As stated previously, the May 17, 1994 proposed rule to establish a tolerance for amitraz in/on imported hops was not finalized because the amitraz reregistration activities indicated the potential for an acute risk of concern. Using the voluntary human study submitted by the company, a revised dietary exposure analysis was performed assessing the acute risk from the proposed use of amitraz on dried hops. Acute exposure from beer was calculated by multiplying individual, single day consumption estimates taken from the USDA's 1977-1978 Nationwide Food Consumption Survey by a residue of 0.22 ppm to derive a distribution of acute exposures for the two subgroups previously identified as being most highly exposed to amitraz through beer, "Males 13 years and older" and "Females 13 years and older." Because hops are mixed as part of the brewing process, a residue value in beer reflecting the average residue in hops was deemed more appropriate than using a residue value in beer based on the tolerance on hops.

The Margin of Exposure (MOE) is a measure of how closely exposure comes to the NOEL (the highest dose at which no effects were observed in the study). and is calculated as the ratio of the NOEL to the exposure (NOEL/exposure = MOE). The Agency normally considers an MOE of 10 or greater acceptable when the NOEL is based on a human study. MOEs at the 99th percentile from amitraz in beer were 10 for "Males, 13 +" and 15 for "Females, 13 +". Only those consumers within both subgroups having consumption greater than the 99th percentile consumer would have MOEs for beer which are below 10. Additionally, the acute risk assessment assumed that 100 percent of all imported beer and 100 percent of all imported hops used in domestic beer production would contain amitraz. The Agency considers this to be extremely unlikely.

The Agency expects a brewing study providing additional residue data to be submitted which may enable further refinement and reevaluation of the risk. At this time, no residue data supporting domestic use have been submitted for the U.S., and there are no U.S. registrations for the use of amitraz on hops. The Agency will not consider any applications for registration of amitraz to be used on hops in the U.S., nor will EPA consider any Special Local Needs Registrations (FIFRA section 24(c)) until acceptable U.S. residue data are submitted and reviewed and a risk/ benefit analysis is performed.

Based on the above information considered by the Agency, the tolerance

established by amending 40 CFR part 180 would protect the public health. Therefore, it is proposed that the tolerance be established as set forth below.

Any person who has registered or submitted an application for registration of a pesticide under FIFRA, as amended, which contains any of the ingredients listed herein may request within 30 days after publication of this document in the Federal Register that this rulemaking proposal be referred to an Advisory Committee in accordance with FFDCA section 408(e).

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed regulation. Comments must bear a notation indicating the document control number, [PP 4E4349/P599]. All written comments filed in response to this petition will be available in the Public Docket and Freedom of Information Section, at the address given above from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new tolerances or raising tolerance levels or establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the Federal Register of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Recording and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: January 12, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that part 180 be amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 371.

2. In § 180.287, by amending the table therein by adding and alphabetically inserting the raw agricultural commodity dried hops, to read as follows:

 $\S 180.287$ Amitraz; tolerances for residues.

Commodity				Parts per million
* Hops, dried	*	*	*	* 60
*	*	*	*	*

[FR Doc. 95–1320 Filed 1–18–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION 45 CFR Part 1611

Eligibility

AGENCY: Legal Services Corporation. **ACTION:** Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Legal Services
Corporation ("LSC" or "Corporation")
proposes to amend regulations relating
to eligibility for LSC-funded legal
services. This regulation has been
substantially revised and reordered, in
part to simplify the regulation and
clarify current Corporation policy and
in part to revise Corporation policy,
particularly with respect to access by
LSC to client records.

DATES: Comments may be submitted on or before March 20, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted to the Office of General Counsel, Legal Services Corporation, 750 First St., NE., 11th Floor, Washington, DC 20002–4250.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Victor Fortuno, General Counsel, (202) 336–8810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Operations and Regulations Committee of the LSC Board ("Committee") held public hearings on June 20, 1994, and September 17, 1994, in Washington, DC, to consider a draft of proposed revisions to 45 CFR part 1611, LSC's regulations on eligibility for LSC-funded legal assistance. At a meeting in Washington, DC, on October 28, 1994, the Committee approved a draft to be published in the Federal Register as a proposed rule for public comment.

Under this proposal, part 1611 has been substantially revised and reordered to make the regulation less complex and easier for recipients to apply. While there are numerous proposals for substantive change, the majority of the revisions reflect the Committee's desire to make this rule more comprehensible and less subject to confusion and misinterpretation than is the current regulation. Throughout the rule, there are slight changes in language to clarify the rule or to make it consistent with