trials performed for bridging study/residue decline purposes should be conducted (at an exaggerated rate, if necessary) such that all residues are ''quantifiable'' (i.e., at or greater than the limit of quantitation (LOQ)). We have stated that it would be considered inappropriate to derive a quantitative relationship between application rate and residue level on residues which were below the LOQ as this could introduce substantial uncertainty into the estimated relationship. Please comment on this proposed restriction. Please also comment on the recommendation that studies be conducted at an exaggerated rate, if necessary, to avoid the potential problem associated with non-quantifiable or non-detectable residues.

5. OPP states that extrapolation of data between similar crops may be allowed on a case-by-case basis considering similar cultural practices and application patterns. Should these extrapolations be limited to crops within a crop subgroup/group or should more extensive extrapolations between groups be permitted? If so, on what basis should more extensive extrapolations be permitted?

6. For the relationship produced by bridging or residue decline data to be used in an exposure assessment, it is necessary to have reliable usage data concerning application rates and/or pre-harvest intervals. For example, if residues resulting from the full (maximum) application rate, three-quarters of the maximum application rate, and one-half the maximum application are determined, it is necessary to also have information on the percentage (or fraction) of the time each of these application rates are used. A similar situation exists for pre-harvest intervals. Is this information available from either public or proprietary sources? If so, from which sources can this data be obtained and how readily available is it?

7. The proposed methodology uses what is believed to be the statistically more appropriate ''lack of fit'' test to determine if the hypothesized model (e.g., linear relationship between application rate and residue level, first order decay in residue concentration with time, etc.) is adequate to describe the data. Please comment on this proposed approach and compare it with the more widely used coefficient of determination ($r^2$). Under what circumstances might the use of $r^2$ to judge a fit adequate be preferred to the ''lack of fit'' test? There may be instances where the lack of fit test reveals that the hypothesized linear association can be rejected, but the coefficient of determination shows that a linear relationship accounts for a significant portion of the variability. Should the two be used in conjunction with one another and if so, how? What statistical tests, if any, should be used to judge whether the $r^2$ is significant?

8. OPP will require that composite samples be collected as part of reduced-use field trials in order to retain comparability with earlier maximum rate/minimum PHI field trials conducted to support tolerance decisions. Nevertheless, OPP still has concerns about the effect compositing may have on unit-to-unit variation. When residue estimates are generated from maximum application rate and minimum PHI's (worst-case conditions), OPP believes that there is an adequate degree of compensating overestimation such that individual unit variation is not of concern. By incorporating the range of application rates and PHI's in a probabilistic scenario, the conservatism built into our use of field trial data is eroded and may require us to compensate for this with statistically valid data on individual samples and/or unit-to-unit variation. OPP is proposing that chemical-specific considerations be considered to determine whether the use of composite data from reduced-rate field trials is acceptable. Alternatively, a ''decomposition'' procedure may be judged appropriate. Please comment on whether these concerns are justified and, if so, how they should be addressed by OPP.

9. In performing the regression analysis for bridging studies, OPP has elected not to ''force'' the regression relationship through zero, despite the fact that an application rate of 0 lbs ai/A would be expected to result in a zero parts per million (ppm) concentration in the plant or plant part. Please comment on this decision and any required changes in interpretation of the statistical parameters which a decision to force the regression through zero would entail.

10. OPP intends to combine the bridging study and residue decline study guidance documents into one document. In doing so, would it be useful to expand the section on multiple regression techniques? How useful would this expansion be and are there any recommendations on how this could best be done?

11. What other data or information similar to that described in this guidance document would provide a sound, empirical basis for determining residues at typical application rates for risk mitigation purposes?

**V. Policies Not Rules**

The draft policy document discussed in this notice is intended to provide guidance to EPA personnel and decision-makers, and to the public. As a guidance document and not a rule, the policy in this guidance is not binding on either EPA or any outside parties. Although this guidance provides a starting point for EPA risk assessments, EPA will depart from its policy where the facts or circumstances warrant. In such cases, EPA will explain why a different course was taken. Similarly, outside parties remain free to assert that a policy is not appropriate for a specific pesticide or that the circumstances surrounding a specific risk assessment demonstrate that a policy should be abandoned.

EPA has stated in this notice that it will make available revised guidance after consideration of public comment. Public comment is not being solicited for the purpose of converting any policy document into a binding rule. EPA will not be codifying this policy in the Code of Federal Regulations. EPA is soliciting public comment so that it can make fully informed decisions regarding the content of each guidance document.

The ''revised'' guidance will not be unalterable. Once a ''revised'' guidance document is issued, EPA will continue to treat it as guidance, not a rule. Accordingly, on a case-by-case basis EPA will decide whether it is appropriate to depart from the guidance

or to modify the overall approach in the guidance. In the course of inviting comment on each guidance document, EPA would welcome comments that specifically address how a guidance document can be structured so that it provides meaningful guidance without imposing binding requirements.

### VI. Contents of Docket

Document that are referenced in this notice will be inserted in the docket under docket control number''OPP–00616.'' In addition, the documents referenced in the framework notice, which published in the **Federal Register** on October 29, 1998 (63 FR 58038) have also been inserted in the docket under docket control number OPP–00557.

### List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, pesticides and pests.

Dated: July 28, 1999.

**Susan H. Wayland,**

*Assistant Administrator for Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.*

[FR Doc. 99–20042 Filed 8–3–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–F**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[OPP–00599A; FRL–6096–6]**

## Pesticides; Draft Guidance on Mandatory/Advisory Labeling Statements

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice; extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** On June 2, 1999, EPA issued a notice of availability for a draft Pesticide Registration (PR) Notice entitled ''Guidance for Mandatory and Advisory Labeling Statements.'' The comment period would have ended August 2, 1999. In response to a request by the National Pest Control Association, EPA has decided to extend the comment period by 45 days.

**DATES:** Comments, identified by docket control number OPP–00599A, must be received on or before September 17, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted by mail, electronically, or in person. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit I.C. of the ''SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION'' section. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number OPP–00599A in the subject line on the first page of your response.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeff Kempter (7505C), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 305–5448; fax number: (703) 305–6920; e-mail address: kempter.carlton@epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### I. General Information

*A. Does this Action Apply to Me?*

You may be potentially affected by this notice if you manufacture or formulate pesticides. Potentially affected categories and entities may include, but are not limited to:

| Categories | NAICS | Examples of potentially affected entities |
|---|---|---|
| Pesticide Producers | 32532 | Pesticide manufacturers<br>Pesticide formulators |

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 could also be affected. If available, the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether or not this notice affects certain entities. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this announcement to you, consult the person listed in the ''FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT'' section.

*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. *Fax on demand.* You may request a faxed copy of the draft Pesticide Registration (PR) Notice entitled ''Guidance for Mandatory and Advisory Labeling Statements,'' by using a faxphone to call (202) 401–0527 and selecting item 6120. You may also follow the automated menu.

3. *In person.* The Agency has established an official record for this action under docket control number OPP–00%99A. The official record consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received during an applicable comment period, and other information related to this action, including any information claimed as confidential business information (CBI). This official record includes the documents that are physically located in the docket, as well as the documents that are referenced in those documents. The public version of the official record does not include any information claimed as CBI. The public version of the official record, which includes printed, paper versions of any electronic comments submitted during an applicable comment period, is available for inspection in the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

*C. How and to Whom Do I Submit Comments?*

As described in Unit I.C. of the June 2, 1999, **Federal Register** notice (64 FR 29641) (FRL–6079–4), you may submit comments through the mail, in person, or electronically. Please follow the instructions that are provided in the June 2, 1999, notice. Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number OPP–00599A in the subject line on the first page of your response.

### II. What Action is the Agency Taking?

The Agency has issued the draft document listed in the ''SUMMARY'' and solicited comments on it. The background can be found in the June 2, 1999, **Federal Register** notice (64 FR 29641). A time extension of 45 days is being provided such that the comment period will now end on September 17, 1999.

### List of Subjects

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