determined, in consultation with EPA, on a site-by-site basis consistent with CERCLA § 104(A) (3) and (4).

- The cooperative agreement recipient can not use BCRLF pilot funds to match any other federal funds without specific statutory authority. (However, the borrower may use BCRLF pilot funds to match other federal funds.)
- The cooperative agreements are governed by EPA's general grant regulations (40 CFR Part 31) and regulations for cooperative agreements under CERCLA § 104(d) (40 CFR Part 35, Subpart C).

Evaluation of the Proposals

Evaluation Process

To ensure a fair evaluation process, EPA will convene a FY97 BCRLF pilot evaluation panel consisting of EPA Regional and Headquarters staff, Economic Development Administration (EDA) staff and other federal agency representatives. The evaluation panel will assess how well the proposals meet the criteria outlined below. The evaluation panel's evaluations will be presented to EPA senior management for final selection. The evaluations will include recommendations for the number and size of the awards.

Proposals must be clear and decisive, strictly follow the criteria, and provide sufficient detail for the panels to compare the merits of each and decide which proposal best supports the intent of the pilot program. Vague descriptions and unnecessary redundancy may reduce the chance of a favorable rating. Proposers are encouraged to contact and, if possible, meet with EPA Brownfields Coordinators (see Appendix C).

Cooperative Agreement Award Process

Upon determination of having been selected, proposers will receive a confirmation letter from EPA Headquarters. Since the cooperative agreements are to be awarded by the EPA Regional offices, at the time the selected proposers are notified, appropriate EPA Regional Brownfields Coordinators and Regional Grants Specialists also will be informed. The proposer then will be contacted by the Regional office and asked to submit a formal cooperative agreement application package. The information in the proposal submitted to EPA Headquarters will form a basis for the cooperative agreement application. However, the cooperative agreement application will require more detailed information on specific products, schedule, and budgets. The cooperative agreement application package will include: the standard application and budget forms; a formal work plan that provides a detailed description of the work to be performed, including a schedule, milestones, products, and budget backup information; information related to community relations, health and safety, and quality assurance plans; and the required certification forms. When the applicant is a political subdivision, an additional letter of support will be required from the appropriate state or tribe as an attachment to the cooperative agreement. In addition, as soon as the proposer is notified of having been selected, they will be asked to contact their State Intergovernmental Review office so that the required intergovernmental review process may begin immediately. The EPA Regional Brownfields Coordinator and Regional Grants Specialist will work closely with the applicant to process and finalize the cooperative agreement package.

Proposers that are not selected will be informed in writing. A proposer may choose to revise the proposal for submittal by a deadline announced by EPA at a later date.

Criteria for the Brownfields Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund Proposal

The proposal evaluation panels will review the proposals carefully and assess each response based on how well it addresses the evaluation criteria, briefly outlined below:

Threshold Criteria (Section A)

A. Ability to Manage a Revolving Loan Fund and Environmental Cleanups

Proposers must meet the threshold criterion—demonstrating an ability to manage a revolving loan fund and environmental cleanups—to be selected for a BCRLF Demonstration Pilot.

A.1. Demonstrate your legal authority to manage a revolving loan fund and environmental cleanups (or demonstrate a firm plan to get authority if provided with funding).

A.2. Demonstrate that you have an effective institutional structure in place or planned. Specifically describe the roles of and relationships between: (1) the potential cooperative agreement recipient; (2) the proposed lead agency; (3) the proposed fund manager; and (4) the brownfields site manager.

A.3. Describe your proposed BCRLF Pilot Financial Plan.

Evaluation Criteria (Sections B–E)

Those proposers that meet the threshold criterion will be evaluated based on their responses to three evaluation criteria: (1) demonstration of need; (2) commitment to creative leveraging of EPA funds; (3) benefits of BCRLF pilot loans to the local community criteria; and (4) long-term benefits and sustainability.

Your response to the following criteria will be the primary basis on which EPA determines the size of award. EPA's evaluation panel will review the proposals carefully and assess each response based on how well it addresses each criterion.

B. Evaluation Criteria: Demonstration of Need

B.1. Problem Statement and Unique Needs of the Community
B.2. Description of Potential Borrowers and Property
B.3. Ability to Finance Cleanups

C. Evaluation Criteria: Commitment to Creative Leveraging of EPA Funds

C.1. Ability to Attract and Support Other Financing
C.2. Cash and In-Kind Contributions
C.3. Efficiency of Planned Administrative Structure

D. Evaluation Criteria: Benefits of BCRLF Loans to the Local Community

D.1. Announcement and Notification of BCRLF Fund Availability
D.2. Community Involvement in Future Land Reuse
D.3. Contribution to Community Economic Development Plans
D.4. Environmental Justice Benefits
D.5 Projected Sustainable Benefits

E. Evaluation Criteria: Long-Term Benefits and Sustainability

E.1. National Replicability
E.2. Measures of Success

Dated: April 22, 1997.

Linda Garczynski,

Director, Outreach and Special Projects Staff, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

[FR Doc. 97–11905 Filed 5–6–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPP–181045; FRL 5714–4]

Benomyl; Receipt of Application for Emergency Exemptions, Solicitation of Public Comment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: EPA has received specific exemption requests from the North

Dakota Department of Agriculture and the Minnesota Department of Agriculture (hereafter referred to as the ''Applicants'') to use the pesticide benomyl (CAS 17804–35–2) (formulated as ''Benlate Fungicide'') for the control of *Sclerotinia* stem rot in canola. A maximum of 60,000 acres in North Dakota, and a maximum of 10,500 acres in Minnesota could be treated. The Applicants propose the use of a pesticide which contains an active ingredient which has been the subject of a Special Review, and is intended for a use that could pose similar risks to the risks posed by the uses that were the subject of the Special Review. In accordance with 40 CFR 166.24, EPA is soliciting public comment before making the decision whether or not to grant the exemptions.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 22, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Three copies of written comments, bearing the identification notation ''OPP–181045,'' should be submitted by mail to: Public Response and Program Resource Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by following the instructions under ''SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.'' No Confidential Business Information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail.

Information submitted in any comment concerning this notice 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 provided by the submitter for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments filed pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in Room 1132, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Olga Odiott, Registration Division (7505W), Office of Pesticide Programs, 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, (703) 308–6418; e-mail: odiott.olga@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 18 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136p), the Administrator may, at her discretion, exempt a state agency from any registration provision of FIFRA if she determines that emergency conditions exist which require such exemption. The Applicants have requested the Administrator to issue specific exemptions for the use of benomyl on canola to control the *Sclerotinia* stem rot. Information in accordance with 40 CFR part 166 was submitted as part of the requests.

The Applicants state that the last 4 years have been favorable to the buildup of *Sclerotinia* in the soil, and that experience with other crops indicates the *Sclerotinia* levels are sufficiently high to place the canola crop in a highly vulnerable position if a rainy period occurs when the crop is flowering. The Applicants state that canola growers will likely suffer severe economic losses since there are no registered alternative pesticides available and the fungus has become sufficiently widespread that crop rotation will be of limited effectiveness in the major canola producing areas.

The Applicants propose to make a single aerial application of benomyl at a rate of 0.5 lbs. active ingredient (a.i.) per acre during the 20 to 30 percent bloom stage. The need for application of the fungicide will be determined by the weather in the weeks prior to bloom and the yield potential. The proposed use is for up to 60,000 acres of canola in North Dakota, and 10,500 acres of canola in Minnesota. Therefore, use under these exemptions could potentially amount to a maximum total of 35,250 lbs. of the active ingredient, benomyl (30,000 in North Dakota and 5,250 in Minnesota). Emergency exemptions for this use were granted to North Dakota in 1989 thru 1992.

This notice does not constitute a decision by EPA on the application itself. The regulations governing section 18 require publication of a notice of receipt in the **Federal Register** for an application for a specific exemption proposing the use of a pesticide which contains an active ingredient which has been the subject of a Special Review, and is intended for a use that could pose similar risks to the risks posed by the uses that were the subject of the Special Review. Such notice provides for opportunity for public comment on the application.

The official record for this notice, as well as the public version, has been established for this notice under docket number [OPP–181045] (including comments and data submitted electronically as described below). A public version of this record, including printed, paper versions of electronic comments, 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 official notice record is located at the address in ''ADDRESSES'' at the beginning of this document.

Electronic comments can be sent directly to EPA at:

opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov

Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comment 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–181045]. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

The Agency will review and consider all comments received during the comment period in determining whether to issue the emergency exemptions requested by the North Dakota Department of Agriculture and the Minnesota Department of Agriculture.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests, Emergency exemptions.

Dated: April 23, 1997.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 97–11634 Filed 5–6–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPTS–400110; FRL–5598–8]

Ethylene Glycol; Toxic Chemical Release Reporting; Community Right-to-Know

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: EPA is issuing the results of its technical review and evaluation of a petition to delete ethylene glycol from the list of toxic chemicals subject to the reporting requirements under section 313 of the Emergency Planning and