

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**Cooperative State Research,
Education, and Extension Service****Special Research Grants Program—
Pest Management Alternatives
Research: Special Program
Addressing Food Quality Protection
Act Issues for Fiscal Year 1997;
Request for Proposals**

AGENCY: Cooperative State Research,
Education, and Extension Service,
USDA.

ACTION: Notice of availability of grant
funds and request for proposals

SUMMARY: Proposals are invited for competitive grant awards under the Special Research Grants Program—Pest Management Alternatives Research: Special Program addressing Food Quality Protection Act Issues for fiscal year (FY) 1997. This program addresses anticipated changes in pest management on food and feed crops resulting from pesticide review under the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA), Public Law 104-170. The goal of the program is to develop or identify alternatives for critical needs to insure that crop food producers have reliable methods of managing pest problems. The program has been developed pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) signed August 15, 1994, and amended April 18, 1996, which establishes a coordinated framework for these two agencies to support programs that make alternative pest management materials available to agricultural producers when regulatory action by EPA or voluntary cancellation by the registrant results in the unavailability of certain agricultural pesticides or pesticide uses. In this MOU, USDA and EPA agreed to: (1) Cooperate in supporting the development and implementation of agricultural pest management approaches that are conducted in the most environmentally-sound manner possible, with sufficient pest management alternatives to reduce risks to human health and the environment, to reduce the incidence of pest resistance to pesticides and to ensure economical agricultural production; and (2) cooperate in establishing a process to conduct the research, technology transfer and registration activities necessary to ensure adequate pest management alternatives are available to meet important agricultural needs for situations in which regulatory action

would result in pest management problems.

The emphasis of this program is to develop mitigation strategies and/or pest management alternatives based on use and usage data for pesticides that are considered a high priority for tolerance review and reassessment under FQPA.

DATES: Project grant applications must be received on or before August 4, 1997. Proposals received after August 4, 1997 will not be considered for funding.

ADDRESSES: Proposals sent by First Class mail must be sent to the following address: Proposal Services Unit, Grants Management Branch; Office of Extramural Programs; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; STOP 2245; 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W.; Washington, D.C. 20250-2245. Telephone: (202) 401-5048.

Proposals that are delivered by Express mail, courier service, or by hand must be sent to the following address: Proposal Services Unit, Grants Management Branch; Office of Extramural Programs; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; Room 303, Aerospace Center; 901 D Street, S.W.; Washington, D.C. 20024. Telephone: (202) 401-5048.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Fitzner, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; STOP 2220; 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W.; Washington, D.C. 20250-2220. Telephone: (202) 401-4939; fax number: (202) 401-4888; e-mail address: mfitzner@reeusda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Authority**

This program is administered by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES), USDA. The authority is contained in section 2(c)(1)(A) of the Act of August 4, 1965, Public Law 89-106, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)(1)(A)). Under this authority, subject to the availability of funds, the Secretary may make grants, for periods not to exceed five years, to State agricultural experiment stations, all colleges and universities, other research institutions and organizations, Federal agencies, private organizations or corporations, and individuals for the purpose of conducting research to facilitate or expand promising breakthroughs in areas of the food and agricultural sciences of importance to the United States.

Proposals from scientists affiliated with non-United States organizations

are not eligible for funding nor are scientists who are directly or indirectly engaged in the registration of pesticides for profit; however, their collaboration with funded projects is encouraged.

The Pest Management Alternatives Program was established to support the development and implementation of pest management alternatives when regulatory action by EPA or voluntary cancellation by the registrant results in the unavailability of certain agricultural pesticides or pesticide uses. On January 6, 1997, the program solicited proposals addressing a specific list of pest-crop combinations, and funds have been obligated for proposals recommended for funding by a review panel. The special program described in this second request for proposals will address specific needs anticipated to result from implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996. Approximately, \$400,000 from the Pest Management Alternatives Program with additional funding from EPA is being made available for this request for proposals. Any proposal meeting the criteria under this RFP will be considered for funding provided the eligibility requirements are met.

Available Funding

The amount available for support of this program in FY 1997 is approximately \$700,000. Proposals should be for no more than a two-year period. However, proposals that focus on or the portion of the proposal that focuses on the generation of use and usage data (see "Use and Usage Data Acquisition" section below) must be completed within one year.

Section 712 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997, Public Law 104-180, prohibits CSREES from paying indirect costs on research grants that exceed 14 percent of total Federal funds provided for each award under this program. In addition, section 716(b) of that Act provides that, in the case of any equipment or product that may be authorized to be purchased with funds appropriated under that Act, entities receiving such funds are encouraged to use such funds to purchase only American-made equipment or products.

Applicable Regulations

This program is subject to the administrative provisions for the Special Research Grants Program found in 7 CFR Part 3400 (56 FR 58147, November 15, 1991), which set forth procedures to be followed when submitting grant proposals, rules governing the evaluation of proposals,

the processes regarding the awarding of grants, and regulations relating to the post-award administration of such grants. Other Federal statutes and regulations apply to grant proposals considered for review or to grants awarded under this program. These include, but are not limited to:

7 CFR Part 3019—USDA Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; and

7 CFR Part 3051—Audits of Institutions of Higher Education and Other Nonprofit Institutions.

Program Description

This competitive grants program addresses the need for reliable pesticide use and usage data, and modification of existing approaches or introduction of new methods that can be rapidly brought to bear on pest management challenges. This program was created to meet the policy goals set forth in sections 1439 and 1484 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990, Public Law 101-624. These activities pertain to pesticides identified for possible regulatory action under section 210 of FQPA, that amends the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

CSREES is seeking proposals that address implementation of FQPA through two categories of activity: (1) The acquisition of use and usage data and (2) the identification or development of replacement or mitigation technologies. Proposals to conduct one or both of the following two categories of activity will be accepted.

I. Use and Usage Data Acquisition: Data generation and analyses establishing the scope of potential alternative pest management needs for a large number of crops, especially minor crops, which currently rely on pesticides identified in Appendix I. Data on the actual amount of use and specific use patterns of identified pesticides are desired as are the analyses that will help determine and refine the scope of future research needed to develop mitigation or alternative management strategies. These data and analyses should lead to an improved understanding of how identified pesticides are used on various crops, the role of each pesticide and its particular use pattern for pest management, potential alternative management strategies and associated constraints, and options for mitigating dietary risk through altering use patterns while maintaining the benefits of the pesticide (however, residue

analyses will not be supported with these funds). Emphasis should be placed on the ability to capture data needed by decision-makers in a form that facilitates data entry and that allows manipulation for data analysis and report generation. Proposals for an information management system will be considered. Proposals under this category must complete and provide a final report within one year. Successful applicants will be provided with information to submit use and usage data electronically.

II. Replacement or Mitigation Technologies

Identification and demonstration of pest management alternatives or mitigation procedures for one or more pesticides identified in Appendix I for which there are no effective alternatives. The focus should be on modification of existing approaches or introduction of new methods, especially ecologically-based methods, that can be rapidly brought to bear on pest management challenges resulting from implementation of FQPA. Durability and practicality of the proposed pest management option(s) or mitigation procedure(s), and compatibility with integrated pest management systems is critical. Both technological and economic feasibility should be considered. Pest management alternatives or risk mitigation options identified should address various EPA risk concerns for pesticides being reviewed under FQPA (e.g., dietary or worker exposure, groundwater or ecological risk). Replacements for methyl bromide are not addressed by this request for proposals.

Proposals must show evidence of significant involvement of producers or other pesticide user groups in project design and implementation, including data acquisition and analysis, and the identification of potential solutions. Producers as used herein refers to farmers or users. Public-private partnerships and matching resources from non-Federal sources, including producer or commodity groups, are encouraged. Proposals should describe how state and federal registrations of new pest management options will be obtained when they are required prior to use of new methods.

Proposal Format

Members of review committees and the staff expect each project description to be complete in itself. The administrative provisions governing the Special Research Grants Program, 7 CFR Part 3400, set forth instructions for the preparation of grant proposals. The

following requirements deviate from those contained in § 3400.4(c). The following provisions of this solicitation shall apply. Proposals submitted to the program should address the format requirements described below.

The pages should be numbered. The text must be prepared on only one side of the page, single-spaced, using no type less than 12 point (10 cpi) font size with one-inch margins. Items (3) through (6) should total no more than 12 pages.

(1) *Application for Funding (Form CSREES-661)*. All proposals must contain an Application for Funding, Form CSREES-661, which must be signed by the proposed principal investigator(s) and endorsed by the cognizant Authorized Organizational Representative who possesses the necessary authority to commit the applicant's time and other relevant resources. Principal investigators who do not sign the proposal cover sheet will not be listed on the grant document in the event an award is made. The title of the proposal must be brief (80-character maximum), yet represent the major emphasis of the project. Because this title will be used to provide information to those who may not be familiar with the proposed project, highly technical words or phraseology should be avoided where possible. In addition, phrases such as "investigation of" or "research on" should not be used.

(2) *Table of Contents*. For ease in locating information, each proposal must contain a detailed table of contents just after the proposal cover page. The Table of Contents should include page numbers for each component of the proposal. Pagination should begin immediately following the Table of Contents.

(3) *Executive Summary*. Describe the project in terms that can be understood by a diverse audience of university personnel, producers, various public and private groups, budget staff, and the general public. This should be on a separate page, no more than one page in length and have the following format: Name(s) of principal investigator(s) and institutional affiliation, project title, key words and project summary.

(4) *Problem Statement*. Identify the pest management problem addressed, its significance and options for solution. Define the scope of the proposed project in terms of the number of pesticide products and commodities to be evaluated. Describe the production area addressed by the proposed solution and the potential applicability to other production regions. This includes the documentation of uses and use patterns, evaluation of significant reduction of risk to human health or the

environment; viable alternatives; and potential losses that will occur without the alternative(s) or mitigation procedures being developed under this proposal.

(5) *Rationale and Significance.*

Provide explicit documentation on the basis and rationale for the proposed project, including pesticide use, timing of application, rates of application, pest pressure and other use parameters that are documented in various crop production regions (See Appendix II). Environmental issues, human safety, or resistance management concerns should be addressed, as appropriate, if they are expected to be impacted by cancellation or revision of tolerances under FQPA. Compatibility with current integrated pest management (IPM) and crop production practices, technologic and economic feasibility and potential durability should be addressed.

(6) *Research, Education and Technology Transfer Plan.* Each proposal should provide a detailed plan for the research, education and technology transfer required to implement the alternative solution in the field, and should identify milestones.

(7) *User Involvement.* Provide documentation on producer or other pesticide user involvement in identification of the proposed solution and involvement in implementing the proposed solution. Involvement of producers or other pesticide users either through funding, proposal development, or project performance, is mandatory for funding.

(8) *Facilities and Equipment.* All facilities and major items of equipment that are available for use or assignment to the proposed research project during the requested period of support should be described. In addition, items of nonexpendable equipment necessary to conduct and successfully conclude the proposed project should be listed with the amount and justification for each item.

(9) *Collaborative Arrangements.* If the nature of the proposed project requires collaboration or subcontractual arrangements with other research scientists, corporations, organizations, agencies, or entities, the applicant must identify the collaborator(s) and provide a full explanation of the nature of the collaboration. Funding contributions by collaborators that will be used to accomplish the stated objectives should be identified. Evidence (i.e., letters of intent) should be provided to assure peer reviewers that the collaborators involved have agreed to render this service. In addition, the proposal must indicate whether or not such a

collaborative arrangement(s) has the potential for conflict(s) of interest.

(10) *Personnel Support.* To assist peer reviewers in assessing the competence and experience of the proposed project staff, key personnel who will be involved in the proposed project must be clearly identified. For each principal investigator involved, and for all senior associates and other professional personnel who are expected to work on the project, whether or not funds are sought for their support, the following should be included:

(i) An estimate of the time commitments necessary;

(ii) Curriculum vitae. The curriculum vitae should be limited to a presentation of academic and research credentials, e.g., educational, employment and professional history, and honors and awards. Unless pertinent to the project, to personal status, or to the status of the organization, meetings attended, seminars given, or personal data such as birth date, marital status, or community activities should not be included. Each vitae shall be no more than two pages in length, excluding the publication lists; and

(iii) Publication List(s). A chronological list of all publications in referred journals during the past five years, including those in press, must be provided for each professional project member for whom a curriculum vitae is provided. Authors should be listed in the same order as they appear on each paper cited, along with the title and complete reference as these items usually appear in journals.

(11) *Budget.* A detailed budget is required for each year of requested support. In addition, a summary budget is required detailing requested support for the overall project period. A copy of the form which must be used for this purpose, Form CSREES-55, along with instructions for completion, is included in the Application Kit and may be reproduced as needed by applicants. Funds may be requested under any of the categories listed, provided that the item or service for which support is requested may be identified as necessary for successful conduct of the proposed project, is allowable under applicable Federal cost principles, and is not prohibited under any applicable Federal statute. However, the recovery of indirect costs under this program may not exceed the lesser of the grantee institution's official negotiated indirect cost rate or the equivalent of 14 percent of total Federal funds awarded. This limitation also applies to the recovery of indirect costs by any subawardee or subcontractor, and should be reflected in the subrecipient budget.

Note: For projects awarded under the authority of Section 2(c)(1)(A) of Public Law 89-106, no funds will be awarded for the renovation or refurbishment of research spaces; the purchase or installation of fixed equipment in such spaces; or for the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of a building or facility.

(12) *Research Involving Special Considerations.* If it is anticipated that the research project will involve recombinant DNA or RNA research, experimental vertebrate animals, or human subjects, an Assurance Statement, Form CSREES-662, must be completed and included in the proposal. Please note that grant funds will not be released until CSREES receives and approves documentation indicating approval by the appropriate institutional committee(s) regarding DNA or RNA research, animal care, or the protection of human subjects, as applicable.

(13) *Current and Pending Support.* All proposals must contain Form CSREES-663 listing this proposal and any other current public or private research support (including in-house support) to which key personnel identified in the proposal have committed portions of their time, whether or not salary support for the person(s) involved is included in the budget. Analogous information must be provided for any pending proposals that are being considered by, or that will be submitted in the near future to, other possible sponsors, including other USDA programs or agencies. Concurrent submission of identical or similar proposals to other possible sponsors will not prejudice proposal review or evaluation by the Administrator of CSREES for this purpose. However, a proposal that duplicates or overlaps substantially with a proposal already reviewed and funded (or that will be funded) by another organization or agency will not be funded under this program.

(14) *Additions to Project Description.* The Administrator of CSREES, the members of peer review groups, and the relevant program staff expect each project description to be complete while meeting the page limit established in this section (Proposal Format). However, if the inclusion of additional information is necessary to ensure the equitable evaluation of the proposal (e.g., photographs that do not reproduce well, reprints, and other pertinent materials that are deemed to be unsuitable for inclusion in the text of the proposal), then 14 copies of the materials should be submitted. Each set of such materials must be identified with the name of the submitting organization, and the name(s) of the

principal investigator(s). Information may not be appended to a proposal to circumvent page limitations prescribed for the project description. Extraneous materials will not be used during the peer review process.

(15) *Organizational Management Information.* Specific management information relating to an applicant shall be submitted on a one-time basis prior to the award of a grant for this program if such information has not been provided previously under this or another program for which the sponsoring agency is responsible. If necessary, USDA will contact an applicant to request organizational management information once a proposal has been recommended for funding.

Compliance With the National Environmental Policy Act

As outlined in 7 CFR Part 3407 (CSREES's implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*)), the environmental data or documentation for any proposed project is to be provided to CSREES in order to assist CSREES in carrying out its responsibilities under NEPA. In some cases, however, the preparation of environmental data or documentation may not be required. Certain categories of actions are excluded from the requirements of NEPA. The USDA and CSREES exclusions are listed in 7 CFR 1b.3 and 7 CFR 3407.6, respectively.

In order for CSREES to determine whether any further action is needed with respect to NEPA (e.g., preparation of an environmental assessment (EA) or environmental impact statement (EIS)), pertinent information regarding the possible environmental impacts of a proposed project is necessary; therefore, the National Environmental Policy Act Exclusions Form (Form CSREES-1234) provided in the Application Kit must be included in the proposal indicating whether the applicant is of the opinion that the project falls within one or more of the categorical exclusions. Form CSREES-1234 should follow Form CSREES-661, Application for Funding, in the proposal.

Even though a project may fall within the categorical exclusions, CSREES may determine that an EA or an EIS is necessary for an activity, if substantial controversy on environmental grounds exists or if other extraordinary conditions or circumstances are present that may cause such activity to have a significant environmental effect.

Proposal Evaluation

Proposals will be evaluated by the Administrator of CSREES assisted by a peer panel with IPM expertise and ad hoc reviewers. Representatives from affected user groups, IR-4, the National Agricultural Pesticide Impact Assessment Program (NAPIAP), and EPA will serve as ad hoc reviewers. Proposals will be evaluated with the following criteria:

1. Relationship to implementation of FQPA—10 points.

An evaluation of how well the proposal relates to issues of implementation of FQPA and how it may be used by producers and various public and private groups in changing management systems in response to FQPA. The proposal should have practical usefulness in implementing FQPA and should result in a better understanding of the importance of the identified pesticide(s) to each commodity.

2. Appropriateness of the Budget—5 points.

An evaluation of appropriate and detailed budget request and collaborative funding to accomplish the proposed project; collaborative arrangements must be clearly documented.

3. Problem Statement, Background and Rationale—15 points.

Includes the documentation of uses and use patterns, evaluation of significant reduction of risk to human health or the environment; evaluation of existing alternatives; and documentation of significant potential losses likely to occur without the alternative(s) or mitigation procedures being developed under this proposal.

4. Methodology—20 points.

Evaluation of a detailed plan for data acquisition and analysis (Category I) or research (Category II). For Category II, a summary of past research or extension activities that demonstrate the practicability of the proposed alternative(s), including evaluation of whether the proposed solutions could rapidly be brought to bear on critical problems and whether registration considerations are addressed where they are required implementation of alternatives.

5. Education and Technology Transfer—20 points. A plan on how results will be shared and utilized by key producer groups, governmental and non-governmental agencies, etc.

6. User Involvement—15 points. Evaluation includes user involvement in the identification of uses, use patterns and risk mitigation procedures; potential approaches to solutions and

the opportunity for public/private partnerships and matching resources from producer or commodity groups.

7. Integration of Ecologically-Based Solutions—15 points. Includes the evaluation of ecologically-based alternatives as partially or fully effective solutions to the pest management problems being addressed and an analysis of the durability and the technologic and economic feasibility of the proposed alternatives. This criterion only applies to proposals, or sections of proposals, that will identify or develop replacement or mitigation technologies (category II).

Note: Proposals to document use and usage patterns and proposed solutions should not exceed one year.

CSREES receives grant proposals in confidence and will protect the confidentiality of their contents to the maximum extent permitted by law. Information contained in unsuccessful proposals will remain the property of the applicant. However, CSREES will retain for one year one file copy of all proposals received; extra copies will be destroyed.

When a proposal results in a grant, it becomes a part of the public record, available to the public upon specific request under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Information that the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be of a privileged nature will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Therefore, any information that the applicant wishes to have considered as privileged should be clearly marked by the applicant with the term "confidential proprietary information."

Programmatic Contact

For additional information on the program, please contact: Dr. Michael Fitzner; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; STOP 2220; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-2220; Telephone: (202) 401-4939; Fax Number: (202) 401-4888; E-mail address: mfitzner@reeusda.gov.

How To Obtain Application Materials

Copies of this solicitation, the administrative provisions for the Program (7 CFR Part 3400), and the Application Kit, which contains required forms, certifications, and instructions for preparing and submitting applications for funding, may be obtained by contacting: Proposal Services Unit, Grants Management Branch; Office of Extramural Programs; Cooperative State Research, Education,

and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; STOP 2245; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-2245; Telephone: (202) 401-5048. When contacting the Proposal Services Unit, please indicate that you are requesting forms for the Special Research Grants Program—Pest Management Alternatives Research: Special Program Addressing Food Quality Protection Act Issues.

Application materials may also be requested via Internet by sending a message with your name, mailing address (not e-mail) and telephone number to psb@reeusda.gov that states that you wish to receive a copy of the application materials for the FY 1997 Special Research Grants Program, Pest Management Alternatives Research: Special Program Addressing Food Quality Protection Act Issues. The materials will then be mailed to you (not e-mailed) as quickly as possible.

Proposal Submission

What To Submit

An original and 14 copies of a proposal must be submitted. Each copy of each proposal must be stapled securely in the upper left-hand corner (Do Not Bind). All copies of the proposal must be submitted in one package.

Where and When To Submit

Proposals must be received on or before August 4, 1997. Proposals sent by First Class mail must be sent to the following address: Proposal Services Unit, Grants Management Branch, Office of Extramural Programs, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Stop 2245, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-2245, Telephone: (202) 401-5048.

Proposals that are delivered by Express mail, a courier service, or by hand must be submitted to the following address (note that the zip code differs from that shown above): Proposal Services Unit, Grants Management Branch; Office of Extramural Programs; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; Room 303, Aerospace Center; 901 D Street, SW., Washington, DC 20024; Telephone: (202) 401-5048.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For reasons set forth in the final rule-related Notice to 7 CFR Part 3015, Subpart V (48 FR 29115, June 24, 1983), this program is excluded from the scope of Executive Order No. 12372 which

requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Action of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3504(h)), the collection of information requirements contained in this Notice have been approved under OMB Document No. 0524-0022.

Done at Washington, DC, on this 12th day of June, 1997.

B.H. Robinson,

Administrator, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.

Appendix I—Pesticides Addressed by the 1997 Special Research Grants Program, Pest Management Alternatives Research: Special Program Addressing Food Quality Protection Act Issues

F = fungicide I = insecticide H = herbicide AM = antimicrobial N = nematocide

Organophosphates

Acephate—I
Azinphos-methyl—I
Bensulide—H
Chlorethoxyfos—I
Chlorpyrifos—I
Chlorpyrifos methyl—I
Coumaphos—I
DEF—Defoliant
Diazinon—I
Dichlorvos -I
Dicrotophos—I
Dimethoate—I
Disulfoton—I
Ethion—I
Ethoprop -I, N
Ethyl parathion—I
Fenamiphos—I, N
Fenitrothion—I
Fenthion—I
Fonofos -I
Fosamine ammonium—plant growth regulator
Isofenphos—I
Malathion -I
Methamidophos—I
Methidathion—I
Methyl parathion—I
Naled—I
Oxydemeton methyl—I
Phorate—I
Phosmet—I
Phostebupirim—I
Pirimiphos methyl -I
Profenofos—I
Propetamphos—I
Sulfotepp—I
Sulprofos—I
Temephos—I
Terbufos—I
Tetrachlorvinphos—I

Trichlorfon—I
Carbamates
2EEEBC—F
Aldicarb—I, N
Asulam—H
Bendiocarb—I
Benomyl—F
Carbaryl—I
Carbendazim—F
Carbofuran—I, N
Chlorpropham—H
Desmidipham—H
Fenoxycarb—I
Formetanate HC—I
Methiocarb—I
Methomyl—I
Oxamyl—I, N
Phenmedipham—H
Propamocarb hydrochloride—F
Propoxur—I
Thiodicarb—I
Thiophanate methyl—F
Troysan KK—AM, F
Potential Carcinogens (B1's and B2's)
Acetochlor—H
Aciflourfen sodium—H
Alachlor—H
Amitrol—H
Cacodylic acid—H
Captan—F
Chlorothalonil—F
Creosote—wood preservative
Cyproconazole—F
Daminozide (Alar)—growth retardant
ETO—fumigant, sterilant
Fenoxycarb—IGR
Folpet—F
Formaldehyde—fumigant, germicide
Heptachlor—I
Iprodione—F
Lactofen—H
Lindane—I
Mancozeb—F
Maneb—F
Metam sodium—F, I, H, N, soil fumigant
Metiram—F
MGK repellent—repellent, synergist
Orthophenylphenol—AM, F, virucide
Oxythioquinox—I
Pentachlorophenol—F
Pronamide—H
Propargite—I
Propoxur—I
Propylene oxide—AM, I, F
Telone—N, soil fumigant
Terrazole—F
Thiodicarb—I
TPTH—F
Vinclozolin—F

APPENDIX II.—INFORMATION NEEDED/USEFUL FOR USE AND USAGE DATA

| Assessment | Dietary | Occupational | Residential (lawn and structural treatments) | Environmental—Water | Environmental—Non-target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Usage/Use Data | % crop treated max. application info. (rate, # applications, timing). Typical application info (when available). | Acres treated acres treated: commercial v. private applicators (if info available), concentration, formulation, personal protective equipment (PPE), restricted entry interval (REI), max. application information (rate, timing, frequency, methods). | Use directions from product labels (frequently use directions and limitations are unclear or unspecified). Quantities used (information frequently not available or not reliable). | Acres treated, concentration, formulation, application information (rate, timing, frequency, method). | Acres treated, concentration, formulation, application information (rate, timing, frequency, method). |
| Information Useful in Evaluation of Risk Reduction from Risk Mitigation Measures. | Information about typical use —number of application, rates, timing, % crop treated, regional use information, alternative pesticides and pest control methods, actual residue levels, efficacy of reduced rates. | Typical application methods, rates, timing, duration of application, season when applied, use by private v. commercial applicators, typical application equipment—closed cabs, etc., efficacy of reduced rates. | Total amount used amounts, finished spray applied, % sites treated, methods of application, formulations/packaging, efficacy of reduced rates. | Geographical use information (by region, state, county), soil vulnerability data (depth to water table, soil characteristics), efficacy of reduced rates. | Geographical use information, typical use information, methods of application, alternative pesticides and pest control methods, efficacy of reduced rates, season when applied. |

[FR Doc. 97-15912 Filed 6-17-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-22-P