

www.govinfo.gov. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site. You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers: 84.007 Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program; 84.032 Federal Family Education Loan Program; 84.032 Federal PLUS Program; 84.033 Federal Work Study Program; 84.038 Federal Perkins Loan Program; 84.063 Federal Pell Grant Program; and 84.268 William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program.)

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1071, 1082, 1087a, 1087aa, Part F–1, 1098aa.

Miguel A. Cardona,
Secretary of Education.

[FR Doc. 2024–01227 Filed 1–23–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2023–0065; FRL–11656–01–OCSPP]

Baicalin in Pesticide Formulations; Tolerance Exemption

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of Baicalin anhydrous and Baicalin hydrate when used as inert ingredients (stabilizer) on growing crops pre-harvest, limited to a maximum concentration of 10% of the end-use formulation. Exponent, Inc. on behalf of UPL NA Inc. submitted a petition to EPA under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), requesting establishment of an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. This regulation eliminates the need to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of baicalin anhydrous and baicalin hydrate, when used in accordance with the terms of those exemptions.

DATES: This regulation is effective January 24, 2024. Objections and

requests for hearings must be received on or before March 25, 2024 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: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2023–0065, is available at <https://www.regulations.gov> or at the Office of Pesticide Programs Regulatory Public Docket (OPP Docket) in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), West William Jefferson Clinton Bldg., Rm. 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room and the OPP docket is (202) 566–1744. Please review the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at <https://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Smith, Registration Division (7505T), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001; main telephone number: (202) 566–1030; email address: RDfRNNotices@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. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

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

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

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of 40 CFR part 180 through the Office of the Federal Register's e-CFR site at <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40>.

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

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a(g), 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–2023–0065 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 March 25, 2024. 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 (excluding any Confidential Business Information (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 the non-CBI copy of your objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2023–0065, by one of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

- **Mail:** OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001.

- **Hand Delivery:** To make special arrangements for hand delivery or delivery of boxed information, please follow the instructions at <https://www.epa.gov/>.

Additional instructions on commenting or visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at <https://www.epa.gov/>.

II. Petition for Exemption

In the **Federal Register** of March 24, 2023 (88 FR 17778) (FRL–10579–02), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408, 21 U.S.C. 346a, announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP IN–11658) by Exponent, Inc., 1150 Connecticut Ave., Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20036, on behalf of UPL NA Inc., 630 Freedom Business Center, Suite 402, King of Prussia, PA 19406. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.920 be amended by establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of baicalin anhydrous (CAS Reg. No.

21967–41–9) and baicalin hydrate (CAS Reg. No. 206752–33–2) when used as inert ingredients (stabilizer) in pesticide formulations applied to growing crops pre-harvest limited to a maximum concentration of 10% of the end-use formulation. That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Exponent, Inc. on behalf of UPL NA Inc., the petitioner, which is available in the docket, <https://www.regulations.gov>. There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing. For ease of reading, baicalin is used throughout this document and refers to both baicalin anhydrous and hydrate forms.

III. Inert Ingredient Definition

Inert ingredients are all ingredients that are not active ingredients as defined in 40 CFR 153.125 and include, but are not limited to, the following types of ingredients (except when they have a pesticidal efficacy of their own): Solvents such as alcohols and hydrocarbons; surfactants such as polyoxyethylene polymers and fatty acids; carriers such as clay and diatomaceous earth; thickeners such as carrageenan and modified cellulose; wetting, spreading, and dispersing agents; propellants in aerosol dispensers; microencapsulating agents; and emulsifiers. The term “inert” is not intended to imply nontoxicity; the ingredient may or may not be chemically active. Generally, EPA has exempted inert ingredients from the requirement of a tolerance based on the low toxicity of the individual inert ingredients.

IV. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Section 408(c)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish an exemption from the requirement for 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(c)(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. When making a safety determination for an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(B) directs EPA to consider the considerations in section 408(b)(2)(C) and (D). 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” Section 408(b)(2)(D) lists other factors for EPA consideration making safety determinations, *e.g.*, the validity, completeness, and reliability of available data, nature of toxic effects, available information concerning the cumulative effects of the pesticide chemical and other substances with a common mechanism of toxicity, and available information concerning aggregate exposure levels to the pesticide chemical and other related substances, among others.

EPA establishes exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance only in those cases where it can be clearly demonstrated that the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide chemical residues under reasonably foreseeable circumstances will pose no harm to human health. In order to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide inert ingredients, the Agency considers the toxicity of the inert in conjunction with possible exposure to residues of the inert ingredient through food, drinking water, and through other exposures that occur as a result of pesticide use in residential settings. If EPA is able to determine that a finite tolerance is not necessary to ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the inert ingredient, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance may be established.

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(A), and the factors specified in FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(B), 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 baicalin including exposure resulting from the exemption established by this action. EPA’s assessment of exposures and risks associated with baicalin follows.

A. Toxicological Profile

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered their 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. Specific information on the studies received and

the nature of the adverse effects caused by baicalin as well as the no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) and the lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level (LOAEL) from the toxicity studies are discussed in this unit.

Baicalin exhibits low levels of acute toxicity via the oral route of exposure. Acute dermal toxicity is expected to be low based on low oral acute toxicity and the absence of clinical signs in a skin irritation study in rabbits. Acute inhalation toxicity is expected to be low based on its low vapor pressure. Baicalin is not a skin sensitizer. Special studies reported no acute adverse effects on respiratory function and the central nervous system (CNS) in rats up to 5,000 mg/kg (equivalent to 3,000 mg/kg baicalin) or on cardiovascular function in dogs up to 1,000 mg/kg (equivalent to 600 mg/kg baicalin).

No effects were seen in subchronic oral toxicity studies in rats up to 2,000 mg/kg/day (~1,200 mg/kg/day baicalin), in mice up to 500 mg/kg/day (~300 mg/kg/day baicalin) and in dogs up to 1,000 mg/kg/day (~630 mg/kg/day baicalin). No increased offspring susceptibility was observed in the available studies as no offspring or maternal effects were observed. Concern for carcinogenicity is low based on a negative result in a mutagenicity study, lack of effects in subchronic studies, and the lack of relevant structural alerts for carcinogenicity.

No evidence of neurotoxicity or immunotoxicity was observed in the available studies. Also, no neurotoxicity was observed in an acute toxicity study evaluating central nervous system effects in rats.

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 <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/overview-risk-assessment-pesticide-program>.

The hazard profile of baicalin is adequately defined. Overall, baicalin is of low acute, subchronic, and developmental toxicity. No systemic toxicity is observed up to 2,000 mg/kg/day (~1,200 mg/kg/day baicalin), in mice up to 500 mg/kg/day (~300 mg/kg/day baicalin) and in dogs up to 1,000 mg/kg/day (~630 mg/kg/day baicalin). Since signs of toxicity were not observed, no toxicological endpoints of concern or PODs were identified. Therefore, a qualitative risk assessment for baicalin can be performed.

C. Exposure Assessment

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to baicalin, EPA considered exposure under the proposed exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. EPA assessed dietary exposures from baicalin in food as follows:

Dietary exposure (food and drinking water) to baicalin may occur following ingestion of foods with residues from their use in accordance with this exemption and use as an herbal supplement. However, a quantitative dietary exposure assessment was not conducted since a toxicological endpoint for risk assessment was not identified.

2. *From non-dietary exposure.* The term “residential exposure” is used in this document to refer to non-occupational, non-dietary exposure (e.g., textiles (clothing and diapers), carpets, swimming pools, and hard surface disinfection on walls, floors, tables).

Baicalin may be present in pesticide and non-pesticide products that may be used in and around the home and in cosmetic products. However, a quantitative residential exposure assessment was not conducted since a toxicological endpoint for risk assessment was not identified.

3. *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.”

Based on the lack of toxicity in the available database, EPA has not found baicalin to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and baicalin does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance exemption, therefore, EPA has assumed that baicalin 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 <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/cumulative-assessment-risk-pesticides>.

D. Additional Safety Factor for the Protection of Infants and Children

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 Food Quality Protection Act (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.

Based on an assessment of baicalin, EPA has concluded that there are no toxicological endpoints of concern for the U.S. population, including infants and children. Because there are no threshold effects associated with baicalin, EPA conducted a qualitative assessment. As part of that assessment, the Agency did not use safety factors for assessing risk, and no additional safety factor is needed for assessing risk to infants and children.

E. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety

Because no toxicological endpoints of concern were identified, 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 baicalin residues.

V. Other Considerations

Analytical Enforcement Methodology

An analytical method is not required for enforcement purposes since the Agency is not establishing a numerical tolerance for residues of baicalin in or on any food commodities. EPA is establishing a limitation on the amount of baicalin that may be used in pesticide formulations applied pre-harvest. This limitation will be enforced through the pesticide registration process under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (“FIFRA”), 7 U.S.C. 136 *et seq.* EPA will not register any pesticide formulation for food use that exceeds 10% by weight of baicalin in the final pesticide formulation.

VI. Conclusions

Therefore, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance is established for residues of baicalin anhydrous (CAS Reg. No. 21967–41–9) and baicalin hydrate (CAS Reg. No. 206752–33–2) when used as inert ingredients (stabilizer) in pesticide formulations on growing crops pre-harvest under 40 CFR 180.920 limited to a maximum concentration of 10% of the end-use formulation.

VII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action establishes exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance under FFDCA section 408(d) 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 action has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866, this action 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 action 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 FFDCA section 408(d), such as the exemptions 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 action 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 FFDCA section 408(n)(4). 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 action. In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*).

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 (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

VIII. Congressional Review Act

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), 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 the rule in the **Federal Register**. This action 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: January 18, 2024.

Charles Smith,
Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, for the reasons stated in the preamble, EPA is amending 40 CFR chapter I as follows:

PART 180—TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUES IN FOOD

■ 1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. In § 180.920, amend table 1 to 180.920 by revising its heading and adding in alphabetical order entries for “Baicalin anhydrous” and “Baicalin hydrate” to read as follows:

§ 180.920 Inert ingredients used pre-harvest; exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance.

* * * * *

TABLE 1 TO § 180.920

Inert ingredients	Limits	Uses
* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *
Baicalin anhydrous (CAS Reg. No. 21967–41–9)	10% by weight	Stabilizer.
Baicalin hydrate (CAS Reg. No. 206752–33–2)	10% by weight	Stabilizer.
* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2024–01321 Filed 1–23–24; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

45 CFR Part 1611

Income Level for Individuals Eligible for Assistance

AGENCY: Legal Services Corporation.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) is required by law to establish maximum income levels for individuals eligible for legal assistance. This document updates the specified income levels to reflect the annual amendments to the Federal Poverty Guidelines issued by the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

DATES: Effective January 24, 2024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stefanie Davis, Deputy General Counsel

and Ethics Officer, Legal Services Corporation, 3333 K St. NW, Washington, DC 20007; (202) 295–1563; sdavis@lsc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 1007(a)(2) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (Act), 42 U.S.C. 2996f(a)(2), requires LSC to establish maximum income levels for individuals eligible for legal assistance. Section 1611.3(c) of LSC’s regulations establishes a maximum income level equivalent to 125% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines (Guidelines), which HHS is responsible for updating and issuing. 45 CFR 1611.3(c).

Each year, LSC updates appendix A to 45 CFR part 1611 to provide client income eligibility standards based on the most recent Guidelines. The figures for 2024, set out below, are equivalent to 125% of the Guidelines published by HHS on January 12, 2024.

In addition, LSC is publishing a chart listing income levels that are 200% of the Guidelines. This chart is for

reference purposes only as an aid to recipients in assessing the financial eligibility of an applicant whose income is greater than 125% of the applicable Guidelines amount, but less than 200% of the applicable Guidelines amount (and who may be found to be financially eligible under duly adopted exceptions to the annual income ceiling in accordance with 45 CFR 1611.3, 1611.4, and 1611.5).

Except where there are minor variances due to rounding, the amount by which the guideline increases for each additional member of the household is a consistent amount.

List of Subjects in 45 CFR Part 1611

Grant programs—law, Legal services.

For reasons set forth in the preamble, the Legal Services Corporation amends 45 CFR part 1611 as follows:

PART 1611—ELIGIBILITY

■ 1. The authority citation for part 1611 continues to read as follows: