Department of Pesticide Regulation, and private organizations. These comments in their entirety are available in the public docket (OPP–00673). Many of the comments were similar in content, and pertained to general issues concerning Agency policy or specific sections within the protocols themselves. To facilitate review and consideration of the comments, the Agency has grouped comments addressing similar issues together.

After the Agency reviewed the comments, it reached three conclusions:

1. It is the Agency's position that duck HBV serves as an adequate surrogate for human HBV and that the *in vitro* assay is sufficiently sensitive to preclude the need for any *in vivo* testing. The Agency is adopting, where possible, policies and data requirements that minimize animal testing, and when animal testing must be conducted, EPA is committed to reducing the number of animals needed for testing, reducing the pain and suffering of the test animals, and whenever scientifically-defensible, replacing animals with validated non-animal test systems. Therefore, relying heavily on the recommendations of the SAP, the Agency expects to rely on the use of the *in vitro* duck protocol as the method for evaluating the efficacy of disinfectants used to inactivate HHBV. Notwithstanding its commitment to maximize the reduction or elimination ofanimal testing where feasible, the Agency recognizes that some testing may already have been initiated or completed using the duck *in vivo* methodology as of the date of this Notice. On a case-by-case basis, the Agency will generally accept these data, if deemed valid, to support a registration.

2. Label claims against either the Hepadnavirus family or, more specifically, HHBV will be permitted when supported by adequate efficacy claims as described below. In addition, the following label claim language will be deemed acceptable: ''effective against HBV.'' The Agency believes that these label claims can be supported by appropriate DHBV efficacy tests, since the surrogate DHBV has been shown to be a reliable predictor of resistence to chemical disinfection for the Hepadnavirus family as a whole.

3. To ensure that the *in vitro* duck method has been adequately validated, data should be provided from at least two independent laboratories for each product tested (two batches per product per laboratory). The validation of a protocol requires the use of a common positive control disinfectant to be tested concurrently with all new products. The recommended control is alkyldimethylammonium chloride (BTC-835, Onyx Chemical Co.) (AOAC Official Methods of Analysis, Chapter 6, p. 136, 15th Edition, 1990). This agent should serve as both an intra-laboratory and an inter-laboratory control and will be used for analyzing the reproducibility of the efficacy data results for that particular protocol. In order to obtain the necessary inter-laboratory data, all submissions must additionally be subjected to confirmatory testing, with the common positive control, at a second laboratory test facility. It is critical for the Agency to know that a test method is repeatable; i.e., that there is an appropriately small standard deviation of log reduction (LR) values found when the test is repeated on different occasions in the same laboratory as well as when the test is conducted in different laboratories. The use of the common positive control and the generation of confirmatory data in a second testing facility will achieve these goals. A more detailed document outlining the criteria for validation is available electronically under the section titled ''Related Documents'' section of the electronic version of this Notice (''Protocol for Testing the Efficacy of Disinfectants Used to Inactivate Hepatitis B Virus''). This document may also be requested by mail directly from the Agency (refer to **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this Notice).

B. Guidance Documents

The guidance discussed in this notice is intended to provide guidance to EPA personnel and to pesticide applicants and registrants. This notice is not binding on EPA, applicants and registrants, and EPA may depart from the guidance where circumstances warrant and without prior notice. Registrants and applicants may propose altenatives to the protocols described in this notice and the Agency will assess them on a case-by-case basis.

List of Subjects

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

Dated: August 17, 2000.

Marcia E. Mulkey,

Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 00–21784 Filed 8–24–00]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6857–6]

Notice of Proposed Settlement Under Section 122(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act; St. Louis River Site, Duluth, MN

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: Notice of Settlement for recovery of past costs. In accordance with section 122(i)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended (CERCLA), notice is hereby given of a proposed administrative settlement under section 122(h) of CERCLA concerning the St. Louis River Superfund Site, Duluth, Minnesota. The Agreement was signed by the Director, Superfund Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, (U.S. EPA) on August 3, 2000. Subject to review by the public pursuant to this Notice, the agreement was approved by the United States Department of Justice on July 31, 2000. Below are listed the parties who have executed binding certifications of their consent to participate in the settlement: Domtar, Inc.; Honeywell International, Inc.; and The Interlake Corporation. These parties will pay a total of $833,000 in a settlement payment for past response costs under the agreement subject to the contingency that U.S. EPA may elect not to complete the settlement based on matters brought to its attention during the public comment period established by this Notice. This amount represents approximately ninety percent of past response costs U.S. EPA and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry have expended at the St. Louis River Superfund Site as of January 31, 2000.

U.S. EPA is authorized to enter into this agreement under the authority of section 122(h) and 107 of CERCLA. Section 122(h) authorizes settlements with potentially responsible parties for the recovery of past costs expended by the Agency where these claims have not been referred to the U.S. Department of Justice for further action.

U.S. EPA will receive written comments relating to this agreement for thirty days from the date of publication of this notice. The Agency will consider all comments received and may withdraw its consent to the settlement if comments received disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the

settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. U.S. EPA's response to any comments will be available for public inspection at the Superfund Records Center, located at 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Seventh Floor, Chicago, Illinois.

DATES: Comments must be provided on or before September 25, 2000.

ADDRESSES: The proposed settlement and additional background information relating to the settlement are available for public inspection at the Superfund Records Center located at 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Seventh Floor, Chicago, Illinois. A copy of the proposed settlement may be obtained from the Superfund Records Center located at 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Seventh Floor, Chicago, Illinois. Comments should be addressed to Thomas J. Kennedy, Senior Attorney, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Office of Regional Counsel, 77 West Jackson Boulevard (C–14J), Chicago, Illinois 60604, and should refer to: In the Matter of: St. Louis River Superfund Site in Duluth, Minnesota, and U.S. EPA Docket No. V–W–'00–C–604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas J. Kennedy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Office of Regional Counsel, 77 West Jackson Boulevard (C–14J), Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–0708.

Authority: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9601–9675.

William E. Muno,

Director, Superfund Division, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 00–21779 Filed 8–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket No. 94–102; DA #00–1875]

Phase I Enhanced 911 Implementation Issues

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this document the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Bureau) seeks comment on a request filed by the King County, Washington E–911 Program Office for assistance in resolving a conflict related to the implementation of wireless Phase I Enhanced 911 (E911) service in the State of Washington. The King County Request states that King County and several other counties in Washington State have ordered Phase I service from wireless carriers operating in the State and that the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in these counties are capable of receiving and utilizing Phase I information over their existing E911 networks. According to the request, some carriers have agreed to implement Phase I service only if King County and the several other requesting counties pay for some or all of certain network and data base components associated with the delivery of the Phase I service.

King County requests that the Bureau clarify whether the funding of certain of the network and data base components of Phase I service, and the interface of these components to the existing E911 system, are the responsibility of the wireless carriers or the PSAPs.

DATES: Submit comments on or before September 18, 2000; submit reply comments on or before October 11, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Send comments and reply comments to the Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW–A325, Washington, D.C. 20554.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The complete text of this Public Notice is available on the Commission's Internet site, at *www.fcc.gov.* Copies of the King County Request may be obtained from the CC Docket No. 94–102 and is also available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Public Reference Room, Room CY–A257, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554. Comments may be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to *http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html,* or by e-mail to ecfs@fcc.gov.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–21540 Filed 8–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The application also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1843). Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States. Additional information on all bank holding companies may be obtained from the National Information Center website at www.ffiec.gov/nic/.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than September 18, 2000.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (JoAnne F. Lewellen, Assistant Vice President) 90 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480–0291:

1. Marquette County Financial Corporation, Negaunee, Michigan; to merge with Tanis Inc., Calumet, Michigan, and thereby indirectly acquire voting shares of First National Bank of Calumet-Lake Linden, Calumet, Michigan.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, August 21, 2000.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 00–21691 Filed 8–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Proposed U.S. Courthouse, Springfield, MA

Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), the General Services Administration (GSA) has filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and made available to other government and interested private parties, the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)