

would have a return linked to the inflation rate in prices or wages. The advance notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the Federal Register on May 20, 1996 (61 FR 25164) and comments were to be received on or before June 19, 1996.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before July 3, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to: Government Securities Regulations Staff, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, 999 E Street, NW., Room 515, Washington, DC 20239-0001. Comments received will be available for public inspection and copying at the Treasury Department Library, Room 5030, Main Treasury Building, 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Norman Carleton, Director, Office of Federal Finance Policy Analysis, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Financial Markets, at 202-622-2680.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of the Treasury (Department or Treasury) announced its intention to issue a new type of marketable book-entry security with a nominal return linked to the inflation rate in prices or wages, as officially published by the United States Government. In the advance notice of proposed rulemaking that was published May 20, 1996, the Treasury specifically requested comments concerning the choice of index, structure of the security, auction technique, offering sizes, and maturities. The Treasury also invited comments on other specific issues raised, as well as on any other issues relevant to the new type of security.

Given the importance of this issue and the desire to provide sufficient time for parties to evaluate and consider Treasury's inflation-protection security proposal, particularly since a series of public meetings to describe further the Department's current thinking on the subject and to obtain potential investor input just concluded on June 12, 1996, the Department believes that additional time is appropriate for market participants and other interested parties to provide written comments. Therefore, the Department is extending the comment period for 14 days until Wednesday, July 3, 1996.

Dated: June 14, 1996.

Roger L. Anderson,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Federal Finance.
[FR Doc. 96-15658 Filed 6-14-96; 3:58 pm]

BILLING CODE 4810-39-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[LA-16-1-7165b; FRL-5522-7]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Plans; Louisiana; Revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP); Addressing Ozone Monitoring

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is proposing to approve a revision to Louisiana's SIP for ozone. This action is based upon a revision request which was submitted by the State to satisfy the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended November 15, 1990, and the Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations (PAMS) regulations. The PAMS regulations require the State to provide for the establishment and maintenance of an enhanced ambient air quality monitoring network in the form of PAMS by November 12, 1993.

In the final rules section of this Federal Register, the EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If the EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn, and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by July 19, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to Mr. Thomas H. Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), at the EPA Regional Office listed below. Copies of the documents relevant to this proposed rule are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations. Interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the visiting day.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Multimedia Planning and

Permitting Division, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, telephone (214) 665-7214.

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Office of Air Quality and Radiation Protection, H. B. Garlock Building, 7290 Bluebonnet Blvd., Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70810.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Jeanne McDaniels, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, telephone (214) 665-7254.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the direct final action of the same title which is located in the rules section of the Federal Register.

Dated: June 10, 1996.

Allyn M. Davis,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96-15590 Filed 6-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

40 CFR Part 180

[PP 2E4042/P661; FRL-5374-6]

RIN 2070-AC18

Chlorothalonil; Pesticide Tolerance for Use in or on Asparagus

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to establish a tolerance for combined residues of the fungicide chlorothalonil and its metabolite in or on the raw agricultural commodity asparagus. The proposed regulation to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of the fungicide was requested in a petition submitted by the Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4).

DATES: Comments, identified by the docket number [PP 2E4042/P661], must be received on or before July 19, 1996.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW, Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202.

Comments and data may also be submitted to OPP by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Electronic comments must be submitted as an

ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket number [PP 2E4042/P661]. Electronic comments on this proposed rule may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries. Additional information on electronic submissions can be found in the "SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION" section of this document.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this document may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as "Confidential Business Information" (CBI). CBI should not be submitted through e-mail. Information marked as CBI will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132 at the address given above, from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Hoyt L. Jamerson, Registration Division (7505W), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Sixth Floor, Crystal Station #1, 2800 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202, (703) 308-8783; e-mail: jamerson.hoyt@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4), New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, P.O. Box 231, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903, has submitted pesticide petition (PP) 2E4042 to EPA on behalf of the Agricultural Experiment Stations of Kentucky, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Washington.

This petition requests that the Administrator, pursuant to section 408(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(e), amend 40 CFR 180.275 by establishing a tolerance for combined residues of the fungicide chlorothalonil [tetrachloroisophthalonitrile] and its metabolite, 4-hydroxy-2,5,6-trichloroisophthalonitrile, in or on the raw agricultural commodity asparagus at 0.1 part per million (ppm).

The scientific data submitted in the petition and other relevant material have been evaluated. A discussion of the toxicological data considered in support of the proposed tolerance for asparagus can be found in a proposed rule (PP 0E3889, 2E4113, and 5E4538/P639) published in the Federal Register of January 24, 1996 (61 FR 1884). The Federal Register notice of January 24, 1996, also provides a discussion of the basis for the EPA's classification of chlorothalonil and hexachlorobenzene (HCB), a manufacturing impurity found in chlorothalonil formulations, as probable human carcinogens (Group B2 of EPA's classification system for carcinogens).

Dietary risk assessments were conducted using Reference Doses (RfD), the applicable cancer potency factors to assess chronic exposure and risk from chlorothalonil and HCB residues, and the Margin of Exposure (MOE) to assess acute toxicity from chlorothalonil residues.

The Reference Dose (RfD) for chlorothalonil is established at 0.018 mg/kg of body weight (bwt)/day, based on a no-observed-effect-level (NOEL) of 1.8 mg/kg/day from the 2-year feeding study in dogs, which demonstrated as effects increased urinary bilirubin levels and kidney vacuolated epithelium, and an uncertainty factor of 100. Available information on anticipated residues and/or percent of crop treated was incorporated into the analysis to estimate the Anticipated Residue Contribution (ARC) from existing uses. The proposed tolerance level of 0.1 ppm and 100 percent crop treated were assumed to estimate dietary exposure to residues of chlorothalonil from the proposed use on asparagus. The ARC from existing uses and the proposed uses utilizes less than 1 percent of the RfD for chlorothalonil for the U.S. population and all population subgroups. EPA generally has no cause for concern for exposures below 100 percent of the RfD.

The RfD for HCB is established at 0.0008 mg/kg bwt/day based on a NOEL of 0.08 mg/kg of bwt/day and an uncertainty factor of 100. The NOEL was taken from a 130 week feeding study in rats that showed hepatic centrilobular basophilic chromogenesis. Since there are no published tolerances for HCB, the ARC was generally calculated by multiplying the anticipated residues for chlorothalonil by 0.05 percent, an adjustment based on comparisons of residue data for the two compounds from controlled field trials. The ARC for HCB from existing uses of chlorothalonil and the proposed use on asparagus utilizes less than 1 percent of

the RfD for the U.S. population and all population subgroups.

The upper bound carcinogenic risks were calculated using the ARC estimates for dietary exposure from existing uses and the proposed use on asparagus, and Q's (Q stars) of 0.00766 (mg/kg/day)⁻¹ for chlorothalonil and 1.02 (mg/kg/day)⁻¹ for HCB. The upper bound carcinogenic risk from existing and all pending uses of chlorothalonil is estimated at 6.5×10^{-7} , with the proposed use for asparagus contributing 1.05×10^{-8} to the cancer risk assessment. The upper bound carcinogenic risk for HCB is estimated at 3.2×10^{-7} from existing and all pending uses, with the proposed use for asparagus contributing 1.2×10^{-7} to the cancer risk assessment. The proposed use on asparagus would contribute negligible increases in the total cancer risks from dietary exposure to residues of chlorothalonil and HCB.

The Margin of Exposure (MOE) is a measure of how closely the high-end acute dietary exposure comes to the NOEL from the toxicity endpoint of concern. For chlorothalonil, the MOE was calculated as ratio of the lowest-observed effect level (LOEL) of 175 mg/kg/day from the subchronic study in rats. A NOEL was not established since an effect (renal and gastric lesions) was observed at the single dose tested. An uncertainty factor of 300 was used to calculate the MOE since there was no available NOEL from the study. The acute dietary MOE for chlorothalonil is calculated to be greater than 1,500 for the general population and all population subgroups. Chlorothalonil poses minimal acute dietary risk.

The nature of the residue in asparagus is adequately understood. The parent compound and its metabolite (4-hydroxy-2,5,6-trichloroisophthalonitrile) are the regulated residues. An adequate analytical method, is available for enforcement purposes. The method is listed in the Pesticide Analytical Manual, Volume II (PAM II).

There is no reasonable expectation that secondary residues will occur in milk, eggs, or meat, fat, or meat byproducts of livestock or poultry as a result of this action; there are no livestock feed items associated with asparagus.

There are presently no actions pending against the continued registration of this chemical. The pesticide is considered useful for the purpose for which the tolerance is sought.

Based on the information and data considered, the Agency has determined that the tolerance established by amending 40 CFR part 180 would

protect the public health. Therefore, it is proposed that the tolerance be established as set forth below.

Any person who has registered or submitted an application for registration of a pesticide, under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as amended, which contains any of the ingredients listed herein, may request within 30 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register that this rulemaking proposal be referred to an Advisory Committee in accordance with section 408(e) of the FFDCA.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed regulation. Comments must bear a notation indicating the docket number [PP 2E4042/P661].

A record has been established for this rulemaking under docket number [PP 2E4042/P661] (including comments and data submitted electronically as described below). A public version of this record, including printed, paper versions of electronic comments, which does not include any information claimed as CBI, is available for inspection from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The public record is located in Room 1132 of the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

The official record for this rulemaking, as well as the public version, as described above will be kept in paper form. Accordingly, EPA will transfer all comments received electronically into printed, paper form as they are received and will place the paper copies in the official rulemaking record which will also include all comments submitted directly in writing. The official rulemaking record is the paper record maintained at the Virginia address in "ADDRESSES" at the beginning of this document.

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, Oct. 4, 1993), the Agency must determine whether the regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to all the requirements of the Executive Order (i.e., Regulatory Impact Analysis, review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)). Under section 3(f), the order defines "significant" as those actions likely to lead to a rule (1) having an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, or adversely and materially affecting a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local or tribal

governments or communities (also known as "economically significant"); (2) creating serious inconsistency or otherwise interfering with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially altering the budgetary impacts of entitlement, grants, user fees, or loan programs; or (4) raising novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order. Pursuant to the terms of this Executive Order, EPA has determined that this rule is not "significant" and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

This action does not impose any enforceable duty, or contain any "unfunded mandates" as described in Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4), or require prior consultation as specified by Executive Order 12875 (58 FR 58093, October 28, 1993), entitled Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership, or special consideration as required by Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new tolerances or raising tolerance levels or establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement explaining the factual basis for this determination was published in the Federal Register of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: June 4, 1996.

Stephen L. Johnson,
Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR part 180 be amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

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

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 371.

2. In § 180.275, the table in paragraph (a) is amended by adding alphabetically the raw agricultural commodity asparagus, to read as follows:

§ 180.275 Chlorothalonil; tolerances for residues.

(a) * * *

Commodity					Parts per million
*	*	*	*	*	*
Asparagus				0.10
*	*	*	*	*	*

[FR Doc. 96-15478 Filed 6-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

40 CFR Part 180

[PP 6E4653/P665; FRL-5377-4]

RIN 2070-AC18

Sodium Salt of Fomesafen; Pesticide Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to establish a time-limited tolerance for residues of the herbicide sodium salt of fomesafen (also referred to in this document as fomesafen) in or on the raw agricultural commodity snap beans. The proposed regulation to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of the herbicide was requested in a petition submitted by the Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4).

DATES: Comments, identified by the docket number [PP 6E4653/P665], must be received on or before July 19, 1996.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202.

Comments and data may also be submitted to OPP by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to:

opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov

Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket number [PP 6E4653/P665]. Electronic comments on this proposed rule may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries. Additional