

for these sources. The RACT standard differs from the standard applicable to BACT, the “best available control technology” defined at section 169(3) of the Act. See also 40 CFR 52.21(b)(12). The RACT standard is also less stringent than LAER, the lowest achievable emission rate, which is defined at section 171(3) of the Act. Thus, a New Source Review determination for a source subject to Rule 358 could require a control technology or an emission rate which is more stringent than the floor created by Rule 358.

The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rule

The TSD describes additional rule revisions that do not affect EPA’s current action but are recommended for the next time the local agency modifies the rules.

D. Public Comment and Final Action

Because EPA believes Rule 358 fulfills all relevant requirements, we are proposing to fully approve it as described in section 110(k)(3) of the Act. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal for the next 30 days. Unless we receive convincing new information during the comment period that would cause us to reconsider our proposed approval, we intend to publish a final approval action that will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP.

Also, because our proposed action is based on a parallel processing submittal, the adopted and submitted version of Rule 358 must be similar in meaning and content to the February 11, 2005 version of the rule published in the Arizona Administrative Register submitted for parallel processing. Should there be substantial and meaningful differences between the two submitted rules, we will publish a new proposal based on the most recent adopted and submitted version of Rule 358.

III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this proposed action is not a “significant regulatory action” and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, “Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use” (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and

imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule proposes to approve pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4).

This proposed rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, 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 by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not 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, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely proposes to approve 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. This proposed 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.

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. This proposed 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.*).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compound.

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

Dated: March 8, 2005.

Jane Diamond,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 05–5718 Filed 3–22–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[OPP–2004–0421; FRL–7701–4]

Alachlor, Carbaryl, Diazinon, Disulfoton, Pirimiphos-methyl, and Vinclozolin; Proposed Tolerance Revocations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document proposes to revoke specific tolerances for residues of the herbicide alachlor, insecticides carbaryl, diazinon, disulfoton, and pirimiphos-methyl, and fungicide vinclozolin. Some of these specific tolerances correspond to commodities either no longer considered to be significant livestock feed items or which have registration restrictions against feeding to livestock. Other tolerances are associated with food registrations that EPA canceled or for which the Agency deleted food uses following requests for voluntary cancellation or use deletion by the registrants. EPA expects to determine whether any individuals or groups want to support these tolerances. The regulatory actions proposed in this document contribute toward the Agency’s tolerance reassessment requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) section 408(q), as amended by the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) of 1996. By law, EPA is required by August 2006 to reassess the tolerances in existence on August 2, 1996. The regulatory actions proposed in this document pertain to the proposed revocation of 15 tolerances and tolerance exemptions of which 9 would be counted as tolerance reassessments toward the August, 2006 review deadline.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 23, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by docket identification (ID) number OPP-2004-0421, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- *Agency Website:* <http://www.epa.gov/edocket/>. EDOCKET, EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, is EPA's preferred method for receiving comments. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- *E-mail.* Comments may be sent by e-mail to opp-docket@epa.gov, Attention: Docket ID number OPP-2004-0421.

- *Mail.* Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB) (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001, Attention: docket ID number OPP-2004-0421.

- *Hand Delivery.* Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1801 S. Bell St., Arlington, VA, Attention: Docket ID number OPP-2004-0421. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Docket's normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Instructions. Direct your comments to docket ID number OPP-2004-0421. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket/>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through EDOCKET, [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), or e-mail. The EPA EDOCKET and the [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) websites are "anonymous access" systems, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through EDOCKET or [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit

an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment.

Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses. For additional information about EPA's public docket visit EDOCKET on-line or see the **Federal Register** of May 31, 2002 (67 FR 38102) (FRL-7181-7).

Docket. 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: Joseph Nevola, Special Review and Reregistration Division (7508C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 308-8037; e-mail address: nevola.joseph@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. To determine whether you or your business may be affected by this action, you should carefully examine the applicability provisions in Unit IA. 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/>.

C. What Should I Consider as I Prepare My Comments for EPA?

1. *Submitting CBI.* Do not submit this information to EPA through EDOCKET, [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), or e-mail. Clearly mark the part or all of the information that you claim to be CBI. For CBI information in a disk or CD ROM that you mail to EPA, mark the outside of the disk or CD ROM as CBI and then identify electronically within the disk or CD ROM the specific information that is claimed as CBI. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2.

2. *Tips for preparing your comments.* When submitting comments, remember to:

- Identify the rulemaking by docket ID number and other identifying information (subject heading, **Federal Register** date, and page number).
- Follow directions.* The Agency may ask you to respond to specific questions or organize comments by referencing a Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part or section number.
- Explain why you agree or disagree; suggest alternatives and substitute language for your requested changes.
- Describe any assumptions and provide any technical information and/or data that you used.
- If you estimate potential costs or burdens, explain how you arrived at

your estimate in sufficient detail to allow for it to be reproduced.

vi. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns, and suggest alternatives.

vii. Explain your views as clearly as possible, avoiding the use of profanity or personal threats.

viii. Make sure to submit your comments by the comment period deadline identified.

D. What Can I do if I Wish the Agency to Maintain a Tolerance that the Agency Proposes to Revoke?

This proposed rule provides a comment period of 60 days for any person to state an interest in retaining a tolerance proposed for revocation. If EPA receives a comment within the 60-day period to that effect, EPA will not proceed to revoke the tolerance immediately. However, EPA will take steps to ensure the submission of any needed supporting data and will issue an order in the **Federal Register** under FFDC section 408(f) if needed. The order would specify data needed and the time frames for its submission, and would require that within 90-days some person or persons notify EPA that they will submit the data. If the data are not submitted as required in the order, EPA will take appropriate action under FFDC.

EPA issues a final rule after considering comments that are submitted in response to this proposed rule. In addition to submitting comments in response to this proposal, you may also submit an objection at the time of the final rule. If you fail to file an objection to the final rule within the time period specified, you will have waived the right to raise any issues resolved in the final rule. After the specified time, issues resolved in the final rule cannot be raised again in any subsequent proceedings.

II. Background

A. What Action is the Agency Taking?

EPA is proposing to revoke certain tolerances for residues of the herbicide alachlor, insecticides carbaryl, diazinon, disulfoton, and pirimiphos-methyl, and the fungicide vinclozolin because the specific tolerances correspond to commodities which are either no longer considered to be significant livestock feed items or which have restrictions against feeding to livestock, or to uses no longer current or registered under FIFRA in the United States. It is EPA's general practice to propose revocation of those tolerances for residues of pesticide active ingredients on crop uses for which there are no active registrations

under FIFRA, unless any person in comments on the proposal indicates a need for the tolerance to cover residues in or on imported commodities or domestic commodities legally treated.

1. *Alachlor*. Active registrations for use of the herbicide alachlor have restrictions against feeding peanut forage; peanut, hay; soybean, forage; and soybean, hay to livestock. Also, peanut forage is no longer considered a significant livestock feed item. The restrictions against the feeding of alachlor treated soybean forage and hay for all alachlor products occurred with the June 22, 1994 cancellation of two registrations which had lacked the restriction. These cancellations had followed publication of a notice in the **Federal Register** of March 17, 1994 (59 FR 12599) (FRL-4764-1) which announced EPA's receipt of requests to voluntarily cancel certain registrations. The restrictions against the feeding of alachlor treated peanut forage and hay for all alachlor products have been on labels since 1993.

The tolerances for peanut forage, peanut hay, soybean forage, and soybean hay were recommended by the Agency for revocation in the 1998 Alachlor RED. A printed copy of the Alachlor RED may be obtained from EPA's National Service Center for Environmental Publications (EPA/NSCEP), P.O. Box 42419, Cincinnati, OH 45242-2419, telephone 1-800-490-9198; fax 1-513-489-8695; internet at <http://www.epa.gov/ncepihom/> and from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161, telephone 1-800-553-6847 or (703) 605-6000; internet at <http://www.ntis.gov/>. An electronic copy of the Alachlor RED is available on the internet at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/reregistration/status.htm>.

Therefore, because there is no longer a need for them, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerances in 40 CFR 180.249 for residues of alachlor and its metabolites on peanut, forage; peanut, hay; soybean, forage; and soybean, hay.

2. *Carbaryl*. Because flax straw is no longer a regulated feed item (no longer considered a raw agricultural commodity (RAC) of flax), the tolerance is no longer needed. Therefore, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerance in 40 CFR 180.169(a)(1) for residues of carbaryl, including its hydrolysis product 1-naphthol, calculated as 1-naphthyl *N*-methylcarbamate, in or on flax, straw.

Because bean forage and bean hay are no longer considered significant livestock feed items, the tolerances are no longer needed. Therefore, EPA is

proposing to revoke the tolerances in 40 CFR 180.169(a)(1) for residues of carbaryl, including its hydrolysis product 1-naphthol, calculated as 1-naphthyl *N*-methylcarbamate, in or on bean, forage and bean, hay.

Because pineapple bran is no longer a regulated feed item (no longer considered a RAC of pineapple), the tolerance is no longer needed. Therefore, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerance in 40 CFR 180.169(a)(4) for residues of carbaryl in or on pineapple bran. Note, the separate tolerance on pineapple is maintained.

3. *Diazinon*. There have been no registered uses of diazinon on coffee beans and dandelions since 1995 and 1991, respectively. Therefore, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerances in 40 CFR 180.153(a)(1) for residues of the insecticide diazinon (*O,O*-diethyl *O*-[6-methyl-2-(1-methylethyl)-4-pyrimidinyl]phosphorothioate) in or on coffee bean and dandelion, leaves.

4. *Disulfoton*. There have been no registered uses of disulfoton on hops since 1991. Therefore, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerance in 40 CFR 180.183(a) for the combined residues of the insecticide *O,O*-diethyl *S*-[2-(ethylthio)ethyl] phosphorodithioate and its cholinesterase-inhibiting metabolites, calculated as demeton, in or on hop, dried cones.

5. *Pirimiphos-methyl*. There have been no registered uses of pirimiphos-methyl on kiwifruits for at least 10-years. Therefore, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerance in 40 CFR 180.409(a)(1) for the combined residues of the insecticide pirimiphos-methyl, *O*-[2-diethylamino-6-methyl-4-pyrimidinyl] *O,O*-dimethyl phosphorothioate, the metabolite *O*-[2-ethylamino-6-methyl-pyrimidin-4-yl] *O,O*-dimethyl phosphorothioate and, in free and conjugated form, the metabolites 2-diethylamino-6-methyl-pyrimidin-4-ol, 2-ethylamino-6-methyl-pyrimidin-4-ol, and 2-amino-6-methyl-pyrimidin-4-ol in or on kiwifruit.

In 2001, EPA published an Interim Reregistration Eligibility Decision (IREDD) for pirimiphos-methyl and made a determination that pirimiphos-methyl residues of concern do not concentrate in wheat flour. Because the tolerance is no longer needed, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerance in 40 CFR 180.409(a)(2) for residues of pirimiphos-methyl and its metabolites in or on wheat flour as a result of application to stored wheat grain.

A printed copy of the pirimiphos-methyl IREDD may be obtained from EPA's National Service Center for Environmental Publications (EPA/NSCEP), P.O. Box 42419, Cincinnati,

OH 45242-2419, telephone 1-800-490-9198; fax 1-513-489-8695; internet at <http://www.epa.gov/ncepihom/> and from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161, telephone 1-800-553-6847 or (703) 605-6000; internet at <http://www.ntis.gov/>. An electronic copy of the pirimiphos-methyl IRED is available on the internet at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/reregistration/status.htm>.

6. **Vinclozolin.** In the **Federal Register** notice of August 22, 2001 (66 FR 44134) (FRL-6795-7), EPA announced use cancellations for certain vinclozolin registrations, including uses of the fungicide vinclozolin on onions and raspberries with a last date for legal use as December 15, 2001. EPA believes that there has been sufficient time for treated commodities to have cleared the channels of trade. Therefore, EPA is proposing to revoke the tolerances in 40 CFR 180.380(a) for the combined residues of the fungicide vinclozolin and its metabolites containing the 3,5-dichloroaniline moiety in or on onion, dry bulb and raspberry.

B. What is the Agency's Authority for Taking this Action?

A "tolerance" represents the maximum level for residues of pesticide chemicals legally allowed in or on RACs and processed foods. Section 408 of FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. 301 et seq., as amended by the FQPA of 1996, Public Law 104-70, authorizes the establishment of tolerances, exemptions from tolerance requirements, modifications in tolerances, and revocation of tolerances for residues of pesticide chemicals in or on RACs and processed foods (21 U.S.C. 346(a)). Without a tolerance or exemption, food containing pesticide residues is considered to be unsafe and therefore "adulterated" under section 402(a) of the FFDCA. Such food may not be distributed in interstate commerce (21 U.S.C. 331(a) and 342(a)). For a food-use pesticide to be sold and distributed, the pesticide must not only have appropriate tolerances under the FFDCA, but also must be registered under FIFRA (7 U.S.C. et seq.). Food-use pesticides not registered in the United States must have tolerances in order for commodities treated with those pesticides to be imported into the United States.

EPA's general practice is to propose revocation of tolerances for residues of pesticide active ingredients on crops for which FIFRA registrations no longer exist and on which the pesticide may therefore, no longer be used in the United States. EPA has historically been

concerned that retention of tolerances that are not necessary to cover residues in or on legally treated foods may encourage misuse of pesticides within the United States. Nonetheless, EPA will establish and maintain tolerances even when corresponding domestic uses are canceled if the tolerances, which EPA refers to as "import tolerances," are necessary to allow importation into the United States of food containing such pesticide residues. However, where there are no imported commodities that require these import tolerances, the Agency believes it is appropriate to revoke tolerances for unregistered pesticides in order to prevent potential misuse.

Furthermore, as a general matter, the Agency believes that retention of import tolerances not needed to cover any imported food may result in unnecessary restriction on trade of pesticides and foods. Under section 408 of the FFDCA, a tolerance may only be established or maintained if EPA determines that the tolerance is safe based on a number of factors, including an assessment of the aggregate exposure to the pesticide and an assessment of the cumulative effects of such pesticide and other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity. In doing so, EPA must consider potential contributions to such exposure from all tolerances. If the cumulative risk is such that the tolerances in aggregate are not safe, then every one of these tolerances is potentially vulnerable to revocation. Furthermore, if unneeded tolerances are included in the aggregate and cumulative risk assessments, the estimated exposure to the pesticide would be inflated. Consequently, it may be more difficult for others to obtain needed tolerances or to register needed new uses. To avoid potential trade restrictions, the Agency is proposing to revoke tolerances for residues on crops uses for which FIFRA registrations no longer exist, unless someone expresses a need for such tolerances. Through this proposed rule, the Agency is inviting individuals who need these import tolerances to identify themselves and the tolerances that are needed to cover imported commodities.

Parties interested in retention of the tolerances should be aware that additional data may be needed to support retention. These parties should be aware that, under FFDCA section 408(f), if the Agency determines that additional information is reasonably required to support the continuation of a tolerance, EPA may require that parties interested in maintaining the tolerances provide the necessary information. If the requisite information

is not submitted, EPA may issue an order revoking the tolerance at issue.

C. When do These Actions Become Effective?

EPA is proposing that revocation of these tolerances become effective on the date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register** because their associated uses have been canceled for several years. The Agency believes that treated commodities have had sufficient time for passage through the channels of trade. However, if EPA is presented with other information and that information is verified, the Agency will consider extending the expiration date of the tolerance. If you have comments regarding existing stocks and whether the effective date allows sufficient time for treated commodities to clear the channels of trade, please submit comments as described under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

Any commodities listed in this proposal treated with the pesticides subject to this proposal, and in the channels of trade following the tolerance revocations, shall be subject to FFDCA section 408(1)(5), as established by FQPA. Under this section, any residues of these pesticides in or on such food shall not render the food adulterated so long as it is shown to the satisfaction of the Food and Drug Administration that: (1) The residue is present as the result of an application or use of the pesticide at a time and in a manner that was lawful under FIFRA, and (2) the residue does not exceed the level that was authorized at the time of the application or use to be present on the food under a tolerance or exemption from tolerance. Evidence to show that food was lawfully treated may include records that verify the dates that the pesticide was applied to such food.

D. What Is the Contribution to Tolerance Reassessment?

By law, EPA is required by August 2006 to reassess the tolerances in existence on August 2, 1996. As of February 14, 2005, EPA has reassessed over 7,140 tolerances. This document proposes to revoke a total of 15 tolerances of which 9 would be counted as tolerance reassessments toward the August, 2006 review deadline of FFDCA section 408(q), as amended by FQPA in 1996.

III. Are The Proposed Actions Consistent with International Obligations?

The tolerance revocations in this proposal are not discriminatory and are designed to ensure that both domestically-produced and imported

foods meet the food safety standards established by the FFDCa. The same food safety standards apply to domestically produced and imported foods.

EPA is working to ensure that the United States tolerance reassessment program under FQPA does not disrupt international trade. EPA considers Codex Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) in setting U.S. tolerances and in reassessing them. MRLs are established by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, a committee within the Codex Alimentarius Commission, an international organization formed to promote the coordination of international food standards. It is EPA's policy to harmonize U.S. tolerances with Codex MRLs to the extent possible, provided that the MRLs achieve the level of protection required under FFDCa. EPA's effort to harmonize with Codex MRLs is summarized in the tolerance reassessment section of individual Reregistration Eligibility Decision documents. EPA has developed guidance concerning submissions for import tolerance support of June 1, 2000 (65 FR 35069) (FRL-6559-3). This guidance will be made available to interested persons. Electronic copies are available on the internet at <http://www.epa.gov/>. On the Home Page select "Laws, Regulations, and Dockets," then select "Regulations and Proposed Rules" and then look up the entry for this document under "Federal Register--Environmental Documents." You can also go directly to the "Federal Register" listings at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/>.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

In this proposed rule, EPA is proposing to revoke specific tolerances established under FFDCa section 408. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this type of action (i.e., tolerance revocation for which extraordinary circumstances do not exist) from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled *Regulatory Planning and Review* (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Because this proposed rule has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866 due to its lack of significance, this proposed 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 proposed 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 as required by 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 other 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). Pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Agency previously assessed whether revocations of tolerances might significantly impact a substantial number of small entities and concluded that, as a general matter, these actions do not impose a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This analysis was published on December 17, 1997 (62 FR 66020), and was provided to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration. Taking into account this analysis, and available information concerning the pesticides listed in this rule, the Agency hereby certifies that this proposed action will not have a significant negative economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Specifically, as per the 1997 notice, EPA has reviewed its available data on imports and foreign pesticide usage and concludes that there is a reasonable international supply of food not treated with canceled pesticides. Furthermore, for the pesticide named in this proposed rule, the Agency knows of no extraordinary circumstances that exist as to the present proposal that would change the EPA's previous analysis. Any comments about the Agency's determination should be submitted to the EPA along with comments on the proposal, and will be addressed prior to issuing a final rule. 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

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

Dated: March 8, 2005.

Anne E. Lindsay,

Acting Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR chapter I be 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.

§ 180.153 [Amended]

2. Section § 180.153 is amended by removing the entries for coffee bean and dandelion, leaves from the table under paragraph (a)(1).

§ 180.169 [Amended]

3. Section § 180.169 is amended by removing the entries for bean, forage; bean, hay; and flax, straw from the table under paragraph (a)(1) and the entry for pineapple bran from the table under paragraph (a)(4).

§ 180.183 [Amended]

4. Section § 180.183 is amended by removing the entry for hop, dried cones from the table under paragraph (a).

§ 180.249 [Amended]

5. Section § 180.249 is amended by removing the entries for peanut, forage; peanut, hay; soybean, forage; and soybean, hay from the table under the paragraph.

§ 180.380 [Amended]

6. Section § 180.380 is amended by removing the entries for onion, dry bulb and raspberry from the table under paragraph (a).

§ 180.409 [Amended]

7. Section § 180.409 is amended by removing the entry for kiwifruit from the table under paragraph (a)(1) and removing paragraph (a)(2).

[FR Doc. 05-5724 Filed 3-22-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 271**

[FRL-7888-2]

North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: North Carolina has applied to EPA for Final authorization of the changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). EPA proposes to grant final authorization to North Carolina. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is authorizing the changes

by an immediate final rule. EPA did not make a proposal prior to the immediate final rule because we believe this action is not controversial and do not expect comments that oppose it. We have explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the immediate final rule. Unless we get written comments which oppose this authorization during the comment period, the immediate final rule will become effective on the date it establishes, and we will not take further action on this proposal. If we get comments that oppose this action, we will withdraw the immediate final rule and it will not take effect. We will then respond to public comments in a later final rule based on this proposal. You may not have another opportunity for comment. If you want to comment on this action, you must do so at this time.

DATES: Send your written comments by April 22, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Thornell Cheeks, North Carolina Authorization Coordinator, RCRA Programs Branch, Waste Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, GA, 30303-3104; (404) 562-8479. You may also e-mail your comments to Cheeks.Thornell@epa.gov or submit your comments at <http://www.regulation.gov>. Copies of the applications submitted by North Carolina can be examined during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA Region IV Library, Atlanta Federal Center, Library, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303; phone number:(404) 562-8190, or the North Carolina Department of Environment, Health and Natural Resources, P.O. Box 27687, Raleigh, North Carolina 29201, (919) 733-2178.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thornell Cheeks, North Carolina Authorization Coordinator, RCRA Programs Branch, Waste Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, GA, 30303-3104; (404) 562-8479.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, please see the immediate final rule published in the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: March 10, 2005.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 05-5721 Filed 3-22-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**48 CFR Part 207 and Appendix D to Chapter 2**

[DFARS Case 2003-D071]

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Component Breakout

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Proposed rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: DoD is proposing to amend the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) to remove procedures for breaking out components of end items for future acquisitions. These procedures will be relocated to the new DFARS companion resource, Procedures, Guidance, and Information. The proposed rule is a result of a transformation initiative undertaken by DoD to dramatically change the purpose and content of the DFARS.

DATES: Comments on the proposed rule should be submitted in writing to the address shown below on or before May 23, 2005, to be considered in the formation of the final rule.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by DFARS Case 2003-D071, using any of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- Defense Acquisition Regulations Web site: <http://emissary.acq.osd.mil/dar/dfars.nsf/pubcomm>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- E-mail: dfars@osd.mil. Include DFARS Case 2003-D071 in the subject line of the message.
- Fax: (703) 602-0350.
- Mail: Defense Acquisition Regulations Council, Attn: Mr. Euclides Barrera, OUSD(AT&L)DPAP(DAR), IMD 3C132, 3062 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-3062.
- Hand Delivery/Courier: Defense Acquisition Regulations Council, Crystal Square 4, Suite 200A, 241 18th Street, Arlington, VA 22202-3402.

All comments received will be posted to <http://emissary.acq.osd.mil/dar/dfars.nsf>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Euclides Barrera, (703) 602-0296.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**A. Background**

DFARS Transformation is a major DoD initiative to dramatically change the purpose and content of the DFARS. The objective is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the