

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 165.T09–0910 to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–0910 Safety Zone; Fox River, Brown County Fireworks, Green Bay, WI.

(a) *Location.* All navigable waters of Fox River within a 210-foot radius of the approximate launch position at 44°31.0167' N, 088°01.016' W (NAD 83).

(b) *Effective and enforcement period.* This rule is effective and will be enforced from 7 p.m. through 7:30 p.m. on October 26, 2018.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into, transiting, or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or a designated on-scene representative.

(2) This safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or a designated on-scene representative.

(3) The “on-scene representative” of the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan to act on his or her behalf.

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone must contact the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or an on-scene representative to obtain permission to do so. The Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or an on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with all directions given to them by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or an on-scene representative.

Dated: October 2, 2018.

Thomas J. Stuhlreyer,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port.

[FR Doc. 2018–22845 Filed 10–18–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R08–OAR–2018–0309 and EPA–R10–OAR–2018–0316: FRL–9985–28–Region 8 and Region 10]

Determination of Attainment by the Attainment Date and Clean Data Determination for the Logan, UT-ID 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} Nonattainment Area

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is finalizing a determination of attainment by the attainment date and a clean data determination (CDD) for the 2006 24-hour fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) Logan, Utah (UT)-Idaho (ID) nonattainment area. These determinations are based upon quality-assured, quality-controlled and certified ambient air monitoring data for the period 2015–2017, available in the EPA’s Air Quality System (AQS) database, showing that the area has attained the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Based on the final determination that the Logan, UT-ID nonattainment area is currently attaining the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS, the EPA is also issuing the final determination that the obligation for Utah and Idaho to make submissions to meet certain Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act) requirements related to attainment of the NAAQS for this area is not applicable for as long as the area continues to attain the NAAQS. Additionally, the sanctions and Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) clocks triggered by the partial disapproval of the contingency measure element for the Idaho portion of the Logan, UT-ID PM_{2.5} State Implementation Plan (SIP) will be suspended.

DATES: This final rule is effective on October 19, 2018.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established dockets for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R08–OAR–2018–0309 and/or Docket ID No. EPA–R10–OAR–2018–0316. All documents in the docket are listed on the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., 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 through <http://www.regulations.gov>, or please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section for additional availability information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Crystal Ostigaard, Air Program, EPA, Region 8, Mail Code 8P–AR, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, Colorado 80202–1129, (303) 312–6602, ostigaard.crystal@epa.gov, or Matthew Jentgen, Air Planning Unit, Office of Air and Waste (OAW–150), EPA, Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, Seattle, Washington 98101; (206) 553–0340; jentgen.matthew@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, wherever “we”, “us” or “our” is used, it is intended to refer to the EPA.

I. Background

On October 17, 2006 (71 FR 61144), the EPA revised the level of the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS, lowering the primary and secondary standards from the 1997 standard of 65 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) to 35 µg/m³. On November 13, 2009 (74 FR 58688), the EPA designated several areas as nonattainment for the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS of 35 µg/m³, including the Logan, Utah UT-ID nonattainment area.

On July 17, 2018 (83 FR 33886), the EPA proposed to determine, based on the most recent 3 years (2015–2017) of valid data,¹ that the Logan, UT-ID nonattainment area has attained the 2006 primary and secondary 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS by the December 31, 2017 attainment date. In addition, based on the CDD, the EPA also proposed to determine that the obligation to submit any remaining attainment-related SIP revisions arising from classification of the Logan, UT-ID area as a Moderate nonattainment area under subpart 4 of part D (of title I of the Act) for the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS is not applicable so long as the area continues to attain the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Additional detail can be found in the July 17, 2018 (83 FR 33886) proposed action.

II. Response to Comments

The EPA received eight public comments on the proposed action. Three of the comments related to forestry practices and wildfire management, primarily in California. One comment related to child labor practices in South America. One comment related to homelessness in California. Another comment discussed

¹ Meeting the requirements of 40 CFR part 50, appendix N, and part 58.

water quality issues in Venezuela. Finally, one comment raised issues concerning lead-based paint. None of these seven comments recommended that the EPA take a different action than the EPA proposed on July 17, 2018 (83 FR 33886). The eighth comment was received from the Idaho Conservation League (ICL) and raised issues relevant to this action, which are addressed below. After reviewing the comments received, the EPA has determined that the comments, with the exception of the ICL comment, fall outside the scope of our proposed action or fail to identify any material issue necessitating a response.

The ICL comment raises concerns regarding monitoring data trends at the Franklin, ID and, to a lesser extent, the Smithfield, UT sites. The comment states that the 3-year average (2015–2017) at the Franklin, ID monitoring site was $30 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$; however, the 98th percentile rose each year (18.8, 33.3, and $38.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, respectively). The commenter briefly mentions the Smithfield, UT monitor and how the 98th percentiles for the three years (2015–2017) rose too, but to a lesser extent. The comment also asserts that if the 2018 monitoring data at the Franklin, ID site yields a 98th percentile measurement of greater than $33.4 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (the commenter observes that this measurement is not unreasonable for this site), then the 2016–2018 design value would exceed the standard of $35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The commenter requests that the EPA address why the year-to-year increases in $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ is occurring, and what regulatory measures are in place to prevent this area from violating again.

In accordance with section 188(b)(2) of the CAA, the EPA is required to determine within 6 months of the applicable attainment date whether a nonattainment area attained the standard by that date. On September 8, 2017, the EPA extended the attainment date for the Logan, UT-ID $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ nonattainment area to December 31, 2017, upon which the EPA proposed a determination of attainment. A determination of attainment is not equivalent to a redesignation, and the states must still meet the statutory requirements for redesignation in order for the area to be redesignated to attainment. The comment may be referring to a redesignation rather than a determination that the area attained by the attainment date and/or a CDD, so the EPA reiterates that the designation status of the area will remain nonattainment for the 2006 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS, until such time as the EPA determines that the area meets the CAA

requirements for redesignation to attainment in CAA section 107(d)(3)(E).

The EPA has established regulations for determining if the 24-hour $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS has been met at 40 CFR 50.13 and part 50, appendix N, section 4.2. Specifically, under 40 CFR 50.13 and part 50, appendix N, section 4.2, the 2006 24-hour $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS is met when the 24-hour $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS design value at each eligible monitoring site is less than or equal to $35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Three years of valid annual $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ 98th percentile mass concentrations generally are required to produce a valid design value. The regulations do not require that there be a downward trend over the course of the three years used to calculate the design value. Rather, according to part 50, appendix N, section 4.5, the design value is an average of the three years of valid annual $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ 98th percentile mass concentrations. Thus, the process the EPA uses to calculate a design value accounts for the fluctuations in 98th percentiles at the Logan, UT and Smithfield, UT monitoring sites. Following the requirements of 40 CFR 50.13 and part 50, appendix N, the EPA determined that the design values at both the Smithfield, UT and Franklin, ID monitors are below $35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, thus the proposed determination of attainment by the attainment date and the proposed CDD are appropriate.

Also, the 3-year design values are lower for the time period used for this attainment determination compared to the time period when the area was designated nonattainment. The Logan, UT design value used for designations² was $36 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (2006–2008). The first period when both the Logan, UT and Franklin, ID monitors had valid design values was in 2008–2010, when the Logan, UT monitor recorded a $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ 24-hour concentration of $43 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and the Franklin, ID monitor was $46 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. In comparison, the most recent design value (2015–2017) is $33 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for the Logan, UT monitor and $30 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for the Franklin, ID monitor, which shows attainment. Moreover, since being designated as a Moderate nonattainment area in 2009, Utah and Idaho have adopted and implemented reasonably available control measures (RACM), including reasonably available control technologies (RACT), on sources of direct $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ precursors. Based on the overall trend towards attainment since the area was designated as nonattainment in 2009, as well as the implementation of RACM on sources in the nonattainment area, it is unlikely the area will re-violate the 24-hour

$\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS. Furthermore, as described in detail in our proposal notice, should the area subsequently violate the 24-hour $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS, in accordance with 40 CFR 51.1015(a)(2), the EPA would rescind the CDD, and Utah and Idaho would be obligated to submit a SIP revision to address any deficiencies. Therefore, the EPA is finalizing our action as proposed.

III. Final Action

Pursuant to CAA section 188(b)(2), the EPA is finalizing a determination, based on the most recent 3 years (2015–2017) of valid data, that the Logan, UT-ID nonattainment area has attained the 2006 primary and secondary 24-hour $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS by the December 31, 2017 attainment date.

In addition, the EPA is finalizing a determination that the obligation to submit any remaining attainment-related SIP revisions arising from classification of the Logan, UT-ID area as a Moderate nonattainment area under subpart 4 of part D (of title I of the Act) for the 2006 24-hour $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS are not applicable under the Clean Data Policy for so long as the area continues to attain the 2006 24-hour $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS. See 40 CFR 51.1015(a). In particular, the obligation for Utah and Idaho to submit attainment demonstrations, projected emissions inventories, RACM (including RACT), reasonable further progress (RFP) plans, motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEB), quantitative milestones, and contingency measures, for the Logan, UT-ID area are suspended until such time as: (1) The area is redesignated to attainment, after which such requirements are permanently discharged; or (2) the EPA determines that the area has re-violated the $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS, at which time the state shall submit such attainment plan elements for the Moderate nonattainment area by a future date to be determined by the EPA and announced through publication in the **Federal Register** at the time the EPA determines the area is violating the $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ NAAQS.

As discussed in the 2015 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ SIP Requirements Rule,³ the nonattainment base emissions inventory required by section 172(c)(3) is not suspended by this determination because the base inventory is a requirement independent of planning for an area's attainment. See 81 FR 58009 at 58028 and 58127–8; 80 FR 15340 at 15441–2. Additionally, Nonattainment New Source Review

³ On August 24, 2016, the EPA finalized the Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards: State Implementation Plan Requirements (“ $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ SIP Requirements Rule”), 81 FR 58010.

² November 13, 2009 (74 FR 58688).

(NNSR) requirements are discussed in the PM_{2.5} SIP Requirements Rule, and required by CAA sections 110(a)(2)(C); 172(c)(5); 173; 189(a); and 189(e), and are not being suspended by a CDD because this requirement is independent of the area's attainment planning. See 81 FR 58010 at 58107 and 58127.

This determination does not invalidate any prior actions that the EPA has made on any Moderate PM_{2.5} area attainment plan elements that were submitted by either the State of Utah or the State of Idaho for the Logan, UT-ID Moderate PM_{2.5} area attainment plans. This action does not preclude either state from submitting, nor the EPA from acting on, the suspended attainment plan elements. As a result of this final action, the sanctions and Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) clocks triggered by the partial disapproval of the contingency measure element of the Idaho portion of the Logan, UT-ID PM_{2.5} SIP are suspended.

This final action does not constitute a redesignation of the Logan, UT-ID nonattainment area to attainment for the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS under CAA section 107(d)(3) because we have not yet approved a maintenance plan for Logan, UT-ID as meeting the requirements of section 175A of the CAA or determined that the area has met the other CAA requirements for redesignation. The classification and designation status in 40 CFR part 81 remains Moderate nonattainment for this area until such time as the EPA determines that Utah and Idaho have met the CAA requirements for redesignation to attainment for the Logan, UT-ID nonattainment area.

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(d), the EPA finds there is good cause for these determinations to become effective immediately upon publication in the **Federal Register**. The expedited effective date for these actions is authorized under both 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1), which provides that rule actions may become effective less than 30 days after publication if the rule "grants or recognizes an exemption or relieves a restriction," and 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), which allows an effective date less than 30 days after publication "as otherwise provided by the agency for good cause found and published with the rule." As noted above, this determination of attainment will result in a suspension of the requirements for Idaho and Utah to submit attainment demonstrations, projected emissions inventories, RACM (including RACT), RFP plans, MVEB, quantitative milestones, and contingency measures, so long as the Logan, UT-ID area continues to attain the PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

Furthermore, the sanctions and FIP clocks triggered by the partial disapproval of the contingency measure element of the Idaho portion of the Logan, UT-ID PM_{2.5} SIP are suspended. The suspension of these requirements and the suspension of sanctions is sufficient reason to allow an expedited effective date of this rule under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1). In addition, the suspension of the obligations of Idaho and Utah to make submissions for these requirements provides good cause to make this rule effective on the date of publication of this action in the **Federal Register**, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3). The purpose of the 30-day waiting period prescribed in 5 U.S.C. 553(d) is to give affected parties a reasonable time to adjust their behavior and prepare before the final rule takes effect. Where, as here, the final rule suspends requirements rather than imposes obligations, affected parties, such as Idaho and Utah, do not need time to adjust and prepare before the rule takes effect.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action finalizes a determination of attainment based on air quality and suspends certain federal requirements, and thus would not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For this reason, this final action:

- Is not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Is not expected to be an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because this action is not significant under Executive Order 12866;
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);
- Does not have federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or

safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and
- Does not provide the EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, the SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where the EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

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. The EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by December 18, 2018. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: September 27, 2018.

Douglas H. Benevento,

Regional Administrator, Region 8.

Dated: September 27, 2018.

Chris Hladick,

Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 2018-22284 Filed 10-18-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 180**

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0531; FRL-9984-63]

Prothioconazole; Pesticide Tolerances

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of prothioconazole in or on rapeseed subgroup 20A. Bayer CropScience requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

DATES: This regulation is effective October 19, 2018. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before December 18, 2018, 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: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0531, is available at <http://www.regulations.gov> or at the Office of Pesticide Programs Regulatory Public Docket (OPP Docket) in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), West William Jefferson Clinton Bldg., Rm. 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460-0001. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305-5805. Please review the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Goodis, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460-0001; main telephone number: (703) 305-7090; email address: RDfRNNotices@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. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

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

B. How can I get electronic access to other related information?

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of EPA's tolerance regulations at 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Publishing Office's e-CFR site at http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl.

C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. 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-2017-0531 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All objections and requests for a hearing must be in writing, and must be received by the Hearing Clerk on or before December 18, 2018. Addresses for mail and hand delivery of objections and hearing requests are provided in 40 CFR 178.25(b).

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 (excluding any Confidential Business Information (CBI)) for inclusion in the public docket.

Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. Submit the non-CBI copy of your objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0531, by one of the following methods:

• **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

• **Mail:** OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460-0001.

• **Hand Delivery:** To make special arrangements for hand delivery or delivery of boxed information, please follow the instructions at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets/contacts.html>. Additional instructions on commenting or visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

II. Summary of Petitioned-For Tolerance

In the **Federal Register** of February 27, 2018 (83 FR 8408) (FRL-9972-17), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP 7F8596) by Bayer CropScience, LP2, T.W. Alexander Dr., Research Triangle Park, NC 27709. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.626 be amended by establishing tolerances for residues of the fungicide prothioconazole, 2-[2-(1-chlorocyclopropyl)-3-(2-chlorophenyl)-2-hydroxypropyl]-1,2-dihydro-3H-1,2,4-triazole-3-thione, and its desthio metabolite in or on rapeseed subgroup, Crop subgroup 20A at 0.15 parts per million (ppm). That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Bayer CropScience, the registrant, which is available in the docket, <http://www.regulations.gov>. Comments were received on the notice of filing. EPA's response to these comments is discussed in Unit IV.C.

Based upon review of the data supporting the petition, EPA is establishing the tolerance requested by the petitioner as Rapeseed subgroup 20A, to be consistent with the commodity terminology commonly used by the Agency.

III. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the