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 1999; Request for Proposals

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

ACTION: Notice of availability of grant funds, request for proposals and request for input.

SUMMARY: Proposals are invited for competitive grant awards under the Special Research Grants Program titled ''Pest Management Alternatives Program: Addressing Food Quality Protection Act Issues for Fiscal Year 1999.'' This program addresses anticipated changes in pest management on food, feed, livestock, and ornamental commodities resulting from implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA).

The goals of this program are to: (1) Develop and demonstrate alternatives and possible mitigation strategies to ensure that crop producers have reliable methods of managing pests; and (2) Develop crop profiles that summarize production practices, pesticide use/usage data, and available pest management alternatives for pesticides considered a high priority for tolerance reassessment under FQPA.

By this notice, the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) additionally solicits stakeholder input from any interested party regarding the FY 1999 solicitation of applications for use in the development of the next request for proposals for this program.

DATES: Proposals are due June 1, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments regarding stakeholder input should be submitted by first-class mail to: Policy and Program Liaison Staff; Office of Extramural Programs; Competitive Research Grants and Awards Management; USDA–CSREES; STOP 2299; 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W.; Washington, D.C. 20250–2299; or via e-mail to: RFP–OEP@reeusda.gov. In your comments, please include the name of the program and the fiscal year request for proposals to which you are responding.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Yaninek, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; Mail Stop 2220; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, D.C. 20250–2220. Telephone: (202) 401–6702; fax number: (202) 401-6869; e-mail address: syaninek@reeusda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

Authority and Eligibility

This program is administered by CSREES, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The authority is contained in section (c)(1)(A) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act, in section 2 of Pub. L. No. 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 three 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 development of pest management tactics 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 the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or voluntary cancellation by the registrant results in the unavailability of certain agricultural pesticides or pesticide uses. These activities pertain to pesticides identified for possible regulatory action under section 210 of the FQPA, Pub. L. No. 104–170, which amends the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. The program has been developed pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between USDA and 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. In this MOU, USDA and EPA agreed to cooperate in conducting the research, technology transfer, and registration activities necessary to address pest management alternatives needed in agriculture. Because of the importance of FQPA, USDA created the Office of Pest Management Policy (OPMP) in 1997 to coordinate FQPA activities within the Department. OPMP found significant gaps in the information available on pesticide use/usage and requested help in developing crop profiles. This program responded in 1998 by linking up with the National Agricultural Pesticide Impact Assessment Program (NAPIAP) to help develop urgently needed crop profiles while continuing the development of critical mitigation strategies. This effort continues in 1999, but will be phased out in the future as the urgency declines and NAPIAP assumes primary responsibility for the profiles.

Applicant Peer Review Requirements

Subsection (c)(5) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. § 450i(c)), as amended by section 212 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (''1998 Act''), Pub. L. No. 105–185, requires applicants to conduct a scientific peer review of a proposed research project in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary prior to the Secretary making a grant award under this authority. Regulations implementing this requirement currently are the subject of a proposed rule making (64 FR 14347, March 24, 1999). The statute requires promulgation of a final rule prior to award of a grant under this program. The proposed rule would impose the following requirements for scientific peer review by applicants of proposed research projects:

1. *Credible and independent.* Review arranged by the grantee must provide for a credible and independent assessment of the proposed project. A credible review is one that provides an appraisal of technical quality and relevance sufficient for an organizational representative to make an informed judgment as to whether the proposal is appropriate for submission for Federal support. To provide for an independent review, such review may include USDA

employees, but should not be conducted solely by USDA employees.

2. *Notice of completion and retention of records.* A notice of completion of the review shall be conveyed in writing to CSREES either as part of the submitted proposal or prior to the issuance of an award, at the option of CSREES. The written notice constitutes certification by the applicant that a review in compliance with these regulations has occurred. Applicants are not required to submit results of the review to CSREES; however, proper documentation of the review process and results should be retained by the applicant.

3. *Renewal and supplemental grants.* Review by the grantee is not automatically required for renewal or supplemental grants as defined in 7 CFR 3400.6. A subsequent grant award will require a new review if, according to CSREES, either the funded project has changed significantly, other scientific discoveries have affected the project, or the need for the project has changed. Note that a new review is necessary when applying for another standard or continuation grant after expiration of the grant term.

4. *Scientific Peer Review.* Scientific peer review is an evaluation of a proposed project for technical quality and relevance to regional or national goals performed by experts with the scientific knowledge and technical skills to conduct the proposed research work. Peer reviewers may be selected from an applicant organization or from outside the organization, but shall not include principal or co-principal investigators, collaborators or others involved in the preparation of the application under review.

Because of the nature of the rule making process, these requirements are subject to change based upon the comments received. Applicants whose proposals are recommended for funding must comply with the review requirements as promulgated in the final rule as a condition precedent to receiving an award under this RFP.

Available Funding

The amount available for support of this program in fiscal year (FY) 1999 is approximately $1,500,000. It is anticipated that EPA will also provide support to the program. Section 711 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999, section 101(a) of Pub. L. No. 105–277, prohibits CSREES from paying indirect costs on competitively awarded research grants that exceed 14 percent of total Federal funds provided for each award under this program.

Applicable Regulations

This program is subject to the administrative provisions for the Special Research Grants Program found in 7 CFR Part 3400, 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. However, where there are differences between this RFP and the administrative provisions, this RFP shall take precedence to the extent that the administrative provisions authorize such deviations. 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 Other Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; and 7 CFR Part 3052—Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.

Program Description

This competitive grants program supports efforts to modify existing pest management approaches or develop new methods that address needs created by the implementation of FQPA. The program also addresses the need for collection of information for regulatory decision making and for prioritization of research and education needs. This information includes crop profiles, pesticide use and usage on commodities (including livestock and ornamentals), potential alternatives for pesticides on EPA's priority list (see Appendix I), integrated pest management programs, pesticide resistance management strategies, and potential mitigation strategies for reducing dietary risk.

In FY 1999, CSREES will provide funding for projects that: (1) Identify and develop replacement or mitigation technologies for pesticides included on EPA's priority list (Appendix I) and/or (2) Develop crop profiles summarizing practices for specific commodities (including livestock and ornamentals) (see Appendix II). Proposals may develop replacement or mitigation technologies (Objective 1), develop crop profiles (Objective 2), or develop both replacement or mitigation technologies and crop profiles. Applicants that address only replacement or mitigation technologies are not restricted to the crops listed in Appendix II, but must document that a crop profile has been or is being developed, or provide compelling evidence otherwise as to the importance of their proposed research.

Proposals will show evidence that producers, commodity groups, and other affected user groups are involved in project design and will be supportive of the project if funded. Public-private partnerships and matching resources from non-Federal sources, including producer or commodity groups, are encouraged. Proposals should show potential for commercialization (including product registration if necessary) of any new technologies that are developed. Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate with staff involved in university Pesticide Impact Assessment Programs (PIAP) and Integrated Pest Management programs to develop crop profiles. The two objectives are described below.

I. Replacement or Mitigation Technologies

The focus should be on modification of existing approaches or introduction of new methods, especially biologically 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, are critical. Both technological and economic feasibility should be considered. Pest management alternatives or risk mitigation options identified should address various risk concerns including dietary, occupational and non-occupational exposure, ground and surface water, and other ecological risks. Applicants must document that a crop profile has been or is being developed for the crop targeted in the proposal, or provide compelling evidence otherwise as to the importance of their proposed research.

II. Crop Profiles

Profiles are needed for commodities (see Appendix II) that depend heavily on pesticides included on EPA's priority list (see Appendix I). Profiles should document the importance of priority pesticides to pest management on the commodities addressed by the proposal. Profiles should describe the production process and provide data on pesticide use (how, why, what, when and where pesticides are used) and usage (how much is used, e.g., percentage crop treated) patterns, pest management practices used by growers, and pest management practices ready for implementation but not yet widely used. Profiles should also indicate whether pesticides on the priority list

(Appendix I) are important to integrated pest management programs or to strategies to manage resistance to other pesticides, and whether there are any potential labeled or unlabeled alternatives (chemical or nonchemical) to replace priority list pesticides on a specific commodity. Alternatives can include other pesticides, biological controls, pest resistant varieties, or cultural practices. In addition, practices or procedures that have the potential to mitigate dietary risk from priority list pesticides should be described. Crop profiles should follow the format presented in Appendix III. Potentially affected growers or commodity groups must be involved in the development of crop profiles. While priority will be given to proposals addressing one or more commodities (see Appendix II) that depend heavily on pesticides included on EPA's priority list (see Appendix I), proposals addressing commodities not included in the list will be considered. Consult the website listed at the end of either Appendix II & III for a current list of crop profiles that are either completed or in progress to avoid duplicate efforts. Profiles must be completed within twelve months after receipt of funding.

Note: The development of replacements for methyl bromide is being supported by other agencies (e.g. see the USDA/ARS website: http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/cgi-bin/ffp.pl/is/np/mba/oct96/epa.htm?methyl bromide alternatives grants#first__hit'') and will not be supported by the Pest Management Alternatives Program.

Proposal Format

Each project description shall 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 section 3400.4(c). The following provisions of this solicitation shall apply. Proposals should adhere to the format requirements for the specific objective addressed by the proposal format below. Items three through six should be no more than 12 pages in length, numbered, and single-spaced with text on one side of the page using a 12 point (10 cpi) type font size and one-inch margins.

(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 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. Identify the commodity(ies) (from the commodity list for crop profiles, Appendix II) and the pesticides (from the priority list, Appendix I) that will be addressed by the proposed project. Proposals can address commodities not listed in Appendix II as long as priority pesticides are used in the production system. Describe the production area addressed (including acreage), frequency and severity of losses to pests controlled with priority pesticides (Appendix I), and the potential applicability to other production regions (if the proposal addresses Objective 1). For crop profiles, provide sources of data and other information on pesticide use, usage patterns, and pest management practices. As appropriate, proposals should address issues as they relate to current integrated pest management and crop production practices, technologic and economic feasibility of potential new practices, and their potential durability.

(5) *Objectives.* Provide clear, concise, complete, and logically arranged statements of the specific aims of the proposed effort.

(6) *Research, Education, and Technology Transfer Plan.* This section is only needed if the proposed project includes development of replacement or mitigation technologies (Objective 1). Proposals 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) *Literature Cited.* A concise list of key references cited in the proposal should be included in this section.

(8) *User Involvement.* Describe role of producers, commodity groups, and other end-users in identifying the need for the work being proposed, and their anticipated involvement in the project if funded. Competitive proposals will demonstrate involvement of affected user groups in project design, implementation, and funding.

(9) *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 complete the proposed project should be listed with the amount and justification for each item.

(10) *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.

(11) *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, or commodity production knowledge or experience with that commodity (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.

(iii) Publication list(s). A chronological list of all publications in refereed journals during the past four 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.

(12) *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 sub-awardee or subcontractor, and should be reflected in the sub-recipient budget.

Note: For projects awarded under the authority of Sec. 2(c)(1)(A) of Pub. L. No. 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.

(13) *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.

(14) *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.

(15) *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 given 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 20 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.

Note: Specific organizational 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.

CSREES Proposal Evaluation

Priority will be given to proposals that address one or more of the commodities listed in Appendix II; however, proposals addressing commodities not included in this list will be considered. Proposals will be evaluated for relevancy (Criterion 1, 25 points) by representatives from USDA, EPA, appropriate farm and commodity organizations, and consumer groups. Methodology and scientific rigor (Criteria 2–6, 75 points) will be evaluated by a panel with appropriate expertise. Panel members will include representatives with appropriate science backgrounds from land-grant universities (including IPM, IR–4, and NAPIAP), USDA, EPA, and other organizations as needed. Funding determinations will come from a rank-ordered list of projects based on the

combined relevancy and scientific merit scores.

Proposals that will only develop Crop Profiles (Objective 2) will be evaluated as a separate group, and will not be scored on potential to reduce reliance (Criterion 4).

The following criteria will be used in evaluating proposals:

1. Relevance to Program Objectives (25 points). Factors that will be considered include: number of crops and pesticides addressed (particularly those listed in Appendices I and II), user involvement in planning and implementation, potential for rapid integration (within 2–3 years) into production practices, and demonstration of consideration of existing IPM programs.
2. Importance of the Problem (Problem Statement) (15 points).
3. Appropriateness of Methods in Meeting Objectives (20 points).
4. Potential to Reduce Reliance (20 points).
5. Level of User Involvement (10 points).
6. Appropriateness of the Budget (10 points).

Confidentiality

CSREES receives grant proposals in confidence and will protect the confidentiality of their contents to the maximum extent permitted by law. Information contained in unfunded proposals will remain the property of the applicant. However, CSREES will retain one copy of all proposals received for a one year period; 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.''

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; Office of Extramural Programs; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mail 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 1999 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 20 copies of a proposal must be submitted. Each copy 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 postmarked by June 1, 1999. Proposals submitted by First Class mail must be sent to the following address: Special Research Grants—Pest Management Alternatives; c/o Proposal Services Unit; Office of Extramural Programs; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; Mail Stop 2245; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250–2245; telephone: (202) 401–5048.

Proposals to be delivered by Express mail, courier service, or by hand must be sent to the following address: Special Research Grants—Pest Management Alternatives; c/o Proposal Services Unit; Office of Extramural Programs; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; Room 303; 901 D Street, SW; Washington, DC 20024; telephone: (202) 401–5048.

Stakeholder Input

CSREES is soliciting comments regarding this solicitation of applications from any interested party. These comments will be considered in the development of the next request for proposals for the program. Such comments will be forwarded to the Secretary or his designee for use in meeting the requirements of section 103(c)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105–185). This section requires the Secretary to solicit and consider input on a current request for proposals from persons who conduct or use agricultural research, education, or extension for use in formulating the next request for proposals for an agricultural research program funded on a competitive basis.

In your comments, please include the name of the program and the fiscal year solicitation of applications to which you are responding. Comments are requested within six months from the issuance of the solicitation of applications. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

Additional 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 Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the collection of information requirements contained in this Notice have been approved under OMB Document No. 0524–0022.

Appendix I

Pesticides—Priority List of Pesticides: pesticides that will be first to undergo review of tolerances by EPA, as required the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996.

Abbreviations: AM = antimicrobial, I = insecticide, F = fungicide, IGR = insect growth regulator, H = herbicide, N = nematicide.

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
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

Commodities—USDA and EPA have determined that production of the following commodities may depend heavily on the pesticides included on the priority list (Appendix I). The possible regulatory impacts of FQPA for these commodities are not known. To answer questions that may arise during FQPA implementation, crop profiles are critical for these commodities. Priority will be given to proposals that address one or more of the commodities on this list.

alfalfa (seed, forage)
artichoke
asparagus
avocado
barley
beans (dry, lima, snap)
beets
blackberry
blueberry
broccoli
brussels sprouts
canola
carrot
cauliflower
celery
citrus
clover seed
cole crops
collards
cranberry
cucumber
date
eggplant
endive
fig
filberts
garlic
green onions
greens
hazelnuts
hops
kale
kiwi
lettuce
livestock
mango
melons
mint
okra
onion
ornamentals (nursery, greenhouse)
parsley
peach
peanut
pear
peas (dry, green, processed)
peppers (bell, sweet, hot)
pineapple
pistachio
potato
pumpkin
radish
spinach
squash
stonefruit
sugarbeet
sweet potato
tomato
turnip
watermelon

Note: Applicants should refer to the National Agricultural Pesticide Impact Assessment Program (NAPIAP) website at: http://ipmwww.ncsu.edu/opmppiap for the latest update of completed and planned crop profiles.

Appendix III

Crop Profiles—FQPA instructs USDA and EPA to obtain pesticide use and usage data on major and minor crops. Of particular importance at this time are use and usage data for the organo-phosphates, carbamates, and possible carcinogens (B1's and B2's). These classes of pesticides have been identified as top priority at EPA for the tolerance reassessment process. These same pesticides are also vital to the production of many of our crops. Because some of these uses may be canceled it is important to identify where we stand now, where we need to be in the future, and what research efforts are needed to get us there as far as pest management practices are concerned. In order to better understand where future research efforts should lead it is necessary first to identify areas of critical need (i.e. those crops or situations where few if any alternative control measures are available to producers). To help USDA and EPA obtain this information ''Crop Profiles'' are being requested. It is the intent that ''profiles'' provide the complete production story for a commodity, including current pest management practices, and look at current research activities directed at finding replacement strategies for the pesticides of concern.

Crop profiles should include typical pesticide use information (not simply what appears on pesticide labels) and for consistency and ease of use should be presented in the following format:

Crop Profile for Commodity in State

Production Facts

- State's ranking in national production of the commodity.
- States contribution to total US production of that commodity (percent).
- Yearly production numbers (total acres grown; total acres harvested; cash value).
- Production costs on a yearly basis.
- Identify percent of crop destined for: fresh market, processing, feed, etc.

Production Regions

- Define the production regions for the commodity within your state.

Cultural Practices

- Describe the cultural practices used for producing this commodity within your state (e.g. Soil types, irrigation practices, land preparation, planting times, thinning practices, etc.).
- Highlight intrastate or regional differences if they exist.

Insect/Mite Control

- Identify and discuss the insect/mite pests on this commodity, include: frequency of occurrence (yearly, sporadic, weather related), the damage they do, percentage of acres infested with the pest (for each growing season or crop cycle), critical timing of control measures, yield losses attributed to each pest.
- Note any regional differences that may occur within your state.

Chemical Controls

- For each pest discussed above identify the active ingredients that are used to manage

that pest, include: chemical name, trade name, formulations, percent crop treated, type of application (aerial, ground, chemigation, banded, broadcast, in-furrow etc.), typical application rates, timing (pre-plant, foliar, 5-leaf stage, etc.), typical number of applications per growing season or crop cycle, typical pre-harvest interval, typical reentry intervals, etc.

- Identify any use of the chemical in IPM programs.
- Identify any use of the chemical in resistance management programs.
- Discuss efficacy issues for each active ingredient.

Alternatives

- Discuss availability and efficacy issues associated with the alternatives for the pest/pesticide combinations discussed above.

Cultural Control Practices

- Identify and discuss any cultural practices (e.g. planting dates, resistant varieties, row spacing) used to manage the pests.

Biological Controls

- Discuss any biological control programs that are relevant for the pest/commodity, include pheromone use if applicable.

Post Harvest Control Practices

- Discuss post harvest management practices that are relevant for the pest/commodity; include preharvest and/or post harvest practices that are used for post harvest pest management.

Other issues

- Discuss any export or food processor restrictions that may limit the use of a given active ingredient or management practice.
- Describe on-going research activities that address a possible replacement strategy for the chemical under discussion. If possible discuss time-frame for implementation.
- Discuss any other relevant issues involving pest management practices used on this commodity.

Weed Control

- Follow same format as for insects/mites.

Disease Control

- Follow same format as for insects/mites.

Nematode Control

- Follow same format as for insects/mites.

Key Contacts

- Identify commodity experts within your state.

Cite References

- Provide the sources for information used in preparing crop profiles.

The Pesticide Impact Assessment Program (PIAP) State Liaison Representative (SLR) will review the draft crop profiles before the final reports are submitted.

Send to: Wilfred Burr (202/720–8647 or wburr@ars.usda.gov), USDA Office of Pest Management Policy, Rm 0110 South Ag. Bldg., 1400 Independence Ave., Washington, DC 20250–0315.

Note: Applicants should refer to the National Agricultural Pesticide Impact Assessment Program (NAPIAP) website at: http://ipmwww.ncsu.edu/opmppiap for examples and the latest update of completed and planned crop profiles.

Done at Washington, DC, on this 19th day of March, 1999.

Colien Hefferan,

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

[FR Doc. 99–7687 Filed 3–29–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–22–P