

COLORADO—PM—10—Continued

Designated area	Designation		Classification	
	Date	Type	Date	Type
AQCR 12 (excluding the Aspen/Pitkin County and Steamboat Springs Area Airshed PM-10 nonattainment areas).	11/15/90	Unclassifiable		
AQCR 13 (excluding the Canon City PM-10 nonattainment area)	1/15/90	Unclassifiable		

[FR Doc. 97-7096 Filed 3-19-97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

40 CFR Part 180

[OPP-300461; FRL-5595-3]

RIN 2070-AC78

Tebufenozide; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes time-limited tolerances for residues of the insecticide tebufenozide in or on the raw agricultural commodities sugar beet roots, sugar beet tops, sugar beet molasses, sugar beet refined sugar and sugar beet dried pulp in connection with EPA's granting of emergency exemptions under section 18 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act authorizing use of tebufenozide on sugar beets in California. This regulation establishes maximum permissible levels for residues of tebufenozide on sugar beets. These tolerances will expire on March 30, 1998.

DATES: This regulation becomes effective March 20, 1997. This entries in the table expire on March 30, 1998. Objections and requests for hearings must be received by EPA on May 19, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written objections and hearing requests, identified by the docket control number, [OPP-300461], must be submitted to: Hearing Clerk (1900), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. M3708, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Fees accompanying objections and hearing requests shall be labeled "Tolerance Petition Fees" and forwarded to: EPA Headquarters Accounting Operations Branch, OPP (Tolerance Fees), P.O. Box 360277M, Pittsburgh, PA 15251. A copy of any objections and hearing requests filed with the Hearing Clerk identified by the document control number, [OPP-300461], should be submitted to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division

(7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring a copy of objections and hearing requests to Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

A copy of objections and hearing requests filed with the Hearing Clerk may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Copies of objections and hearing requests must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Copies of objections and hearing requests will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All copies of objections and hearing requests in electronic form must be identified by the docket number [OPP-300461]. No Confidential Business Information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail. Electronic copies of objections and hearing requests on this rule may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Pat Cimino, Registration Division (7505W), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location, telephone number, and e-mail: Sixth Floor, Crystal Station #1, 2800 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202, (703) 308-8328, e-mail: cimino.pat@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA, pursuant to section 408(e) and (l)(6) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(e) and (l)(6), is establishing tolerances for residues of the insecticide tebufenozide (benzoic acid, 3,5-dimethyl-1-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-2-(4-ethylbenzoyl)hydrazide) in or on sugar beet roots at 0.3 parts per million (ppm), sugar beet tops at 0.6 ppm, sugar beet dried pulp at 6.0 ppm, and sugar beet molasses and refined sugar at 4.0 ppm. These tolerances will expire by EPA on March 30, 1998.

I. Background and Statutory Authority

The Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA) (Pub.L. 104-170) was signed into law August 3, 1996. FQPA

amends both the FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. 301 et seq., and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), 7 U.S.C. 136 et seq. The FQPA amendments went into effect immediately. Among other things, FQPA amends FFDCA to bring all EPA pesticide tolerance-setting activities under a new FFDCA section 408 with a new safety standard and new procedures. These activities are described below and discussed in greater detail in the final rule establishing the time-limited tolerance associated with the emergency exemption for use of propiconazole on sorghum (61 FR 58135, November 13, 1996)(FRL-5572-9).

New FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the tolerance is "safe." FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(A)(ii) defines "safe" to mean that "there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information." This includes exposure through drinking water, but does not include occupational exposure. Section 408(b)(2)(C) requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to "ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue...."

Section 18 of FIFRA authorizes EPA to exempt any Federal or State agency from any provision of FIFRA, if EPA determines that "emergency conditions exist which require such exemption." This provision was not amended by FQPA. EPA has established regulations governing such emergency exemptions in 40 CFR part 166.

FFDCA section 408(l)(6) requires EPA to establish a time-limited tolerance or exemption from the requirement for a tolerance for pesticide chemical residues in food that will result from the use of a pesticide under an emergency

exemption granted by EPA under section 18 of FIFRA.

FFDCA section 408(l)(6) also requires EPA to promulgate regulations by August 3, 1997, governing the establishment of tolerances and exemptions under FFDCA section 408(l)(6) and requires that the regulations be consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2) and (c)(2) and FIFRA section 18.

FFDCA section 408(l)(6) allows EPA to establish tolerances or exemptions from the requirement for a tolerance, in connection with EPA's granting of FIFRA section 18 emergency exemptions, without providing notice or a period for public comment. Thus, consistent with the need to act expeditiously on requests for emergency exemptions under FIFRA, EPA can establish such tolerances or exemptions under the authority of FFDCA section 408(e) and (l)(6) without notice and comment rulemaking.

In establishing FIFRA section 18-related tolerances and exemptions during this interim period before EPA issues the FFDCA section 408(l)(6) procedural regulation and before EPA makes its broad policy decisions concerning the interpretation and implementation of the new FFDCA section 408, EPA does not intend to set precedents for the application of FFDCA section 408 and the new safety standard to other tolerances and exemptions. Rather, these early FIFRA section 18 tolerance and exemption decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis and will not bind EPA as it proceeds with further rulemaking and policy development. EPA intends to act on FIFRA section 18-related tolerances and exemptions that clearly qualify under the new law.

II. Emergency Exemptions for Tebufenozide on Sugar Beets and FFDCA Tolerances

On October 11, 1996, the California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Pesticide Regulation requested a specific exemption under FIFRA section 18 for the use of tebufenozide to control Granulate Cutworm (*Agrotis subterranea*) on sugar beets. Sugar beets grown in Imperial County, California are severely infested with granulate cutworms and growers have already experienced economic loss from this pest. The registered alternative products do not provide control of this pest and lack of a viable alternative is responsible for acreage loss over the last several years. Growers will experience significant economic loss if the pest is not controlled. After having reviewed their submission, EPA concurs that an emergency condition exists.

As part of its assessment of these applications for emergency exemption, EPA assessed the potential risks presented by residues of tebufenozide on sugar beets. In doing so, EPA considered the new safety standard in FFDCA section 408(b)(2), and EPA decided to grant the FIFRA section 18 exemptions only after concluding that the necessary tolerance under FFDCA section 408(l)(6) would clearly be consistent with the new safety standard and with FIFRA section 18. These tolerances for tebufenozide will permit the marketing of sugar beets treated in accordance with the provisions of the FIFRA section 18 emergency exemptions. Consistent with the need to move quickly on the emergency exemptions and to ensure that the resulting food is safe and lawful, EPA is issuing this tolerance without notice and opportunity for public comment under FFDCA section 408(e) as provided in FFDCA section 408(l)(6). Although these tolerances will expire and be revoked by EPA on March 30, 1998, under FFDCA section 408(l)(5), residues of tebufenozide not in excess of the amount specified in the tolerances remaining in or on sugar beets after that date will not be unlawful, provided the pesticide is applied during the term of, and in accordance with all the conditions of, the emergency exemptions. EPA will take action to revoke this tolerance earlier if any experience with, scientific data on, or other relevant information on this pesticide indicate that the residues are not safe.

EPA has not made any decisions about whether tebufenozide meets the requirements for registration under FIFRA section 3 for use on sugar beets or whether permanent tolerances for tebufenozide for sugar beets would be appropriate. This action by EPA does not serve as a basis for registration of tebufenozide by a State for special local needs under FIFRA section 24(c). Nor does this action serve as the basis for any State other than California to use this product on this crop under section 18 of FIFRA without following all provisions of FIFRA section 18 as identified in 40 CFR 180.166. For additional information regarding the emergency exemptions for tebufenozide, contact the Agency's Registration Division at the address provided above.

III. Risk Assessment and Statutory Findings

EPA performs a number of analyses to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide residues. First, EPA determines the toxicity of pesticides based primarily on

toxicological studies using laboratory animals. These studies address many adverse health effects, including (but not limited to) reproductive effects, developmental toxicity, toxicity to the nervous system, and carcinogenicity. For many of these studies, a dose response relationship can be determined, which provides a dose that causes adverse effects (threshold effects) and doses causing no observed effects (the "no-observed effect level" or "NOEL").

Once a study has been evaluated and the observed effects have been determined to be threshold effects, EPA generally divides the NOEL from the study with the lowest NOEL by an uncertainty factor (usually 100 or more) to determine the Reference Dose (RfD). The RfD is a level at or below which daily aggregate exposure over a lifetime will not pose appreciable risks to human health. An uncertainty factor (sometimes called a "safety factor") of 100 is commonly used since it is assumed that people may be up to 10 times more sensitive to pesticides than the test animals, and that one person or subgroup of the population (such as infants and children) could be up to 10 times more sensitive to a pesticide than another. In addition, EPA assesses the potential risks to infants and children based on the weight of the evidence of the toxicology studies and determines whether an additional uncertainty factor is warranted. Thus, an aggregate daily exposure to a pesticide residue at or below the RfD (expressed as 100 percent or less of the RfD) is generally considered by EPA to pose a reasonable certainty of no harm.

Lifetime feeding studies in two species of laboratory animals are conducted to screen pesticides for cancer effects. When evidence of increased cancer is noted in these studies, the Agency conducts a weight of the evidence review of all relevant toxicological data including short term and mutagenicity studies and structure activity relationship. Once a pesticide has been classified as a potential human carcinogen, different types of risk assessments (e.g., linear low dose extrapolations or margin of exposure calculation based on the appropriate NOEL) will be carried out based on the nature of the carcinogenic response and the Agency's knowledge of its mode of action.

In examining aggregate exposure, FFDCA section 408 requires that EPA take into account available and reliable information concerning exposure from the pesticide residue in the food in question, residues in other foods for which there are tolerances, and other

non-occupational exposures, such as where residues leach into groundwater or surface water that is consumed as drinking water. Dietary exposure to residues of a pesticide in a food commodity are estimated by multiplying the average daily consumption of the food forms of that commodity by the tolerance level or the anticipated pesticide residue level. The Theoretical Maximum Residue Contribution (TMRC) is an estimate of the level of residues consumed daily if each food item contained pesticide residues equal to the tolerance. The TMRC is a "worst case" estimate since it is based on the assumptions that food contains pesticide residues at the tolerance level and that 100 percent of the crop is treated by pesticides that have established tolerances. If the TMRC exceeds the RfD or poses a lifetime cancer risk that is greater than approximately one in a million, EPA attempts to derive a more accurate exposure estimate for the pesticide by evaluating additional types of information (anticipated residue data and/or percent of crop treated data) which show, generally, that pesticide residues in most foods when they are eaten are well below established tolerances.

IV. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action. Tebufenozide is not registered by EPA for indoor or outdoor residential use. Existing food and feed use tolerances for tebufenozide are listed in 40 CFR 180.482. EPA has sufficient data to assess the hazards of tebufenozide and to make a determination on aggregate exposure, consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2), for the time-limited tolerances for residues of tebufenozide in or on sugar beet roots at 0.3 ppm, sugar beet tops at 0.6 ppm, sugar beet dried pulp at 6.0 ppm, and sugar beet molasses and refined sugar at 4.0 ppm. EPA's assessment of the dietary exposures and risks associated with establishing these tolerances follows.

A. Toxicological Profile

1. *Chronic toxicity.* Based on the available chronic toxicity data, the EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) has established the RfD for tebufenozide at 0.018 milligrams/kilogram/day (mg/kg/day). The RfD is based on a 1-year feeding study in dogs with a NOEL of 1.8 mg/kg/day and an uncertainty factor of 100. Decreased red

blood cells, hematocrit, and hemoglobin and increased heinz bodies, reticulocytes, and platelets were observed at the Lowest-Observed Effect Level (LOEL) of 8.7 mg/kg/day.

2. *Acute toxicity.* No appropriate acute dietary endpoint was identified by OPP. This risk assessment is not required.

3. *Carcinogenicity.* Using its Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment published September 24, 1986 (51 FR 33992), OPP has classified tebufenozide as a Group "E" chemical (no evidence of carcinogenicity) based on the results of carcinogenicity studies in two species. There was no evidence of carcinogenicity in a 2-year rat study and an 18-month mouse study.

B. Aggregate Exposure

Tolerances for residues of tebufenozide are currently expressed as benzoic acid, 3,5-dimethyl-1-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-2-(4-ethylbenzoyl) hydrazide. Tolerances currently exist for residues on apples and walnuts (see 40 CFR 180.482).

For purposes of assessing the potential dietary exposure under this tolerance, EPA assumed tolerance level residues and 100 percent of crop treated to estimate the TMRC from all established food uses for tebufenozide (walnuts and import tolerances for apples) as well as other recently granted emergency exemption uses (peppers) and the proposed use on sugar beets. There are sugar beet animal feed items. However, the residue levels in animal commodities potentially resulting from feeding of these commodities would most likely be undetectable. For purposes of the FIFRA section 18 emergency exemption only, the Agency is not recommending establishment of time-limited tolerances for tebufenozide on animal commodities.

In examining aggregate exposure, FQPA directs EPA to consider available information concerning exposures from the pesticide residue in food and all other non-occupational exposures. The primary non food sources of exposure the Agency looks at include drinking water (whether from groundwater or surface water), and exposure through pesticide use in gardens, lawns, or buildings (residential and other indoor uses).

Based on the available studies used in EPA's assessment of environmental risk, tebufenozide is moderately persistent to persistent and mobile, and could potentially leach to groundwater and runoff to surface water under certain environmental conditions. There is no established Maximum Concentration Level for residues of tebufenozide in

drinking water. No drinking water health advisory levels have been established for tebufenozide. There is no entry for tebufenozide in the "Pesticides in Groundwater Database" (EPA 734-12-92-001, September 1992).

Because the Agency lacks sufficient water-related exposure data to complete a comprehensive drinking water risk assessment for many pesticides, EPA has commenced and nearly completed a process to identify a reasonable yet conservative bounding figure for the potential contribution of water related exposure to the aggregate risk posed by a pesticide. In developing the bounding figure, EPA estimated residue levels in water for a number of specific pesticides using various data sources. The Agency then applied the estimated residue levels, in conjunction with appropriate toxicological endpoints (RfD's or acute dietary NOEL's) and assumptions about body weight and consumption, to calculate, for each pesticide, the increment of aggregate risk contributed by consumption of contaminated water. A more detailed description of this analysis is included in the docket for this rulemaking. While EPA has not yet pinpointed the appropriate bounding figure for consumption of contaminated water, the ranges the Agency is continuing to examine are all well below the level that would cause tebufenozide to exceed the RfD if the tolerances being considered in this document were granted.

The Agency has therefore concluded that the potential exposures associated with tebufenozide in water, even at the higher levels the Agency is considering as a conservative upper bound, would not prevent the Agency from determining that there is a reasonable certainty of no harm if the tolerances are granted.

C. Cumulative Exposure to Substances with Common Mechanism of Toxicity

FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D)(v) requires that, when considering whether to establish, modify, or revoke a tolerance, the Agency consider "available information" concerning the cumulative effects of a particular pesticide's residues and "other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity." "The Agency believes that "available information" in this context might include not only toxicity, chemistry, and exposure data, but also scientific policies and methodologies for understanding common mechanisms of toxicity and conducting cumulative risk assessments. For most pesticides, although the Agency has some information in its files that may turn out

to be helpful in eventually determining whether a pesticide shares a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, EPA does not at this time have the methodologies to resolve the complex scientific issues concerning common mechanism of toxicity in a meaningful way. EPA has begun a pilot process to study this issue further through the examination of particular classes of pesticides. The Agency hopes that the results of this pilot process will increase the Agency's scientific understanding of this question such that EPA will be able to develop and apply scientific principles for better determining which chemicals have a common mechanism of toxicity and evaluating the cumulative effects of such chemicals. The Agency anticipates, however, that even as its understanding of the science of common mechanisms increases, decisions on specific classes of chemicals will be heavily dependent on chemical specific data, much of which may not be presently available.

Although at present the Agency does not know how to apply the information in its files concerning common mechanism issues to most risk assessments, there are pesticides as to which the common mechanism issues can be resolved. These pesticides include pesticides that are toxicologically dissimilar to existing chemical substances (in which case the Agency can conclude that it is unlikely that a pesticide shares a common mechanism of activity with other substances) and pesticides that produce a common toxic metabolite (in which case common mechanism of activity will be assumed).

EPA does not have, at this time, available data to determine whether tebufenozide has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances or how to include this pesticide in a cumulative risk assessment. Unlike other pesticides for which EPA has followed a cumulative risk approach based on a common mechanism of toxicity, tebufenozide does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has not assumed that tebufenozide has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances.

D. Safety Determinations for U.S. Population

Based on the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data and the conservative TMRC dietary exposure assumptions, EPA has concluded that dietary exposure from food to tebufenozide will utilize 11.9 percent of the RfD for the U.S. population. EPA

generally has no concern for exposures below 100 percent of the RfD because the RfD represents the level at or below which daily aggregate dietary exposure over a lifetime will not pose appreciable risks to human health. Whatever reasonable bounding figure the Agency eventually decides upon for the contribution from water, that number is expected to be well below 88.1% of the RfD. EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to tebufenozide residues.

E. Determination of Safety for Infants and Children

In assessing the potential for additional sensitivity of infants and children to residues of tebufenozide, EPA considered data from developmental toxicity studies in the rat and rabbit and a 2-generation reproduction study in the rat. The developmental toxicity studies are designed to evaluate adverse effects on the developing organism resulting from pesticide exposure during prenatal development to one or both parents. Reproduction studies provide information relating to effects from exposure to the pesticide on the reproductive capability of mating animals and data on systemic toxicity.

Developmental toxicity was not observed in developmental studies using rats and rabbits. The NOEL for developmental effects in both rats and rabbits was 1,000 mg/kg/day (HDT), which is the limit dose for testing in developmental studies.

In the two-generation reproductive toxicity study in the rat, the reproductive/developmental toxicity NOEL of 12.1 mg/kg/day was fourteenfold higher than the parental (systemic) toxicity NOEL (0.85 mg/kg/day). The reproductive (pup) LOEL of 171.1 mg/kg/day was based on a slight increase in both generations in the number of pregnant females that either did not deliver or had difficulty and had to be sacrificed. In addition, the length of gestation increased and implantation sites decreased significantly in F1 dams. Because these reproductive effects occurred in the presence of parental (systemic) toxicity, these data do not suggest an increased post-natal sensitivity to children and infants (that infants and children might be more sensitive than adults) to tebufenozide exposure.

FFDCA section 408 provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold margin of exposure (safety) for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for pre-and post-natal toxicity and the completeness of the

database unless EPA determines that a different margin of exposure (safety) will be safe for infants and children. Margins of exposure (safety) are often referred to as uncertainty (safety) factors. EPA believes that reliable data support using the standard margin of exposure (usually 100x for combined inter- and intra-species variability) and not the additional tenfold margin of exposure when EPA has a complete data base under existing guidelines and when the severity of the effect in infants or children or the potency or unusual toxic properties of a compound do not raise concerns regarding the adequacy of the standard margin of exposure. Based on current toxicological data requirements, the database for tebufenozide relative to pre- (provided by rat and rabbit developmental studies) and post-natal (provided by the rat reproduction study) toxicity is complete. The additional uncertainty factor is not needed to protect the safety of infants and children.

Based on TMRC exposure estimates for food, as described above, EPA has concluded that the percentage of the RfD that will be utilized by dietary exposure to residues of tebufenozide ranges from 18.8 percent for children 7 to 12 years old, up to 53.3 percent for non-nursing infants (the most highly exposed population subgroup). Therefore, taking into account the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data and the conservative exposure assessment, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to tebufenozide residues.

V. Other Considerations

The metabolism of tebufenozide in plants is adequately understood for the purposes of this tolerance. There is no Codex maximum residue level established for residues of tebufenozide on sugar beets. There is a practical analytical method (liquid chromatography with ultraviolet detection) for detecting and measuring levels of tebufenozide in or on food with a limit of detection that allows monitoring of food with residues at or above the level set by the tebufenozide tolerance. EPA has provided information on this method to the Food and Drug Administration. The method is available to anyone who is interested in pesticide residue enforcement from: By mail, Calvin Furlow, Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Office location and telephone number: Crystal Mall #2, Rm 1128, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202, 703-305-5805.

VI. Conclusion

Therefore, tolerances in connection with the FIFRA section 18 emergency exemptions are established for residues of tebufenozide in or on sugar beet roots at 0.3 ppm, sugar beet tops at 0.6 ppm, dried pulp at 6.0 ppm, and molasses and refined sugar at 4.0 ppm. These tolerances will expire and be revoked on March 30, 1998.

VII. Objections and Hearing Requests

The new FFDCa section 408(g) provides essentially the same process for persons to "object" to a tolerance regulation issued by EPA under new FFDCa section 408(e) and (l)(6) as was provided in the old section 408 and in section 409. However, the period for filing objections is 60 days, rather than 30 days. EPA currently has procedural regulations which govern the submission of objections and hearing requests. These regulations will require some modification to reflect the new law. However, until those modifications can be made, EPA will continue to use those procedural regulations with appropriate adjustments to reflect the new law.

Any person may, by May 19, 1997, file written objections to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. Objections and hearing requests must be filed with the Hearing Clerk, at the address given above (40 CFR 178.20). A copy of the objections and/or hearing requests filed with the Hearing Clerk should be submitted to the OPP docket for this rulemaking. The objections submitted must specify the provisions of the regulation deemed objectionable and the grounds for the objections (40 CFR 178.25). Each objection must be accompanied by the fee prescribed by 40 CFR 180.33(i). If a hearing is requested, the objections must include a statement of the factual issues on which a hearing is requested, the requestor's contentions on such issues, and a summary of any evidence relied upon by the requestor (40 CFR 178.27). A request for a hearing will be granted if the Administrator determines that the material submitted shows the following: There is genuine and substantial issue of fact; there is a reasonable possibility that available evidence identified by the

requestor would, if established, resolve one or more of such issues in favor of the requestor, taking into account uncontested claims or facts to the contrary; and resolution of the factual issues in the manner sought by the requestor would be adequate to justify the action requested (40 CFR 178.32). Information submitted in connection with an objection or hearing request may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as Confidential Business Information (CBI). Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the information 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.

VIII. Public Docket

A record has been established for this rulemaking under docket number [OPP-300461]. A public version of this record, which does not include any information claimed as CBI, is available for inspection from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The public record is located in Room 1132 of the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

The official record for this rulemaking, as well as the public version, as described above, is kept in paper form. Accordingly, in the event there are objections and hearing requests, EPA will transfer any copies of objections and hearing requests received electronically into printed, paper form as they are received and will place the paper copies in the official rulemaking record. The official rulemaking record is the paper record maintained at the address in "ADDRESSES" at the beginning of this document.

IX. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and, since this action does not impose any information collection requirements as defined by the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq., it is not subject to review by the Office of

Management and Budget. In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4), or require prior consultation with State officials as specified by Executive Order 12875 (58 FR 58093, October 28, 1993), or special considerations as required by Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

Because FFDCa section 408(l)(6) permits establishment of this regulation without a notice of proposed rulemaking, the regulatory flexibility analysis requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 604(a), do not apply.

Under 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Title II of Pub. L. 104-121, 110 Stat. 847), EPA submitted a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office prior to publication of the rule in today's Federal Register. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2) of the APA as amended.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and record keeping requirements.

Dated: March 11, 1997.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Acting Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR Chapter I is amended as follows:

PART 180 [AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:
Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 371.

2. In § 180.482(b), by adding alphabetically the following entries to the table:

§ 180.482 Tebufenozide; tolerances for residues.

*	*	*	*	*
(b)	*	*	*	

Commodity	Parts per million	Expiration/Revocation Date
Sugar beet, tops	0.6	March 30, 1998
Sugar beet, roots	0.3	March 30, 1998
Sugar beet, dried pulp	6.0	March 30, 1998
Sugar beet, molasses	4.0	March 30, 1998
Sugar beet, refined sugar	4.0	March 30, 1998

[FR Doc. 97-7062 Filed 3-19-97; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

41 CFR Ch. 301

[FTR Am. 56]

RIN 3090-AG36

Federal Travel Regulation; Maximum Per Diem Rates

AGENCY: Office of Governmentwide Policy, GSA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule amends Federal Travel Regulation (FTR) Amendment 52, published in the Federal Register on Thursday, November 21, 1996 (61 FR 59185) to

add per diem localities in the States of Louisiana and Virginia, and to add the State of North Dakota with a clarifying footnote (number 5), explaining that all locations within that State are subject to the standard CONUS rate. This rule also corrects footnote number three and an incorrect entry listed in the prescribed maximum per diem rate for Gettysburg (Adams County), Pennsylvania.

DATES: This final rule is effective January 1, 1997, and applies for travel performed on or after January 1, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joddy P. Garner, Travel and Transportation Management Policy Division (MTT), Washington, DC 20405, telephone 202-501-1538.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The General Services Administration has determined that this rule is not a significant regulatory action for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 of

September 30, 1993. This final rule is not required to be published in the Federal Register for notice and comment. Therefore, the Regulatory Flexibility Act does not apply. This rule also is exempt from congressional review prescribed under 5 U.S.C. 801 since it relates solely to agency management and personnel. For reasons set out in the preamble, under 5 U.S.C. 5701-5709, title 41, Chapter 301 of the Code of Federal Regulation is revised to read as follows:

CHAPTER 301—TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

1. Appendix A to Chapter 301 is amended by adding and correcting the following per diem localities and footnote ³ to read as follows:

Appendix A to Chapter 301—
 Prescribed Maximum Per Diem Rates for CONUS

* * * * *

Per diem locality		Maximum lodging amount (a)	+	M&IE rate (b)	=	Maximum per diem rate ⁴ (c)
Key city ¹	County and/or other defined location ^{2,3}					
Louisiana:						
St. Francisville	West Feliciana	85		30		115
North Dakota: (See footnote 5)						
Pennsylvania:						
Gettysburg	Adams					
	(May 1–October 31)	68		34		102
	(November 1–April 30)	62		34		96
Virginia:						
Harrisonburg	Harrisonburg	51		30		81

¹ Unless otherwise specified, the per diem locality is defined as "all locations within, or entirely surrounded by, the corporate limits of the key city, including independent entities located within those boundaries."

² Per diem localities with county definitions shall include "all locations within, or entirely surrounded by, the corporate limits of the key city as well as the boundaries of the listed counties, including independent entities located within the boundaries of the key city and the listed counties."

³ When a military installation or Government-related facility (whether or not specifically named) is located partially within more than one city or county boundary, the applicable per diem rate for the entire installation or facility is the higher of the two rates which apply to the cities and/or counties, even though part(s) of such activities may be located outside the defined per diem locality.

⁴ Federal agencies may submit a request to GSA for review of the costs covered by per diem in a particular city or area where the standard CONUS rate applies when travel to that location is repetitive or on a continuing basis and travelers' experiences indicate that the prescribed rate is inadequate. Other per diem localities listed in this appendix will be reviewed on an annual basis by GSA to determine whether rates are adequate. Requests for per diem rate adjustments shall be submitted by the agency headquarters office to the General Services Administration, Office of Governmentwide Policy, Attn: Travel and Transportation Management Policy Division (MTT), Washington, DC 20405. Agencies should designate an individual responsible for reviewing, coordinating, and submitting to GSA any requests from bureaus or subagencies. Requests for rate adjustments shall include a city designation, a description of the surrounding location involved (county or other defined area), and a recommended rate supported by a statement explaining the circumstances that cause the existing rate to be inadequate. The request also must contain an estimate of the annual number of trips to the location, the average duration of such trips, and the primary purpose of travel to the locations. Agencies should submit their requests to GSA no later than May 1 in order for a city to be included in the annual review.

⁵ The standard CONUS rate of \$80 (\$50 for lodging and \$30 for M&IE) applies to all per diem localities in the State of North Dakota.