

circuit by December 19, 2016. 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 in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by

reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: October 5, 2016.

**Robert A. Kaplan,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

#### PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

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

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

#### EPA-APPROVED OHIO REGULATIONS

■ 2. In § 52.1870 the table in paragraph (c) is amended under “Chapter 3745–21 Carbon Monoxide, Ozone, Hydrocarbon Air Quality Standards, and Related Emission Requirements” by revising the entry for 3745–21–09 “Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds from Stationary Sources and Perchloroethylene from Dry Cleaning Facilities” to read as follows:

#### § 52.1870 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

Ohio citation	Title/subject	Ohio effective date	EPA approval date	Notes
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
<b>Chapter 3745–21 Carbon Monoxide, Ozone, Hydrocarbon Air Quality Standards, and Related Emission Requirements</b>				
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
3745–21–09 ...	Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds from Stationary Sources and Perchloroethylene from Dry Cleaning Facilities.	1/17/2014	10/18/2016, [Insert <b>Federal Register</b> citation].	except (U)(1)(h).
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2016–24912 Filed 10–17–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0558; FRL–9951–78]

#### Metaldehyde; Pesticide Tolerances

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes tolerances with regional registration for residues of metaldehyde in or on multiple commodities which are identified and discussed later in this document. Interregional Research Project Number 4 (IR–4) requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

**DATES:** This regulation is effective October 18, 2016. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before December 19, 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–2015–0558, 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:** Michael Goodis, Acting Director, 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](mailto: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](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-2015-0558 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 December 19, 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-2015-0558, 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 Wednesday, September 9, 2015 (80 FR 54257) (FRL-9933-26), 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 5E8377) by Interregional Research Project Number 4 (IR-4), IR-4 Headquarters, 500 College Road East, Suite 201 W., Princeton, NJ

08540. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.523 be amended by establishing tolerances for residues of the molluscicide metaldehyde, 2,4,6,8-tetramethyl-1,3,5,7-tetroxocane, in or on beet, garden, roots at 0.05 parts per million (ppm); beet, garden, tops at 0.08 ppm; hop, dried cones at 0.05 ppm; rutabaga, roots at 0.05 ppm; turnip, greens (tops) at 0.08 ppm; turnip, roots at 0.05 ppm; wheat, forage at 0.05 ppm; wheat, grain at 0.05 ppm; wheat, hay at 0.05 ppm and wheat, straw at 0.05 ppm. That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Lonza, Inc., 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 made certain modifications to the petitioned-for crop tolerances. 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 metaldehyde including exposure resulting from the tolerances established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with metaldehyde follows.

### A. Toxicological Profile

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity database and considered its

validity, completeness, and reliability as well as the relationship of the results of the studies to human risk. EPA has also considered available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers, including infants and children.

The toxicity profile of metaldehyde shows that the principal toxic effects are clinical signs of neurotoxicity. The dog is the most sensitive species for the neurotoxic effects. The nervous system effects observed in subchronic and chronic oral toxicity studies include: (1) Neurotoxic signs, *i.e.*, ataxia; tremor; twitching; salivation; emesis; and rapid respiration in dogs and maternal rats; and (2) neuropathology, *i.e.*, limb paralysis, spinal cord necrosis, and hemorrhage in maternal rats.

The liver is a target organ following subchronic and chronic oral exposure to metaldehyde as evidenced by increased liver weight, increased incidence of liver lesions, *i.e.*, hepatocellular necrosis, hepatocellular hypertrophy, inflammation, and an increased incidence of hepatocellular adenomas/carcinomas in female rats and hepatocellular adenomas in both sexes of mice. The testes and prostate are also target organs following subchronic and chronic exposure as evidenced by atrophy of both organs in dogs.

Developmental toxicity was not observed in the rat or rabbit developmental toxicity studies. Maternal toxicity was not observed in the rabbit, although maternal toxicity was observed in the rat, as evidenced by clinical signs including ataxia, tremors, and twitching at the highest dose tested (HDT). In the rat reproductive toxicity study, mortality and clinical signs, *i.e.*, limb paralysis, spinal cord necrosis and hemorrhage were observed in the maternal animals, and the effects on the offspring consisted of decreased pup body weight and body weight gains. Reproductive toxicity was not observed.

In chronic feeding studies in mice and rats, benign liver tumors were seen in both sexes of mice and in female rats. The Agency has determined that quantification of risk using a non-linear Reference Dose (RfD) approach for metaldehyde will adequately account for all chronic toxicity, including carcinogenicity, that could result from exposure to metaldehyde. That conclusion is based on the following considerations: (1) The tumors found are commonly seen in the mouse; (2) the liver tumors (adenomas) in both species were benign; (3) metaldehyde is not mutagenic; (4) no carcinogenic response was seen in the male rat; (5) incidence of adenomas at the high-dose in the

female rat was within the historical control range of the testing lab; and (6) both the no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) and the lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level (LOAEL) from the chronic rat study on which the chronic RfD/population-adjusted dose (PAD) was based are well below the dose at which adenomas were seen.

Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the adverse effects caused by metaldehyde as well as the NOAEL and the LOAEL from the toxicity studies can be found at <http://www.regulations.gov> in document "Metaldehyde; Human Health Risk Assessment for Proposed New Uses on Garden Beets, Hops, Rutabaga, Turnips and Wheat with Regional Registration in the Pacific Northwest," in docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0558.

#### *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 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 PAD or a 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 metaldehyde used for human risk assessment is discussed in Unit III.B. of the final rule published in the **Federal Register** of November 27, 2013 (78 FR 70864) (FRL-9388-8).

#### *C. Exposure Assessment*

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to metaldehyde, EPA

considered exposure under the petitioned-for tolerances as well as all existing metaldehyde tolerances in 40 CFR 180.523. EPA assessed dietary exposures from metaldehyde 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.

Such effects were identified for metaldehyde. In estimating acute dietary exposure, EPA used the Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model software with the Food Commodity Intake Database (DEEM-FCID), Version 3.16, which incorporates 2003–2008 food consumption data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, What We Eat in America, (NHANES/WWEIA). As to residue levels in food, EPA assumed tolerance-level residues for all commodities and 100 percent crop treated (PCT). In addition, the Agency assumed processing factors to be 1.0 for all commodities except for tomato, dried; tomato, juice; cranberry, juice; and high fructose corn syrup; for these commodities, DEEM default processing factors were used.

ii. *Chronic exposure.* In conducting the chronic dietary exposure assessment EPA used the DEEM-FCID, Version 3.16, which incorporates 2003–2008 food consumption data from the USDA's, NHANES/WWEIA. As to residue levels in food, EPA assumed tolerance-level residues for all commodities and 100 PCT. Processing factors were assumed to be 1.0 for all commodities except for tomato, dried; tomato, juice; cranberry, juice; and high fructose corn syrup; for these commodities, DEEM default processing factors were used.

iii. *Cancer.* Based on the data summarized in Unit III.A., EPA concluded that quantification of risk using a non-linear RfD approach will adequately account for all chronic toxicity, including carcinogenicity. Therefore, a dietary exposure assessment for the purpose of assessing cancer risk was not conducted.

iv. *Anticipated residue and PCT information.* EPA did not use anticipated residue or PCT information in the dietary assessment for metaldehyde. Tolerance-level residues and 100 PCT were assumed for all food commodities.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.*

The Agency used screening level water exposure models in the dietary exposure analysis and risk assessment for metaldehyde in drinking water. These simulation models take into account data on the physical, chemical, and fate/transport characteristics of metaldehyde. 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 Pesticide Root Zone Model/Exposure Analysis Modeling System (PRZM/EXAMS) and Pesticide Root Zone Model Ground Water (PRZM GW), the estimated drinking water concentrations (EDWCs) of metaldehyde for acute exposures are estimated to be 205 parts per billion (ppb) for surface water and 1880 ppb for ground water. Chronic exposures for non-cancer assessments are estimated to be 136 ppb for surface water and 915 ppb for ground water.

For acute dietary risk assessment, the full distribution of ground water concentrations from the PRZM-GW model was used to assess the contribution from drinking water.

For chronic dietary risk assessment, the water concentration of value 915 ppb was used to assess the contribution from 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).

Metaldehyde is currently registered for the following uses that could result in residential exposures: Residential ornamentals and lawn/turf applications. EPA assessed residential exposure using the following assumptions and exposure factors: For adult residential handlers, EPA conducted a short-term exposure assessment of metaldehyde for adults based on the inhalation route, incorporating the maximum labeled application rate, and unit exposure values and estimates for area treated/amount handled taken from the 2012 Residential Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). The scenario resulting in the highest adult exposure in a residential setting was hand dispersal of granules, which was used in the short-term aggregate assessment. Additional scenarios assessed included; loading and applying distinct metaldehyde product types, i.e., liquid ready-to-use products applied manually via pressurized hand wands, hose-end sprayers, and sprinkler cans, as well as

applying granular products via push-type rotary spreaders, belly grinders, spoons, cups, hands, and shaker cans.

For children, the highest estimated metaldehyde exposure resulted from post-application incidental oral exposures of short-term duration from hand-to-mouth and object-to-mouth contact with treated turf, and short- and intermediate-term exposures from treated soil. Further information regarding EPA standard assumptions and generic inputs for residential exposures may be found at <http://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/standard-operating-procedures-residential-pesticide>.

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 metaldehyde to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and metaldehyde does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has assumed that metaldehyde 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.* Developmental toxicity was not observed in the rat or rabbit developmental toxicity studies and no maternal toxicity observed in the rabbit. Maternal toxicity was observed in the rat, as evidenced by clinical signs, *i.e.*, ataxia, tremors, and twitching, however these effects were observed only at the highest dose tested. In the rat reproductive toxicity study, mortality and clinical signs, *i.e.*, limb paralysis, spinal cord necrosis and hemorrhage were observed in the maternal animals, and the effects on the offspring consisted of decreased pup body weight and body weight gains. Reproductive toxicity was not observed.

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 metaldehyde is complete;
- ii. Although there are indications of neurotoxicity from exposure to metaldehyde, there are clear NOAELs/LOAELs for these effects, and Points of Departure selected for risk assessment are protective for these effects. EPA has determined that the acute and developmental neurotoxicity studies are not needed, nor are additional uncertainty factors (UFs) necessary to account for neurotoxicity. There were no indications of neurotoxic effects in developing rats or rabbits in either the developmental or reproductive studies. Although there were some effects in adult rats, those effects occurred at doses much higher than in the dog study. The dog is the more sensitive species for neurotoxic effects and points of departure (30 mg/kg/day and 10 mg/kg/day) are based on the chronic dog oral toxicity study, which EPA considers to be protective of any neurotoxicity at higher dose levels.

- iii. There is no evidence that metaldehyde results in increased susceptibility following *in utero* exposure to metaldehyde in either the rat or rabbit developmental toxicity study, and there is no evidence of increased susceptibility following *in utero* and/or pre-/post-natal exposure in the 2-generation reproduction study in rats.

- iv. There are no residual uncertainties identified in the exposure databases. The dietary food exposure assessments were performed based on established and proposed tolerance-level residues, 100 PCT, default processing factors, and EDWCs from chronic ground water (worst case) models to assess exposure to metaldehyde in drinking water. EPA

used similarly conservative assumptions to assess exposure to adult handlers, and post application exposure of children (including incidental oral exposure of toddlers). These assessments will not underestimate the exposure and risks posed by metaldehyde based on the current and proposed use patterns.

#### 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.* Using the exposure assumptions discussed in this unit for acute exposure, the acute dietary exposure from food and water to metaldehyde will occupy 18% of the aPAD for the general population, and 55% of the aPAD for all infants less than 1 year old, the population group receiving the greatest exposure.

2. *Chronic risk.* Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for chronic exposure, EPA has concluded that chronic exposure to metaldehyde from food and water will utilize 22% of the cPAD for the general population, and 52% of the cPAD for all infants less than 1 year old, the population group receiving the greatest exposure. Based on the explanation in Unit III.C.3., regarding residential use patterns, chronic residential exposure to residues of metaldehyde is not expected.

3. *Short-term risk:* Short-term aggregate exposure takes into account short-term residential exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water (considered to be a background exposure level).

Metaldehyde is currently registered for uses that could result in short-term residential exposure, and the Agency has determined that it is appropriate to aggregate chronic exposure through food and water with short-term residential exposures to metaldehyde. Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for short-term exposures, EPA has concluded the combined short-term food, water, and residential exposures result in aggregate MOEs of 1400 for adults and 580 for children. Because EPA’s level of concern for metaldehyde

is an MOE of 100 or below, these MOEs are not of concern.

#### 4. Intermediate-term risk.

Intermediate-term aggregate exposure takes into account intermediate-term residential exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water (considered to be a background exposure level). Metaldehyde is currently registered for uses that could result in intermediate-term residential exposure, and the Agency has determined that it is appropriate to aggregate chronic exposure through food and water with intermediate-term residential exposures to metaldehyde. Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for intermediate-term exposures, EPA has concluded that the combined intermediate-term food, water, and residential exposures result in an aggregate MOE of 270 (for children only). Because EPA's level of concern for metaldehyde is a MOE of 100 or below, this MOE is not of concern.

5. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* Based on the data summarized in Unit III, EPA believes that quantification of metaldehyde risk using a non-linear RfD approach will adequately account for all related chronic toxicity, including carcinogenicity. Based on the chronic risk assessment, EPA concludes that aggregate exposure to metaldehyde will not pose a cancer risk.

6. *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 metaldehyde residues.

## IV. Other Considerations

### A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

Adequate enforcement methodology (gas chromatography with mass spectrometry (GC/MS) method (EN-CAS<sup>TM</sup> Method No. ENC-3/99, Revision 1) is available to enforce the tolerance expression. The limit of quantitation (LOQ) for this method is 0.05 ppm for all plant commodities except hops, for which it is 0.10 ppm.

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 metaldehyde.

### C. Revisions to Petitioned-for Tolerances

For hop, dried cones, the analytical method was not successfully validated at the proposed tolerance level of 0.05 ppm. Therefore, EPA is establishing the tolerance level for this commodity at the lowest validated LOQ for hops of 0.10 ppm. In addition, the commodity definition proposed as "beet, garden, tops" is corrected to read: "beet, garden, leaves".

## V. Conclusion

Therefore, tolerances are established for residues of metaldehyde, 2,4,6,8-tetramethyl-1,3,5,7-tetroxocane, in or on beet, garden, leaves at 0.08 ppm; beet, garden, roots at 0.05 ppm; hop, dried cones at 0.10 ppm; rutabaga, roots at 0.05 ppm; turnip, greens at 0.08 ppm; turnip, roots at 0.05 ppm; wheat, forage at 0.05 ppm; wheat, grain at 0.05 ppm; wheat, hay at 0.05 ppm and wheat, straw at 0.05 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: September 30, 2016.

**Michael L. Goodis,**

*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 § 180.523, add alphabetically the  
commodities “beet, garden, leaves”;  
“beet, garden, roots”; “hop, dried  
cones”; “rutabaga, roots”; “turnip  
greens”; “turnip, roots”; “wheat,  
forage”; “wheat, grain”; “wheat, hay”;  
and “wheat, straw” to the table in  
paragraph (c) to read as follows:

**§ 180.523 Metaldehyde; tolerances for  
residues.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

Commodity	Parts per million
Beet, garden, leaves .....	0.08
Beet, garden, roots .....	0.05
* * * * *	*
Hop, dried cones .....	0.10
Rutabaga, roots .....	0.05
* * * * *	*
Turnip greens .....	0.08
Turnip, roots .....	0.05
Wheat, forage .....	0.05
Wheat, grain .....	0.05
Wheat, hay .....	0.05
Wheat, straw .....	0.05

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2016–25166 Filed 10–17–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

**NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND  
SPACE ADMINISTRATION****48 CFR Parts 1816, 1823, 1832, 1845,  
and 1852****NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation  
Supplement**

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and  
Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Technical amendments.

**SUMMARY:** NASA is making technical  
amendments to the NASA FAR

Supplement (NFS) to provide needed  
editorial changes.

**DATES:** *Effective:* October 18, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Manuel Quinones, NASA, Office of  
Procurement, Contract and Grant Policy  
Division, via email at  
*manuel.quinones@nasa.gov*, or  
telephone (202) 358–2143.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Background**

As part of NASA’s retrospective  
review of existing regulations NASA is  
conducting periodic reviews of the  
NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) to ensure  
the accuracy of information  
disseminated to the acquisition  
community. This rule makes  
administrative changes to the NFS to  
correct typographical errors as well as  
inadvertent omissions from prior  
rulemaking actions. A summary of  
changes follows:

- Section 1816.406–70(c) is revised to  
correct a typographical error.
- Section 1823.7001(c) is revised by  
replacing the word “clause” with the  
word “provision.”
- Section 1832.908 is revised to add  
a clause prescription inadvertently  
omitted.
- Section 1845.107–70(e) is revised to  
replace the word “property” with  
“equipment” and paragraph (m) is  
revised to replace the term “NASA  
owned property” with “NASA real  
property.”
- Section 1852.217–72 is revised to  
correct the clause date.
- Section 1852.223–73 is revised to  
replace the word “clause” with the  
word “provision.”
- Section 1852.231–71 is revised to  
correct the clause date.

**List of Subject in 48 CFR Parts 1816,  
1823, 1832, 1845, and 1852**

Government procurement.

**Manuel Quinones,**

*NASA FAR Supplement Manager.*

Accordingly, 48 CFR parts 1816, 1823,  
1832, 1845, and 1852 are amended as  
follows:

- 1. The authority citation for parts  
1816, 1823, 1832, and 1852 continues to  
read as follows:

**Authority:** 51 U.S.C. 20113(a) and 48 CFR  
chapter 1.

**PART 1816—TYPES OF CONTRACTS****1816.406–70 [Amended]**

- 2. Amend section 1816.406–70(e) by  
removing the words “in cost an award  
fee” and adding “in award fee” in its  
place.

**PART 1823—ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY  
AND WATER EFFICIENCY,  
RENEWABLE ENERGY  
TECHNOLOGIES, OCCUPATIONAL  
SAFETY, AND DRUG-FREE  
WORKPLACE****1823.7001 [Amended]**

- 3. Amend section 1823.7001(c) by  
removing the word “clause” and adding  
word “provision” wherever it occurs.

**PART 1832—CONTRACT FINANCING**

- 4. Amend section 1832.908 by adding  
paragraph (c)(2) to read as follows:

**1832.908 Contract clauses.**

(c)(2) When the clause at FAR 52.232–  
25, Prompt Payment, is used in such  
contracts with the Canadian  
Commercial Corporation (CCC), insert  
“17th” in lieu of “30th” in paragraphs  
(a)(1)(i)(A) and (B) and (a)(1)(ii).

**PART 1845—GOVERNMENT  
PROPERTY**

- 5. The authority citation for part 1845  
is revised to read as follows:

**Authority:** 51 U.S.C. 20113(a) and 48 CFR  
chapter 1.

**1845.107–70 [Amended]**

- 6. Amend section 1845.107–70—

■ a. In paragraph (e) introductory text,  
by removing “Government Property”  
and adding “Government Equipment”  
in its place; and

■ b. In paragraph (m), by removing  
“NASA owned property” and adding  
“NASA real property” in its place.

**PART 1852—SOLICITATION  
PROVISIONS AND CONTRACT  
CLAUSES****1852.217–72 [Amended]**

- 7. Amend section 1852.217–72 by  
removing “MAY 2000” and adding  
“NOV 2011” in its place.

**1852.223–73 [Amended]**

- 8. Amend section 1852.223–73 by  
removing the word “clause” and adding  
in its place the word “provision”  
wherever it occurs.

**1852.231–71 [Amended]**

- 9. Amend section 1852.231–71 by  
removing “MAR 1994” and adding  
“APR 2015” in its place.

[FR Doc. 2016–25014 Filed 10–17–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7510–13–P**