effects unless EPA determines that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. The toxicological data base for evaluating pre- and post-natal toxicity for lactofen is complete with respect to current data requirements. There are no special pre- or post-natal toxicity concerns for infants and children, based on the results of the rat and rabbit developmental toxicity studies and the reproductive toxicity study in rats. Systemic toxicity effects, and not reproductive or developmental toxicity determined the no effect levels for these studies of 50, 4, and 2.5 mg/kg bw/day, respectively. Valent concludes that reliable data support use of the standard 100-fold uncertainty factor with respect to protection of infants and children, and that an additional uncertainty factor is not needed to be further protective.

Furthermore, the chronic RfD for lactofen is based on the Lowest Effect Level (LEL) of 1.5 mg/kg/day in the 18-month mouse feeding study with an uncertainty factor of 1,000. An additional margin of safety, 10-fold, was used since a clear NOEL was not established in the mouse study. Thus, although an extra safety factor is not needed to further protect infants and children, an extra 10-fold uncertainty factor has been included because of the lack of a clear NOEL in the mouse study.

9. *Chronic— Food*. Using the dietary exposure assessment procedures described above (and performed by Valent) for lactofen, and a recent assessment for acifluorfen published in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 16740; April 17, 1996) total chronic dietary exposures resulting from existing and proposed uses of lactofen and acifluorfen were compared to their respective reference doses. The following contributions to the RfD were found for all of subpopulations including infants and children for which dietary consumption data are available:

i. *Lactofen*. Exposure 0.0000001 (mg/kg bw/day) less than 0.01% of RfD.

ii. *Acifluorfen*. Exposure 0.0000052 (mg/kg bw/day), (61 FR 16740; April 17, 1996) less than 0.04% of RfD.

10. *Chronic- drinking water- lactofen*. Using the conservative assumption that all drinking water contains lactofen at levels calculated by GENEEC for a small farm pond surrounded by lactofen treated fields, a very conservative estimate of risk can be made. Using standard assumptions about body weight and water consumption, the child chronic exposure from this drinking water would be 1.7×10^{-5} mg/kg bw/day, 0.85 percent of the RfD.

11. *Acifluorfen*. Using the very conservative assumption that all drinking water contains acifluorfen at 0.00044 ppm, from the USGS NAWQA data on acifluorfen, a very conservative estimate of risk can be made. Using standard assumptions about body weight and water consumption, the child chronic exposure from this drinking water would be 4.4×10^{-5} mg/kg bw/day, 0.34 percent of the RfD.

Summary - Cumulative aggregate chronic dietary risk— Infants and children. The aggregate chronic dietary risks from both food and drinking water exposure expressed as a percentage of their respective RfD values is presented below for children for both lactofen and acifluorfen. It is noteworthy that the calculated exposures and consequent risks are very small, yet dominated by the very conservative estimates of residues in water.

(a) *Lactofen*. Less than 0.86 % for all infant and children subpopulations.

(b) *Acifluorfen*. Less than 0.38 % for all infant and children subpopulations.

EPA generally has no concern for exposures below 100% 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. The current and proposed uses of these two chemicals, even when considered collectively, represent a minimal chronic toxicological risk to infants and children and it can be concluded that there is reasonable certainty of no harm from chronic exposures.

1. *Acute*. Assessment of aggregate acute exposure to food and drinking water residues of lactofen to non-nursing infants has demonstrated that exposures are small. MOE values using very conservative exposure assumptions and a conservative toxicity endpoint approximate 1,000. It can be concluded that there is reasonable certainty of no harm to infants and children from acute dietary exposures to lactofen residues.

G. International Tolerances

There are no Codex Maximum Residue Limits (MRL) established for lactofen on any commodity.

[FR Doc. 98–4811 Filed 2–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPPTS–00232; FRL–5770–1]

Lithographic Printing Industry Pollution Prevention and Risk Reduction Materials

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: The EPA's Design for the Environment (DfE) Program is announcing the availability of two documents providing pollution prevention and human health and environmental risk reduction information for the lithographic printing industry. The two documents being made available are:

The Cleaner Technologies Substitutes Assessment (CTSA): Lithographic Blanket Washes (document number EPA 744–R–97–006) is a comparison of 37 different blanket wash formulations in terms of performance, cost, risk, resource conservation and other aspects. The CTSA contains the technical data and analyses of the DfE Lithography Project. A draft of this report was released in September 1996 and comments have been addressed in this final version.

Solutions for Lithographic Printers: An Evaluation of Substitute Blanket Washes (document number EPA 744–F–96–003) is a simple, user friendly summary of the information developed through the DfE Lithography Project. This booklet will help printers to choose the best blanket wash for their facilities. The 35 page document describes how to identify, select and use substitute blanket washes and other ways to reduce pollution in a lithographic printing facility.

ADDRESSES: Both documents are available free of charge for a limited time from the Pollution Prevention Information Clearinghouse (PPIC), Environmental Protection Agency (7409), 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460 telephone 202–260–1023, fax 202–260–4659 and e-mail at ppic@epamail.epa.gov. Also, both documents will be viewable and downloadable from the DfE Program web site at HTTP://www.epa.gov/dfe after March 14, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen Seeh, Economics, Exposure, and Technology Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, (7406), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW., Washington, DC 20460, telephone 202–260–1714, fax 202–260–

0981, e-mail seeh.karen@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Design for the Environment (DfE) Lithography Project is a voluntary, cooperative partnership between the EPA and the printing industry to develop a comparative assessment of blanket washes used by lithographers. The partnership has completed the comparative analysis of 37 blanket wash formulations entitled ''Cleaner Technologies Substitutes Assessment (CTSA): Lithographic Blanket Washes.'' The CTSA contains information that helps lithographers in making decisions that incorporate environmental concerns along with cost and performance information when purchasing these chemicals. The full report is intended for technical audiences, formulators and suppliers, and environmental health personnel.

To convey better the results of the assessment to small business printers, the DfE Lithography Project created a summary document entitled ''Solutions for Lithographic Printers: An Evaluation of Substitute Blanket Washes.'' This booklet is designed to help printers evaluate their current blanket wash and compare it to substitute washes. How safe are they to use? How do they perform? How much do they cost to use? What are their environmental risks? This booklet tells how to answer these questions in a direct, easy to understand style for small business printers and press operators.

Dated: February 17, 1998.

William H. Sanders, III,

Director, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics

[FR Doc. 98–4813 Filed 2-24-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5970–5]

Superfund Program; Revisions to Model CERCLA RD/RA Consent Decree

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Agency is today publishing revisions to selected provisions of the Model CERCLA RD/RA Consent Decree. The revisions, which will supersede counterpart provisions in the previously effective version of the Model published in 1995, have been jointly adopted by EPA and the Department of Justice. The primary effect of the revisions is to amend or supplement language in the Model dealing principally with the subjects of access to Superfund site property and ''institutional controls'' designed to restrict land/water use on such properties. By publishing these revisions to Model language EPA seeks to broadly inform affected members of the public of changes in the government's policy with respect to settlements for the performance of remedial design/remedial action (RD/RA).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Botts, Mail Code 2272–A, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202)564–4217.

Steven A. Herman,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance.

Memorandum

Subject: Revisions to the Access and Institutional Control Provisions of the Model CERCLA RD/RA Consent Decree

From: Steven A. Herman, Assistant Administrator; Lois J. Schiffer, Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice.

To: EPA Regional Administrators, Regions I–X.

We herewith transmit to you final language revising selected provisions of the Model CERCLA RD/RA Consent Decree published in the July 28, 1995 **Federal Register** (60 Fed. Reg. 38,817). The attached language is designed to completely supplant that now appearing in (1) the definition of ''Future Response Costs'' contained in Section IV of the 1995 Model, (2) Paragraph 9 of the 1995 Model (entitled ''Notice of Obligations to Successors-in-Title'') and (3) Section IX of the 1995 Model (entitled ''Access [and Institutional Controls]''). The new Model language has been developed over the last two years by an Institutional Controls Workgroup comprised of representatives from the Department of Justice and EPA Headquarters and Regional offices. A draft of the new Model language has been subjected to review and comment by all interested offices.

One important impetus behind the development of this revised Model language has been EPA's continued heavy reliance on Superfund remedies which are designed to contain discovered contamination on-site. At sites where the remedial strategy is to consolidate wastes on-site or contain them in place, it is particularly important to develop effective means of preventing the public from coming into contact with contaminated wastes or disturbing important features of the remedial technology. The revisions to the access and institutional control provisions of the Model have accordingly been drafted to provide the government with a broader range of options and more efficacious mechanisms for ensuring not only that government representatives and responsible private parties performing remedial work will have continuing access to sites as necessary to implement, operate, and maintain remedies, but also that needed restrictions on land and water use at Superfund site properties can be enforced against all persons, including subsequent purchasers of contaminated site property.

Legal research suggests that in most jurisdictions the most powerful tool available to government for guaranteeing site access and restricting site activities on a long-term basis is acquisition of a property interest (generally an easement or restrictive covenant) running with the land. Thus, the revised Model language contains procedures pursuant to which owners of contaminated site property can effectively convey to the United States (or other responsible entities) a right of access and a right to enforce needed land/water use restrictions that run with the land. It should be emphasized here that State law generally governs the conveyance of real property interests. It is therefore important that Regional offices be alert to the possible need to modify or supplement Model language regarding any such conveyance as necessary to comport with the requirements of applicable State law.

We also wish to remind the Regions that whenever EPA acquires an interest in real property in order to effectuate remedial action at a Superfund site (as, for example, in the case where EPA is granted an easement including access rights or the right to enforce land/water use restrictions on certain property), EPA must comply with the requirements of CERCLA Section 104(j) and the federal land acquisition regulations. Section 104(j) requires that the State in which the property is located agree in advance to accept transfer of any property interest held by EPA upon completion of the remedial action. The federal land acquisition regulations impose additional requirements designed to ensure the United States obtains a valid property interest. The Regions should consult with EPA's Office of General Counsel