destruction of controlled substances and special exemptions beyond the phaseout of class I controlled substances through reporting requirements that are designed to:

(1) Satisfy U.S. obligations under the international treaty, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and fulfill statutory obligations under CAA section 603(b);

(2) Report to Congress on the production, use and consumption of class I and class II controlled substances as statutorily required in Section 603(d) of the CAA;

(3) Ensure compliance with the exempted limits on production, import, export after the phaseout and ensure a level playing field for those companies allocated allowances for these exemptions; and

(4) Address Federal and industry concerns regarding illegal imports of newly produced and previously used controlled substances that are undercutting U.S. markets.

The information submitted to EPA is maintained in a Tracking System that allows the Agency:

(1) to maintain control over total production and consumption of controlled substances to satisfy conditions of the CAA and fulfill U.S. obligations under the Protocol, and

(2) to monitor compliance with limits and restrictions on production, imports, exports and specific exemptions to the control of class I and class II controlled substances.

EPA uses the information to direct special attention to illegal activities associated with the import of both newly produced and previously used substances and the avoidance of the tax on these chemicals, such activities make the substances more available, reduce the incentive to shift to alternatives, and penalize companies who are complying with U.S. laws. EPA is an active part of the Federal inter-agency taskforce conducting nationwide enforcement actions. The information provided to EPA in response to the accelerated phaseout regulations often form the basis for cases.

Burden Statement: The following is a Table summarizing the burden hours for compiling information and submitting it to EPA Headquarters:

Collection activity	Number of respondents	Responses/respondent	Total responses	Hours per response	Total hours
Producer's Report	8	4	32	16	512
Importer's Report	6	4	24	16	384
Notification of Trade	2	1	2	2	4
Export Report	10	1	10	120	1,200
Lab Certification	1,000	1	1,000	1	1,000
Class II Report	14	4	56	16	896
Transformation & Destruction	15	1	15	120	1,800
Essential Use &	12	4	48	32	1,536
Lab Suppliers	25	4	100	32	3,200
Total hours					10,532

This estimate includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Respondents/Affected Entities: Producers, importers, transhippers, and exporters of ozone-depleting substances.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1092.

Frequency of Response: quarterly.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 10,532 hours.

Estimated Total Annualized Cost Burden: $0.

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques to the following addresses. Please refer to EPA ICR No. 1432.16. and OMB Control No. 2060–0170 in any correspondence.

Ms. Sandy Farmer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, OPPE Regulatory Information Division (2137), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460 and

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

Joseph Retzer,

Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 96–20111 Filed 8–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[FRL–5548–6]

Stakeholders' Meeting on Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Implementation Issues

ACTION: Notice of Stakeholders' Meeting on Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Implementation Issues and Request for Additional Implementation Issues.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing a stakeholder's meeting for reviewing WET implementation issues to be held on September 24–26, 1996 at the Georgetown University Conference Center. WET implementation issues which were raised by stakeholders at a May 16, 1996 scoping meeting are described below. EPA is soliciting additional issues for discussion at the September 1996 meeting.

DATES: The stakeholders' meeting on WET implementation issues is scheduled for Tuesday, September 24, through Thursday, September 26, 1996. Meeting attendees should register by August 30, in order to allow EPA to plan facilitation of breakout sessions. Additional implementation issues should be submitted on or before September 3, 1996 to Debra Denton, EPA, via fax at (415) 744–1873 or electronic mail: denton.debra@epamail.epa.gov.

ADDRESSES: The stakeholders' meeting will be held at the Georgetown University Conference Center in Washington, DC. To pre-register for the meeting, please fax your first and second preferences for breakout sessions along with your name, title,

organization, mailing address, phone number, fax number, and E-mail address (if available) to (703) 903–1374, attention Ms. Betty Peterson, Science Applications International Corporation, 1710 Goodridge Drive Mail Stop 1–11–7, McLean, Virginia 22102; phone number (703) 917–8240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: To reserve a room for the meeting, contact Georgetown University Conference Center, 3800 Reservoir Road, NW, Washington, DC 20057; to reserve single rooms @ $108 + 13% DC tax + $1.50 occupancy tax and double rooms @ $133 + 13% DC tax + $1.50 occupancy tax. Rates will be guaranteed until September 3, 1996. Parking is $8/day for hotel guests and other conference participants. Phone: (202) 687–3200, fax (202) 687–3291.

Transportation from the area airports can be made by: contacting the Washington Flyer to arrange shuttle service from Washington National and Washington Dulles Airports at (703) 685–1400.

The blue Georgetown University Transportation Service (GUTS) Shuttle from Dupont Circle Metro and Rosslyn Metro to the Leavy Center at Georgetown University runs: 6:15 am to 9:30 am every 15 minutes and 9:45 am to 8:40 pm every hour. Cost is $1.00. Phone: (202) 687–4364.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Draft Agenda

Tuesday, September 24, 1996

11:00–1:00 pm Registration and pick up meeting package
1:00–3:00 pm Plenary session, goals and ground rules
3:00–5:00 pm Breakout sessions to discuss and prioritize issues

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

8:00–12:00 am Continuation of breakout sessions
12:00–1:00 pm Lunch
1:00–4:00 pm Continuation of breakout sessions
4:00–5:00 pm Large group session

Thursday, September 26, 1996

8:00–12:00 pm Breakout sessions
12:00–1:00 pm Lunch
1:00–5:00 pm Large group session presentations and next steps
5:00 pm Adjourn

Background

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program utilizes Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing and monitoring to ensure that ''no toxics in toxic amounts'' will be discharged into the Nation's waters. Over the past few years, a number of issues have arisen as a result of increasing experience with WET limits and monitoring requirements. EPA is undertaking a series of initiatives designed to make any appropriate ''mid-course'' adjustments reflecting the science underlying WET, as well as to better support ongoing WET implementation. During September 1995, the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC) sponsored a workshop on WET in Pellston, Michigan. This workshop was co-funded by the American Industrial Health Council, the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies, and EPA. The purpose of the Pellston Workshop was for nationally recognized scientists from government, academia and industry to look at the scientific basis of the WET program. SETAC will publish written proceedings from this workshop shortly. EPA held an open forum on December 5, 1995, in Crystal City Virginia to report results of the Pellston WET Workshop to interested stakeholders. At that time, EPA promised to hold an open meeting to discuss the implementation issues surrounding WET.

Today, EPA is announcing a stakeholders' meeting for reviewing WET implementation issues to be held on September 24–26, 1996 at the Georgetown Conference Center in Washington, DC. The purpose of this meeting is to examine issues surrounding the implementation of the WET program. EPA will consider all the points raised, but the Agency cannot make policy decisions at this meeting. The Agency will, however, develop a follow-up action plan at the conclusion of the meeting. In the interim, it is EPA's position that the WET program is technically and scientifically based and that the options and suggestions resulting from the implementation meeting being announced today will only serve to strengthen the existing WET program.

In order to prepare for the September meeting, the Agency held a small group scoping meeting on May 16, 1996. EPA invited States, environmental groups, and members of the regulated community to attend this meeting. The attendees at the small group WET scoping meeting included the American Auto Manufacturers Association (AAMA), the American Forestry and Paper Association (AFPA), National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI), the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies (AMSA), the American Petroleum Institute (API), the Western Coalition of Arid States (WESTCAS), and the EPA. At this scoping meeting the participants listed out the issues which were of most concern to their organizations with respect to WET implementation. A summarized list of these WET implementation issues raised at the May 16, 1996 scoping meeting follows and is broken out into four categories: Water Quality Criteria/ Standards; Exposure Assumptions; NPDES Permits; and Enforcement/Compliance issues.

Water Quality Criteria/Standards Issues

1. Narrative vs. numeric WET criteria: With respect to WET: (1) Should EPA guidance clarify that State and Tribal WET criteria can be written as narrative with implementation procedures (e.g., no toxics in toxic amounts) or numeric (e.g., 1.0 TUc, chronic toxic unit), or on a case-specific basis? (2) Should different segments of a waterbody have different water quality standards, which vary in criteria or beneficial uses? (3) How should toxicity, which does not cause an exceedance of a water quality standard, be addressed?

2. Duration, frequency and magnitude criteria components: With respect to WET: (1) Are the current criteria protective for saltwater, estuarine, intermittent or variable flow discharges? How should these factors be considered in criteria development (e.g., should duration of the criteria be made consistent with the exposure period used in the tests and permit limits?). (2) Since most chronic test durations have become abbreviated from 30 to 7 days, should the acute and chronic toxicity criteria be re-defined to be made consistent with the toxicity test method frequency? (3) Should EPA re-evaluate the toxic unit definitions, data supporting the one hour duration period for acute criteria and the once in 3 year exceedance frequency exposure and re-emphasize support of inhibition concentration response (IC25) in determining test results.

3. Flexibility vs. consistency in WET criteria: (1) Where is the balance between flexibility and consistency in the application of WET criteria? (2) Is it necessary for test species to be indigenous to the receiving water? (3) Is it appropriate to allow testing with resident species (considering species-specific sensitivity to classes of toxicants) and appropriate designated uses? (4) Is there flexibility in conducting a reasonable potential analysis for WET?

4. Independent Application Policy: (1) What options are there for using WET as an indicator of water quality? (2) What options are available for consideration

of ''weight-of-evidence'' instead of independent applicability of biological assessments, WET results, and chemical analyses? (3) What does the data show with respect to WET tests predicting in-stream effects in waters having low chronic toxicity or in waters that are effluent dependent?

Exposure Assumption Issues

1. WET-specific exposure issues: Identify issues that are specific to WET as opposed to those that are in common for other parameters (e.g., exposure assumptions may be difficult for storm water discharges or for characterizing ephemeral streams)?

2. Critical flows and modeling inputs: What critical flows and types of models (e.g., dynamic models for ocean discharges) should be used in assessing exposure and beneficial use designation?

3. Application of mixing zones for WET: What are the applications (e.g., critical flows) and limitations for WET mixing zones in saltwater, freshwater, storm events, and flash floods? Should WET criteria be applied at the end-of-pipe? Under what circumstances is it appropriate to apply WET criteria at the end-of-pipe instead of allowing a mixing zone?

4. Balancing exposure assumptions with test duration: Is it necessary that toxicity test method duration match expected the criteria exposure duration?

5. Balancing test method dilution water with receiving water characteristics: (1) What test species should be used when testing a freshwater discharge to an estuarine water body, especially when testing at high effluent concentrations? (Sometimes ionic imbalances can contribute to the observed WET toxicity.) (2) Will EPA reconsider the use of synthetic water which lacks the hardness, organic content, and other attenuating capacities of natural, upstream water? (3) Should test methods be conducted to take into account site-specific factors, such as ionic characteristics of receiving water?

NPDES Permit issues

1. Expression of WET limits: (1) How should WET test method variability be addressed or accounted for when reporting WET test results? (2) Should permit limits be expressed in terms of toxicity units (e.g., TUa, TUc) or should percentage of effluent (e.g., must meet at 75% effluent) be used? (3) Can permit limits account for toxic effects of ionic imbalance? (4) Should the averaging period for WET limits be consistent with the exposure period of the tests (e.g., acute WET as a 48-hour average rather than a daily maximum) or should EPA increase daily maximums to compensate for the shorter exposure period? (5) Are acute toxicity end-of-pipe limits at 1.0 acute toxic unit (TUa) or greater scientifically valid? (6) Do magnitude and exposure assumptions (e.g., 7Q10 flows vs. continuous flows or Monte Carlo models) used to develop limits reflect actual exposure? (7) How are WET limits applied to effluents discharging into intermittent and effluent-dominated streams? (8) Should permits in arid areas monitor only for acute effects if chronic limits are inappropriate and the flow is beneficial?

2. Fair notice in permit: (1) Should permits contain specific language stating what the permittee needs to do to comply with the permit requirements (vs. providing cites to regulations)? (2) How much detail is desirable? (3) Can EPA change the discharge monitoring report with respect to the certification that WET test results are accurate, because ''there is no true value [in WET tests] from which to measure deviations and to determine bias or accuracy (54 FR 50218)?''

3. Re-evaluate/define reasonable potential determinations: (1) Do small data sets critically affect the flexibility available for conducting a reasonable potential analysis? (2) Are there alternative method detection levels/quantitation levels for WET test methods which can be used in reasonable potential determinations? (3) Will reasonable potential determinations eliminate setting permit limits for water quality not limited to discharge quality?

4. Water conservation leading to toxicity—conflicting environmental goals: How should conflicting environmental goals be reconciled? For example, water conservation is not encouraged with end-of-pipe limits.

5. Tiered procedures for TRE/TIEs—cross-over to enforcement: (1) Can EPA provide guidance on when to set permit limits, establish monitoring, and begin TIE/TREs? (2) How could EPA address inconclusive TIEs/TREs? (3) Should permits only require a trigger for further testing or conducting a TIE/TRE instead of penalties? (4) Should the test species used in the toxicity identification evaluations (TIEs) or toxicity reduction evaluations (TREs) be the same test species used for NPDES compliance testing? (5) Should TIE and TRE procedures only use methods with standard and/or codified guidelines?

6. Low chronic toxicity: (1) Since many discharges have improved the quality of their discharges, the focus is moving from acute to chronic toxicity. Can EPA identify procedures to determine when apparent exceedences are caused by test variation and treatment plant fluctuations (effluent variability) and procedures for TIEs/TREs to identify and remove toxicants? (2) Evaluate whether the NOEC level may be set at >90% effluent? (3) Can chronic WET tests be used as a monitoring trigger for increased monitoring and conducting a TIE/TRE as opposed to a permit limit? (4) What are the technical limits of TIE/TRE in reducing chronic toxicity to acceptable levels?

7. Ubiquitous pollutants: What are effective ways in the permit process to deal with ubiquitous pollutants (e.g., diazinon, chlorpyrifos) that have been identified in the TRE/TIE process?

8. EPA-approved chemicals causing toxicity: (1) How could the approval process for pesticides and other chemicals (e.g., treatment additives) be reconciled with the permitting process? (2) Can permit limits for total dissolved solids or chlorides replace a WET limit when common salts are the toxicants?

9. Correlate permit limits to exposure assumptions: (1) How could permit limits be more realistically linked to exposure assumptions? (2) Can EPA encourage wider use of available exposure models? Can WET limits have mixing zones to reflect allowable dilution?

10. IU WET limits to POTWs: Should WET limits be applied to industrial users (IUs), and if so, how can test results account for downstream POTW treatment processes?

11. Reevaluation of toxic units: Which statistical endpoint is best for expressing toxicity (e.g., no observed effect concentration or effect concentration? What allowed effect or inhibition concentration (e.g., IC25) is appropriate?

12. Analytical variability in reporting (quantitation/detection issues): (1) What are the best and technically available ways to deal with test variability? (2) Are there options for addressing test-specific inter-laboratory variability in order to account for test variability in permit limits?

13. Application of test methods in permits: (1) Are non-lethal chronic endpoints equivalent to acute endpoints? (2) Is it possible to either establish test precision criteria for test methods or determine the lowest reliable level response? (3) Can EPA methods specify culture media in order to improve the health of cultures and reliable endpoints? (4) Can EPA determine the accuracy of all WET test methods? (5) How does EPA justify the *Selenastrum* 4-day growth test use of EDTA except in tests with metals

present? If algal growth test results cannot predict toxicity in a reservoir, will EPA restrict use of certain test species in large water bodies? (6) How to address toxicity caused by artifacts of the test methods. (7) How should WET testing be conducted when in-stream conditions differ substantially from WET toxicity test methods (e.g., temperature, hardness)?

Compliance and Enforcement Issues

1. Single exceedance: (1) Are there alternatives for dealing with a single test failure that results in a WET limit exceedance (e.g., further testing and TIE/TRE where appropriate, as agreed to by regulatory agencies and permittees)? (2) Can EPA evaluate the Pellston findings that concluded that usually episodic exceedances (especially one chronic test failure) would not impact the receiving system? (3) Will one violation be subject to enforcement actions?

2. Inconclusive TRE/TIEs: (1) How should inconclusive (i.e., no sources of toxicity identified) TRE/TIEs be treated by regulatory authorities? (2) Should more guidance be given on what is an acceptable TIE/TRE? (3) Should a pattern of toxicity be observed before compliance actions are initiated? (4) How should low level chronic toxicity be addressed when conducting a TIE?

3. Test/data variability in determining compliance: (1) How should EPA consider data variability when determining compliance (especially since laboratories with low test variability are more likely to detect test failure)? (2) For a LC50 value greater than 100 percent effluent, how should compliance be determined? (3) Should EPA provide a laboratory certification for WET testing and a more rigorous test acceptance criteria program?

4. Fair notice (cross over w/permits). How should permits be written to bring closure to (successful/unsuccessful) TIE/TREs?

5. ''Good actor'' relief in TIE/TRE: When WET limits continue to be exceeded while TIE/TRE is being conducted, is the permittee subject to enforcement action?

6. Ability to track permit conditions: Narrative limits could be viewed differently than numeric limits.

7. Treatment chemicals causing toxicity: How can compliance determinations account for use of EPA-registered pesticides or common salts causing ionic imbalance toxic effects from salinity?

Dated: July 31, 1996.

Michael B. Cook,

Director, Office of Wastewater Management.

[FR Doc. 96–20114 Filed 8–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[OPP–64031; FRL–5385–9]

Iprodione on Cowpeas; Proposed Voluntary Cancellation of Registration

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of Receipt of Request to Cancel and Proposed Cancellation Order.

SUMMARY: This notice announces that EPA has received a request from Rhone-Poulenc AG Company to cancel the use of iprodione on cowpeas. Under section 6(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136d(f)(1)), EPA must announce the receipt of such requests and allow public comment before approving them. The registrant has requested that the comment period for this cancellation request be waived. However, the Agency will provide the public an opportunity to comment on the request and proposed cancellation order. The agency accepted Rhone-Poulenc AG Company's proposed program to relabel existing stocks and stocks of iprodione that were in the channels of trade when other amendments to the iprodione registrations (i.e., amendments that are not subject to this Notice) were approved. Relabeling was completed by May 31, 1996.

DATES: Public comment on the use deletion will be accepted until September 6, 1996.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit comments to Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, deliver comments to room 1132, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by docket number [OPP–64031]. No ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository libraries. Additional information on electronic submissions can be found below in this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail, Vivian Prunier, Review Manager, Special Review Branch, Special Review and Reregistration Division (7508W), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Third floor, Westfield Building, 2800 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA (703) 308–8034, e-mail: prunier.vivian@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Request for Voluntary Cancellation of Use

Under section 6(f) of the Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)(7 U.S.C. 136d(f)(1)), a registrant may at any time request that any of its pesticide registrations be canceled or be amended to delete one or more uses. Section 6(f) of FIFRA requires the Administrator to publish a notice of receipt of the request and allow public comment before approving such request. The Administrator may waive the comment period prior to issuing an order if the registrant requests a waiver or if the continued use of the pesticide would pose an unreasonable adverse effect on the environment.

On March 14, 1996, Rhone-Poulenc AG Company requested amendments to the registrations of its iprodione products (ROVRAL Fungicide (EPA Reg. No. 264–453), ROVRAL 4 Flowable Fungicide (EPA Reg. No. 264–482) and ROVRAL WG Fungicide (EPA Reg. No. 264–524). Among other requested changes, Rhone-Poulenc AG Company requested voluntary cancellation of the use of iprodione on cowpeas. The other amendments were accepted in March 1996 and included reductions in the number of iprodione applications to grapes or stone fruits and a feeding restriction for peanut hay. Because these amendments do not result in the deletion of any uses of iprodione, they are not subject to this Notice. EPA has determined that iprodione residues in or on cowpeas contribute slightly to human dietary risk because iprodione residues from cattle feed are carried over into cows' milk. Iprodione residues in or on peanut hay account for the vast majority of iprodione residues in milk. This source of dietary exposure has been eliminated because the March 1996 amendment request included amending the registration for the use of iprodione on peanuts to add a feeding