

August 10, 1999). This action merely approves a state rule implementing a federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act.

Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks

This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

National Technology Transfer Advancement Act

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the state to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

Congressional Review Act

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

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the

appropriate circuit by January 10, 2005. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule 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 oxide, Ozone.

Dated: October 8, 2004.

Norman Niedergang,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

■ Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

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

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

Subpart YY—Wisconsin

■ 2. Section 52.2570 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(111) to read as follows:

§ 52.2570 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(111) On May 25, 2004, Lloyd L. Eagan, Director, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, submitted a revision to its rule for control of nitrogen oxide emissions as a requested revision to the Wisconsin State Implementation Plan. The revision modifies language to clarify which sources are eligible to participate in the NO_x emission averaging program to demonstrate compliance as part of the one-hour ozone attainment plan approved by EPA for the Milwaukee-Racine ozone nonattainment area (Kenosha, Manitowoc, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Sheboygan, Washington, and Waukesha counties). The rule revision also creates a separate categorical emission limit for new combustion turbines burning biologically derived gaseous fuels. The new NO_x categorical limit for newly installed combustion turbines burning biologically derived fuel applies only to new sources located in Kenosha, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Washington, and Waukesha counties in southeastern Wisconsin.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) NR 428.02(1) and (1m); NR 428.04(2)(g)(1); NR 428.04(2)(g)(4); and NR 428.06(2)(a) as published in the (Wisconsin) Register, December 2003, No. 576 and effective January 1, 2004.

[FR Doc. 04-24914 Filed 11-9-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[OPP-2004-0329; FRL-7684-2]

Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes time-limited tolerances for combined residues of hexythiazox (trans-5-(4-chlorophenyl)-N-cyclohexyl-4-methyl-2-oxothiazolidine-3-carboxamide) and its metabolites containing the (4-chlorophenyl)-4-methyl-2-oxo-3-thiazolidine moiety in or on field corn grain, stover, and fodder. This action is in response to EPA's granting of an emergency exemption under section 18 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) authorizing use of the pesticide on field corn. This regulation establishes maximum permissible levels for residues of hexythiazox in these food commodities. The tolerances will expire and are revoked on December 31, 2007.

DATES: This regulation is effective November 10, 2004. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before January 10, 2005.

ADDRESSES: To submit a written objection or hearing request follow the detailed instructions as provided in Unit VII. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**. EPA has established a docket for this action under docket identification (ID) number OPP-2004-0329. All documents in the docket are listed in the EDOCKET index at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket>. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in EDOCKET or in hard copy at the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1801 S. Bell St.,

Arlington, VA. This docket facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The docket telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew Ertman, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 308-9367; e-mail address: sec-18-mailbox@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected entities may include, but are not limited to:

- Crop production (NAICS 111)
- Animal production (NAICS 112)
- Food manufacturing (NAICS 311)
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS 32532)

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in this unit could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether this action might apply to certain entities. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

B. How Can I Access Electronic Copies of this Document and Other Related Information?

In addition to using EDOCKET (<http://www.epa.gov/edocket/>), you may access this **Federal Register** document electronically through the EPA Internet under the “**Federal Register**” listings at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/>. A frequently updated electronic version of 40 CFR part 180 is available at E-CFR Beta Site Two at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/ecfr/>.

II. Background and Statutory Findings

EPA, on its own initiative, in accordance with sections 408(e) and 408(l)(6) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a, is establishing tolerances for combined residues of hexythiazox (trans-5-(4-chlorophenyl)-N-cyclohexyl-4-methyl-2-oxothiazolidine-3-carboxamide) and its metabolites containing the (4-

chlorophenyl)-4-methyl-2-oxo-3-thiazolidine moiety in or on corn, field, grain at 0.05 ppm; corn, field, forage at 2.0 ppm; and corn, field, stover at 2.0 ppm. These tolerances will expire and are revoked on December 31, 2007. EPA will publish a document in the **Federal Register** to remove the revoked tolerances from the Code of Federal Regulations.

Section 408(l)(6) of the FFDCA requires EPA to establish a time-limited tolerance or exemption from the requirement for a tolerance for pesticide chemical residues in food that will result from the use of a pesticide under an emergency exemption granted by EPA under section 18 of FIFRA. Such tolerances can be established without providing notice or period for public comment. EPA does not intend for its actions on section 18 related tolerances to set binding precedents for the application of section 408 of the FFDCA and the new safety standard to other tolerances and exemptions. Section 408(e) of the FFDCA allows EPA to establish a tolerance or an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance on its own initiative, i.e., without having received any petition from an outside party.

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of the 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 the 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 the 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. . . .”

Section 18 of the FIFRA authorizes EPA to exempt any Federal or State agency from any provision of FIFRA, if EPA determines that “emergency conditions exist which require such exemption.” This provision was not amended by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA). EPA has established regulations governing such emergency exemptions in 40 CFR part 166.

III. Emergency Exemption for Hexythiazox on Corn and FFDCA Tolerances

The applicant stated that the development of resistance in spider mite populations to the standard acaricide used to control mites has created an urgent and non-routine situation. EPA has authorized under FIFRA section 18 the use of hexythiazox on corn for control of Banks grass mite and two-spotted spider mite in Texas. After having reviewed the submission, EPA concurs that emergency conditions exist for this State.

As part of its assessment of this emergency exemption, EPA assessed the potential risks presented by residues of hexythiazox in or on field corn grain, stover, and fodder. In doing so, EPA considered the safety standard in section 408(b)(2) of the FFDCA, and EPA decided that the necessary tolerance under section 408(l)(6) of the FFDCA would be consistent with the safety standard and with FIFRA section 18. Consistent with the need to move quickly on the emergency exemption in order to address an urgent non-routine situation and to ensure that the resulting food is safe and lawful, EPA is issuing these tolerances without notice and opportunity for public comment as provided in section 408(l)(6) of the FFDCA. Although these tolerances will expire and are revoked on December 31, 2007, under section 408(l)(5) of the FFDCA, residues of the pesticide not in excess of the amounts specified in the tolerances remaining in or on field corn grain, stover, and fodder after that date will not be unlawful, provided the pesticide is applied in a manner that was lawful under FIFRA, and the residues do not exceed levels that were authorized by these tolerances at the time of that application. EPA will take action to revoke these tolerances earlier if any experience with, scientific data on, or other relevant information on this pesticide indicate that the residues are not safe.

Because these tolerances are being approved under emergency conditions, EPA has not made any decisions about whether hexythiazox meets EPA’s registration requirements for use on corn or whether permanent tolerances for this use would be appropriate. Under these circumstances, EPA does not believe that these tolerances serve as a basis for registration of hexythiazox by a State for special local needs under FIFRA section 24(c). Nor do these tolerances serve as the basis for any State other than Texas to use this pesticide on this crop under section 18 of FIFRA without following all

provisions of EPA's regulations implementing FIFRA section 18 as identified in 40 CFR part 166. For additional information regarding the emergency exemption for hexythiazox, contact the Agency's Registration Division at the address provided under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

IV. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

EPA performs a number of analyses to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide residues. For further discussion of the regulatory requirements of section 408 of the FFDCA and a complete description of the risk assessment process, see the final rule on Bifenthrin Pesticide Tolerances (62 FR 62961, November 26, 1997) (FRL-5754-7).

Consistent with section 408(b)(2)(D) of the FFDCA, 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 hexythiazox and to make a determination on aggregate exposure, consistent with section 408(b)(2) of the FFDCA, for time-limited tolerances for combined residues of hexythiazox (trans-5-(4-chlorophenyl)-N-cyclohexyl-4-methyl-2-oxothiazolidine-3-carboxamide) and its metabolites containing the (4-chlorophenyl)-4-methyl-2-oxo-3-thiazolidine moiety in or on corn, field, grain at 0.05 ppm; corn, field, forage at 2.0 ppm; and corn,

field, stover at 2.0 ppm. EPA's assessment of the dietary exposures and risks associated with establishing the tolerance follows.

A. Toxicological Endpoints

The dose at which no observed adverse effect level (the NOAEL) from the toxicology study identified as appropriate for use in risk assessment is used to estimate the toxicological endpoint. However, the lowest dose at which adverse effects of concern are identified (the lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL)) is sometimes used for risk assessment if NOAEL was achieved in the toxicology study selected. An uncertainty factor (UF) is applied to reflect uncertainties inherent in the extrapolation from laboratory animal data to humans and in the variations in sensitivity among members of the human population as well as other unknowns. An UF of 100 is routinely used, 10X to account for interspecies differences and 10X for intraspecies differences.

For dietary risk assessment (other than cancer) the Agency uses the UF to calculate an acute or chronic reference dose (aRfD or cRfD) where the RfD is equal to the NOAEL divided by the appropriate UF (RfD = NOAEL/UF). Where an additional safety factor is retained due to concerns unique to the FQPA, this additional factor is applied to the RfD by dividing the RfD by such additional factor. The acute or chronic

Population Adjusted Dose (aPAD or cPAD) is a modification of the RfD to accommodate this type of FQPA SF.

For non-dietary risk assessments (other than cancer) the UF is used to determine the level of concern (LOC). For example, when 100 is the appropriate UF (10X to account for interspecies differences and 10X for intraspecies differences) the LOC is 100. To estimate risk, a ratio of the NOAEL to exposures (margin of exposure (MOE) = NOAEL/exposure) is calculated and compared to the LOC.

The linear default risk methodology (Q*) is the primary method currently used by the Agency to quantify carcinogenic risk. The Q* approach assumes that any amount of exposure will lead to some degree of cancer risk. A Q* is calculated and used to estimate risk which represents a probability of occurrence of additional cancer cases (e.g., risk is expressed as 1×10^{-6} or one in a million). Under certain specific circumstances, MOE calculations will be used for the carcinogenic risk assessment. In this non-linear approach, a "point of departure" is identified below which carcinogenic effects are not expected. The point of departure is typically a NOAEL based on an endpoint related to cancer effects though it may be a different value derived from the dose response curve. To estimate risk, a ratio of the point of departure to exposure ($MOE_{\text{cancer}} = \text{point of departure/exposures}$) is calculated.

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF TOXICOLOGICAL DOSE AND ENDPOINTS FOR HEXYTHIAZOX FOR USE IN HUMAN RISK ASSESSMENT

Exposure Scenario	Dose Used in Risk Assessment, UF	FQPA SF and Endpoint for Risk Assessment	Study and Toxicological Effects
Acute dietary females (13-50 years of age)	Developmental NOAEL = 240 mg/kg/day UF = 100 Acute RfD = 2.4 mg/kg/day	FQPA SF = 1X aPAD= acute RfD/FQPA SF = 2.4 mg/kg/day	Developmental toxicity study - rat Developmental LOAEL = 720 mg/kg/day based on delayed ossification
Acute dietary (general population including infants and children)	A dose and endpoint attributable to a single exposure were not identified from the available oral toxicity studies, including maternal toxicity in the developmental toxicity studies.		
Chronic dietary (all populations)	NOAEL= 2.5 mg/kg/day UF = 100 chronic RfD= 0.025 mg/kg/day	FQPA SF = 1X cPAD= chronic RfD/FQPA SF = 0.025 mg/kg/day	One-Year toxicity feeding study - dog LOAEL = 12.5 mg/kg/day based on increased absolute and relative adrenal weights and associated adrenal histopathology
Cancer (oral, dermal, inhalation)	Category C (possible human carcinogen)	Q1* = 2.22×10^{-2}	Increases in incidence of malignant and combined benign/malignant liver tumors in mice

B. Exposure Assessment

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* Tolerances have been established (40 CFR 180.448) for the combined of hexythiazox, in or on a variety of raw agricultural commodities. Risk assessments were conducted by EPA to assess dietary exposures from hexythiazox in food as follows:

i. *Acute exposure.* Acute dietary 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. The Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model (DEEM™) analysis evaluated the individual food consumption as reported by respondents in the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) 1994–1996, and 1998 nationwide Continuing Surveys of Food Intake by Individuals (CSFII) and accumulated exposure to the chemical for each commodity. Published and proposed tolerance level residues were used. Default and specially assigned processing factors were assumed for all commodities.

ii. *Chronic exposure.* In conducting this chronic dietary risk assessment, the DEEM™ analysis evaluated the individual food consumption as reported by respondents in the USDA 1994–1996, and 1998 nationwide CSFII and accumulated exposure to the chemical for each commodity. The following assumptions were made for the chronic exposure assessments: Partially refined, deterministic assessment using tolerance-level residue or anticipated residues, average weighted percent crop treated (% CT) information and modified DEEM™ (version 2.0) processing factors for some commodities based on guideline processing studies.

iii. *Cancer.* The Agency believes that pesticidal use of hexythiazox is likely to pose a carcinogenic hazard to humans. Thus, a cancer dietary risk assessment is required. Hexythiazox was classified by the Agency as a “Group C” - possible human carcinogen-chemical. It has been assigned a $Q1^* = 2.22 \times 10^{-2}$ milligrams/kilogram/day (mg/kg/day) for purposes of risk assessment. The estimated exposure of the U.S. population (total) to hexythiazox is 3.0×10^{-5} mg/kg/day.

iv. *Anticipated residue and PCT information.* Section 408(b)(2)(E) of the FFDCA authorizes EPA to use available data and information on the anticipated residue levels of pesticide residues in food and the actual levels of pesticide chemicals that have been measured in food. If EPA relies on such information, EPA must require that data be provided

5 years after the tolerance is established, modified, or left in effect, demonstrating that the levels in food are not above the levels anticipated. Following the initial data submission, EPA is authorized to require similar data on a time frame it deems appropriate. As required by section 408(b)(2)(E) of the FFDCA, EPA will issue a Data Call-In for information relating to anticipated residues to be submitted no later than 5 years from the date of issuance of this tolerance.

Section 408(b)(2)(F) of the FFDCA states that the Agency may use data on the actual percent of food treated for assessing chronic dietary risk only if the Agency can make the following findings: Condition 1, that the data used are reliable and provide a valid basis to show what percentage of the food derived from such crop is likely to contain such pesticide residue; Condition 2, that the exposure estimate does not underestimate exposure for any significant subpopulation group; and Condition 3, if data are available on pesticide use and food consumption in a particular area, the exposure estimate does not understate exposure for the population in such area. In addition, the Agency must provide for periodic evaluation of any estimates used. To provide for the periodic evaluation of the estimate of PCT as required by section 408(b)(2)(F) of the FFDCA, EPA may require registrants to submit data on PCT.

The Agency used PCT information as follows:

Almond nutmeat, 2%; pecans, <1%; other nutmeat, <1%; almond hulls, 2%; apricots, 2%; cherries, <1%; peaches, 1%; nectarines, 2%; plum, 1%; plum, prune, fresh, <1%; plum, prune, dried, <1%; caneberry crop subgroup, 15%; spearmint tops, 5%; peppermint, tops, 5%; undelinted cottonseed, 1%; cottonseed meal, 1%; refined cottonseed oil, 1%; apples, 4%; apple juice, 4%; wet apple pomace, 4%; pears, 3%; hops, 45%; dates, 45%; strawberries, 14%.

The Agency believes that the three conditions listed above have been met. With respect to Condition 1, PCT estimates are derived from Federal and private market survey data, which are reliable and have a valid basis. EPA uses a weighted average PCT for chronic dietary exposure estimates. This weighted average PCT figure is derived by averaging State-level data for a period of up to 10 years, and weighting for the more robust and recent data. A weighted average of the PCT reasonably represents a person's dietary exposure over a lifetime, and is unlikely to underestimate exposure to an individual because of the fact that pesticide use patterns (both regionally and nationally)

tend to change continuously over time, such that an individual is unlikely to be exposed to more than the average PCT over a lifetime. For acute dietary exposure estimates, EPA uses an estimated maximum PCT. The exposure estimates resulting from this approach reasonably represent the highest levels to which an individual could be exposed, and are unlikely to underestimate an individual's acute dietary exposure. The Agency is reasonably certain that the percentage of the food treated is not likely to be an underestimation. As to Conditions 2 and 3, regional consumption information and consumption information for significant subpopulations is taken into account through EPA's computer-based model for evaluating the exposure of significant subpopulations including several regional groups. Use of this consumption information in EPA's risk assessment process ensures that EPA's exposure estimate does not understate exposure for any significant subpopulation group and allows the Agency to be reasonably certain that no regional population is exposed to residue levels higher than those estimated by the Agency. Other than the data available through national food consumption surveys, EPA does not have available information on the regional consumption of food to which hexythiazox may be applied in a particular area.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* The Agency lacks sufficient monitoring exposure data to complete a comprehensive dietary exposure analysis and risk assessment for hexythiazox in drinking water. Because the Agency does not have comprehensive monitoring data, drinking water concentration estimates are made by reliance on simulation or modeling taking into account data on the physical characteristics of hexythiazox.

The Agency uses the Generic Estimated Environmental Concentration (GENEEC) or the Pesticide Root Zone/Exposure Analysis Modeling System (PRZM/EXAMS) to estimate pesticide concentrations in surface water and SCI-GROW, which predicts pesticide concentrations in ground water. In general, EPA will use GENEEC (a Tier 1 model) before using PRZM/EXAMS (a Tier 2 model) for a screening-level assessment for surface water. The GENEEC model is a subset of the PRZM/EXAMS model that uses a specific high-end runoff scenario for pesticides. GENEEC incorporates a farm pond scenario, while PRZM/EXAMS incorporate an index reservoir environment in place of the previous

pond scenario. The PRZM/EXAMS model includes a percent crop (PC) area factor as an adjustment to account for the maximum PC coverage within a watershed or drainage basin.

None of these models include consideration of the impact processing (mixing, dilution, or treatment) of raw water for distribution as drinking water would likely have on the removal of pesticides from the source water. The primary use of these models by the Agency at this stage is to provide a coarse screen for sorting out pesticides for which it is highly unlikely that drinking water concentrations would ever exceed human health levels of concern.

Since the models used are considered to be screening tools in the risk assessment process, the Agency does not use estimated environmental concentrations (EECs) from these models to quantify drinking water exposure and risk as a %RfD or %PAD. Instead drinking water levels of comparison (DWLOCs) are calculated and used as a point of comparison against the model estimates of a pesticide's concentration in water. DWLOCs are theoretical upper limits on a pesticide's concentration in drinking water in light of total aggregate exposure to a pesticide in food, and from residential uses. Since DWLOCs address total aggregate exposure to hexythiazox, they are further discussed in the aggregate risk sections below.

Based on the GENEEC and SCI-GROW models, the EECs of hexythiazox for acute exposures are estimated to be 1.81 parts per billion (ppb) for surface water and 0.009 ppb for ground water. The EECs for chronic exposures are estimated to be 0.91 ppb for surface water and 0.009 ppb for ground 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).

Hexythiazox is not registered for use on any sites that would result in residential exposure.

4. *Cumulative exposure to substances with a common mechanism of toxicity.* Section 408(b)(2)(D)(v) of the 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 does not have, at this time, available data to determine whether

hexythiazox has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances or how to include this pesticide in a cumulative risk assessment. Unlike other pesticides for which EPA has followed a cumulative risk approach based on a common mechanism of toxicity, hexythiazox does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has not assumed that hexythiazox has 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 the final rule for Bifenthrin Pesticide Tolerances (62 FR 62961, November 26, 1997).

C. Safety Factor for Infants and Children

1. *In general.* Section 408 of the FFDCA provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold 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 data base on toxicity and exposure unless EPA determines that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. Margins of safety are incorporated into EPA risk assessments either directly through use of a MOE analysis or through using uncertainty (safety) factors in calculating a dose level that poses no appreciable risk to humans.

2. *Developmental toxicity studies—*a. *rats.* In the rat developmental study, the maternal (systemic) NOEL was 240 mg/kg/day. The maternal LOEL of 720 mg/kg/day was based on decreased food consumption and decreased body weight. The developmental (fetal) NOEL was 240 mg/kg/day. The developmental LOEL was based on slight delayed ossification.

b. *Rabbits.* In the rabbit developmental toxicity study, the maternal (systemic) NOEL was 1,080 mg/kg/day at the highest dose tested (HDT). The developmental (fetal) NOEL was 1,080 mg/kg/day at the HDT.

3. *Reproductive toxicity study—*rats. In the 2-generation reproductive toxicity study in rats, the parental (systemic) NOEL was 20 mg/kg/day. The LOEL of 120 mg/kg/day was based on decreased body weight and decreased food consumption. The developmental NOEL was 20 mg/kg/day. The developmental LOEL of 120 mg/kg/day was based on decreased body weight and delayed maturation. The reproductive NOEL was 120 mg/kg/day at the HDT.

4. *Prenatal and postnatal sensitivity.* The prenatal and postnatal toxicology data base for hexythiazox is complete with respect to current toxicological data requirements. There are no prenatal or postnatal toxicity concerns for infants and children, based on the results of the rat and rabbit developmental toxicity studies and the 2-generation rat reproductive toxicity study. In the developmental study in rats, the developmental NOEL and LOEL is the same as the maternal NOEL and LOEL demonstrating that no extra-sensitivity for infants and children is present. In rabbits, there are no maternal or developmental effects up to the limit dose of 1,080 mg/kg/day HDT. In the 2-generation reproductive toxicity study in rats, there are no pup effects at doses below maternal effects and the common effects in both pups and parental animals decreased body weight also demonstrates that there is no extra-sensitivity for infants and children.

5. *Conclusion.* Based on the above, EPA concludes that reliable data support use of the standard 100-fold uncertainty factor and that the 10x FQPA safety factor be removed since the hazard and exposure assessments do not indicate a concern for potential risk to infants and children.

D. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety

To estimate total aggregate exposure to a pesticide from food, drinking water, and residential uses, the Agency calculates DWLOCs which are used as a point of comparison against the model estimates of a pesticide's concentration in water (EECs). DWLOC values are not regulatory standards for drinking water. DWLOCs are theoretical upper limits on a pesticide's concentration in drinking water in light of total aggregate exposure to a pesticide in food and residential uses. In calculating a DWLOC, the Agency determines how much of the acceptable exposure (i.e., the PAD) is available for exposure through drinking water e.g., allowable chronic water exposure (mg/kg/day) = cPAD - (average food + chronic non-dietary, non-occupational exposure). This allowable exposure through drinking water is used to calculate a DWLOC.

A DWLOC will vary depending on the toxic endpoint, drinking water consumption, and body weights. Default body weights and consumption values as used by the USEPA Office of Water are used to calculate DWLOCs: 2 liter (L)/70 kg (adult male), 2L/60 kg (adult female), and 1L/10 kg (child). Default body weights and drinking water consumption values vary on an individual basis. This variation will be

taken into account in more refined screening-level and quantitative drinking water exposure assessments. Different populations will have different DWLOCs. Generally, a DWLOC is calculated for each type of risk assessment used: Acute, short-term, intermediate-term, chronic, and cancer.

When EECs for surface water and ground water are less than the calculated DWLOCs, EPA concludes with reasonable certainty that exposures to hexythiazox in drinking water (when considered along with other sources of exposure for which EPA has reliable

data) would not result in unacceptable levels of aggregate human health risk at this time. Because EPA considers the aggregate risk resulting from multiple exposure pathways associated with a pesticide's uses, levels of comparison in drinking water may vary as those uses change. If new uses are added in the future, EPA will reassess the potential impacts of hexythiazox on drinking water as a part of the aggregate risk assessment process.

1. *Acute risk.* Using the exposure assumptions discussed in this unit for acute exposure, the acute dietary

exposure from food to hexythiazox will occupy 0.12 of the aPAD for females 13–49 years old, the population sub-group of concern. In addition, despite the potential for acute dietary exposure to hexythiazox in drinking water, after calculating DWLOCs and comparing them to conservative model EECs of hexythiazox in surfacewater and ground water, EPA does not expect the aggregate exposure to exceed 100% of the aPAD, as shown in the following Table 2:

TABLE 2.—AGGREGATE RISK ASSESSMENT FOR ACUTE EXPOSURE TO HEXYTHIAZOX

Population Subgroup	aPAD (mg/kg)	% aPAD (Food)	Surface Water EEC (ppb)	Ground Water EEC (ppb)	Acute DWLOC (ppb)
Females (13-49 years old)	2.4	0.12	1.81	0.009	72,000

2. *Chronic risk.* Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for chronic exposure, EPA has concluded that exposure to hexythiazox from food will utilize 0.1% of the cPAD for the U.S. population, 0.2% of the cPAD for all infants, and 0.4% of the cPAD for

children 1–5 years old. There are no residential uses for hexythiazox that result in chronic residential exposure to hexythiazox. In addition, despite the potential for chronic dietary exposure to hexythiazox in drinking water, after calculating DWLOCs and comparing

them to conservative model EECs of hexythiazox in surface water and ground water, EPA does not expect the aggregate exposure to exceed 100% of the cPAD, as shown in the following Table 3:

TABLE 3.—AGGREGATE RISK ASSESSMENT FOR CHRONIC (NON-CANCER) EXPOSURE TO HEXYTHIAZOX

Population Subgroup	cPAD mg/kg/day	% cPAD (Food)	Surface Water EEC (ppb)	Ground Water EEC (ppb)	Chronic DWLOC (ppb)
General U.S. population	0.025	0.1	0.910	0.009	870
All Infants (< 1 year old)	0.025	0.2	0.910	0.009	250
Children (1-2 years old)	0.025	0.4	0.910	0.009	250
Females (13-49 years old)	0.025	0.1	0.910	0.009	750
Youth (13-19 years old)	0.025	0.1	0.910	0.009	750
Adults (20-49 years old)	0.025	0.1	0.910	0.009	870

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

Hexythiazox is not registered for use on any sites that would result in residential exposure. Therefore, the aggregate risk is the sum of the risk from food and water, which were previously addressed.

4. *Intermediate-term risk.* Intermediate-term aggregate exposure takes into account non-dietary, non-occupational exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water (considered to be a background exposure level).

Hexythiazox is not registered for use on any sites that would result in

residential exposure. Therefore, the aggregate risk is the sum of the risk from food and water, which were previously addressed.

5. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* Chronic (cancer) aggregate risk estimates are below the Agency's level of concern. A partially refined analysis was performed using anticipated residue levels for most crops, processing factors where applicable, and PCT or anticipated market share information for all crops. The chronic cancer analysis applied to the U.S. population only. The carcinogenic risk estimate (food only) for the general U.S. population was 6.6×10^{-7} . The Agency's level of concern is for risks that exceed 1×10^{-6} . Thus, the

estimated dietary cancer risk to the U.S. population associated with the existing and pending uses is below the level the Agency generally considers negligible for excess lifetime cancer risk.

The surface water and ground water EECs were used to compare against back-calculated DWLOCs for aggregate risk assessments. For the carcinogenic risk scenario, the DWLOC is 3.675 ppb for the U.S. population. For ground water and surface water, the EECs for hexythiazox are less than EPA's DWLOCs for hexythiazox in drinking water as a contribution to carcinogenic aggregate exposure. Therefore, EPA concludes with reasonable certainty that residues of hexythiazox in drinking water do not contribute significantly to

the carcinogenic aggregate human-health risk at the present time.

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, and to infants and children from aggregate exposure to hexythiazox residues.

V. Other Considerations

A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

Adequate enforcement methodology (example—gas chromatography) 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; e-mail address: residuemethods@epa.gov.

B. International Residue Limits

There are no international residues limits for hexythiazox on field corn, and therefore, this is not an issue.

VI. Conclusion

Therefore, the tolerances are established for combined residues of hexythiazox (trans-5-(4-chlorophenyl)-N-cyclohexyl-4-methyl-2-oxothiazolidine-3-carboxamide) and its metabolites containing the (4-chlorophenyl)-4-methyl-2-oxo-3-thiazolidine moiety in or on corn, field, grain at 0.05 ppm; corn, field, forage at 2.0 ppm; and corn, field, stover at 2.0 ppm.

VII. Objections and Hearing Requests

Under section 408(g) of the FFDCA, as amended by the FQPA, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. The EPA procedural regulations which govern the submission of objections and requests for hearings appear in 40 CFR part 178. Although the procedures in those regulations require some modification to reflect the amendments made to the FFDCA by the FQPA, EPA will continue to use those procedures, with appropriate adjustments, until the necessary modifications can be made. The new section 408(g) of the FFDCA provides essentially the same process for persons to “object” to a regulation for an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance issued by EPA under new section 408(d) of the FFDCA, as was provided in the old sections 408 and 409 of the FFDCA. However, the period for filing objections is now 60 days, rather than 30 days.

A. What Do I Need to Do to File an Objection or Request a Hearing?

You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in this unit and in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket identification (ID) number OPP–2004–0329 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All requests must be in writing, and must be mailed or delivered to the Hearing Clerk on or before January 10, 2005.

1. *Filing the request.* Your objection must specify the specific provisions in the regulation that you object to, and the grounds for the objections (40 CFR 178.25). If a hearing is requested, the objections must include a statement of the factual issues(s) on which a hearing is requested, the requestor’s contentions on such issues, and a summary of any evidence relied upon by the objector (40 CFR 178.27). Information submitted in connection with an objection or hearing request may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as CBI. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the information 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.

Mail your written request to: Office of the Hearing Clerk (1900L), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001. You may also deliver your request to the Office of the Hearing Clerk in Suite 350, 1099 14th St., NW., Washington, DC 20005. The Office of the Hearing Clerk is open from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Office of the Hearing Clerk is (202) 564–6255.

2. *Tolerance fee payment.* If you file an objection or request a hearing, you must also pay the fee prescribed by 40 CFR 180.33(i) or request a waiver of that fee pursuant to 40 CFR 180.33(m). You must mail the fee to: EPA Headquarters Accounting Operations Branch, Office of Pesticide Programs, P.O. Box 360277M, Pittsburgh, PA 15251. Please identify the fee submission by labeling it “Tolerance Petition Fees.”

EPA is authorized to waive any fee requirement “when in the judgement of the Administrator such a waiver or refund is equitable and not contrary to the purpose of this subsection.” For additional information regarding the waiver of these fees, you may contact

James Tompkins by phone at (703) 305–5697, by e-mail at tompkins.jim@epa.gov, or by mailing a request for information to Mr. Tompkins at Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001.

If you would like to request a waiver of the tolerance objection fees, you must mail your request for such a waiver to: James Hollins, Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001.

3. *Copies for the Docket.* In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in Unit VII.A., you should also send a copy of your request to the PIRIB for its inclusion in the official record that is described in **ADDRESSES**. Mail your copies, identified by the docket ID number OPP–2004–0329, to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch, Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001. In person or by courier, bring a copy to the location of the PIRIB described in **ADDRESSES**. You may also send an electronic copy of your request via e-mail to: opp-docket@epa.gov. Please use an ASCII file format and avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Copies of electronic objections and hearing requests will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 6.1/8.0 or ASCII file format. Do not include any CBI in your electronic copy. You may also submit an electronic copy of your request at many Federal Depository Libraries.

B. When Will the Agency Grant a Request for a Hearing?

A request for a hearing will be granted if the Administrator determines that the material submitted shows the following: There is a genuine and substantial issue of fact; there is a reasonable possibility that available evidence identified by the requestor would, if established resolve one or more of such issues in favor of the requestor, taking into account uncontested claims or facts to the contrary; and resolution of the factual issues(s) in the manner sought by the requestor would be adequate to justify the action requested (40 CFR 178.32).

VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This final rule establishes time-limited tolerances under section 408 of the FFDCA. 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 rule has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866 due to its lack of significance, this rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, *Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use* (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This final rule does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, or impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Public Law 104-4). 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); or OMB review or any Agency action under Executive Order 13045, entitled *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks* (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). 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 of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note). Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a FIFRA section 18 exemption under section 408 of the FFDCA, such as the tolerances 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. In addition, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States, on the relationship between the national government and the States,

or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132, entitled *Federalism* (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure “meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications.” “Policies that have federalism implications” is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have “substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.” This final rule directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, not States. This action does not alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of section 408(n)(4) of the FFDCA. For these same reasons, the Agency has determined that this rule does not have any “tribal implications” as described in Executive Order 13175, entitled *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments* (65 FR 67249, November 6, 2000). Executive Order 13175, requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure “meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications.” “Policies that have tribal implications” is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have “substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and the Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.” This rule will not have substantial direct effects on tribal governments, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified in Executive Order 13175. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule.

IX. Congressional Review Act

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this 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 this final rule in the **Federal Register**. This final rule 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: October 27, 2004.

Lois Rossi,

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. Section 180.448 is amended by adding text to paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 180.448 Hexythiazox; tolerances for residues.

* * * * *

(b) *Section 18 emergency exemptions.* Time-limited tolerances are established for the combined residues of the insecticide hexythiazox and its metabolites containing the (4-chlorophenyl)-4-methyl-2-oxo-3-thiazolidine moiety in connection with use of the pesticide under section 18 emergency exemptions granted by EPA. These tolerances will expire and are revoked on the dates specified in the following table.

Commodity	Parts per million	Expiration/revocation date
Corn, field, grain	0.05 ppm	12/31/07
Corn, field, forage	2.0 ppm	12/31/07
Corn, field, stover	2.0 ppm	12/31/07

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 04-24926 Filed 11-9-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 180**

[OPP-2004-0323; FRL-7683-9]

Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerance**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes a tolerance for residues of glyphosate, N-(phosphonomethyl)glycine, resulting from the application of glyphosate, the isopropylamine salt of glyphosate, the ethanolamine salt of glyphosate, the ammonium salt of glyphosate, and the potassium salt of glyphosate in or on cotton, gin byproducts and cotton, undelinted seed. Monsanto Company requested this tolerance under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), as amended by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA).

DATES: This regulation is effective November 10, 2004. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before January 10, 2005.

ADDRESSES: To submit a written objection or hearing request follow the detailed instructions as provided in Unit VII. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket identification (ID) number OPP-2004-0323. All documents in the docket are listed in the EDOCKET index at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket/>. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in EDOCKET or in hard copy at the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1801 South Bell St., Arlington, VA. This docket facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The docket telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James A. Tompkins, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave.,

NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 305-5697; e-mail address: tompkins.jim@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. General Information***A. Does this Action Apply to Me?*

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected entities may include, but are not limited to:

- Crop production (NAICS 111), e.g., agricultural workers; greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture workers; farmers.
- Animal production (NAICS 112), e.g., cattle ranchers and farmers, dairy cattle farmers, livestock farmers.
- Food manufacturing (NAICS 311), e.g., agricultural workers; farmers; greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture workers; ranchers; pesticide applicators.
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS 32532), e.g., agricultural workers; commercial applicators; farmers; greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture workers; residential users.

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in this unit could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether this action might apply to certain entities. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

B. How Can I Access Electronic Copies of this Document and Other Related Information?

In addition to using EDOCKET (<http://www.epa.gov/edocket/>), you may access this **Federal Register** document electronically through the EPA Internet under the “**Federal Register**” listings at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/>. A frequently updated electronic version of 40 CFR part 180 is available on E-CFR Beta Site Two at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/ecfr/>. To access the OPPTS Harmonized Guidelines referenced in this document, go directly to the guidelines at <http://www.epa.gov/opptsfrs/home/guidelin.htm/>.

II. Background and Statutory Findings

In the **Federal Register** of August 18, 2004 (69 FR 51301) (FRL-7364-5), EPA issued a notice pursuant to section 408(d)(3) of FFDCA, 21 U.S.C.

346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of pesticide petitions (PP 0F6195, 1F6274, 2F6487, and 3F6570) by Monsanto Company, 600 13th St., NW., Suite 660, Washington, DC 20005. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.364 be amended by establishing a tolerance for residues of the herbicide glyphosate, N-(phosphonomethyl)glycine, in or on alfalfa seed at 0.5 parts per million (ppm) (PP 2F6487); increasing the current tolerance for cotton, gin byproducts from 100 ppm to 150 ppm (PP 3F6570); rice, bran at 30 ppm; rice, grain at 15 ppm; and rice, hulls at 25 ppm (PP 1F6274); wheat, forage at 10.0 ppm; wheat, hay at 10.0 ppm (PP 0F6195). Monsanto Company also proposed to revise the entry for grain, cereal group tolerance “except rice” to read as grain, cereal group 15 except barley, field corn, grain sorghum, oats, rice, and wheat at 0.1 ppm (PP 1F6274). Monsanto Company also amended PP 0F6195 to delete the proposal for wheat grain at 6 ppm that was announced in the **Federal Register** of April 17, 2002 (67 FR 18894) (FRL-6830-5). The notice stated that tolerances for alfalfa, rice, wheat, and cotton gin byproducts include both conventional and genetically altered crops.

The notice also proposed that the tolerances for alfalfa, forage at 175 ppm and alfalfa, hay at 400 ppm be deleted from § 180.364. Also proposed was to amend § 180.364 by replacing the current listing vegetable, legume, group 6 except soybean at 5.0 ppm with the current crop group pea and bean, dried and shelled, subgroup 6C at 5.0 ppm. That notice included a summary of the petition prepared by Monsanto Company, the registrant. One comment was received in response to the notice of filing from B. Sachau, 15 Elm St., Florham Park, NJ 07932. The commenter objected to allowing any tolerance, wavier, or exemption for glyphosate. The commenter also objected to animal testing and stated that a more reliable method of testing should be developed. This comment is discussed further in Unit V.

During the course of the review the Agency decided to correct the company address to read Monsanto Company, 1300 I St., NW., Suite 450 East, Washington, DC 20005. The Agency also determined the tolerance proposed for cotton, gin byproducts should be raised to 175 ppm and that the current tolerance for cotton, undelinted seed be increased to 35 ppm.

The Agency has determined that based on available data, the current tolerances for alfalfa, forage and alfalfa, hay are to be maintained and that the current listing for vegetable, legume,