

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

Section 6(f)(1) of FIFRA provides that a registrant of a pesticide product may at any time request that any of its pesticide registrations be amended to delete one or more uses. The Act further provides that, before acting on the request, EPA must publish a notice of receipt of any such request in the **Federal Register**. Thereafter, the Administrator may approve such a request.

IV. Loss of Active Ingredients

Unless the requests for cancellations are withdrawn, two pesticide active ingredients will no longer appear in any registered products. Those who are concerned about the potential loss of these active ingredients for pesticidal use are encouraged to work directly with the registrant(s) to explore the possibility of their withdrawing the request for cancellation. The active ingredients are listed in the following Table 3, with the EPA company and CAS number.

TABLE 3. — ACTIVE INGREDIENT DISAPPEARING AS A RESULT OF REGISTRANTS' REQUEST TO CANCEL

CAS No.	Chemical Name	EPA Company No.
29457-72-5	Lithium (Perfluorooctane sulfonate)	004822
58138-08-2	Dichlorophenyl-2-(2,2,2-trichloroethyl)oxirane	062719

V. Procedures for Withdrawal of Request

Registrants who choose to withdraw a request for cancellation must submit such withdrawal in writing to James A. Hollins, at the address given above, postmarked before March 25, 2002, unless indicated otherwise. This written withdrawal of the request for cancellation will apply only to the applicable 6(f)(1) request listed in this notice. If the product(s) have been subject to a previous cancellation action, the effective date of cancellation and all other provisions of any earlier cancellation action are controlling. The withdrawal request must also include a commitment to pay any reregistration fees due, and to fulfill any applicable unsatisfied data requirements.

VI. Provisions for Disposition of Existing Stocks

The effective date of cancellation will be the date of the cancellation order. The orders effecting these requested cancellations will generally permit a registrant to sell or distribute existing stocks for 1-year after the date the cancellation request was received by the Agency. This policy is in accordance with the Agency's statement of policy as prescribed in **Federal Register** of June 26, 1991 (56 FR 29362) (FRL-3846-4). Exception to this general rule will be made if a product poses a risk concern, or is in noncompliance with reregistration requirements, or is subject to a data call-in. In all cases, product-specific disposition dates will be given in the cancellation orders.

Existing stocks are those stocks of registered pesticide products which are currently in the United States and which have been packaged, labeled, and released for shipment prior to the effective date of the cancellation action. Unless the provisions of an earlier order apply, existing stocks already in the hands of dealers or users can be distributed, sold or used legally until they are exhausted, provided that such further sale and use comply with the EPA-approved label and labeling of the affected product(s). Exceptions to these general rules will be made in specific cases when more stringent restrictions on sale, distribution, or use of the products or their ingredients have already been imposed, as in Special Review actions, or where the Agency has identified significant potential risk concerns associated with a particular chemical.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests.

Dated: September 10, 2001.

Richard D. Schmitt,

Associate Director, Information Resources and Services Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 01-24058 Filed 9-25-01; 8:45 a.m.]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-OW-7063-7]

Notice of Availability of Draft Aquatic Life Criteria Document for Atrazine

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability of draft aquatic life criteria document for atrazine.

SUMMARY: Section 304(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop and publish, and from time to time revise, criteria for water accurately reflecting the latest scientific knowledge. These criteria provide EPA's recommendations to states and authorized tribes as guidance in establishing their water quality standards as state or tribal law or regulation. Today, EPA is notifying the public about the availability of the draft aquatic life criteria document for atrazine.

EPA is notifying the public about the availability of this draft document in accordance with the Agency's process for developing or revising criteria (63 FR 68354, December 10, 1998). As indicated in the December 10, 1998 FR notice, the Agency believes it is important to provide the public with an opportunity to submit scientific information on draft criteria. EPA is soliciting views from the public on issues of science pertaining to the information used in deriving the draft criteria. EPA is also soliciting input from the public on harmonizing risk assessment methods used by the Office of Water (OW) in its draft aquatic life criteria document for atrazine and by the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) in its Preliminary Ecological Fate and Effects Risk Assessment for Atrazine, published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.

DATES: All significant scientific information must be submitted to the Agency under docket number W-01-10. All significant scientific information submissions are requested to be submitted within 60 days after publication of this notice. The Administrative Record supporting this draft guidance document is available at the Water Docket, Room EB 57, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20460 on Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. For access to docket materials call (202) 260-3027 for an appointment. A reasonable fee will be charged for photocopies.

ADDRESSES: Send an original and three copies of any written significant scientific information to W-01-10 Comment Clerk, Water Docket (MC4101), USEPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460. Information may be hand-delivered to the Water Docket, USEPA, Room EB 57,

401 M Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. Information may also be submitted electronically to OW-Docket@epa.gov. Information should be submitted as a WP5.1, 6.1 and/or 8.0 or an ASCII file with no form of encryption.

Copies of the criteria document entitled, Ambient Aquatic Life Water Quality Criteria for Atrazine may be obtained from EPA's Water Resource Center by phone at (202) 260-7786, or by e-mail to center.water-resource@epa.gov or by conventional mail to EPA Water Resource Center, RC-4100, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, DC 20460. Alternatively, consult www.epa.gov/OST/standards for download availability.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frank Gostomski, Health and Ecological Criteria Division (4304), US EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20460; (202) 260-1321; gostomski.frank@epa.gov

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

What Are Recommended Water Quality Criteria?

Recommended water quality criteria are the concentrations of a chemical in water at or below which aquatic life are protected from acute and chronic adverse effects of the chemical. Section 304(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act requires EPA to develop and publish, and from time to time revise, criteria for water accurately reflecting the latest scientific knowledge. Water quality criteria developed under section 304(a) are based solely on data and scientific judgments. They do not consider economic impacts or the technological feasibility of meeting the criteria in ambient water. Section 304(a) criteria provide guidance to States and Tribes in adopting water quality standards and provide a scientific basis for them to develop controls of discharges or releases of pollutants. The criteria also provide a scientific basis for EPA to develop Federally promulgated water quality standards under section 303(c).

What Is Atrazine and Why Are We Concerned About It?

Atrazine is an organic chemical used as an herbicide throughout the U.S. for control of weeds in agricultural crops. Environmental exposure occurs mainly from its application as an herbicide but may also occur from industrial manufacture, distribution releases, precipitation, field runoff, and drift. Atrazine is moderately volatile and soluble in water, and resistant to natural degradation in water. Because of atrazine's chemical properties and

widespread use as an herbicide, concerns have been raised over the potential risks posed by exposure of aquatic organisms to it. For these reasons, EPA has developed the following water quality criteria:

Freshwater

Aquatic life should not be affected unacceptably if the:

- One-hour average concentration of atrazine does not exceed 350 ug/l more than once every three years on the average (Acute Criterion); and
- Four-day average concentration of atrazine does not exceed 12 ug/l more than once every three years on the average (Chronic Criterion).

Saltwater

Aquatic life should not be affected unacceptably if the:

- One hour average concentration of atrazine does not exceed 760 ug/l more than once every three years on the average (Acute Criterion); and
- Four-day average concentration of atrazine does not exceed 26 ug/l more than once every three years on the average (Chronic Criterion).

Definitions of Criteria Terminology

One hour average: the average of all samples taken during a one hour period by either continuous sampling or periodic grab samples.

Four day average: the average of all samples taken during four consecutive days by either continuous sampling or periodic grab samples. Also known as a 96-hour average.

Acute Criterion: A chemical concentration protective of aquatic organisms from short term exposure to fast acting chemicals or spikes in concentrations. For example exposure of a fish moving through an area for foraging but not residing in the area.

Chronic Criterion: A chemical concentration protective of aquatic organisms from longer term exposure to slower acting chemicals or relatively steady concentrations. For example, exposure of a fish that resides in an area.

How Has EPA Coordinated Development of Ecological Risk Assessments on Atrazine Between the Office of Water (OW) and the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP)?

Concurrent with OW's release of the Draft Aquatic Life Criteria Document for Atrazine, OPP is releasing its Preliminary Ecological Fate and Effects Risk Assessment for Atrazine. Both offices shared their aquatic toxicity data bases for atrazine in the development of their risk assessment documents. OW

and OPP are currently consulting on their respective ecological risk assessment methodologies. Although there are similarities in the approaches, differences remain. When the consultation is completed, there may be revisions to this assessment. While the consultation is underway, both offices are making their respective ecological risk assessments for atrazine available to the public and requesting comment on their respective methodologies. It would be helpful if comments regarding a methodology that are made to one office are also made available to the other. OW and OPP will share comments received on their respective risk assessment methodologies and will coordinate review of those comments.

Why Is EPA Notifying the Public About the Draft Atrazine Criteria Document?

Today, EPA is notifying the public about the availability of the draft aquatic life criteria document for atrazine to expand the public's involvement in the criteria development process. EPA notified the public of its intent to develop aquatic life criteria for atrazine in the **Federal Register** on October 29, 1999 (64 FR 58409). At that time EPA made available to the public all references identified by a recent literature review and solicited any additional pertinent data or scientific views that would be useful in developing the aquatic life criteria for atrazine. EPA is now making the draft aquatic life criteria document for atrazine available for public review.

As indicated in the December 10, 1998 FR notice, the Agency believes it is important to provide the public with an opportunity to submit scientific information on draft criteria. EPA is soliciting views from the public on issues of science pertaining to the information used to derive the draft criteria. EPA will review and consider significant scientific information submitted by the public that might not have otherwise been identified during development of these criteria.

Where Can I Find More Information on EPA's Revised Process for Developing New or Revised Criteria?

The Agency published detailed information about its revised process for developing and revising criteria in the **Federal Register** on December 10, 1998 (63 FR 68354) and in the EPA document entitled, National Recommended Water Quality—Correction (EPA 822-Z-99-001, April 1999). The purpose of the revised process is to provide expanded opportunities for public input, and to make the criteria development process more efficient.

Dated: August 8, 2001.

Geoffrey H. Grubbs,

Director, Office of Science and Technology.

[FR Doc. 01-23753 Filed 9-25-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Farm Credit Administration Board; Special Meeting

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), of the forthcoming special meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board).

DATE AND TIME: The special meeting of the Board will be held at the offices of the Farm Credit Administration in McLean, Virginia, on September 27, 2001, from 9 a.m. until such time as the Board concludes its business.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kelly Mikel Williams, Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, (703) 883-4025, TDD (703) 883-4444.

ADDRESS: Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102-5090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This meeting of the Board will be open to the public (limited space available). In order to increase the accessibility to Board meetings, persons requiring assistance should make arrangements in advance. The matters to be considered at the meeting are:

Open Session

New Business—Other

—FY 2002 Revised Budget and FY 2003 Proposed Budget

Dated: September 24, 2001.

Kelly Mikel Williams,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 01-24259 Filed 9-24-01; 2:55 pm]

BILLING CODE 6705-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket No. 01-138; FCC 01-269]

Application by Verizon Pennsylvania Inc., Verizon Long Distance, Verizon Enterprise Solutions, Verizon Global Networks Inc., and Verizon Select Services Inc., Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Pennsylvania

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this document the Federal Communications Commission grants the section 271 application of Verizon Pennsylvania Inc., *et al.* (Verizon) for authority to enter the interLATA telecommunications market in the state of Pennsylvania. The Commission grants Verizon's application based on our conclusion that Verizon has satisfied all of the statutory requirements for entry, and opened its local exchange markets to full competition.

DATES: Effective date September 26, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Tanner, Attorney-Advisor, Policy and Program Planning Division, Common Carrier Bureau, (202) 418-1580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's *Memorandum Opinion and Order* in CC Docket No. 01-138, FCC 01-269, released September 19, 2001. The complete text of this document is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Courtyard Level, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC, and also may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Qualex International, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554. It is also available on the Commission's website at <http://www.fcc.gov/ccb/ppp/2001ord.html>.

Synopsis of the Order

1. On June 21, 2001, Verizon filed an application, pursuant to section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for authority to provide in-region, interLATA service in the state of Pennsylvania.

2. *The State Commission's Evaluation.* The Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission (Pennsylvania Commission) advised the Commission,

following months of extensive review, that Verizon met the checklist requirements of section 271(c) and has taken the statutorily required steps to open its local markets to competition. Consequently, the Pennsylvania Commission recommended that the Commission approve Verizon's in-region, interLATA entry in its June 25, 2001 evaluation of the application.

3. *The Department of Justice's Evaluation.* The Department of Justice does not oppose Verizon's section 271 application for Pennsylvania, but states that it is unable fully to endorse it due to concerns about Verizon's wholesale billing systems. The Department of Justice also states, however, that local markets in Pennsylvania show a substantial amount of competitive entry, and does not foreclose the possibility that the Commission may be able to approve Verizon's application.

Primary Issues in Dispute

4. *Checklist Item 2—Unbundled Network Elements.* Based on the record, the Commission finds that Verizon has provided "[n]ondiscriminatory access to network elements in accordance with the requirements of sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1)" of the Act in compliance with checklist item 2. The Commission addresses herein those aspects of this checklist item that raised significant issues concerning whether Verizon's performance demonstrated compliance with the Act: (1) Operations Support Systems (OSS), particularly billing; (2) UNE pricing; and (3) provisioning of UNE combinations.

5. *Access to Operations Support Systems (OSS).* The Commission concludes that Verizon provides nondiscriminatory access to its OSS. Our decision focuses only on issues of controversy, particularly Verizon's wholesale billing functions. The Commission finds that, despite some historical problems in producing a readable, auditable and accurate wholesale bill, Verizon provides a wholesale bill that gives competitive LECs a meaningful opportunity to compete. Verizon demonstrates that recent data show significantly improved performance in delivering timely and accurate bills. Similarly, performance data indicate that any delay associated with BOS BDT bills was temporary, associated with on-going improvements to the billing process and not indicative of a larger, systemic problem with delivering timely bills. In addition, the Commission finds that third-party studies of Verizon's billing systems, processes and performance support Verizon's recent commercial data both for retail-formatted bills and BOS BDT