

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 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.

VII. 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: September 18, 2006.

James Jones,

Director, 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 180.617 is added to read as follows:

§ 180.617 Metconazole; tolerances for residues.

(a) *General.* Tolerances are established for the residue of the fungicide metconazole (5-[(4-chlorophenyl)methyl]-2,2-dimethyl-1-(1*H*-1,2,4-triazol-1-ylmethyl)cyclopentanol) in or on the following commodity:

Commodity	Parts per million
Banana ¹	0.1

¹ No U.S. registration as of August 30, 2006.

(b) *Section 18 emergency exemptions.* [Reserved]

(c) *Tolerances with regional registrations.* [Reserved]

(d) *Indirect or inadvertent residues.* [Reserved]

[FR Doc. 06–8256 Filed 9–26–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2005–0058; FRL–8091–5]

Ethaboxam; Pesticide Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes a tolerance for residues of ethaboxam in or on grape at 6.0 parts per million (ppm), with no U.S. registration. Landis International, Inc., agent for LG Life Sciences, Ltd. 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 September 27, 2006. Objections and

requests for hearings must be received on or before November 27, 2006, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2005–0058. All documents in the docket are listed in the index for the docket. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information (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 in the electronic docket at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or, if only available in hard copy, at the OPP Regulatory Public Docket in Rm. S–4400, One Potomac Yard (South Building), 2777 S. Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. The 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:

Bryant Crowe, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (703) 305–0025; e-mail address: crowe.bryant@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?

In addition to accessing an electronic copy of this **Federal Register** document through the electronic docket at <http://www.regulations.gov>, you may access this **Federal Register** document electronically through the EPA Internet under the "**Federal Register**" listings at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr>. You may also access a frequently updated electronic version of 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's pilot e-CFR site at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/ecfr>.

C. Can I File an Objection or Hearing Request?

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. You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0058 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 November 27, 2006.

In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in 40 CFR part 178, please submit a copy of the filing that does not contain any CBI for inclusion in the public docket that is described in **ADDRESSES**. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. Submit your copies, identified by docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0058, by one of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- **Mail:** Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) Regulatory Public Docket (7502P),

Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001.

- **Delivery:** OPP Regulatory Public Docket (7502P), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. S-4400, One Potomac Yard (South Building), 2777 S. Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. Deliveries are only accepted during the Docket's normal hours of operation (8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays). Special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The Docket Facility telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

II. Background and Statutory Findings

In the **Federal Register** of July 6, 2005 (70 FR 38918) (FRL-7719-3), EPA issued a notice pursuant to section 408(d)(3) of FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP 4E6863) by LG Life Sciences, Ltd., c/o Landis International, Inc., P.O. Box 5126, Valdosta, GA 31603-5126. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.622 be amended by establishing a tolerance for residues of the fungicide ethaboxam, *N*-(cyano-2-thienylmethyl)-4-ethyl-2-(ethylamino)-5-thiazolecarboxamide, in or on grape, grape juice, and raisins at 6.0 ppm. That notice included a summary of the petition prepared by the registrant LG Life Sciences, Ltd., c/o Landis International, Inc. There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the tolerance is "safe." Section 408(b)(2)(A)(ii) of FFDCA defines "safe" to mean that "there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information." This includes exposure through drinking water and in residential settings, but does not include occupational exposure. Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to "ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue...."

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 <http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/trac/science>.

III. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Consistent with section 408(b)(2)(D) of 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 and to make a determination on aggregate exposure, consistent with section 408(b)(2) of FFDCA, for a tolerance for residues of ethaboxam on grape at 6.0 ppm. Studies examining the transfer of ethaboxam to processed grape commodities (e.g., grape juice, raisins) show that some concentration of ethaboxam may occur during the production of raisins and grape juice; however, the supported tolerance of 6.0 ppm for grape is sufficient to cover the potential for residues in the processed commodities, and separate tolerances for these commodities are not needed. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with establishing the tolerance follows.

A. Toxicological Profile

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered its validity, completeness, and reliability as well as the relationship of the results of the studies to human risk. EPA has also considered available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers, including infants and children. Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the toxic effects caused by ethaboxam as well as the no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL) and the lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) from the toxicity studies can be found in the electronic docket (docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0058) for this rule at <http://www.regulations.gov> or <http://www.epa.gov/oppr001/factsheets>.

B. Toxicological Endpoints

For hazards that have a threshold below which there is no appreciable risk, the dose at which no adverse effects are observed (the NOAEL) from the toxicology study identified as appropriate for use in risk assessment is used to estimate the toxicological level of concern (LOC). However, the lowest dose at which adverse effects of concern are identified (the LOAEL) is sometimes used for risk assessment if no 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.

The linear default risk methodology (Q*) is the primary method currently used by the Agency to quantify non-

threshold hazards such as cancer. The Q* approach assumes that any amount of exposure will lead to some degree of cancer risk, estimates risk in terms of the probability of occurrence of additional cancer cases. More information can be found on the general principles EPA uses in risk

characterization at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/riskassess.htm> and <http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/trac/science>.

A summary of the toxicological endpoints for ethaboxam used for human risk assessment is shown in Table 1. of this unit:

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

Exposure/Scenario	Dose Used in Risk Assessment, Interspecies and Intraspecies and any Traditional UF	Special FQPA SF and Level of Concern for Risk Assessment	Study and Toxicological Effects
Acute Dietary (Females 13–49 years of age)	NOAEL = 30 mg/kg/day UF = 100 Acute RfD = 0.3 mg/kg/day	Special FQPA SF = 1 aPAD = acute RfD/Special FQPA SF = 0.3 mg/kg/day	Developmental Toxicity Rat LOAEL = 100 mg/kg/day based on abnormal liver lobation
Acute Dietary (General population including infants and children)	NOAEL = N/A UF = N/A Acute RfD = N/A	Special FQPA SF = N/A aPAD = acute RfD/Special FQPA SF = N/A	No appropriate endpoint attributable to a single dose identified. LOAEL = N/A
Chronic Dietary (All populations)	NOAEL = 5.5 mg/kg/day UF = 100 Chronic RfD = 0.055 mg/kg/day	Special FQPA SF = 1 cPAD = chronic RfD/Special FQPA SF = 0.055 mg/kg/day	Combined Chronic/Carcinogenicity-Rat LOAEL = 16.4 mg/kg/day based on effects observed in the male reproductive organs (testes, epididymides, prostate, and seminal vesicles).
Cancer (oral, dermal, inhalation)	N/A	N/A	The Agency classified ethaboxam as having “suggestive evidence of carcinogenicity.”

C. Exposure Assessment

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* Risk assessments were conducted by EPA to assess dietary exposures from ethaboxam in food as follows:

i. *Acute exposure.* Quantitative acute dietary exposure and risk assessments are performed for a food-use pesticide, if a toxicological study has indicated the possibility of an effect of concern occurring as a result of a one-day or single exposure. No such effects were identified in the toxicological studies for ethaboxam that pertain to the general population including infants and children; however, an effect of concern was identified for females, 13–49 years of age. Therefore, a quantitative acute dietary exposure assessment was necessary for females, 13–49 years of age.

ii. *Chronic exposure.* In conducting the chronic dietary exposure assessment EPA used the Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model software with the Food Commodity Intake Database (DEEM-FCID™), which incorporates food consumption data as reported by respondents in the USDA 1994–1996 and 1998 Nationwide Continuing Surveys of Food Intake by Individuals (CSFII), and accumulated exposure to the chemical for each commodity. The following assumptions were made for the chronic exposure assessment:

Chronic dietary analysis is based on the tolerance level residues and an assumption that 100% of the crop will be treated.

iii. *Cancer.* The Agency classified ethaboxam as having “suggestive evidence of carcinogenicity.” The Agency concluded that the quantification of carcinogenic potential is not required.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* This petition is not associated with an application to register ethaboxam uses in the U.S. Ethaboxam is proposed for use on fruit commodities that may be imported into the U.S., thus, the source of exposure expected for ethaboxam is solely from residues in food. Consequently, an exposure assessment that includes ethaboxam residues in drinking water is not warranted at this time.

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

4. *Cumulative effects from 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.”

Unlike other pesticides for which EPA has followed a cumulative risk approach based on a common mechanism of toxicity, EPA has not made a common mechanism of toxicity finding as to ethaboxam and any other substances and ethaboxam 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 ethaboxam 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 policy statements released by EPA’s Office of Pesticide Programs concerning common mechanism determinations and procedures for cumulating effects from substances found to have a common mechanism on EPA’s website at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/cumulative>.

D. Safety Factor for Infants and Children

1. *In general.* Section 408 of 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 based on reliable data 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. In applying this provision, EPA either retains the default value of 10X when reliable data do not support the choice of a different factor, or, if reliable data are available, EPA uses a different additional safety factor value based on the use of traditional uncertainty factors and/or special FQPA safety factors, as appropriate.

2. *Prenatal and postnatal sensitivity.* There is evidence of increased qualitative susceptibility in the rat developmental and reproduction studies. Considering the overall toxicity profile and the doses and endpoints selected for risk assessment for ethaboxam, the degree of concern for prenatal and postnatal effects observed in the studies is low based on the following: The developmental/offspring effects observed in the studies are well characterized and occur in the presence of maternal toxicity; a clear NOAEL has been identified in both of the studies; and there are no residual uncertainties for pre-and/or postnatal toxicity. Furthermore, the toxicology endpoint established for risk assessment is based on a lower NOAEL than the reproductive NOAEL, and thus is considered protective of developmental/offspring effects.

3. *Conclusion.* The Agency recommends that the FQPA safety factor be reduced to 1X because there are no/low concerns and no residual uncertainties with regard to pre- and post-natal toxicity. Although there was evidence of increased qualitative susceptibility observed in rat developmental and reproduction studies, the studies submitted adequately address questions regarding pre- and post- natal toxicity, and the developmental/offspring effects observed in the studies are well characterized (clear NOAELs established). The toxicology endpoint established for risk assessment is based

on a lower NOAEL than the reproductive NOAEL, and is considered protective of the developmental/offspring effects observed. In addition, the toxicology endpoint established for risk assessment is also considered protective of the male reproductive alterations observed in the toxicology database. There is a complete toxicity database for ethaboxam and exposure data are complete or are estimated based on data that reasonably accounts for potential exposures.

E. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety

1. *Acute risk.* Using the exposure assumptions discussed in this unit for acute exposure, the acute dietary exposure from food to ethaboxam will occupy 10% of the aPAD for the U.S. population and 4% of the aPAD for females 13 years and older.

2. *Chronic risk.* Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for chronic exposure, EPA has concluded that exposure to ethaboxam from food will utilize 6% of the cPAD for the U.S. population, 9% of the cPAD for all infants less than 1 year of age, and 31% of the cPAD for children 1–2 years of age. There are no residential uses for ethaboxam that result in chronic residential exposure to ethaboxam.

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).

Ethaboxam is not registered for use on any sites that would result in residential exposure or residues in drinking water. Therefore, the aggregate risk is the sum of the risk from food only, which does not exceed the Agency's level of concern.

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

Ethaboxam is not registered for use on any sites that would result in residential exposure or residues in drinking water. Therefore, the aggregate risk is the sum of the risk from food only, which does not exceed the Agency's level of concern.

5. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* The Agency classified ethaboxam as having "suggestive evidence of carcinogenicity based on Leydig cell tumors observed in male rats." The Agency has determined that potential human risk to Leydig cell tumorigenesis would not be expected at exposure levels that do not cause tumors in rats. The NOAEL and LOAEL

selected for the chronic reference dose (cRfD) is based on reproductive toxicity observed at lower doses than the Leydig cell tumor response. Thus, the cRfD would be protective of the cancer effects.

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 ethaboxam residues.

IV. Other Considerations

A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

Adequate enforcement methodology (HPLC/MS) 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 currently no established Codex, Canadian, or Mexican maximum residue levels (MRLs) for ethaboxam.

V. Conclusion

Therefore, an imported tolerance is established for residues of ethaboxam, N-(cyano-2-thienylmethyl)-4-ethyl-2-(ethylamino)-5-thiazolecarboxamide, in or on grape at 6.0 ppm. Studies examining the transfer of ethaboxam to processed grape commodities (e.g., grape juice, raisins) show that some concentration of ethaboxam may occur during the production of raisins and grape juice; however, the supported tolerance of 6.0 ppm for grape is sufficient to cover the potential for residues in the processed commodities, and separate tolerances for these commodities are not needed.

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This final rule establishes a tolerance under section 408(d) of FFDCA in response to a petition submitted to the Agency. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled *Regulatory Planning and Review* (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Because this 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 petition under section 408(d) of FFDCA, such as the tolerance in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) do not apply. 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 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.

VII. 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: September 13, 2006.

James Jones,

Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

■ Therefore, 40 CFR part 180 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 180.622 is added to read as follows:

§ 180.622 Ethaboxam; tolerances for residues.

(a) *General.* Tolerances are established for residues of ethaboxam, N-(cyano-2-thienylmethyl)-4-ethyl-2-(ethylamino)-5-thiazolecarboxamide in or on the following commodity:

Commodity	Parts per million
Grape ¹	6.0

¹ There is no U.S. registration as of September 27, 2006

(b) *Section 18 emergency exemptions.* [Reserved]

(c) *Tolerances with regional registrations.* [Reserved]

(d) *Indirect or inadvertent residues.* [Reserved]

[FR Doc. 06–8176 Filed 9–26–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2006–0036; FRL–8089–6]

p-Chlorophenoxyacetic acid, Glyphosate, Diflufenoxat, and Hexazinone; Tolerance Actions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is revoking certain tolerances for the plant growth regulator *p*-chlorophenoxyacetic acid and the herbicide hexazinone. Also, EPA is modifying certain tolerances for the plant growth regulator *p*-chlorophenoxyacetic acid and the herbicides glyphosate, diflufenoxat, and hexazinone. In addition, EPA is establishing new tolerances for the herbicides diflufenoxat and hexazinone.

DATES: This regulation is effective September 27, 2006. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before November 27, 2006, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2006–0036. All documents in the docket are listed in the index for the docket. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business