

control number OPP-00658A 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, 1200 Pennsylvania, Ave., NW., 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 6.1/8.0 or ASCII file format. All comments in electronic form must be identified by docket control number OPP-00658A. 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 under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

#### *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 documents, 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 copies if any technical information and/or data to support your views.
4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate that you provide.
5. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns.
6. Offer alternative ways to improve the proposed rule or collection activity.
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-00658A in the subject line on the first page of your response. You may also provide the name, date, and **Federal Register** citation.

#### **II. Background**

EPA is extending until September 15, 2000 the comment period for its draft science policy document entitled, "Proposed Guidance on Cumulative Risk Assessment of Pesticide Chemicals that Have a Common Mechanism of Toxicity." The original comment period would have closed on August 28, 2000. EPA has received requests from a group of stakeholders, who wish to comment on the draft document, asking EPA to extend the comment period. The group requested an additional 30 days for comment, citing the length and complexity of the proposal, as well as the difficulty of preparing comment during the summer vacation period.

#### **III. Do Any Regulatory Assessment Requirements Apply to this Action?**

No. This action is not a rulemaking, it merely extends the date by which public comments must be submitted to EPA on a pesticide draft science policy document that previously published in

the **Federal Register** of June 30, 2000 (65 FR 40644) (FRL-6556-4). For information about the applicability of the regulatory assessment requirements to that document, please refer to the discussion in Unit I. of the June 30, 2000, document.

#### **List of Subjects**

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

Dated: August 8, 2000.

**Susan H. Wayland,**

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

[FR Doc. 00-20998 Filed 8-17-00]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[AZ023-CORR; FRL-6853-2]

#### **Adequacy Status of the Maricopa County, Arizona Submitted PM-10 Attainment Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes, Correction**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of correction.

**SUMMARY:** This action corrects language in a public notice that was published in the **Federal Register** on April 6, 2000, that stated that the submitted Maricopa County (Phoenix, Arizona) serious area particulate matter (PM-10) attainment plan is adequate for transportation conformity purposes. This notice does not change the adequacy status of the plan, just clarifies language in the April 6 notice.

**DATES:** This notice is effective August 18, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The finding is available at EPA's conformity website: <http://www.epa.gov/oms/traq>, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity"). You may also contact Karina O'Connor, U.S. EPA, Region IX, Air Division AIR-2, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105; (415) 744-1247 or [occonnor.karina@epa.gov](mailto:occonnor.karina@epa.gov).

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

The April 6, 2000 notice announced our finding that the *Revised MAG 1999 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM-10 for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area* (February 2000), submitted by the Arizona on February 16, 2000, contains

adequate emissions budgets<sup>1</sup> for transportation conformity purposes. The last sentence of the notice, which refers to how the adequacy decision was made, incorrectly stated "We followed this guidance in making our inadequacy determination on the Maricopa County PM-10 plan." This sentence should have stated, "We followed this guidance in making our adequacy determination on the Maricopa County PM-10 plan."

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

Dated: August 10, 2000.

**Laura Yoshii,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 00-21077 Filed 8-17-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6854-3]

### Water Pollution Control; Approval of Modification to Wisconsin's Approved National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permitting Program To Administer a State Sewage Sludge Management (Biosolids) Program

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

**ACTION:** Notice; approval of application.

**SUMMARY:** On July 28, 2000, pursuant to section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Regional Administrator for EPA, Region 5, approved the State of Wisconsin's modification of its existing Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WPDES) program to include the administration and enforcement of a state sewage sludge management program where it has jurisdiction.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Soong, at (312) 886-0136, NPDES Support and Technical Assistance Branch, (WN-16J), EPA, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590, or electronically at soong.david@epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document "we," "us," or "our" means EPA.

### Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Was notice provided seeking public comments on Wisconsin's program submittal?
- III. Was a public hearing held?
- IV. Was the State Historic Preservation

- Officer and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service contacted?
- V. Did EPA receive any public comments?
- VI. Does EPA's approval affect Indian Country (18 U.S.C. 1151) in Wisconsin?
- VII. Conclusion
- VIII. **Federal Register** Notice of Approval of State NPDES Programs or Modifications
- IX. Administrative Requirements
  - A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review
  - B. Executive Order 13045: Children's Health Protection
  - C. Executive Order 13084: Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments
  - D. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
  - E. Regulatory Flexibility Act, as Amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*
  - F. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
  - G. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
  - H. Paperwork Reduction Act

### I. Introduction

Wisconsin's application to modify its existing WPDES program to administer and enforce a state sewage sludge management program was submitted on May 26, 1998. Specifically, the state sought approval of a sludge management program which addresses the land application of sludge, surface disposal of sludge, and the landfilling of sludge. On March 8, 1999, the state amended its submittal limiting the state's request to all sludge activities mentioned above within the state except for those activities occurring within "Indian Country" as defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151. The state's sludge management program does not extend to Indian Country, and will not include lands within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations within or abutting the State of Wisconsin, as they did not seek approval for these areas at this time. Wisconsin did not seek approval for the incineration of sludge or the land application of septage. The sludge management program is administered by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resource (WDNR). Modifications were made to the program submittal based on discussions between EPA and WDNR. These modifications are part of the record of the program application and review process.

### II. Was Notice Provided Seeking Public Comments on Wisconsin's Program Submittal?

Wisconsin's application was described in the May 8, 2000 **Federal Register** (65 FR 26607-26611), in which EPA requested public comments for a period of 45 days. Further notice was provided by way of publication in the following newspapers on May 8, 2000:

Wisconsin State Journal; Milwaukee Journal/Sentinel; Green Bay Press Gazette; Superior Daily Telegram; Lacrosse Tribune; Eau Claire Leader Telegram; and Wausau Daily Herald. EPA also provided copies of the public notice to interested persons and parties: permitted facilities, Indian tribes, other Federal and state agencies, and environmental groups within Wisconsin. Copies of WDNR's application package were available for public review at the EPA Region 5 Office and at WDNR's regional offices.

### III. Was a Public Hearing Held?

A public hearing was not held. The above notice explained that a hearing had not been scheduled and how a hearing could be requested. EPA will hold a public hearing whenever the Regional Administrator finds, on the basis of requests, a significant degree of public interest. No request for a hearing was received during the public comment period and therefore, no hearing was held.

### IV. Was the State Historic Preservation Officer and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Contacted?

By letter dated February 23, 2000, we requested concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer that approval of WDNR to implement a sewage sludge management program would not have an adverse impact on historical and archeological resources. We received concurrence on April 12, 2000.

EPA and WDNR discussed the program application with the Green Bay Ecological Services Field Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). On July 20, 2000, an agreement was reached. The objective of the agreement is to ensure compliance with conditions of the Endangered Species Act. The agreement provides that:

1. land application of municipal sludge on actively farmed agricultural land (cultivated within the previous two years) will not have an adverse impact on federally-listed threatened or endangered species or its critical habitat listed as of July 28, 2000, when done in compliance with state rules;
2. the 1999 Wisconsin Statewide Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the Karner Blue Butterfly and Incidental Take Permit TE 010064 issued for the HCP by the FWS covers any incidental take that may occur to the Karner Blue Butterfly as a result of spreading municipal sewage on actively farmed agricultural land until September 27, 2009. It is understood that the issue may need to be further addressed if the HCP and permit are amended in the interim

<sup>1</sup> Note that the plan provides for a regional PM10 emission budget which is applicable for both the annual and 24 hour PM-10 standards.