IV. How Were these Test Guidelines Developed?

These guidelines were adapted from the series of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Testing of Chemicals. The OECD guidelines which were adapted and are being announced for publication today are: OECD Guideline 407 (Repeated Dose 28-day Oral Toxicity in Rodents) for OPPTS 870.3050, OECD Guideline 421 (Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test) for OPPTS 870.3550, and OECD Guideline 422 (Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study With the Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test) for OPPTS 870.3650. EPA has retained the OECD guideline names. EPA scientists reviewed the OECD guidelines and reformatted them to the OPPTS harmonized guideline format with only minor editorial changes.

The OECD test guidelines were developed initially under the OECD Chemicals Testing Programme and are updated under the OECD Updating Programme for Test Guidelines and the OECD Test Guidelines Programme. The OECD test guideline process involves the use of multi-national panels of scientific and technical experts who develop guideline drafts which are submitted to a review panel. The review process is concluded by the endorsement of the guidelines by the OECD Chemicals Group and the OECD Environment Committee prior to the formal submission to the OECD Council. The OECD Council then adopts the guidelines and publishes them in the official OECD Guidelines for Testing of Chemicals.

V. Are there Any Applicable Voluntary Consensus Standards that EPA Should Consider?

This notice of availability does not involve a proposed regulatory action that would require the Agency to consider 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). Section 12(d) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, business practices, etc.) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA requires EPA to provide an explanation to Congress, through OMB, when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards when the NTTAA directs the Agency to do so.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Chemical testing, Test guideline.

Dated: June 22, 2000.

Susan H. Wayland,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 00–17754 Filed 7–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[WT Docket No. 97–82; DA 00–1531]

Deadline for Final Ex Parte and Other Presentations on Proposed Revisions to Broadband Personal Communications Services (PCS) Rules Extended to July 17, 2000

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document extends the period for final *ex parte* and other presentations on issues raised in this proceeding pertaining to proposed revisions to portions of the broadband Personal Communications Services C and F block rules.

DATES: Final *ex parte* presentations are due July 17, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Audrey Bashkin, Attorney, Auctions and Industry Analysis Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, at (202) 418–0660.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This a summary of a public notice, WT Docket No. 97–82, DA 00–1531, released July 7, 2000. The complete text of the public notice is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room CY–A257, Washington, D.C. 20554, and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., (ITS, Inc.), 1231 20th Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, (202) 857–3800. It is also available on the Commission's website at *http://www.fcc.gov/wtb/auctions.*

1. On June 7, 2000, the Commission released a *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (''FNPRM''), 65 FR 37092 (June 13, 2000), in the above-referenced proceeding. The *FNPRM* seeks comment on proposed revisions to portions of the broadband Personal Communications Services (''PCS'') C and F block rules. The *FPRM* established comment and reply comment deadlines for June 22, 2000 and June 30, 2000, respectively. The *FNPRM* also established 7 p.m., July 12, 2000 as the time and date after which *ex parte* and other presentations would be prohibited.

2. In order to provide interested parties additional time to make *ex parte* presentations, the period for final *ex parte* and other presentations on issues raised in the *FNPRM* is extended until 7 p.m. on July 17, 2000.

3. Pursuant to § 1.1200(a) of the Commission's rules, presentations on issues in the *FNPRM* will be prohibited after 7 p.m., July 17, 2000. 47 CFR 1.1200(a). In all other respects, parties are required to follow the procedures previously outlined in the *FNPRM.*

Federal Communications Commission.

Louis J. Sigalos,

Deputy Chief, Auctions and Industry Analysis Division.

[FR Doc. 00–17671 Filed 7–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket Nos. 96–98, 99–68; FCC 00–227]

Reciprocal Compensation; Inter-Carrier Compensation for ISP-Bound Traffic

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On March 24, 2000, the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated certain provisions of the Commission's Reciprocal Compensation Ruling regarding ISP-bound traffic, and remanded the matter to the Commission. The Commission seeks comment on the issues identified by the court in its decision, including the jurisdictional nature of ISP-bound traffic, the scope of the reciprocal compensation requirement, and the relevance of the concepts of ''termination,'' ''telephone exchange service,'' ''exchange access service,'' and ''information access.'' The Commission also seeks comment on any ex parte presentations filed after the close of the reply period on April 27, 1999, and on any new or innovative inter-carrier compensation arrangements for ISP-bound traffic that may have been considered or entered into during the pendency of this proceeding.

DATES: Comments are due on or before July 21, 2000, and reply comments are due on or before August 4, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Submit electronic comments and reply comments to *http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html.* Requests for filing instructions for e-mail comments may be sent to *ecfs@fcc.gov.* Comments and reply comments filed by paper must be filed with the Commission's Secretary, Magalie Roman Salas, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW–A325, Washington, D.C. 20554. Copies filed with International Transcription Services (ITS), the Commission's duplicating contractor, must be sent to 1231 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, and copies to the Chief, Competitive Pricing Division, must be sent to 445 12th Street, S.W., TW–A225, Washington, D.C. 20554. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for further information on filing requirements.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rodney McDonald, Common Carrier Bureau, Competitive Pricing Division, (202) 418–1520.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission's Public Notice, Comment Sought on Remand of the Commission's Reciprocal Compensation Declaratory Ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, Pleading Cycle Established, CC Docket Nos. 96–98, 99–68, FCC 00–227, was adopted June 22, 2000, and released June 23, 2000. The item in its entirety is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center. The complete text may also be obtained through the world wide web, at http:/www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Common__Carrier/Public__Notices, or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., 1231 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Public Notice

On February 26, 1999, the Commission released a Declaratory Ruling and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Reciprocal Compensation Ruling) to address the issue of inter-carrier compensation for the delivery of telecommunications traffic to an Internet service provider (ISP). (64 FR 14203, 64 FR 14239, March 24, 1999). In the Reciprocal Compensation Ruling, the Commission determined that ISP-bound calls are not local calls subject to reciprocal compensation under our rules implementing section 251(b)(5) of the Act. 47 U.S.C. 251(b)(5). Using an ''end-to-end'' analysis of these calls, the Commission concluded that ISP-bound calls do not terminate at the ISP's local server, but instead continue to one or more Internet websites that are often located in another state. It therefore found that ISP-bound calls are jurisdictionally mixed, largely interstate, and thus not subject to reciprocal compensation. The Commission also acknowledged that there was no federal rule establishing an inter-carrier compensation mechanism for such traffic or governing what amounts, if any, should be paid. In the absence of a federal rule regarding the appropriate inter-carrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic, the Commission held that parties were bound by their interconnection agreements as interpreted and enforced by state commissions. The Commission sought comment, therefore, on a federal inter-carrier compensation mechanism for ISP-bound traffic.

On March 24, 2000, the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated certain provisions of the Reciprocal Compensation Ruling, and remanded the matter to the Commission. *Bell Atl. Tel. Companies* v. *F.C.C.,* 206 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2000). The court ruled that the Commission had not adequately justified the application of its jurisdictional analysis in determining whether a call to an ISP is subject to the reciprocal compensation requirement of section 251(b)(5). The court noted that (1) the Commission failed to apply its definition of ''termination'' to its analysis; and (2) cases upon which the Commission relied in its end-to-end analysis can be distinguished on the theory that they involve continuous communications switched by interexchange carriers (IXCs), as opposed to ISPs, which are not telecommunications providers. The court also found that a remand was required because the Commission did not provide a satisfactory explanation as to how its conclusions regarding ISP-bound traffic accord with the statutory definitions of ''telephone exchange service'' and ''exchange access service.''

The Commission seeks comment on the issues identified by the court in its decision. In particular, the Commission asks parties to comment on the jurisdictional nature of ISP-bound traffic, as well as the scope of the reciprocal compensation requirement of section 251(b)(5), and on the relevance of the concepts of ''termination,'' ''telephone exchange service,'' (47 U.S.C. 153(47)) ''exchange access service,'' (47 U.S.C. 153(16)) and ''information access.'' (47 U.S.C. 251(g); 47 U.S.C. 153(20)) In addition, the Commission seeks to update the record in the pending rulemaking proceeding by inviting parties to comment on any ex parte presentations filed after the close of the reply period on April 27, 1999. Finally, the Commission seeks comment regarding any new or innovative inter-carrier compensation arrangements for ISP-bound traffic that parties may be considering or may have entered into, either voluntarily or at the direction of a state commission, during the pendency of this proceeding.

This matter shall be treated as a ''permit-but-disclose'' proceeding in accordance with the Commission's ex parte rules. 47 CFR 1.1200, 1.1206. Persons making oral ex parte presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentations must contain summaries of the substance of the presentations and not merely a listing of the subjects discussed. More than a one or two sentence description of the views and arguments presented generally is required. 47 CFR 1.1206(b). Other rules pertaining to oral and written ex parte presentations in permit-but-disclose proceedings are set forth in section 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.1206(b).

Interested parties may file comments no later than July 21, 2000. Reply comments may be filed no later than August 4, 2000. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies. (63 FR 24121, May 1, 1998) When filing comments, please reference CC Docket Nos. 96–98, 99–68.

Comments filed through ECFS can be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to *http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html.* Generally, only one copy of an electronic submission must be filed. If multiple docket or rulemaking numbers appear in the caption of this proceeding, however, commenters must transmit one electronic copy of the comments to each docket or rulemaking number referenced in the caption. In completing the transmittal screen, commenters should include their full name, Postal Service mailing address, and the applicable docket or rulemaking number. Parties also may submit an electronic comment by Internet e-mail. To get filing instructions for e-mail comments, commenters should send an e-mail message to *ecfs@fcc.gov* and include ''get form <your e-mail address>'' in the body of the message. A sample form and directions will be sent in reply.

An original and four copies of all comments and reply comments filed by paper must be filed with the Commission's Secretary, Magalie Roman Salas, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW—A325, Washington, D.C. 20554. In addition, one copy of each pleading must be filed with International Transcription Services (ITS), the Commission's duplicating contractor, at its office at 1231 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, and one copy with the Chief, Competitive Pricing Division, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW—A225, Washington, D.C. 20554.

Federal Communications Commission.

Magalie Roman Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–17666 Filed 7–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[MM Docket No. 98–35; FCC 00–191]

Broadcast Services; Radio Stations, Television Stations

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document is the Commission's Report in its 1998 biennial review of its broadcast ownership rules. Such biennial reviews are required by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The intended effect of these reviews is to assure that the Commission's broadcast ownership rules are no more extensive than necessary in the public interest as the result of competition.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roger Holberg, Mass Media Bureau, Policy and Rules Division, (202) 418–2134 or Dan Bring, Mass Media Bureau, Policy and Rules Division, (202) 418–2170.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the *Report* in MM Docket No. 98–35, FCC 00–191, adopted May 26, 2000, and released June 20, 2000. The complete text of this *Report* is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, Room CY–A257, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC and may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service (202) 857–3800, 445 12th Street, SW, Room CY–B402, Washington, DC. The *NPRM* is also available on the Internet at the Commission's website: *http://www.fcc.gov*.

Synopsis of Report

I. Introduction

1. This *Report* reviews our broadcast ownership rules as required by section 202(h) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996)) (''Telecom Act''). That section provides:

> The Commission shall review its rules adopted pursuant to this section and all of its ownership rules biennially as part of its regulatory reform review under section 11 of the Communications Act of 1934 and shall determine whether any of such rules are necessary in the public interest as the result of competition. The Commission shall repeal or modify any regulation it determines to be no longer in the public interest.

Section 11(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, similarly provides that under the statutorily required review, the Commission ''shall determine whether any such regulation is no longer necessary in the public interest as a result of meaningful economic competition'' and requires that the Commission ''shall repeal or modify any regulation it determines to be no longer necessary in the public interest.'' More recently, Congress has prescribed a period of 180 days from November 29, 1999, in which the Commission is to complete the 1998 biennial review of its broadcast ownership rules. (Section 5003, Pub. L. 106–113, 113 Stat. 1501 (1999).) The Conference Report for this 1999 Act states that within the subject period the Commission shall issue a report and if it concludes that it should retain any of the rules unchanged, it ''shall issue a report that includes a full justification of the basis for so finding.''

2. Six rules are reviewed in this *Report*: (1) the national TV ownership rule (including the ''UHF discount''); (2) the local radio ownership rules; (3) the dual network rule; (4) the daily newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule; (5) the cable/television cross-ownership rule; and (6) an experimental broadcast station ownership rule. The *Report* provides a regulatory history of each rule, followed by a discussion of the competitive and diversity issues that justify our decision as to whether the rule remains in the public interest.

3. On March 12, 1998, we adopted a *Notice of Inquiry* (''*NOI*'') in this proceeding seeking comment on the six rules included in this biennial ownership report. The NOI did not seek comment on the local television ownership rule or one-to-a-market ownership rule because these rules were already the subject of pending proceedings and we reasoned that their examination in those proceedings complied with Congress' mandate that we review all of our ownership rules biennially beginning in 1998. On August 5, 1999, we adopted a *Report and Order* (*Report and Order* in MM Docket Nos. 91–221 & 87–8), relaxing our local television ownership rule and one-to-a-market ownership rule. Those decisions provided broadcasters with expanded opportunities to realize the efficiencies of television duopolies and local radio/television combinations in markets where an essential level of competition and diversity would be preserved. More specifically, we narrowed the geographic scope of the television duopoly rule from the Grade B contour approach to a ''DMA'' test. This new approach allows the common ownership of two television stations without regard to contour overlap if the stations are in separate Nielsen Designated Market Areas (''DMAs''). Additionally, it allows the common ownership of two television stations in the same DMA if their Grade B contours do not overlap or if eight independently owned, full-power and operational television stations will remain post merger, and one of the stations is not among the top four ranked stations in the market based on audience share. Furthermore, we adopted waiver criteria presuming, under certain circumstances, that a waiver to allow common local television station ownership is in the public interest where one of the stations is a ''failed station,'' is a ''failing station,'' or where the applicants can show that the combination will result in the construction and operation of an authorized but as yet ''unbuilt'' station. We also substantially relaxed the radio/television cross-ownership (''one-to-a-market'') rule to permit more such combinations, including allowing a party to own as many as one TV station and seven radio stations under certain circumstances. These actions were taken in fulfillment of our obligations under section 202(h) of the Telecom Act and satisfy its requirements as to the subject rules.

4. In the instant phase of our biennial review of broadcast ownership rules, we conclude that the local radio ownership rules, the national television ownership rule (including the UHF discount), and cable/TV cross-ownership rule continue to serve the public interest and so retain these rules. As noted, we have just recently substantially relaxed our local