the decision and further production and use might have been allowed during the appeal process. In addition, Amvac had agreed to conduct a recall of mevinphos products in the hands of dealers and distributors. If the Agency had to mandate a recall rather than utilize a voluntary recall, it would have had to do so through a rulemaking process which can take more time to implement than the voluntary program agreed to by Amvac. Finally, the Agency anticipated that a safer alternative, NTN, would be registered by end of 1994 that would have mitigated the economic impact on growers from the loss of mevinphos. Weighing the risk and benefit outlined above, the Agency believed that it was in the public's interest to enter into the agreement with Amvac that is reflected in the July 1, 1994 Cancellation Order.

On June 29, 1994, California imposed some additional restrictions on mevinphos use. The specific restrictions were not known to the Agency at the time it came to agreement with Amvac. It is now the Agency's understanding that these restrictions possibly along with other factors such as low pest pressure lead to significantly less use of mevinphos during the rest of 1994. Consequently, there was significantly more mevinphos product in the hands of growers, dealers, and distributors than originally anticipated by the Agency on July 1, 1994. Because of the quantity of existing stocks in the channels-of-trade, Amvac indicated there were substantial difficulties and costs associated with the recall program and it expressed reluctance to undertake such an extensive recall. If the product was not recalled in a timely manner pursuant to a voluntary recall, then the potential for illegal use and risk associated with possession of a potential hazardous waste would be greater than expected. In addition, the safer alternative that the Agency expected to be available by the end of 1994 has yet to be registered. Consequently, the economic impact of enforcing the existing stocks provisions of the July 1, 1994 Cancellation Order would have been greater than originally anticipated. The potential for greater existing stocks at all levels in the channels-of-trade for a longer time and greater potential economic impacts than originally anticipated were considerations for the Agency extending the last date for distribution, sale, and use of existing stocks on January 13, 1995.

In addition to extending the use of existing stocks, the Agency also required that additional protective measures for the use of mevinphos, a relabelling program, and an expanded recall of mevinphos products be carried out by Amvac. The protective measures are intended to reduce exposure during the extended use period. Product in the hands of dealers and distributors will be relabelled to include the new protective measures, information on the recall, including an 800 number, and the last legal use date. Amvac has agreed to recall and reimburse any person possessing any unopened mevinphos product produced by Amvac or by supplemental registrants, even stocks held by growers, to accept mevinphos products produced by other companies including Dupont, Shell, and Helena and to accept opened containers of mevinphos product. A voluntary recall that includes opened and partially filled containers and goes down through the end-user is unprecedented. Because of the recall which includes reimbursement provisions, growers are less likely to have a potential hazardous waste for an extended period. This plan reduces potential accidental poisonings and the opportunity for illegal use in the future. The minimization of the holding of hazardous waste, accidental poisonings, and illegal use along with the imposition of additional protective measures for workers were important benefits contributing to the Agency's decision.

The Agency believes that the amount of mevinphos product used by November 30, 1995, will likely be no more than the amount originally anticipated when the Agency entered into the agreement with Amvac on July 1, 1994. This level of use combined with the requirement for additional protective measures for those using the product during the extended use period leads the Agency to believe that exposure to agricultural workers from the continued use of mevinphos will be no greater, and likely less, than the Agency anticipated in July of 1994.

An additional benefit associated with the new arrangement is that it allows the Agency to avoid the uncertainty associated with litigation over the cancellation and recall.

The Agency has considered the risks and benefits of extending the distribution, sale, and use of existing stocks of products containing mevinphos. When the risk of continued use through November 30, 1995, is weighed against the benefits, both economic and in terms of risk reduction, the Agency believes that the agreement signed on January 13, 1995, was in the best interest of the public.

Dated: March 27, 1995.

Daniel M. Barolo,

Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–8344 Filed 4–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

[FEMA–1046–DR]

(California); Amendment to Notice of a Major Disaster Declaration

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of California, (FEMA–1046–DR), dated March 12, 1995, and related determinations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 24, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pauline C. Campbell, Response and Recovery Directorate, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–3606.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The notice of a major disaster for the State of California dated March 12, 1995, is hereby amended to include the following areas among those areas determined to have been adversely affected by the catastrophe declared a major disaster by the President in his declaration of March 12, 1995:

Alameda, Alpine, Calaveras, Contra Costa, Merced, San Francisco, San Joaquin, and San Mateo Counties for Individual Assistance and Public Assistance.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.516, Disaster Assistance)

Richard W. Krimm,

Associate Director, Response and Recovery Directorate.

[FR Doc. 95–8248 Filed 4–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718–02–M

Changes to the Hotel and Motel Fire Safety Act National Master List

AGENCY: United States Fire Administration, FEMA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA or Agency) gives notice of additions and corrections/changes to, and deletions from, the national master list of places of public accommodations which meet the fire prevention and control guidelines under the Hotel and Motel Fire Safety Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 5, 1995.