or anchor in the safety zone while it is being enforced without permission of the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or a designated representative.

DATES: The regulation in 33 CFR 165.929 will be enforced for the safety zone listed as (e)(35) in Table 165.929 on July 4, 2016 from 8:45 p.m. until 9:45 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this notice of enforcement, call or email LT Lindsay Cook, Waterways Management Division, Marine Safety Unit Chicago, at 630–986–2155, email address *Lindsay.N.Cook@uscg.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Coast Guard will enforce the Michigan City Summerfest listed as item (e)(35) in Table 165.929 of 33 CFR 165.929 from 8:45 p.m. until 9:45 p.m. on July 4, 2016. This action is being taken to provide for the safety of life on a navigable waterway during the fireworks display. Section 165.929 lists many annual events requiring safety zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone. This safety zone encompasses all waters of Michigan City Harbor and Lake Michigan within the arc of a circle with a 1,000 foot radius from the launch site located in position 41°43.700′ N., 086°54.617′ W. During the enforcement period, no vessel may transit this regulated area without approval from the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan (COTP) or a COTP designated representative. Vessels and persons granted permission to enter the safety zone shall obey all lawful orders or directions of the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan, or his or her on-scene representative.

This notice of enforcement is issued under authority of 33 CFR 165.929, Safety Zones; Annual events requiring safety zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan zone and 5 U.S.C. 552 (a). In addition to this notification in the **Federal Register**, the Coast Guard will provide the maritime community with advance notification of this enforcement period via Broadcast Notice to Mariners or Local Notice to Mariners. The Captain of the Port Lake Michigan, or a designated on-scene representative may be contacted via Channel 16, VHF–FM.

Dated: March 18, 2016.

A.B. Cocanour,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Lake Michigan.

[FR Doc. 2016–06910 Filed 3–25–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0031; FRL–9943–00]

Mandipropamid; Pesticide Tolerances

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation increases existing tolerances for residues of mandipropamid in or on potato, wet peel, and the vegetable, tuberous and corm subgroup 1C. Syngenta Crop Protection requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

DATES: This regulation is effective March 28, 2016. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before May 27, 2016, 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–2015–0031, is available at *http://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 is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305–5805. Please review the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Lewis, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; main telephone number: (703) 305–7090; email address: *RDFRNotices@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 EPA's tolerance regulations at 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at *http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/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–2015–0031 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 May 27, 2016. 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–2015–0031, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://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 *http://www.epa.gov/dockets/contacts.html.*

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

II. Summary of Petitioned-For Tolerance

In the **Federal Register** of March 4, 2015 (80 FR 11611) (FRL–9922–68), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP 4F8329) by Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC., 410 Swing Road, P.O. Box 18300, Greensboro, NC 27419. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.637 be amended by establishing a tolerance for residues of the fungicide mandipropamid in or on potato at 0.08 parts per million (ppm). The petition also requested to amend the tolerance in 40 CFR 180.637 for residues of mandipropamid in or on potato, wet peel at 0.12 ppm, and amend the current tolerance commodity terminology which contains potato from ''vegetable, tuberous and corm, subgroup 1C,'' to ''vegetable, tuberous and corm, subgroup 1C, except potato.'' That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Syngenta Crop Protection, the registrant, which is available in the docket, *http://www.regulations.gov.* There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

Based upon review of the data supporting the petition, EPA has modified the tolerances being established by this document. 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 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 FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), and the factors specified in FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), 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 mandipropamid including exposure resulting from the tolerances established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with mandipropamid 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.

Subchronic and chronic studies indicate that the liver is the primary target organ for mandipropamid. Liver effects were identified in subchronic studies with rats, mice, and dogs. Liver effects included: Periportal hypertrophy (rats), increased eosinophilia (rats and mice), increased plasma albumin, total protein, cholesterol, and gamma-glutamyl transferase (rats), increased liver weights (rats, mice and dogs), increased liver enzymes (dogs), increased pigment in hepatocytes and Kupffer cells (dogs), and centrilobular hepatocyte vacuolation (dogs). In the chronic dog study, increases in microscopic pigment in the liver and increased liver enzymes were observed. No liver effects were observed in chronic rat and mouse studies up to the highest doses tested. Instead, nephrotoxicity was observed in the chronic rat study and only decreased body weight and food utilization was observed in the chronic mouse study. The findings of liver toxicity and nephrotoxicity are consistent with the results from metabolism studies where the tissues with the highest levels of radioactivity were the liver followed by the kidney.

No evidence of neurotoxicity was observed in the acute or subchronic neurotoxicity screening battery. No systemic or dermal toxicity was observed following dermal exposure for 28 days up to the limit dose.

No evidence of increased quantitative or qualitative susceptibility was seen in developmental toxicity studies in rats and rabbits or in a reproduction study in rats. The only effects observed in fetuses or pups were in the two-generation reproduction study, where decreased pup body weight was observed in the presence of maternal toxicity (decreased body weight, body weight gain, and food utilization). In addition, there was a delay in preputial separation in F1 males which was considered to be the result of lower body weights.

There was no evidence of tumors in the carcinogenicity study in mice or in the chronic/carcinogenicity study in rats and there was no evidence that mandipropamid was mutagenic or clastogenic. Therefore, mandipropamid is classified as ''not likely to be carcinogenic to humans.''

Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the adverse effects caused by mandipropamid 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 the document titled ''*Mandipropamid: Human Health Risk Assessment For Amended Use of the Fungicide on Potato, to Replace the Established Tolerance in Tuberous and Corm Vegetable Subgroup 1C, and to Revise the Established Tolerance in Potato Wet Peel''* on page 30 in docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0031.

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://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/assessing-human-health-risk-pesticides.*

A summary of the toxicological endpoints for mandipropamid used for human risk assessment is discussed in Unit III.B. of the final rule published in the **Federal Register** of December 20, 2013 (78 FR 76987) (FRL–9903–57).

C. Exposure Assessment

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to mandipropamid. EPA considered exposure under the petitioned-for tolerances as well as all existing mandipropamid tolerances in 40 CFR 180.637. EPA assessed dietary exposures from mandipropamid 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 mandipropamid; 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's National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, What We Eat in America, (NHANES/WWEIA). As to residue levels in food, EPA assumed 100 percent crop treated (PCT) and tolerance level residues, with the exception of vegetable, tuberous and corm, subgroup 1C, which was assessed at 0.115 ppm, assuming tolerance-level residues of parent mandipropamid (0.09 ppm) and including the SYN 500003 metabolite in parent-equivalents (at 0.025 ppm).

iii. *Cancer.* Based on the data summarized in Unit III.A., EPA has concluded that mandipropamid 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 PCT information.* EPA did not use anticipated residue or PCT information in the dietary assessment for mandipropamid. Tolerance-level residues and 100 PCT were assumed for all existing and proposed food commodities, except subgroup 1C, as described above.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* The Agency used screening level water exposure models in the dietary exposure analysis and risk assessment for mandipropamid in drinking water. These simulation models take into account data on the physical, chemical, and fate/transport characteristics of mandipropamid. Further information regarding EPA drinking water models used in pesticide exposure assessment can be found at *http://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/about-water-exposure-models-used-pesticide.*

Based on the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) Index Reservoir Screening Tool (FIRST) model for surface water and both the Screening Concentration in Ground Water (SCI–GROW) and Pesticide Root Zone Model Ground Water (PRZM GW) models, the estimated drinking water concentrations (EDWCs) of mandipropamid for chronic exposures are estimated to be 9.0 parts per billion (ppb) for surface water and 79 ppb for ground water.

Modeled estimates of drinking water concentrations were directly entered into the dietary exposure model. For the chronic dietary risk assessment, the water concentration value of 79 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).

Mandipropamid is not registered for any specific use patterns that would result in residential exposure.

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 mandipropamid to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and mandipropamid does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has assumed that mandipropamid 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 Web site at *http://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/cumulative-assessment-risk-pesticides.*

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 were no treatment-related effects observed in dams or fetuses in the developmental toxicity studies in rats or rabbits up to the limit dose of 1,000 mg/kg/day. In the rat reproductive study, decreased pup weight occurred only in the presence of comparable maternal toxicity (decreased body weight). Therefore, the Agency concludes that there is no increased quantitative or qualitative susceptibility to rat or rabbit offspring exposed *in utero* or post-natally to mandipropamid, and there are no residual uncertainties with respect to pre- or postnatal exposure.

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 mandipropamid is complete.

ii. There is no indication that mandipropamid is a neurotoxic chemical and there is no need for a developmental neurotoxicity study or additional uncertainty factors (UFs) to account for neurotoxicity.

iii. There is no evidence that mandipropamid 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 PCT and

tolerance-level residues, except for subgroup 1C, as described in Section C.1.ii. EPA made conservative (protective) assumptions in the ground and surface water modeling used to assess exposure to mandipropamid in drinking water. These assessments will not underestimate the exposure and risks posed by mandipropamid.

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, mandipropamid 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 mandipropamid from food and water will utilize 42% of the cPAD for children 1–2 years old, the population group receiving the greatest exposure. There are no residential uses for mandipropamid.

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).

Both a short- and intermediate-term adverse effects were identified; however, mandipropamid is not registered for any use patterns that would result in either short- or intermediate-term residential exposure. Short- and intermediate-term risk is assessed based on short- and intermediate-term residential exposure plus chronic dietary exposure. Because there is no short- or intermediate-term residential exposure and chronic dietary exposure has already been assessed under the appropriately protective cPAD (which is at least as protective as the POD used to assess short-term risk), no further assessment of short- or intermediate-term risk is necessary, and EPA relies on the chronic dietary risk assessment for evaluating short- and intermediate-term risk for mandipropamid.

4. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* Based on the lack of evidence of carcinogenicity in two adequate rodent carcinogenicity studies, mandipropamid 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 mandipropamid residues.

IV. Other Considerations

A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

Adequate enforcement methodology (high performance liquid chromatography with tandem mass spectrometric detection (LC/MS/MS)) is available to enforce the tolerance expression.

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; email address: *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 United Nations 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.

There is a Codex MRL established on potato at 0.01 ppm. With the increased tolerance in subgroup 1C to 0.09 ppm, the U.S. tolerance will no longer be in harmonization with Codex's MRL in potato. Harmonization with the Codex value is not feasible, given that the Codex MRL is based on the foliar use pattern only, and the U.S. tolerance is based on the proposed combination of seed piece treatment and foliar uses.

C. Revisions to Petitioned-For Tolerances

Instead of the proposed tolerance in potato (0.08 ppm), EPA is revising the existing tolerance for residues in tuberous and corm vegetable subgroup 1C from 0.01 to 0.09 ppm. The proposed tolerance was based on a dataset that only included results from trials conducted in the U.S. The calculated tolerance in subgroup 1C, based on US and Canadian potato field trial data entered into the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) tolerance calculation procedure, was 0.07 ppm. However, EPA is establishing a tolerance in subgroup 1C of 0.09 ppm, in order to harmonize with Canada's recommended MRL.

The proposed tolerance in potato wet peel (0.12 ppm) was based on the average processing factor (2.0X) multiplied by the highest average field trial (HAFT) (0.056 ppm). However, the tolerance being established (0.15 ppm) is based on the rounding protocol in the User Guide for the OECD tolerance calculation procedure.

It is not appropriate to establish the proposed tolerance in tuberous and corm vegetable subgroup 1C (except potato), because potato is the only representative commodity for subgroup 1C. For the same reason, the proposed separate tolerance in potato is unnecessary.

V. Conclusion

Therefore, the existing tolerance for residues of mandipropamid on ''potato, wet peel'' is modified from 0.03 ppm to 0.15 ppm and the existing tolerance on ''vegetable, tuberous and corm, subgroup 1C'' is modified from 0.01 to 0.09 ppm.

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action establishes tolerances 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 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 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).

VII. 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: March 16, 2016.

Susan Lewis,

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. In § 180.637, revise the entries for ''Potato, wet peel'' and ''Vegetable, tuberous and corm, subgroup 1C'' to the table in paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 180.637 Mandipropamid; tolerances for residues.

(a) * * *

Commodity	Parts per million
* * * * *	
Potato, wet peel	0.15
* * * * *	
Vegetable, tuberous and corm, subgroup 1C	0.09

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2016–06948 Filed 3–25–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[GN Docket No. 12–268; FCC 14–50]

Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule; announcement of effective date.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) announces that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved, for a period of three years, certain information collection requirements associated with the Commission's Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions Report and Order (*Incentive Auction Report and Order*), FCC 14–50. This document is consistent with the *Incentive Auction Report and Order,* which stated that the Commission would publish a document in the **Federal Register** announcing OMB approval and the effective date of the new

DATES: 47 CFR 73.3700(b)(1)(i) through (v), (b)(2)(i) and (ii), (b)(3), (b)(4)(i) and (ii), and (b)(5); 73.3700(c); 73.3700(d); 73.3700(f); 73.3700(g); 73.3700(h)(5), and FCC Form 2100, Schedules A, B, E and F, published at 79 FR 48442, August 15, 2014, are effective March 28, 2016. OMB approved the information collection requirements in 47 CFR 73.3700(b)(1)(vii) and (h)(2) on March 17, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cathy Williams, *Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov,* (202) 418–2918.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document announces that, on March 17, 2016, OMB approved the information collection requirements contained in the Commission's *Incentive Auction Report and Order,* FCC 14–50, published at 79 FR 48442, August 15, 2014. The OMB Control Numbers are 3060–0016, 3060–0027, 3060–0386, 3060–0837, 3060–0928, 3060–0932 and 3060–1216. The Commission publishes this document as an announcement of the effective date of the requirements. If you have any comments on the burden estimates listed below, or how the Commission can improve the collections and reduce any burdens caused thereby, please contact Cathy Williams, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1–C823, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554. Please include the OMB Control Number, 3060–1194, in your correspondence. The Commission will also accept your comments via the Internet if you send them to *PRA@fcc.gov.*

To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

Synopsis

As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507), the FCC is notifying the public that it received OMB approval on March 17, 2016, for some of the information