proposal utilizes <1% of the RfD for the U.S. population. Non-nursing infants <l represent the most exposed sub-population and the percent of the RfD consumed by this group is <3%. BASF has estimated the theoretical oncogenic risk for the currently registered uses of hexythiazox (apples and pears) to be approximately 1.5 x 10^{-6}. This risk number includes the very conservative assumptions that all apples and pears are treated with hexythiazox and that all resulting residues are at the tolerance level. In its recent FR Notice establishing the tolerance in apples the Agency recognized these conservative overestimations and concluded ''in reality, the Agency knows that all apples would not be treated with this pesticide and expect that even apples receiving maximum treatment will have residues far below tolerance level. For example, in field trials conducted using application rates 10 times the label amount, residues in apples still did not exceed the tolerance level. Further, the maximum residue level (MRL) in apple juice would be expected to be less than 50% of the residue level in whole fruit. Based on an assessment of the cancer risks of the proposed use of hexythiazox, the Agency believes that the proposed use of hexythiazox on apples will pose an extremely small risk to humans.'' The current proposal will not increase the theoretical oncogenic risk significantly.

In addition, the Agency has concluded that based on the residue and feeding levels of spent hops ''meat and milk tolerances are not required for this petition.''

2. *''Other'' exposure*. Other potential sources of exposure of the general population to residues of pesticides are residues in drinking water and exposure from non-occupational sources. Since this tolerance is for an ''imported use,'' BASF does not anticipate exposure to residues of hexythiazox in drinking water. BASF has not estimated non-occupational exposure for hexythiazox. Since the current registrations for hexythiazox in the United States are limited to commercial apple/pear production, the potential for non-occupational exposure to the general population is considered to be insignificant.

D. Cumulative Effects

BASF also considered the potential for cumulative effects of hexythiazox and other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity. BASF is unaware of any conclusive data regarding the potential for hexythiazox to share a common mechanism for toxic effects with any other compound. In dietary assessment, the food factor for hops is only 0.03%. Therefore, BASF concluded that any concern regarding a common mechanism of toxicity would be insignificant.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population*. Using the exposure assumptions described above, BASF concludes that aggregate exposure to hexythiazox will utilize approximately <1% of the RfD for the U.S. population. EPA generally has no concern for exposures below 100% of the RfD. In addition the calculated theoretical oncogenic risk associated with this use is more than 100 times less than the Agency's general level of concern (1 x 10^{-6}).

Therefore, based on the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data and the conservative exposure assessment, BASF concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to residues of hexythiazox, including all anticipated dietary exposure and all other non-occupational exposures.

2. *Infants and children*. The toxicity database includes both developmental and reproductive testing in which no significant concerns were identified. BASF therefore believes the established RfD of 0.025 mg/kg/day is the appropriate approach for assessing risk in children. Based on the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data and the conservative exposure assessment, BASF concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the residues of hexythiazox, including all anticipated dietary exposure and all other non-occupational exposures.

F. Other Considerations

The qualitative nature of the residues in plants and animals is adequately understood. There is a practical analytical method for detecting and measuring levels of hexythiazox in or on food with a limit of detection that allows monitoring of food with residues at or above the levels set in these tolerances.

G. International Tolerances

A maximum residue level has not been established for hexythiazox by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

[FR Doc. 98–19247 Filed 7–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6126–2]

Report on the Shrimp Virus Peer Review Workshop

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability of a draft final report.

SUMMARY: This document announces the availability of a draft final report of a peer review and risk assessment workshop, sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Center for Environmental Assessment, on behalf of the Joint Subcommittee on Aquaculture (JSA), National Science and Technology Council, held January 7–8, 1998. The report entitled, ''Report on the Shrimp Virus Peer Review and Risk Assessment Workshop: Developing a Qualitative Risk Assessment'' (EPA/630/R–98/001A), was completed under contract to the EPA. It develops a qualitative ecological risk assessment describing the potential risks of nonindigenous pathogenic shrimp viruses on wild shrimp populations in U.S. coastal waters. Expert conclusions and recommendations contained in the report are currently undergoing an independent scientific review. The results of this independent review and the draft final report will be used as the basis for a risk management workshop on shrimp viruses scheduled for July 28–29, 1998 in New Orleans (see 63 FR 36895–36896 (July 8, 1998)).

DATES: The report will be available on or about July 24, 1998.

ADDRESSES: An electronic version of the draft final report will be accessible on the EPA National Center for Environmental Assessment home page at http://www.epa.gov/ncea/.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. H. Kay Austin, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Center for Environmental Assessment (8601D), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460; telephone (202) 564–3328; fax: (202) 565–0066; e-mail *austin.kay@epa.gov*. For technical assistance contact Dr. Tom McIlwain, Chairperson of the JSA Shrimp Virus Work Group, National Marine Fisheries Service, 3209 Frederick Street, Pascagoula, MS 39567, (601) 762–4591.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Public concerns over the potential introduction and spread of nonindigenous pathogenic shrimp viruses to the wild shrimp fishery and shrimp aquaculture

industry in U.S. coastal waters are increasing. Although these viruses pose no threat to human health, outbreaks on U.S. shrimp farms, the appearance of diseased shrimp in U.S. commerce, and new information on the susceptibility of shrimp and other crustaceans to these viruses prompted calls for action. In response, the JSA (representing Federal organizations including the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service (DOC/NOAA/NMFS); the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service (DOA/CREES); Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (DOA/APHIS); and Agricultural Research Service (DOA/ARS); U.S. Department of Energy; U.S. Department of Defense; Army Corp of Engineers (DOD/ACE); U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration (HHS/FDA); Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA); the EPA; and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)) tasked the Federal interagency Shrimp Virus Workgroup (DOC/NMFS, EPA, FWS, and USDA/APHIS) with assessing the shrimp virus problem.

Publication of this draft final report is another in a series of related activities sponsored by EPA, in cooperation with DOC/NMFS, USDA/APHIS, and FWS, on behalf of the JSA. In June 1997, the Shrimp Virus Workgroup summarized the available information on shrimp viruses in a report to the JSA entitled, ''An Evaluation of Potential Shrimp Virus Impacts on Cultured Shrimp and on Wild Shrimp Populations in the Gulf of Mexico and Southeastern U.S. Atlantic Coastal Water'' (JSA Shrimp Virus Report (JSVR)). The JSVR was reviewed at four stakeholder meetings (see 62 FR 31790–31791 (June 11, 1997)), jointly sponsored by EPA, DOC/NMFS, and USDA/APHIS on behalf of the JSA, during July 1997. Previous products of these efforts include the JSVR (see http://kingfish.ssp.nmfs.gov/oit/oit.html) and the Minutes of the Stakeholder Meetings Report (EPA/630/R–92/001) (see http://www.epa.gov/ncea/pdfs/shrimp5.pdf). These products and additional stakeholder (public) comments formed the basis for the shrimp virus peer review and risk assessment workshop. The workshop participants considered potential pathways to wild shrimp populations including shrimp aquaculture, shrimp processing and ''other'' sources and pathways, and independently assessed risks using a qualitative risk assessment approach developed by the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force.

The workshop report concludes that viruses could survive in pathways leading to coastal environments, and that there is potential for viruses to affect native shrimp in localized areas, such as an estuary or bay. However, it concludes that local populations of shrimp would recover rapidly as a result of reintroduction of shrimp or increases in reproduction. Although there was high uncertainty, the report concludes that the risks from viral introductions to the entire population of native shrimp in U.S. coastal waters is relatively low. Though limited by the time and information available, the report determines that impacts to organisms besides shrimp deserved further consideration.

Finally, while qualitative evaluations are valuable, the report concludes that they are associated with a great deal of uncertainty. Therefore, given the limited information currently available, it is not feasible to conduct a more comprehensive, quantitative assessment of the risks associated with nonindigenous pathogenic shrimp viruses at this time. Participants noted that there is a need to conduct further systematic research efforts to reduce uncertainty.

The workshop report, and the results of the independent scientific review of its conclusions and recommendations, will be used as the basis for a risk management workshop on shrimp viruses scheduled for July 28–29, 1998, in New Orleans. This workshop, jointly sponsored by the EPA Gulf of Mexico Program, DOC/NMFS, and DOA/CREES/ARS, will develop options and strategies for managing the threat of shrimp viruses to cultured and wild stocks of shrimp in the Gulf of Mexico and southeastern U.S. Atlantic coastal waters. Persons interested in attending the upcoming risk management workshop should contact William D. Holland, Gulf of Mexico Program Office, Building 1103, Room 202, Stennis Space Center, MS 39529–6000; telephone: (228) 688–3726; fax: (228) 688–2709; e-mail:holland.bill@epa.gov.

Dated: July 10, 1998.

William H. Farland,

Director, National Center for Environmental Assessment.

[FR Doc. 98–19248 Filed 7–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PB–402404–MS; FRL–5799–4]

Lead-Based Paint Activities in Target Housing and Child-Occupied Facilities; State of Mississippi's Authorization Application

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

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

SUMMARY: On March 12, 1998, the State of Mississippi submitted an application for EPA approval to administer and enforce training and certification requirements, training program accreditation requirements, and work practice standards for lead-based paint activities in target housing and child-occupied facilities under section 402 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). This notice announces the receipt of Mississippi's application, provides a 45–day public comment period, and provides an opportunity to request a public hearing on the application.

DATES: Comments on the authorization application must be received on or before August 31, 1998. Public hearing requests must be received on or before August 3, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit all written comments and/or requests for a public hearing identified by docket control number ''PB–402404–MS'' (in duplicate) to: Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth St., SW., Atlanta, GA 30303–3104.

Comments, data, and requests for a public hearing may also be submitted electronically to: rudd.roseanne@epa.epamail.gov. Follow the instructions under Unit V. of this document. No information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rose Anne Rudd, Regional Lead Coordinator, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth St., SW., Atlanta, GA 30303–3104, telephone: (404) 562–8998, e-mail address: rudd.roseanne@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On October 28, 1992, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, Pub. L. 102–550, became law. Title X of that statute was the Residential Lead-