

**List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52**

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: October 15, 1996.

William T. Wisniewski,

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.*

[FR Doc. 96-27472 Filed 10-24-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**40 CFR Part 81**

[WA 54-7127; FRL-5640-7]

**Clean Air Act Reclassification; Spokane, Washington Carbon Monoxide Nonattainment Area: Reopening for Public Comment**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; reopening for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is seeking additional public comment on a July 1, 1996 (61 FR 33879), proposal to find that the Spokane, Washington carbon monoxide (CO) nonattainment area has not attained the CO national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) by December 31, 1995, as required by the Clean Air Act (CAA). The additional public comment solicited herein pertains only to an EPA memorandum, dated September 11, 1996, titled "Region X (Spokane, Washington) Site Evaluation Trip." This document provides information on the siting of a CO monitoring site (identified as site #54-063-0044) located at 3rd Avenue and Washington Street in Spokane, Washington. The memorandum is available at the address listed below. EPA is reviewing the monitoring site in order to respond to comments on the July 1, 1996, proposed rule (61 FR 33879).

**DATES:** Comments concerning this action must be received by EPA on or before November 25, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to: Montel Livingston, SIP Manager, Office of Air Quality, M/S OAQ-107, EPA Region 10, Docket #WA 54-7127, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101. The proposed rule and the document entitled "Region X (Spokane, Washington) Site Evaluation Trip" will be available in the public docket.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William M. Hedgebeth of the EPA Region 10 Office of Air Quality, (206) 553-7369.

Dated: October 18, 1996.

Chuck Clarke,

*Regional Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 96-27477 Filed 10-24-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**40 CFR Parts 153 and 159**

[OPP-60010G; FRL-5571-6]

RIN 2070-AB50

**Reporting Requirements for Risk/Benefit Information; Extension of Comment Period to Request Comments on Burden Estimates**

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

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

**SUMMARY:** In the Federal Register of September 20, 1996, EPA extended the reopening of the comment period for a proposed rule that published in the Federal Register of September 24, 1992, which defined the specifics of reporting requirements under section 6(a)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. This document announces a further extension of the comment period for an additional 15 days.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before November 12, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments identified by the docket control number OPP-60010G by mail to: Public Response Section, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments directly to the OPP docket which is located in Rm. 1132 of Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form or encryption. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket number "OPP-60010G." No Confidential Business Information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail. Electronic comments on this document may be

filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this document may be claimed confidential 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. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132 at the Virginia address given above from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jim Roelofs, Policy and Special Projects Staff, Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code (7501C), 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, Telephone: (703) 308-2964, e-mail: roelofs.jim@epamail.epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the Federal Register of August 12, 1996 (61 FR 41764) (FRL-5388-1), EPA announced the reopening of the comment period to a proposed rule published in the Federal Register of September 24, 1992 (57 FR 44290), which defined the specifics of reporting requirements under section 6(a)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Comments were limited to the sole issue of the costs or burdens associated with the proposed rule and the latest draft of the final rule.

On August 29, 1996, a number of industry trade associations formally petitioned the Agency to extend the comment period for 60 days, and to initiate a broader reopening of the rulemaking record to take comment on a number of provisions in the June 14, 1996 "draft final" version of the rule.

In the Federal Register of September 20, 1996 (61 FR 49427) (FRL-5396-1), EPA extended the comment period for an additional 30 days, but denied the petitioners' request to reopen the rulemaking record on issues beyond the costs and burdens associated with the draft final rule. At a meeting on October 11, 1996, between representatives of EPA, a public interest group, and several pesticide industry trade associations, a request was made to allow more time for submitting comments, due to the difficulty of compiling information from numerous registrants on the current and projected burden of compliance with rule