Agency is issuing the carbaryl RED without a comment period.

B. What is the Agency’s Authority for Taking this Action?

Section 4(g)(2) of FIFRA, as amended, directs that, after submission of all data concerning a pesticide active ingredient, “the Administrator shall determine whether pesticides containing such active ingredient are eligible for reregistration,” before calling in product specific data on individual end-use products and other reregistering products or taking other “appropriate regulatory action.”
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B. What Should I Consider as I Prepare my Comments for EPA?

1. Submitting CBI. Do not submit this information to EPA through regulations.gov or e-mail. Clearly mark the part or all of the information that you claim to be CBI. For CBI information in a disk or CD-ROM that you mail to EPA, mark the outside of the disk or CD-ROM as “CBI” and then identify electronically within the disk or CD-ROM the specific information that is
claimed as CBI. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2.

2. Tips for preparing your comments.

When submitting comments, remember to:
i. Identify the document by docket ID number and other identifying information (subject heading, Federal Register date and page number).

ii. Follow directions. The Agency may ask you to respond to specific questions or organize comments by referencing a Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part or section number.

iii. Explain why you agree or disagree; suggest alternatives and substitute language for your requested changes.

iv. Describe any assumptions and provide any technical information and/or data that you used.

v. If you estimate potential costs or burdens, explain how you arrived at your estimate in sufficient detail to allow for it to be reproduced.

vi. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns and suggest alternatives.

vii. Explain your views as clearly as possible, avoiding the use of profanity or personal threats.

viii. Make sure to submit your comments by the comment period deadline identified.

II. What Action is the Agency Taking?

EPA requests public comment during the next 60 days on a petition (available in docket number EPA–HQ–OPP–2007–1005) received from the NRDC and PANNA requesting that the Agency revoke all tolerances (maximum legal residue limits) and cancel all registrations for the pesticide chlorpyrifos. The petitioners, NRDC and PANNA, claim that EPA cannot make a finding that there is a reasonable certainty of no harm from dietary residues of chlorpyrifos and, therefore, that the Agency must revoke all tolerances established under section 408 of the FFDCA, as amended by the FQPA. As a part of their petition, NRDC and PANNA claim that the Agency did not consider the full spectrum of potential health effects associated with chlorpyrifos in connection with EPA’s reassessment of the existing chlorpyrifos tolerances, including:

1. Evidence showing the potential for a greater than 10-fold difference in susceptibility to chlorpyrifos across human populations and, in particular, evidence of greater susceptibility in early life stages than EPA estimated;

2. The endocrine disrupting effects of the chemical, or

3. Evidence of cancer risk data as indicated from a National Institutes of Health study.

The petition further asserts that EPA’s evaluation of chlorpyrifos in the organophosphate cumulative risk assessment (CRA) misrepresented the risks of chlorpyrifos and that EPA failed to incorporate inhalation routes of exposure to chlorpyrifos in conducting its assessment. EPA’s human health assessment of chlorpyrifos and findings on whether the tolerances for chlorpyrifos comply with the safety standard in FFDCA Section 408, as amended by the FQPA, are contained in the Interim Reregistration Eligibility Decision document for chlorpyrifos and the organophosphate CRA, which are available on EPA’s pesticide webpage at http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/reregistration/status.htm and http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/cumulative/2006-op/index.htm. Docket materials for this pesticide are available in the electronic docket at http://www.regulations.gov; risk assessment and related documents for this pesticide have been removed to Special Docket EPA–HQ–OPP–2007–0151.
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Dated: October 9, 2007.

Steven Bradbury, Director, Special Review and Reregistration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.
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BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–8483–6]

Proposed CERCLA Administrative Cost Recovery Settlement; Company, Inc., Buckley Drive Waterline Supersfund Site, Bennington, VT

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed settlement; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Section 122(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (“CERCLA”), 42 U.S.C. 9622(i), notice is hereby given of a proposed administrative settlement for recovery of past response costs concerning the Buckley Drive Waterline Superfund Site in Bennington, Vermont. The settlement requires the settling parties to pay $740,000.00 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund. The settlement includes a covenant not to sue the settling parties pursuant to Section 107(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607. For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the settlement. The Agency will consider all comments received and may modify or withdraw its consent to the settlement if comments received disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate.

The Agency’s response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at One Congress Street, Boston, MA 02114–2023.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 16, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to the Regional Hearing Clerk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress Street, Suite 1100, Mailcode RAA, Boston, Massachusetts 02114–2023 and should refer to: In re: Buckley Drive Waterline Superfund Site, U.S. EPA Docket No. 01–2007–160.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: A copy of the proposed settlement may be obtained from Mary Jane O’Donnell, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, Office of Site Remediation & Restoration, One Congress Street, Suite 1100, Mailcode HBT, Boston, MA 02114–2023.


James T. Owens III, Director, Office of Site Remediation & Restoration.

[FR Doc. E7–20437 Filed 10–16–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY


Hazard Education before Renovation of Target Housing; State of Utah Authorization Application

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; request for comments and opportunity for public hearing.

SUMMARY: On October 13, 2006, EPA received an application from the State of