

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2016-19388 Filed 8-15-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

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

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0652; FRL-9949-21]

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

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of flumioxazin in or on soybean forage and hay. Valent U.S.A. Corporation requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

**DATES:** This regulation is effective August 16, 2016. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before October 17, 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-2015-0652, 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:** 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: [RDPRNotices@epa.gov](mailto:RDPRNotices@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](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl). To access the OCSPP test guidelines referenced in this document electronically, please go to <http://www.epa.gov/ocspp> and select "Test Methods and Guidelines."

*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-2015-0652 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 October 17, 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-2015-0652, 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 April 25, 2016 (81 FR 24046) (FRL-9944-86), 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 5F8353) by Valent USA Corporation, 1600 Riviera Avenue, Suite 200, Walnut Creek, CA 94596 U.S.A. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.180.568 be amended by establishing tolerances for residues of the herbicide flumioxazin, in or on soybean forage at 0.05 parts per million (ppm) and hay at 0.02 ppm. That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Valent USA 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.

Based upon review of the data supporting the petition, EPA has determined that the tolerance for soybean forage should be lowered from the proposed level of 0.05 ppm to 0.03 ppm. The reason for these changes are explained in Unit IV.D.

**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 flumioxazin including exposure resulting from the tolerances established by this action. EPA’s assessment of exposures and risks associated with flumioxazin follows.

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.

In the **Federal Register** of April 05, 2013 (78 FR 20462) (FRL–9381–7), EPA published a final rule establishing tolerances for residues of flumioxazin on globe artichoke, chinese cabbage, olive, pomegranate, and prickly pear cactus commodities based on EPA’s conclusion that aggregate exposure to flumioxazin is safe for the general population, including infants and children. Since that rulemaking, the toxicity profile for flumioxazin has not changed. The requested tolerances will not result in residues on human food commodities, only animal feed (soybean forage and hay). The available residue data submitted for use in soybean forage and hay indicates that the dietary burden for livestock will not change from the current levels that were previously assessed. Therefore, the residues of flumioxazin soybean forage and hay from the proposed new use will not impact the existing human dietary and aggregate risk assessments for flumioxazin. For a detailed discussion of the aggregate risk assessments and determination of safety, as well as a summary of the toxicological endpoints used for human risk assessment, please refer to the final rule published in the **Federal Register** of April 05, 2013. EPA relies upon those supporting risk assessments and the findings made in the **Federal Register** document in support of this final rule.

Based on the risk assessments and information described above, 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 flumioxazin residues.

#### IV. Other Considerations

##### A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

Adequate enforcement methodology (gas chromatography/nitrogen-phosphorus detection (GC/NPD) method, Valent Method RM30–A–1) 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](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 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.

The Codex has not established a MRL for flumioxazin.

##### C. Revisions to Petitioned-For Tolerances

The agency has determined that the tolerance for soybean forage should be lowered from the proposed level of 0.05 ppm to 0.03 ppm. The modifications were due to the Agency’s use of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) calculation procedures to determine the appropriate tolerance levels.

#### V. Conclusion

Therefore, tolerances are established for residues of flumioxazin, in or on soybean forage at 0.03 parts per million (ppm) and hay at 0.02 (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: August 5, 2016.

**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.
- 2. In § 180.568, add alphabetically the commodities “Soybean forage” and “Soybean hay” to the table in paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 180.568 Flumioxazin; tolerance for residues.

(a) \* \* \*

Commodity	Parts per million
* * *	*
Soybean forage .....	0.03
Soybean hay .....	0.02
* * *	*

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2016–19553 Filed 8–15–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials  
Safety Administration

49 CFR Parts 192 and 195

[Docket No. PHMSA–2016–0075]

Pipeline Safety: Clarification of Terms  
Relating to Pipeline Operational Status

**AGENCY:** Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA); DOT.  
**ACTION:** Issuance of Advisory Bulletin.

**SUMMARY:** PHMSA is issuing this advisory bulletin to all owners and operators (operators) of hazardous liquid, carbon dioxide, and gas pipelines, as defined in 49 Code of Federal Regulations Parts 192 and 195, to clarify the regulatory requirements that may vary depending on the operational status of a pipeline. Further, this advisory bulletin identifies regulatory requirements operators must follow for the abandonment of pipelines. Pipeline owners and operators should verify their operations and procedures align with the regulatory intent of defined terms as described under this bulletin. Congress recognized the need for this clarification in its Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act of 2016.

**DATES:** August 16, 2016.  
**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Linda Daugherty at 816–329–3800 or by email to [Linda.Daugherty@dot.gov](mailto:Linda.Daugherty@dot.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On March 17, 2014, a hazardous liquid pipeline company was notified by emergency responders of crude oil leaking up from below the pavement in a residential area in Wilmington, California. The leak was close to a refinery. The company initially informed the regulator that it had no active lines in the area but responded anyway.  
On March 18, 2014, the company excavated the area surrounding the leaking oil and learned that the leak originated from a pipeline that it owned. The pipeline had been purchased 16 years ago and the company understood that the previous operator had properly abandoned and purged the pipeline prior to purchase. Regulators determined the pipeline leaked due to an internal “pinhole” corrosion leak on a weld.  
Subsequent investigations determined that while the pipeline was not in

operation, its valves were positioned to prevent flow but the pipeline had never been purged and cleaned. Some regulators and industry representatives informally referred to such pipelines as “idled.”  
On May 31, 2015, a 24-inch natural gas “auxiliary” pipeline crossing the Arkansas River in North Little Rock, Arkansas, failed due to vortex-induced vibration after high water levels eroded the ground cover and exposed the pipeline to the river’s flow. The failure released 3,858 cubic feet of natural gas into the atmosphere and resulted in the temporary closure of the Arkansas River to vessel traffic for five days. The pipeline at the time of the failure was isolated by two mainline valves, at an approximate pressure of 700 pounds per square inch (psig). The pipeline, considered an emergency back-up pipeline crossing the river, has not been fully operated since 1972. However, the company did maintain the pipeline as an active pipeline, subject to in-line inspection, cathodic protection, and other maintenance requirements.  
On October 28, 2015, Cypress, California, city public works employees identified an oil-water mixture on a local road. Approximately 28 barrels of oil-water mixture was determined to have leaked from an oil pipeline that was believed to have been purged of oil prior to deactivation in 1997. The owner of the pipeline had purchased it from another company just prior to the failure.  
Congress recognized the need for PHMSA to provide clarification of operational terms and ensure all operators are aware of and abide by the regulatory requirements for properly abandoning pipelines. In its “Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act of 2016,” Congress required PHMSA to issue an advisory bulletin to owners and operators of gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities and Federal and State pipeline safety personnel regarding procedures required to change the status of a pipeline facility from active to abandoned, including specific guidance on the terms recognized by the Secretary for each pipeline status referred to in such advisory bulletin.  
PHMSA regulations do not recognize an “idle” status for hazardous liquid or gas pipelines. The regulations consider pipelines to be either active and fully subject to all relevant parts of the safety regulations or abandoned. The process and requirements for pipeline abandonment are captured in §§ 192.727 and 195.402(c)(10) for gas and hazardous liquid pipelines, respectively. These requirements