

## EPA-APPROVED NORTH CAROLINA NON-REGULATORY PROVISIONS

Provision	State effective date	EPA approval date	Federal Register citation
* * * *			
1997 Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan for the Hickory, North Carolina Area (Catawba County).	12/18/09	11/18/11	[Insert citation of publication].
1997 Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan for the Hickory, North Carolina Area—MOVES Update.	12/22/10	11/18/11	[Insert citation of publication].

**PART 81—[AMENDED]**

■ 3. The authority citation for part 81 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

■ 4. In § 81.334, the table entitled “North Carolina—PM<sub>2.5</sub> (Annual NAAQS)” is amended under “Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC” by revising the

entry for “Catawba County” to read as follows:

**§ 81.334 North Carolina.**

\* \* \* \*

NORTH CAROLINA—PM<sub>2.5</sub> (ANNUAL NAAQS)

Designated area	Designation <sup>a</sup>	
	Date <sup>1</sup>	Type
* * * *		
Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC:		
Catawba County .....	This action is effective 11/18/11 .....	Attainment.
* * * *		

<sup>a</sup> Includes Indian Country located in each county or area, except as otherwise specified.

<sup>1</sup> This date is 90 days after January 5, 2005, unless otherwise noted.

\* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2011–29769 Filed 11–17–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Parts 52 and 81**

[EPA–R04–OAR–2009–1011–201159; FRL–9493–6]

**Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; North Carolina: Redesignation of the Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule; correcting amendment.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking final action to approve a request submitted on December 18, 2009, and supplemented on December 22, 2010, from the State of North Carolina, through the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NC DENR), Division of Air Quality (DAQ), to

redesignate the Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) nonattainment area (hereafter the “Greensboro Area” or “Area”) to attainment for the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The Greensboro Area is comprised of Davidson and Guilford Counties in their entireties. EPA’s approval of the redesignation request is based on the determination that the State of North Carolina has met the criteria for redesignation to attainment set forth in the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act), including the determination that the Greensboro Area has attained the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS by its applicable attainment date of April 5, 2010. Additionally, EPA is approving a revision to the North Carolina State Implementation Plan (SIP) to include the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> maintenance plan for the Greensboro Area that contains the new 2011 and 2021 motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEBs) for nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and PM<sub>2.5</sub> for both Davidson and Guilford Counties. This action also approves the emissions inventory submitted with the maintenance plan. Further, EPA is correcting a typographical error for the citation associated with a previous adequacy finding the Agency made for

the NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEBs for both Davidson and Guilford Counties.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* This rule will be effective December 19, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket Identification No. EPA–R04–OAR–2009–1011. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., Confidential Business Information 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 either electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are

Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Madolyn Dominy or Joel Huey, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Madolyn Dominy may be reached by phone at (404) 562-9644 or via electronic mail at [dominy.madolyn@epa.gov](mailto:dominy.madolyn@epa.gov). Joel Huey may be reached by phone at (404) 562-9104 or via electronic mail at [huey.joel@epa.gov](mailto:huey.joel@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Table of Contents**

- I. What is the background for the actions?
- II. What are the actions EPA is taking?
- III. Why is EPA taking these actions?
- IV. What are the effects of these actions?
- V. Final Action
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. What is the background for the actions?**

On December 18, 2009, and supplemented on December 22, 2010, the State of North Carolina, through NC DENR, submitted a request to redesignate the Greensboro Area to attainment for the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS and for EPA approval of the North Carolina SIP revisions containing a maintenance plan for the Area. In an action published on September 26, 2011 (76 FR 59345), EPA proposed approval of North Carolina's plan for maintaining the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS,

including the emissions inventory submitted pursuant to CAA section 172(c)(3) and the NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEBs for Davidson and Guilford Counties in the Greensboro Area as contained in the maintenance plan. At that time, EPA also proposed to approve the redesignation of the Greensboro Area to attainment. Additional background for today's action is set forth in EPA's September 26, 2011, proposal.

The MVEBs, specified in kilograms per year (kg/yr), included in the maintenance plan are as follows:

**TABLE 1—DAVIDSON COUNTY MVEBS**  
[kg/yr]

Conformity MVEB	2011	2021
NO <sub>x</sub> .....	4,086,413	2,148,938
PM <sub>2.5</sub> .....	153,313	153,313

**TABLE 2—GUILFORD COUNTY MVEBS**  
[kg/year]

Conformity MVEB	2011	2021
NO <sub>x</sub> .....	11,133,605	6,309,650
PM <sub>2.5</sub> .....	421,841	421,841

In its September 26, 2011, proposed action, EPA noted that the adequacy public comment period on these MVEBs (as contained in North Carolina's submittal) began on November 23, 2010, and closed on December 23, 2010. No comments were received during the public comment period. Thus, EPA

deemed the new MVEBs for Davidson and Guilford Counties in the Greensboro Area adequate for the purposes of transportation conformity on May 2, 2011 (76 FR 24474).

As stated in the September 26, 2011, proposal, this redesignation addresses the Greensboro Area's status solely with respect to the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, for which designations were finalized on January 5, 2005 (70 FR 944), and as supplemented on April 14, 2005 (70 FR 19844).

EPA reviewed PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring data from ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring stations in the Greensboro Area for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> seasons from 2007–2009. These data have been quality-assured and are recorded in Air Quality System (AQS). The annual arithmetic mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations for 2006–2009 and the 3-year averages of these values (*i.e.*, design values) are summarized in Table 3. EPA has reviewed more recent data which indicate that the Greensboro Area continues to attain the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. The design values for 2007–2009 and 2008–2010 are also included in Table 3 and demonstrate that the Greensboro Area continues to meet the PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS and that the ambient concentrations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> are continuing to decrease in the Area. Preliminary monitoring data for the 2011 PM<sub>2.5</sub> season indicate that the Area is continuing to attain the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS based on data from 2009–2011. These preliminary data are available in the docket for today's action although they are not yet certified.

**TABLE 3—DESIGN VALUE CONCENTRATIONS FOR THE GREENSBORO 1997 ANNUAL PM<sub>2.5</sub> NONATTAINMENT AREA (µg/m<sup>3</sup>)**

County	Site name	Monitor ID	Annual average PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentrations (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )				
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Davidson .....	Lexington .....	37-057-0002	15.13	14.64	13.61	10.61	12.1
Guilford .....	Mendenhall .....	37-081-0013	14.5	13.14	11.41	9.31	10.4
Guilford .....	Colfax .....	37-035-0014	N/A	N/A	12.32	9.63	10.5
			Three-year PM <sub>2.5</sub> design values (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )				
			2006–2008		2007–2009		2008–2010
Davidson .....	Lexington .....	37-057-0002	14.5		13.0		12.1
Guilford .....	Mendenhall .....	37-081-0013	13.0		11.3		10.4
Guilford .....	Colfax .....	37-035-0014	N/A		N/A		10.8

**II. What are the actions EPA is taking?**

In today's rulemaking, EPA is approving: (1) North Carolina's emissions inventory which was submitted pursuant to CAA section 172(c)(3); (2) North Carolina's 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> maintenance plan (such approval being one of the CAA criteria

for redesignation to attainment status) for the Greensboro Area, including MVEBs; and (3) North Carolina's redesignation request to change the legal designation of the Greensboro Area from nonattainment to attainment for the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. The maintenance plan is designed to

demonstrate that the Greensboro Area will continue to attain the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS through 2021. EPA's approval of the redesignation request is based on EPA's determination that the Greensboro Area meets the criteria for redesignation set forth in CAA, sections 107(d)(3)(E) and 175A, including EPA's

determination that the Greensboro Area has attained the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. EPA's analyses of North Carolina's redesignation request, emissions inventory, and maintenance plan are described in detail in the September 26, 2011, proposed rule (76 FR 59345).

Consistent with the CAA, the maintenance plan that EPA is approving also includes 2011 and 2021 MVEBs for NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> for Davidson and Guilford Counties in the Greensboro Area. In this action, EPA is approving these NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEBs for the purposes of transportation conformity. For required regional emissions analysis years beyond 2011 and prior to 2021, the applicable budgets will be the new 2011 MVEBs. For required regional emissions analysis years that involve 2021 or beyond, the applicable budgets will be the new 2021 MVEBs.

EPA is also correcting an inadvertent typographical error for the citation (in EPA's September 26, 2011, proposed rulemaking) associated with EPA's adequacy finding for the NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEB for Davidson and Guilford Counties. In EPA's September 26, 2011, proposed rulemaking, EPA provides the citation for the adequacy determination for the NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEBs as 76 FR 24472 in the last paragraph of the section entitled "VIII. What Is the Status of EPA's Adequacy Determination for the Proposed PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> MVEBs for 2011 and 2021 for the Greensboro Area?" and in the second to last paragraph in the section entitled "X. Proposed Actions on the Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan SIP Revisions Including Approval of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> MVEBs for 2011 and 2021 for the Greensboro Area." The correct citation is 76 FR 24474. Through this action, EPA is making this correction.

### III. Why is EPA taking these actions?

EPA has determined that the Greensboro Area has attained the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS and has also determined that all other criteria for the redesignation of the Greensboro Area from nonattainment to attainment of the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS have been met. See CAA section 107(d)(3)(E). One of those requirements is that the Greensboro Area has an approved plan demonstrating maintenance of the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. EPA is also taking final action to approve the maintenance plan for the Greensboro Area as meeting the requirements of sections 175A and 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA. In addition, EPA is approving the emissions inventory as meeting the requirements of section 172(c)(3) of the

CAA. Finally, EPA is approving the new NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEBs for the years 2011 and 2021 as contained in North Carolina's maintenance plan for Davidson and Guilford Counties in the Greensboro Area because these MVEBs are consistent with maintenance of the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard in the Greensboro Area. The detailed rationale for EPA's findings and actions are set forth in the proposed rulemaking and in other discussion in this final rulemaking.

### IV. What are the effects of these actions?

Approval of the redesignation request changes the legal designation of Davidson and Guilford Counties in their entirety from nonattainment to attainment for the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. EPA is modifying the regulatory table in 40 CFR 81.334 to reflect a designation of attainment for these full and partial counties. EPA is also approving, as a revision to the North Carolina SIP, North Carolina's plan for maintaining the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in the Greensboro Area through 2021. The maintenance plan includes contingency measures to remedy possible future violations of the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS and establishes NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEBs for the years 2011 and 2021 for the Greensboro Area. Additionally, this action approves the emissions inventory for the Greensboro Area pursuant to section 172(c)(3) of the CAA.

### V. Final Action

EPA is taking final action to approve the redesignation and change the legal designation of Davidson and Guilford Counties in their entirety from nonattainment to attainment for the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. EPA is also approving into the North Carolina SIP the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> maintenance plan for the Greensboro Area. For Davidson County, the maintenance plan includes the new MVEBs of 4,086,413 kg/yr of NO<sub>x</sub> and 153,313 kg/yr of PM<sub>2.5</sub> for 2011 and 2,148,938 kg/yr of NO<sub>x</sub> and 153,313 kg/yr of PM<sub>2.5</sub> for 2021. Further, for Guilford County, the maintenance plan includes the new MVEBs of 11,133,605 kg/yr of NO<sub>x</sub> and 421,841 kg/yr of PM<sub>2.5</sub> for 2011 and 6,309,650 kg/yr of NO<sub>x</sub> and 421,841 kg/yr of PM<sub>2.5</sub> for 2021.

Additionally, EPA is approving the 2008 emissions inventory for the Greensboro Area pursuant to section 172(c)(3) of the CAA. In a previous action, EPA found the new Greensboro Area MVEBs adequate for the purposes of transportation conformity (76 FR 24474, May 2, 2011). Within 24 months

from the effective date of EPA's adequacy finding for the MVEBs, the transportation partners are required to demonstrate conformity to the new PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> MVEBs pursuant to 40 CFR 93.104(e).

### VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, redesignation of an area to attainment and the accompanying approval of the maintenance plan under CAA section 107(d)(3)(E) are actions that affect the status of geographical area and do not impose any additional regulatory requirements on sources beyond those required by state law. A redesignation to attainment does not in and of itself impose any new requirements, but rather results in the application of requirements contained in the CAA for areas that have been redesignated to attainment. Moreover, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For these reasons, these actions:

- Are not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- Do not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Are certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Do not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);
- Do not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Are not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Are not significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Are not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National

Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and

- Do not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, this final rule does not have Tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the SIP is not approved to apply in Indian country located in the State, and EPA notes that it will not impose substantial direct costs on Tribal governments or preempt Tribal law.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this action 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**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by January 17, 2012. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

#### List of Subjects

##### 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

##### 40 CFR Part 81

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, National parks.

Dated: November 7, 2011.

**A. Stanley Meiburg,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

40 CFR parts 52 and 81 are amended as follows:

#### PART 52—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

##### Subpart II—North Carolina

■ 2. Section 52.1770(e) is amended by adding new entries “1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan for the Greensboro, North Carolina Area (Davidson and Guilford Counties)” and “1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan for the Greensboro, North Carolina Area—MOVES Update” at the end of the table to read as follows:

##### § 52.1770 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) \* \* \*

#### EPA-APPROVED NORTH CAROLINA NON-REGULATORY PROVISIONS

Provision	State effective date	EPA approval date	Federal Register citation
* * * * *			
1997 Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan for the Greensboro, North Carolina Area (Davidson and Guilford Counties).	12/18/09	11/18/11	[Insert citation of publication].
1997 Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan for the Greensboro, North Carolina Area—MOVES Update.	12/22/10	11/18/11	[Insert citation of publication].

#### PART 81—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 81 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

■ 2. In § 81.334, the table entitled “North Carolina—PM<sub>2.5</sub> (Annual NAAQS)” is amended under “Greensboro-Winston Salem-High Point, NC” by revising the entries for

“Davidson County” and “Guilford County” to read as follows:

##### § 81.334 North Carolina.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### NORTH CAROLINA—PM<sub>2.5</sub>—(ANNUAL NAAQS)

Designated area	Designation <sup>a</sup>	
	Date <sup>1</sup>	Type
Greensboro-Winston Salem-High Point, NC:		
Davidson County .....	This action is effective 11/18/11 .....	Attainment.
Guilford County .....	This action is effective 11/18/11 .....	Attainment.
* * * * *		

<sup>a</sup> Includes Indian Country located in each county or area, except as otherwise specified.

<sup>1</sup> This date is 90 days after January 5, 2005, unless otherwise noted.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2011-29777 Filed 11-17-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 180**

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0780; FRL-9326-4]

**Prohexadione Calcium; Pesticide Tolerances****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes a tolerance for residues of prohexadione calcium in or on sweet cherry. BASF Corporation requested this tolerance under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

**DATES:** This regulation is effective November 18, 2011. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before January 17, 2012, 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-2010-0780. 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:** Rose Mary Kearns, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 305-5611; email address: [kearns.rosemary@epa.gov](mailto:kearns.rosemary@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://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab\\_02.tpl](http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl).

*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-2010-0780 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 January 17, 2012. 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-2010-0780, 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 October 27, 2010 (75 FR 66092) (FRL-8848-3), 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 0F7765) by BASF Corporation, 26 Davis Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.547 be amended by establishing tolerances for residues of the plant growth regulator prohexadione calcium, calcium, 3-oxido-5-oxo-4-propionylcyclohex-3-enecarboxylate, in or on sweet cherries at 0.50 parts per million (ppm). That notice referenced a summary of the petition prepared by BASF Corporation, the registrant, which is available in the docket, <http://www.regulations.gov>. There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing for these changes are explained in Unit IV.D. Based upon review of the data supporting the petition, EPA has lowered the tolerance from 0.5 ppm to 0.4 p.m. The reason 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