

information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, nor does it require any special considerations under Executive Order 12898, entitled *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a petition under section 408(d) of FFDCA, such as the tolerance in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) do not apply.

This final rule directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, not States or tribes, nor does this action alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of section 408(n)(4) of FFDCA. As such, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States or tribal governments, on the relationship between the national government and the States or tribal governments, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government or between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. Thus, the Agency has determined that Executive Order 13132, entitled *Federalism* (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) and Executive Order 13175, entitled *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments* (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000) do not apply to this final rule. In addition, this final rule does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104-4).

This action does not involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

#### V. Congressional Review Act

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit 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 United States prior to

publication of this final rule in the **Federal Register**. This final rule is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

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

Dated: December 10, 2010.

**Daniel J. Rosenblatt,**

*Acting Director, Registration Division, 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. 321(q), 346a and 371.

##### § 180.430 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 180.430, in the table to paragraph (b), amend the entries for “Grass, forage” and “Grass, hay” by revising the expiration dates “12/31/10” to read “12/31/13.”

##### § 180.434 [Amended]

■ 3. In § 180.434, in the table to paragraph (b), amend the entries for “Nectarine” and “Peach” by revising the expiration dates “12/31/10” to read “12/31/13.”

##### § 180.449 [Amended]

■ 4. In § 180.449, in the table to paragraph (b), amend the entry for “Bean, lima, seed” by revising the expiration date “12/31/10” to read “12/31/13.”

##### § 180.498 [Amended]

■ 5. In § 180.498, in the table to paragraph (b), amend the entries for “Flax, seed” and “Strawberry” by revising the expiration dates “12/31/10” to read “12/31/13.”

##### § 180.517 [Amended]

■ 6. In § 180.517, in the table to paragraph (b), amend the entries for “Rutabaga” and “Turnip” by revising the expiration dates “12/31/10” to read “12/31/13.”

##### § 180.566 [Amended]

■ 7. In § 180.566, in the table to paragraph (b), amend the entry for “Honey” by revising the expiration date “12/31/10” to read “12/31/13.”

##### § 180.572 [Amended]

■ 8. In § 180.572, in the table to paragraph (b), amend the entries for

“Timothy, forage,” and “Timothy, hay” by revising the expiration dates “12/31/10” to read “12/31/13.”

##### § 180.582 [Amended]

■ 9. In § 180.582, in the table to paragraph (b), amend the entry for “Endive, Belgian” by revising the expiration date “12/31/10” to read “12/31/13.”

##### § 180.589 [Amended]

■ 10. In § 180.589, in the table to paragraph (b), amend the entry for “Endive, Belgian” by revising the expiration date “12/31/10” to read “12/31/13.”

[FR Doc. 2010-32148 Filed 12-21-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 180

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0775; FRL-8855-7]

### Flutolanil; Pesticide Tolerances

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of flutolanil in or on Brassica leafy vegetable group 5 and turnip greens. The Interregional Research Project Number 4 requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

**DATES:** This regulation is effective December 22, 2010. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before February 22, 2011, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (*see also* Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under docket identification (ID) number EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0775. All documents in the docket are listed in the docket index available at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, *e.g.*, Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available in the electronic docket at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or, if only available in hard copy, at the OPP Regulatory Public Docket in Rm. S-

4400, One Potomac Yard (South Bldg.), 2777 S. Crystal Dr., Arlington, VA. The Docket Facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The Docket Facility telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Andrew Ertman, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 308-9367; e-mail address: [ertman.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:ertman.andrew@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. General Information**

*A. Does this action apply to me?*

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected entities may include, but are not limited to those engaged in the following activities:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to provide a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in this unit could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether this action might apply to certain entities. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

*B. How can I get electronic access to other related information?*

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of EPA's tolerance regulations at 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/ecfr>. You may access Harmonized Guidelines referenced in this document at <http://www.epa.gov/ocspp/pubs/frs/home/guideline.htm>.

*C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?*

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. You must file your objection

or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0775 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All objections and requests for a hearing must be in writing, and must be received by the Hearing Clerk on or before February 22, 2011. Addresses for mail and hand delivery of objections and hearing requests are provided in 40 CFR 178.25(b).

In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in 40 CFR part 178, please submit a copy of the filing that does not contain any CBI for inclusion in the public docket. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. Submit a copy of your non-CBI objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0775, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) Regulatory Public Docket (7502P), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001.
- *Delivery:* OPP Regulatory Public Docket (7502P), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. S-4400, One Potomac Yard (South Bldg.), 2777 S. Crystal Dr., Arlington, VA. Deliveries are only accepted during the Docket Facility's normal hours of operation (8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays). Special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The Docket Facility telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

**II. Summary of Petitioned-For Tolerance**

In the **Federal Register** of January 6, 2010 (75 FR 864) (FRL-8801-5), EPA issued a notice pursuant to section 408(d)(3) of FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP 9E7612) by the Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4), 500 College Road East, Suite 201W, Princeton, NJ 08540. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.484 be amended by establishing tolerances for residues of the fungicide flutolanil, *N*-(3-(1-methylethoxy)phenyl)-2-(trifluoromethyl)benzamide and its metabolites converted to 2-(trifluoromethyl) benzoic acid and calculated as flutolanil, in or on ginseng at 3.5 parts per million (ppm); vegetable,

*Brassica*, leafy, group 5 at 0.11 ppm; and turnip, greens at 0.11 ppm. That notice referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Gowan Company, the registrant, which is available in the docket, <http://www.regulations.gov>. There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

IR-4 later withdrew their request to establish a tolerance on ginseng. Also, EPA has revised the tolerance levels proposed by IR-4. The reasons for these changes are explained in Unit IV.C.

**III. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety**

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA 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." Section 408(b)(2)(A)(ii) of FFDCA 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 and in residential settings, but does not include occupational exposure. Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the 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. \* \* \*"

Consistent with section 408(b)(2)(D) of FFDCA, and the factors specified in section 408(b)(2)(D) of FFDCA, EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action. EPA has sufficient data to assess the hazards of and to make a determination on aggregate exposure for flutolanil including exposure resulting from the tolerances established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with flutolanil follows.

*A. Toxicological Profile*

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered its validity, completeness, and reliability as well as the relationship of the results of the studies to human risk. EPA has also considered available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers, including infants and children. The toxicology studies conducted on flutolanil demonstrate few or no biologically significant toxic effects. Liver effects in

rats included increases in absolute and relative liver weight in the absence of clinical chemistry and/or histopathology findings. In dogs, there was an elevation in alkaline phosphatase and cholesterol levels together with dose-related increases in absolute and relative liver weights, slightly enlarged livers, and an increase in severity of glycogen deposition. The increased liver weights are considered to be an adaptive response to flutolanil treatment and not an adverse effect. Based on the lack of evidence of carcinogenicity and the lack of evidence of mutagenicity, flutolanil is classified as “not likely to be carcinogenic to humans.”

Flutolanil is not neurotoxic, and it is not a developmental or reproductive toxicant. No maternal, reproductive, or developmental toxicity was observed at the limit dose. There was no evidence for increased susceptibility of rat or rabbit fetuses to *in utero* exposure or rat pups to pre- and post-natal exposure to flutolanil. No toxic effects were observed in studies in which flutolanil was administered by the dermal route of exposure at the limit dose.

Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the adverse effects caused by flutolanil as well as the no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) and the lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level (LOAEL) from the toxicity studies can be found at <http://www.regulations.gov> in docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0775 in the document titled “Flutolanil: Human Health Risk Assessment for Flutolanil on *Brassica* Leafy Vegetables (Crop Group 5) and Turnip Greens” on pages 27–30.

#### B. Toxicological Points of Departure/Levels of Concern

Once a pesticide’s toxicological profile is determined, EPA identifies toxicological points of departure (POD) and levels of concern to use in evaluating the risk posed by human exposure to the pesticide. For hazards that have a threshold below which there is no appreciable risk, the toxicological POD is used as the basis for derivation of reference values for risk assessment. PODs are developed based on a careful analysis of the doses in each toxicological study to determine the dose at which no adverse effects are observed (the NOAEL) and the lowest dose at which adverse effects of concern are identified (the LOAEL). Uncertainty/safety factors are used in conjunction with the POD to calculate a safe exposure level—generally referred to as a population-adjusted dose (PAD) or a reference dose (RfD)—and a safe margin

of exposure (MOE). For non-threshold risks, the Agency assumes that any amount of exposure will lead to some degree of risk. Thus, the Agency estimates risk in terms of the probability of an occurrence of the adverse effect expected in a lifetime. For more information on the general principles EPA uses in risk characterization and a complete description of the risk assessment process, see <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/riskassess.htm>.

A summary of the toxicological endpoints for flutolanil used for human risk assessment is discussed in Unit III.B., of the final rule published in the **Federal Register** of June 11, 2008 (73 FR 33013) (FRL–8365–6).

#### C. Exposure Assessment

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to flutolanil, EPA considered exposure under the petitioned-for tolerances as well as all existing flutolanil tolerances in 40 CFR 180.484. EPA assessed dietary exposures from flutolanil in food as follows:

i. *Acute exposure.* Quantitative acute dietary exposure and risk assessments are performed for a food-use pesticide, if a toxicological study has indicated the possibility of an effect of concern occurring as a result of a 1–day or single exposure.

No such effects were identified in the toxicological studies for flutolanil; therefore, a quantitative acute dietary exposure assessment is unnecessary.

ii. *Chronic exposure.* In conducting the chronic dietary exposure assessment EPA used the food consumption data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) 1994–1996 and 1998 Continuing Survey of Food Intake by Individuals (CSFII). As to residue levels in food, the chronic dietary analysis included tolerance level residues, 100% crop treated estimates and default processing factors.

iii. *Cancer.* Based on the data summarized in Unit III.A., EPA has concluded that flutolanil does not pose a cancer risk to humans. Therefore, a dietary exposure assessment for the purpose of assessing cancer risk is unnecessary.

iv. *Anticipated residue and percent crop treated (PCT) information.* EPA did not use anticipated residue and/or PCT information in the dietary assessment for flutolanil. Tolerance level residues and/or 100% CT were assumed for all food commodities.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* The Agency used screening level water exposure models in the dietary exposure analysis and risk assessment

for flutolanil in drinking water. These simulation models take into account data on the physical, chemical, and fate/transport characteristics of flutolanil. Further information regarding EPA drinking water models used in pesticide exposure assessment can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/models/water/index.htm>.

Based on the Pesticide Root Zone Model and Exposure Analysis Modeling System (PRZM–EXAMS) and Screening Concentration in Ground Water (SCI–GROW) models, the estimated drinking water concentrations (EDWCs) of flutolanil for chronic exposures are estimated to be 8.5 parts per billion (ppb) for surface water and 0.7 ppb for ground water.

Modeled estimates of drinking water concentrations were directly entered into the dietary exposure model. For chronic dietary risk assessment, the water concentration of value 8.5 ppb was used to assess the contribution to drinking water.

3. *From non-dietary exposure.* The term “residential exposure” is used in this document to refer to non-occupational, non-dietary exposure (e.g., for lawn and garden pest control, indoor pest control, termiticides, and flea and tick control on pets). Flutolanil is currently registered for the following uses that could result in residential exposures: Turf grass and ornamental plants. Although there is a potential for residential (non-occupational) exposure, a quantitative exposure assessment was not conducted since no toxicological endpoint attributable to acute, short-term or intermediate-term exposure have been identified and the current use pattern does not indicate chronic or long-term exposure (6 or more months of continuous exposure) potential. Further information regarding EPA standard assumptions and generic inputs for residential exposures may be found at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/trac/science/trac6a05.pdf>.

4. *Cumulative effects from substances with a common mechanism of toxicity.* Section 408(b)(2)(D)(v) of FFDCA 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.”

EPA has not found flutolanil to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and flutolanil does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has

assumed that flutolanil does not have a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances. For information regarding EPA's efforts to determine which chemicals have a common mechanism of toxicity and to evaluate the cumulative effects of such chemicals, see EPA's website at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/cumulative>.

#### D. Safety Factor for Infants and Children

1. *In general.* Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold (10X) margin of safety for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for prenatal and postnatal toxicity and the completeness of the database on toxicity and exposure unless EPA determines based on reliable data that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. This additional margin of safety is commonly referred to as the FQPA Safety Factor (SF). In applying this provision, EPA either retains the default value of 10X, or uses a different additional safety factor when reliable data available to EPA support the choice of a different factor.

2. *Prenatal and postnatal sensitivity.* There was no evidence of increased susceptibility of rat or rabbit fetuses to *in utero* exposure or rat pups to prenatal and postnatal exposure to flutolanil. Flutolanil is not a developmental or reproductive toxicant. No maternal, reproductive, or developmental toxicity was observed at the limit dose.

3. *Conclusion.* EPA has determined that reliable data show the safety of infants and children would be adequately protected if the FQPA SF were reduced to 1X. That decision is based on the following findings:

i. The toxicity database for flutolanil is complete except for acute and subchronic neurotoxicity and immunotoxicity studies. Recent changes to 40 CFR part 158 make acute and subchronic neurotoxicity testing (OPPTS Test Guideline 870.6200), and immunotoxicity testing (OPPTS Test Guideline 870.7800) required for pesticide registration. However, the available data for flutolanil do not suggest that the compound produces hematological or thymus/spleen organ effects indicative of immunotoxicity. Further, there is no evidence of neurotoxicity in any study in the toxicity database for flutolanil. Therefore, EPA does not believe that conducting neurotoxicity and immunotoxicity studies will result in a lower POD than currently used for overall risk assessment. Consequently, an additional database uncertainty factor (UF) does not need to be applied.

ii. There is no indication that flutolanil is a neurotoxic chemical and there is no need for a developmental neurotoxicity study or additional UFs to account for neurotoxicity.

iii. There is no evidence that flutolanil exposure results in increased susceptibility in *in utero* rats or rabbits in the prenatal developmental studies or in young rats in the 2-generation reproduction study.

iv. There are no residual uncertainties identified in the exposure databases. The dietary food exposure assessments were performed based on 100% CT and tolerance-level residues. EPA made conservative (protective) assumptions in the ground and surface water modeling used to assess exposure to flutolanil in drinking water. Residential exposure does not pose a concern for flutolanil because (1) chronic residential exposure is not expected; and (2) although short-term or intermediate-term residential exposure may occur, no relevant adverse effects were identified for dermal or incidental oral or inhalation exposure related to residential use. These assessments will not underestimate the exposure and risks posed by flutolanil.

#### E. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety

EPA determines whether acute and chronic dietary pesticide exposures are safe by comparing aggregate exposure estimates to the acute PAD (aPAD) and chronic PAD (cPAD). For linear cancer risks, EPA calculates the lifetime probability of acquiring cancer given the estimated aggregate exposure. Short-, intermediate-, and chronic-term risks are evaluated by comparing the estimated aggregate food, water, and residential exposure to the appropriate PODs to ensure that an adequate MOE exists.

1. *Acute risk.* An acute aggregate risk assessment takes into account acute exposure estimates from dietary consumption of food and drinking water. No adverse effect resulting from a single oral exposure was identified and no acute dietary endpoint was selected. Therefore, flutolanil is not expected to pose an acute risk.

2. *Chronic risk.* Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for chronic exposure, EPA has concluded that chronic exposure to flutolanil from food and water will utilize 1.5% of the cPAD for children 1 to 2 years old, the population group receiving the greatest exposure. Based on the explanation in Unit III.C.3., regarding residential use patterns, chronic residential exposure to residues of flutolanil is not expected.

3. *Short- and intermediate-term risk.* Short- and intermediate-term aggregate exposure takes into account short- and intermediate-term residential exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water (considered to be a background exposure level). Because no short- and/or intermediate-term adverse effects were identified, flutolanil is not expected to pose a short- or intermediate-term risk.

4. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* Based on the lack of evidence of carcinogenicity in two adequate rodent carcinogenicity studies, flutolanil is not expected to pose a cancer risk to humans.

5. *Determination of safety.* Based on these risk assessments, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the general population or to infants and children from aggregate exposure to flutolanil residues.

#### IV. Other Considerations

##### A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

An adequate enforcement methodology, (Method AU/95R/04), a common moiety Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS) method which determines residues of flutolanil and metabolites as 2-trifluoromethyl benzoic acid (2-TFBA) is available for enforcement.

The method may be requested from: Chief, Analytical Chemistry Branch, Environmental Science Center, 701 Mapes Rd., Ft. Meade, MD 20755-5350; telephone number: (410) 305-2905; e-mail address: [residuemethods@epa.gov](mailto:residuemethods@epa.gov).

##### B. International Residue Limits

In making its tolerance decisions, EPA seeks to harmonize U.S. tolerances with international standards whenever possible, consistent with U.S. food safety standards and agricultural practices. EPA considers the international maximum residue limits (MRLs) established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex), as required by FFDCA section 408(b)(4). The Codex Alimentarius is a joint U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization/World Health Organization food standards program, and it is recognized as an international food safety standards-setting organization in trade agreements to which the United States is a party. EPA may establish a tolerance that is different from a Codex MRL; however, FFDCA section 408(b)(4) requires that EPA explain the reasons for departing from the Codex level. No Canadian, Mexican or Codex MRLs have been established for Brassica leafy vegetables and/or turnip greens.

*C. Revisions to Petitioned-For Tolerances*

The proposed tolerance level of 0.11 ppm for both Brassica leafy vegetable group 5 and turnip greens has been revised to 0.1 ppm. The level of 0.1 ppm is based on the sum of the demonstrated levels of quantitation of flutolanil and metabolite M4, each 0.05 ppm. The proposed tolerance of 0.11 ppm is based on one mustard green trial (of 10 trials) where flutolanil was quantitated at 0.05 to 0.06 ppm, and M4 was approximately 0.03 ppm. Because total residues were < 0.1 ppm, EPA is setting the tolerance level at 0.1 ppm.

**V. Conclusion**

Therefore, tolerances are established for residues of flutolanil, N-(3-(1-methylethoxy)phenyl)-2-(trifluoromethyl)benzamide, including its metabolites and degradates, in or on vegetable, *brassica*, leafy group 5 at 0.1 ppm, and turnip greens at 0.1 ppm.

**VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

This final rule establishes tolerances under section 408(d) of FFDCFA in response to a petition submitted to the Agency. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled *Regulatory Planning and Review* (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Because this final rule has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866, this final rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, entitled *Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use* (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) or Executive Order 13045, entitled *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks* (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). This final rule does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, nor does it require any special considerations under Executive Order 12898, entitled *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a petition under section 408(d) of FFDCFA, such as the tolerance in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) do not apply.

This final rule directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers,

and food retailers, not States or tribes, nor does this action alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of section 408(n)(4) of FFDCFA. As such, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States or tribal governments, on the relationship between the national government and the States or tribal governments, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government or between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. Thus, the Agency has determined that Executive Order 13132, entitled *Federalism* (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) and Executive Order 13175, entitled *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments* (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000) do not apply to this final rule. In addition, this final rule does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104-4).

This action does not involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

**VII. Congressional Review Act**

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit 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 United States prior to publication of this final rule in the **Federal Register**. This final rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

**List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180**

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

Dated: December 10, 2010.

**Daniel J. Rosenblatt**,  
Director, Registration Division, 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. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. Section 180.484 is amended by alphabetically adding the following commodities to the table in paragraph (a) to read as follows:

**§ 180.484 Flutolanil; tolerances for residues.**

(a) *General.* \* \* \*

Commodity	Parts per million
* * *	* * *
Turnip, greens .....	0.1
Vegetable, brassica, leafy, group 5 .....	0.1

[FR Doc. 2010-32147 Filed 12-21-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

**41 CFR Parts 300-3, 301-10, 301-12, 301-30, 301-70, Chapter 301, Parts 302-1, 302-2, 302-3, 302-7, 302-11, and 303-70**

[FTR Amendment 2010-07; FTR Case 2010-307; Docket 2010-0020, Sequence 1]

RIN 3090-AJ09

**Federal Travel Regulation; Removal of Privately Owned Vehicle Rates; Privately Owned Automobile Mileage Reimbursement When Government Owned Automobiles Are Authorized; Miscellaneous Amendments; Correction**

**AGENCY:** Office of Governmentwide Policy, General Services Administration (GSA).

**ACTION:** Final rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** GSA is correcting a final rule that appeared in the **Federal Register** on November 29, 2010. The applicability date for the final rule was incorrectly designated December 29, 2010. This final rule correction document corrects the applicability date to January 1, 2011.

**DATES:** The effective date for the final rule published on November 29, 2010 at 75 FR 72965 remains November 29, 2010. The *applicability date* is corrected to January 1, 2011.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The Regulatory Secretariat (MVCB), 1275 First Street, NE., Washington, DC, 20417, (202) 501-4755, for information pertaining to status or publication schedules. For clarification of content,