shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to $33,000 as the amount of the guaranty to which the veteran is entitled under 38 U.S.C. 1810 at the time the loan is made bears to $27,500. This limitation shall not preclude the making of advances, otherwise proper, subsequent to the making of the loan pursuant to the provisions of § 36.4511. Except as to home improvement loans, loans made by the VA shall bear interest at the rate of 13 percent per annum. Loans solely for the purpose of energy conservation improvements or other alterations, improvements, or repairs shall bear interest at the rate of 14½ percent per annum. (38 U.S.C. 1811 (d)(1) and (2)(A))

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 84-28282 Filed 10-25-84; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[A-7-FRL-2704-6; EPA No. 1513]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; States of Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, requires states to adopt and submit plans to EPA for the control of emissions of certain pollutants at designated facilities. If there are no sources of a designated pollutant located in a state, the state may submit a negative declaration, i.e., a certification to that effect in lieu of a plan for control of the pollutant.

EPA has received negative declarations for kraft pulp mills from the States of Iowa and Nebraska, and primary aluminum reduction plants from the States of Kansas and Nebraska. EPA is taking action today to approve these negative declarations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action is effective December 26, 1984 unless notice is received within 30 days that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Robert J. Chanslor, Environmental Protection Agency, Region VII, Air Branch, 324 East 11th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Copies of the state submissions are available for inspection during normal business hours at the above address and at the following locations:

Iowa Department of Water, Air and Waste Management, Henry A. Wallace Building, 900 East Grand, Des Moines, Iowa 50319;

Kansas Department of Health and Environment, Forbes Field, Topeka, Kansas 66620;

Nebraska Department of Environmental Control, Air Pollution Control Division, State House Station, Box 94877, 301 Centennial Mall South, Lincoln, Nebraska 68509.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert J. Chanslor at (816) 374-3791, FTS 758-3791.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act requires states to prepare and submit plans to control certain pollutants (designated pollutants) at existing sources (designated facilities) whenever standards of performance have been established under Section 111(b) for those pollutants at new sources of the same type. Designated pollutants do not include those that are already listed under Section 109(a), 108(a), National Ambient Air Quality Standards, or Section 112(b)(1)(A), Hazardous Air Pollutants.

Subparts B of CFR Part 60 establishes procedures to be followed and requirements to be met in the development and submission of state plans for controlling designated pollutants. Part 62 of the Code of Federal Rgulations provides the procedural framework for the submission of these plans. When designated facilities are located in a state, the state must develop and submit a plan for the control of the designated pollutant. However, 40 CFR 62.06 provides that if there are no existing sources of the designated pollutant located in a state, a letter of certification to that effect (negative declaration) is all that is required from the state. The negative declaration is in lieu of a plan.

To date, EPA has published guideline documents for four designated facilities and pollutants. EPA published standards for control of fluoride emissions from phosphate fertilizer plants on August 6, 1975, at 40 FR 33152; standards for control of fluoride emissions from primary aluminum reduction plants on January 26, 1976, at 41 FR 3826; standards for control of sulfuric acid mist from sulfuric acid plants on October 18, 1977, at 42 FR 55796; and standards for control of total reduced sulfur from kraft pulp mills on February 23, 1978 at 43 FR 7568.

The States of Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska have submitted negative declarations for various designated pollutants. On February 7, 1983, the State of Iowa submitted a negative declaration for kraft pulp mills. The State of Kansas submitted a negative declaration for primary aluminum reduction plants on May 23, 1984. The State of Nebraska submitted a negative declaration for kraft pulp mills and primary aluminum reduction plants on March 16, 1984.

Action

EPA approves the negative declarations discussed in this rulemaking in lieu of Section 111(d) plans.

EPA believes these submissions are noncontroversial and is taking final action to approve them without prior proposal. The public should be advised that this action will be effective December 26, 1984. However, if notice is received within 30 days that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments, this action will be withdrawn and two subsequent notices will be published before the effective date. One notice will withdraw the final action and another will begin a new rulemaking by announcing a proposal of the action and establishing a comment period.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of Section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

Under 5 U.S.C. 605(b), I certify that these negative declarations do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Under Section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals by (60 days from today). This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements [See 307(b)(2)].

This notice is issued under the authority of Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 62

Air pollution control, fluoride, sulfur, administrative practice and procedure, intergovernmental relations, and reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: October 22, 1984.

William D. Ruckelshaus,

Administrator.

PART 62—[AMENDED]

Part 62 of Chapter 1, Subchapter C, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended by adding a new Subpart Q and amending Subparts R and CC as follows:

1. Subpart Q is added to read as follows:

Subpart Q—Iowa

Total Reduced Sulfur Emissions From Existing Kraft Pulp Mills

§ 62.3910 Identification of Plan—Negative Declaration.

Letter from Executive Director of Iowa Department of Environmental Quality submitted on February 7, 1983, certifying that there are no Kraft pulp mills in the State of Iowa, subject ot Part 60, Subpart B of this chapter.

2. Subpart R is amended by adding an undesignated center heading and § 62.4150 to read as follows:

Subpart R—Kansas

* * * * *

Fluoride Emissions From Existing Primary Aluminum Reduction Plants

§ 62.4150 Identification of Plan—Negative Declaration.

Letter from the Director, Division of Environment, Kansas Department of Health and Environments submitted on May 23, 1984, certifying that there are no primary aluminum reduction plants on the State of Kansas, subject to Part 60, Subpart B of this chapter.

3. Subpart CC is amended by adding undesignated center headings and §§ 62.6880 and 62.6910 to read as follows:

Subpart CC—Nebraska

* * * * *

Total Reduced Sulfur Emissions From Existing Kraft Pulp Mills

§ 62.6880 Identification of Plan—Negative Declaration.

Letter from the Chief of the Air Pollution Control Division of the Department of Environmental Control submitted on March 16, 1984, certifying that there are no existing Kraft pulp mills in the State of Nebraska, subject to Part 60, Subpart B of this chapter.

Fluoride Emissions From Existing Primary Aluminum Reduction Plants

§ 62.6910 Identification of Plan—Negative Declaration.

Letter from the Chief of the Air Pollution Control Division of the Department of Environmental Control submitted on March 16, 1984, certifying that there are no existing primary aluminum reduction plants in the State of Nebraska, subject ot Part 60, Subpart B of this chapter.

[FR Doc. 84-28300 Filed 10-25-84; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

---

40 CFR Part 721

[OPTS-50504A; FRL-2560-8]

Significant New Uses of Chemical Substances 1,2-Benzenediamine, 4-Ethoxy, Sulfate

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is issuing a significant new use rule (SNUR) under section 5(a)(2) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) for a chemical substance which was the subject of premanufacture notice (PMN) P-83-105.

DATES: This rule shall be promulgated for purposes of judicial review at 1:00 p.m. eastern time on November 9, 1984. This rule shall become effective January 18, 1985.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward A. Klein, Director, TSCA Assistance Office (TS-799), Office of Toxic Substances, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, Toll free: (800-424-9065), In Washington, D.C.: (554-1404), Qutside the USA: (Operator-202-554-1404).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OMB Control Number 2070-0012.

I. Authority

Section 5(a)(2) of TSCA authorizes EPA to determine that a use of a chemical substance is a "significant new use." EPA must make this determination by rule, after considering all relevant factors, including those listed in section 5(a)(2). Once a use is determined to be a significant new use, persons must, under section 5(a)(1)(B), submit a notice to EPA at least 90 days before they manufacture, import, or process the substance for that use. Such a notice is subject to the same requirements and procedures as a PMN submitted under section 5(a)(1)(A) of TSCA which are interpreted at 40 CFR Part 720 published in the **Federal Register** of May 13, 1983 (48 FR 21722). In particular, these include the information submission requirements of section 5(b) and (d)(1), certain exemptions authorized by section 5(h), and the regulatory authorities of section 5 (e) and (f). If EPA does not take regulatory action under section 5, 6, or 7 to control activities on which it has received a SNUR notice, section 5(g) requires the Agency to explain in the **Federal Register** its reasons for not taking action.

Substances covered by proposed or final SNURs are subject to the export reporting requirements of TSCA section 12(b). EPA regulations interpreting section 12(b) requirements appear at 40 CFR Part 707. Substances subject to final SNURs are subject to TSCA section 13 import certification requirements at 19 CFR 12.118 through 12.127 and 127.28 published in the **Federal Register** of August 1, 1983 (48 FR 34734). The EPA policy in support of these requirements appears at 40 CFR Part 707 published in the **Federal Register** of December 13, 1983 (48 FR 55462).

II. Applicability of General Provisions

EPA has promulgated general provisions under 40 CFR Part 721, Subpart A which are applicable to SNURs and were published in the **Federal Register** of September 5, 1984 (49 FR 35011). These general provisions will apply to this SNUR without change except as discussed in this preamble. Interested persons should refer to that document for a detailed discussion of the general provisions.

The general provisions governing SNUR reporting were promulgated subsequent to the proposal of this rule in the **Federal Register.**

Therefore, this final rule is structurally different from its proposal format because the non-substantive and procedural matters are now contained in Subpart A to Part 721.

III. Summary of This Rule

The chemical substance subject to this rule is identified as 1,2-benzenediamine, 4-ethoxy, sulfate. It was the subject of PMN P-83-105. EPA is designating the following as a significant new use of the substance: manufacture, import, or processing in powder or dry solid form.

IV. Background

The chemical substance subject to this rule was the subject of a PMN designated P-83-105. The notice submitter claimed the proposed import volume as confidential business information (CBI).

For purposes of clarity, the substance is referred to in this preamble by its PMN number.

The Agency is concerned that P-83-105 may possess carcinogenic potential following inhalation or ingestion, including swallowing of inhaled particles. The basis for this concern was presented in the preamble to the proposal for this rule which was published in the **Federal Register** of

August 30, 1983 (48 FR 39245). EPA believes that the carcinogenic potential of P–83–105 merits Agency review if a use of the substance may result in inhalation or ingestion of the substance. In EPA's review of the PMN exposures, the Agency determined that human exposure, including inhalational exposure, would be negligible because of the substance's physical state.

V. Designation of Significant New Use

To determine what would constitute a significant new use of this chemical substance, EPA considered relevant information about the toxicity of the substance and likely exposures associated with possible uses, including the four factors listed in section 5(a)(2) of TSCA. In particular, EPA considered the extent to which potential uses may change or increase the exposure to humans. Based on these considerations, EPA is defining the significant new use of P–83–105 as it appears in Unit III of this preamble and in § 721.195(a)(2).

A comment on the proposed rule stated that the Agency's definition of powder or dry solid form does not include any consideration of the potential of the material to form a respirable dust. The Agency believes that by defining powder or dry solid form as having "the potential to become fine, loose, solid particles," it has addressed the potential of the material to form a respirable dust. The Agency does not believe that imposing a more stringent definition such as might be defined by percent of particles falling within a particular mass median diameter or particular micron range would improve the rule. Particle size and weight, and hence respirability, may vary as a function of not only process, but also environmental factors. As a consequence, the respirability of P–83–105, engineering controls, and protective equipment must be addressed on a case-by-case basis by SNUR notice submitters.

Given EPA's concerns about P–83–105, EPA believes the potential levels of exposure could result in significant risks to workers. Based on analogue data, any significant exposure would present a carcinogenic risk to workers.

The Agency believes that the data described in this preamble and in the preamble to the proposed rule are sufficient to substantiate that manufacture, import, or processing for use in powder or dry solid form of P–83–105 presents a potentially significant increase in the type and magnitude of human exposure. Section 5(a)(2) of TSCA does not require the Agency to make either a "may present" or a "will present" risk finding with regard to satisfying the requirements for a significant new use. The statute imposes the requirement that the Agency provide for a "consideration of all relevant factors." The Agency believes that a reasonable qualitative assessment of these factors was incorporated in the preamble of the proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** of August 30, 1983 (48 FR 39245).

A comment on the proposed rule indicated a belief that EPA's exposure estimates were exaggerated and that monitoring efforts had shown dust exposure below the 5 mg/m^3 nuisance dust time weighted average (TWA) limit. The Agency has reevaluated the available information and has concluded that its original assessment was reasonable. While controls at some facilities may keep airborne concentrations below the 5 mg/m^3 limit, the available Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) data suggest that similar conditions are not uniformly maintained throughout the industry. In addition, while utilizing the 5 mg/m^3 limit as a benchmark, the Agency does not believe that airborne concentrations in this range would necessarily prove acceptable depending upon duration of exposure, effect of concern, and potency.

The comment also indicated that during drumming or reactor charging operations in one plant, workers will be exposed for only a few hours per day. The comment also pointed out that intermediates are manufactured in batches in that plant that would expose workers for periods significantly less than half the year. The Agency, as it did in the proposed rule, is aware that these reduced exposure situations exist. The Agency, however, believes that even at the levels of exposure described in the comment, there remains the potential for significant exposure and EPA believes review of those exposures, is necessary before they occur.

VI. Alternatives

In the proposed SNUR, EPA considered other possible approaches. These alternatives included the promulgation of a section 8(a) reporting rule, and/or regulation under section 6. For the reasons discussed in the proposed rule, the Agency has elected to proceed with the promulgation of a SNUR covering a significant new use of P–83–105.

VII. Exemptions to Reporting Requirements

The Agency has promulgated exemptions to SNUR reporting requirements under § 721.19 of the general SNUR provisions. In the case of P–83–105, the terms of § 721.19 apply without change.

EPA issued it final premanufacture notification rules under 40 CFR Part 720 which were published in the **Federal Register** of May 13, 1983 (48 FR 21722) including § 720.36 which contained detailed rules for the section 5(h)(3) exemption for chemical substances manufactured or imported in small quantities solely for research and development. On September 13, 1983 (48 FR 41132), EPA stayed the effectiveness of § 720.36, among other provisions of the PMN rule, pending further rulemaking to revise the provisions. Because § 720.36 was not in effect when EPA codified § 721.19, the Agency relied on the general definition of "small quantities solely for research and development" in § 720.3(cc) and section 5(h)(3) of TSCA to determine whether activities qualify under this exemption. Upon promulgation of a revised § 720.36, EPA intends to amend § 721.19 to adopt the provisions of the revised § 720.36.

Section 721.19(g) of the general SNUR provisions exempts persons from SNUR reporting when they manufacture or process the substance solely for export and label the substance in accordance with section 12(a)(1)(B) of TSCA. While EPA is concerned about worker exposure during such manufacture and processing of the substance, EPA lacks the authority under section 12(a) of TSCA to require reporting of such manufacture or processing for a significant new use. EPA does not yet have sufficient information to make the "will present an unreasonable risk" finding necessary to regulate a substance manufactured or processed solely for export. However, persons must notify EPA of such export under section 12(b) of TSCA (see § 721.7 of the general SNUR provisions). Such notification will allow EPA to monitor manufacture and processing activities which are not subject to significant new use reporting. The term "manufacture solely for export" is defined in the PMN rule (40 CFR 720.3(s)). The term "process solely for export" is defined in § 721.3 of the general SNUR provisions in a similar fashion. Thus the persons would be exempt from reporting under this SNUR if a person manufactures (the term manufacture includes import) or processes the substance solely for export from the U.S. under the following restrictions: (1) There is no use of the substance in the U.S.; (2) processing is restricted to sites under the control of the manufacturer or processor, respectively; and (3) distribution in commerce is limited to purposes of export. If a person manufactured or processed the substance both for export and for use in the U.S., such manufacture and processing would not be "solely for export" because manufacture or processing would be for use in the U.S.

A commentor expressed concern that the inclusion of impurities in the definition of "process for commercial purposes" might prove burdensome due to the perception that finished dye products might be liable to the SNUR due to the presence of residual traces of the intermediate. The presence of P–83–105 as a minor impurity in dye products does not fall under the definition. Section 721.19 of Subpart A specifically excludes such impurities and the Agency has determined that that section will apply to this rule. This section provides that P–83–105 is not subject to the notification requirements if the substance is manufactured, imported or processed only as an impurity or byproduct.

VIII. Applicability to Uses Which May Have Occurred Before Promulgation of Final Rule

To establish a significant new use rule, the Agency must, among other things, determine that the use is not ongoing. In this case, the chemical substance in question has already been added to the Inventory and, thus, could have been manufactured, imported, or processed for use in powder or dry solid form prior to promulgation of this final rule. However, no person has indicated to EPA that such activities have occurred subsequent to Inventory listing.

As indicated in the proposal, EPA has found that the intent of section 5(a)(1)(B) is best served by determining whether a use is a significant new use as of the proposal date of the SNUR. If a use begun during the proposal period were not considered to be a significant new use, it would be almost impossible for the Agency to establish SNUR notice requirements, since any person could defeat the SNUR by initiating the proposed significant new use before the rule becomes final. This is contrary to the general intent of section 5(a)(1)(B).

Thus, even if the substance was imported, manufactured, or processed for a significant new use between proposal and promulgation of this rule, such activities may not continue after the effective date of this rule. Any such person must cease such activities until it has complied with all SNUR notice requirements.

IX. Test Data and Other Information

EPA recognizes that under TSCA section 5, a person is not required to develop any particular test data before submitting a notice. Rather, a person is required only to submit test data in that person's possession or control and to describe any other data known to or reasonably ascertainable by that person. However, in view of the potential health risk that may be posed by a significant new use of P–83–105, EPA encourages possible SNUR notice submitters to test the substance's potential for carcinogenicity. The Agency believes that the results of a two-year rodent bioassay would adequately characterize possible carcinogenic effects of the substance. If a SNUR notice is submitted for activities involving significant exposure without adequate test data, EPA is likely to take action under section 5(e). As an alternative to testing the substance, potential notice submitters may want to consider the use of engineering controls and/or personal protective equipment to reduce exposure to the substance.

EPA encourages persons to consult with the Agency before selecting a protocol for testing the substance. As part of this prenotice consultation, EPA will discuss the test data it believes necessary to evaluate the significant new use of the substance. Data should be developed and submitted in accordance with the TSCA good laboratory practices regulations at 40 CFR Part 792 published in the **Federal Register** of November 29, 1983 (48 FR 53922).

EPA urges SNUR notice submitters to provide detailed information on human exposure that will result from the significant new use. In addition, EPA urges persons to submit information on potential benefits of the substance and information on risks posed by the substance compared to risks posed by potential substitutes.

X. Economic Analysis

The Agency has evaluated the potential costs of establishing significant new use reporting requirements for P–83–105. This evaluation is summarized below.

Persons who intend to manufacture, import, or process the substance for a significant new use, as defined in this rule, would be required to submit a SNUR notice with the information required by the statute. The cost of submitting a SNUR notice can be estimated from the cost of submitting a PMN, which has been estimated to range between $1,400 and $7,900 per substance.

The SNUR may also result in delay costs. The delay caused by the preparation of a SNUR notice and the statutory notice review period could reduce the value of future profits. EPA estimates that these delay costs would be about $700.

The SNUR would not require that persons submitting notices perform additional toxicity testing. However, EPA has insufficient information to determine if P–83–105 would present an unreasonable risk of injury to human health if manufactured, processed, or used in a powder or dry solid form. The Agency has determined that the results of a two-year rodent bioassay would adequately characterize possible carcinogenic effects resulting from exposure to P–83–105. EPA could require the submitter of a SNUR notice either to control exposures or limit production under section 5(e) until sufficient information is provided for EPA to make its determination.

In light of the high cost of performing a two-year bioassay (the direct cost of a two-year bioassay, inhalation route test ranges from $742,000 to $874,500 per chemical substance tested), EPA does not anticipate that a company will perform the testing. However, depending upon the potential market for P–83–105 in a powder or dry solid form, a company may produce and process the substance using certain exposure controls.

While EPA is unable to specify, prior to submission of a SNUR notice, combinations of exposure controls that may be appropriate to reduce risks for the variety of manufacturing and processing methods that may be used, the Agency estimates that a SNUR notice submitter will have to spend a maximum of $12,500 on exposure controls.

The total direct costs, including notification, complying with a section 5(e) order, purchase of exposure controls, and delay, would be between $25,700 and $74,000. These direct costs would add between 11.8 and 34 percent to the estimated price of the substance.

EPA has not estimated any indirect costs that may result from this SNUR. These indirect costs may result from decisions not to manufacture or process the substance because of uncertainty about possible Agency regulatory action. Similarly, a decision not to manufacture might result in response to the magnitude of the direct costs. The cost of this impact would be whatever profits or benefits to users that the substance would have generated. In addition, EPA has not estimated the potential public benefits gained through the avoidance of potential health problems. Such benefits include the avoidance of costs such as the medical costs of treating exposed persons. While the Agency acknowledges that indirect costs and benefits exist, it is impossible at this time to estimate their extent precisely.

A more complete economic analysis of this SNUR and other regulatory options is included in the rulemaking record and is available for public review.

XI. Judicial Review

Judicial review of this final rule may be available under section 19 of TSCA in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or for the circuit in which the person seeking review resides or has its principal place of business. To provide all interested persons an equal opportunity to file a timely petition for judicial review and to avoid so called "races to the courthouse," EPA has decided to promulgate this rule for purposes of judicial review two weeks after publication in the **Federal Register**, as reflected in DATES in this notice. The effective date has, in turn, been calculated from the promulgation date.

XII. Rulemaking Record

EPA has established a record for this rulemaking (docket control number OPTS-50504A). A public version of this record from which CBI has been deleted is available to the public from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays, in the OTS Reading Room, Rm. E-107, 401 M St. SW., Washington, D.C.

The record includes basic information considered by the Agency in developing this rule. The record now includes the following:

1. The PMN for the substance.
2. The **Federal Register** notice of receipt of the PMN.
3. The proposed SNUR.
4. The economic analysis of this SNUR.
5. Public comments.
6. The summary of toxicity concerns for the substance.
7. The analysis of potential new uses of the substance.
8. OMB comments and EPA's response, if any.

XIII. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

A. Executive Order 12291

Under Executive Order 12291, EPA must judge whether a regulation is "Major" and therefore requires a Regulatory Impact Analysis. EPA has determined that this rule is not a "Major Rule" because it does not have an effect on the economy of $100 million or more and it will not have a significant effect on competition, costs, or prices. While there is no precise way to calculate the annual cost of this rule, for the reason explained in Unit X of this preamble and the proposal for this rule, EPA believes that the cost will be low. In addition, because of the nature of the rule and the substance subject to it, EPA believes that there will be few significant new use notices submitted. Further, while the expense of a notice and the suggested testing and the uncertainty of possible EPA regulation may discourage certain innovation, that impact may be limited because such factors are unlikely to discourage an innovation which has high potential value. Finally, this SNUR may encourage innovation in safe chemical substances or highly beneficial uses.

This regulation was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review as required by Executive Order 12291.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 605(b), EPA certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses. The Agency cannot determine whether parties affected by this rule are likely to be small businesses. However, EPA believes that the number of small businesses affected by this rule would not be substantial even if all the potential new uses were developed by small companies. EPA expects to receive few SNUR notices for the substance.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

Information collection requirements contained in this rule have been approved by the OMB under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* and have been assigned OMB control number 2070-0012.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 721

Environmental protection, Chemicals, Hazardous substances, Recordkeeping and reporting requirements, Significant new uses.

Dated: October 12, 1984.

William D. Ruckelshaus,
Administrator.

PART 721—[AMENDED]

Therefore, Part 721 of Chapter I of Title 40, is amended as follows:

1. By adding the following definitions to § 721.3 in alphabetical sequence:

§ 721.3 Definitions.

* * * * *

"Powder or dry solid form" means a state where all or part of the substance would have the potential to become fine, loose, solid particles.

* * * * *

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under Control Number 2070-0012)

2. By adding a new § 721.195 to read as follows:

§ 721.195 1,2-Benzenediamine, 4-ethoxy, sulfate.

(a) *Chemical substance and significant new use subject to reporting.* (1) The following chemical substance referred to by its chemical name is subject to reporting under this section for the significant new use described in paragraph (a)(2) of this section: 1,2-benzenediamine, 4-ethoxy, sulfate, PMN P-83-105.

(2) The significant new use is: Manufacture, import, or processing in powder or dry solid form.

(b) [Reserved]

(Sec. 5, Pub. L. 94-469, 90 Stat. 2012 (15 U.S.C. 2604))

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under Control Number 2070-0012)

[FR Doc. 84-28292 Filed 10-25-84; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

---

40 CFR Part 721

[OPTS-50508A; FRL-2620-6]

Significant New Uses of Chemical Substances; Dicarboxylic Acid Monoester

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is issuing a significant new use rule (SNUR) under section 5(a)(2) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) for a chemical substance which was the subject of premanufacture notice (PMN) P-83-255 and a TSCA section 5(e) consent order issued by EPA.

DATES: This rule shall be promulgated for purposes of judicial review at 1:00 p.m. eastern time on November 9, 1984. This rule shall become effective January 18, 1985.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward A. Klein, Director, TSCA Assistance Office (TS-799), Office of Toxic Substances, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, Toll free: (800-424-9065), In Washington, D.C.: (554-1404), Outside the USA: (Operator—202-554-1404).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OMB Control Number 2070-0012.