

ATF-152 (48 FR 46518). This revision is based on a petition submitted by Mr. A.G. Boissevain, President, El Dorado Wine Growers Association, Camino, California. The establishment of viticultural areas and the subsequent use of viticultural area names as appellations of origin in wine labeling and advertising will help consumers better identify wines they purchase. The use of viticultural area appellations of origin will also help wineries distinguish their products from wines made in other areas.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rule is effective July 24, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James A. Hunt, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Ariel Rios Federal Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20226 (202-566-7626).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The El Dorado Wine Grape Growers Association in Camino, California, petitioned ATF for the establishment of an American viticultural area to be named "El Dorado." The El Dorado viticultural area is located within El Dorado County, east of Sacramento, California. In response to this petition, ATF published a notice of proposed rulemaking, Notice No. 439 (47 FR 55954), in the *Federal Register* on December 14, 1982, proposing the establishment of El Dorado as a viticultural area.

On October 13, 1983, ATF published T.D. ATF-152 (48 FR 46518) establishing the El Dorado viticultural area. Mr. A.G. Boissevain, President, El Dorado Wine Grape Growers Association, submitted a petition to include a vineyard just outside of the western boundary of the El Dorado viticultural area. The vineyard was unintentionally omitted when the boundaries were established along Range and Township lines rather than along a more complicated contour line of 1200 foot elevation. Mr. Boissevain stated that the petitioned for area has the same name identification, topography, soil types, amount of rainfall, elevation and temperatures as found in the El Dorado viticultural area and would be distinguished from the surrounding area.

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

In response to Mr. Boissevain's second petition, ATF published a notice of proposed rulemaking, Notice No. 592 (51 FR 19853), proposing a revision of the El Dorado viticultural area boundary. No comments were received.

Conclusion

After considering the evidence presented by the petitioner, ATF determined that it would be proper to extend the El Dorado viticultural area. Accordingly, this document prescribes a revised boundary for the El Dorado viticultural area.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act relating to a final regulatory flexibility analysis (5 U.S.C. 604) are not applicable to this final rule because it will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The final rule will not impose, or otherwise cause, a significant increase in reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance burdens on a substantial number of small entities. The final rule is not expected to have a significant secondary or incidental effect on a substantial number of small entities.

Accordingly, it is hereby certified under the provisions of Section 3 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Compliance With Executive Order 12291

In compliance with Executive Order 12291, 48 FR 13193 (1981), ATF has determined that this final rule is not a "major rule" since it will not result in:

- (a) An annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more;
- (b) A major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or
- (c) Significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96-511, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR Part 1320, do not apply to this final rule because no requirement to collect information is imposed.

List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 9

Administrative practice and procedure, Consumer protection, Viticultural areas, and Wine.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this document is James A. Hunt, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

Authority and Issuance

Title 27, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 9, American Viticultural Areas is amended as follows:

PART 9—[AMENDED]

Paragraph 1. The authority citation for Part 9 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 27 U.S.C. 205.

Par. 2. Section 9.61 is amended by revising paragraph (c)(12), redesignating existing paragraphs (c)(13) through (c)(15) as (c)(17) through (c)(19) respectively, and adding new paragraphs (c)(13) through (c)(16) to read as follows:

§ 9.61 El Dorado.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(12) Thence north along the range line to its intersection with U.S. Route 50;

(13) Thence west along U.S. Route 50 to its intersection with Cameron Park Drive;

(14) Thence north along Cameron Park Drive to its intersection with Green Valley Road;

(15) Thence east along Green Valley Road to its intersection with range line R.10 E/ R.9 E;

(16) Thence north along the range line to its intersection with the township line T.10 N./ T.11 N;

* * * * *

Signed: May 29, 1987.

Stephen E. Higgins,
Director.

Approved: June 4, 1987.

John P. Simpson,
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Regulatory, Trade and Tariff Enforcement).
[FR Doc. 87-14297 Filed 6-23-87; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4810-31-M

27 CFR Part 9

[T.D. ATF-255; Re: Notice No. 399 and No. 434]

Revision of the Monticello Viticultural Area Boundary, Virginia

AGENCY: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), Treasury.

ACTION: Treasury decision, Final rule.

SUMMARY: ATF is revising the boundary of the Monticello viticultural area to include vineyards which were omitted from the original petition which ATF adopted in T.D. ATF-164 (49 FR 2757). This rule is based on a petition submitted by Edward W. Schwab, Autumn Hill Vineyards, located in Stanardsville, Virginia. The

establishment of viticultural areas and the subsequent use of viticultural area names as appellations of origin in wine labeling and advertising will help consumers better identify wines they purchase. The use of viticultural area appellations of origin will also help wineries distinguish their products from wines made in other areas.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rule is effective July 24, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James A. Hunt, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Ariel Rios Federal Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20226 (202-566-7626).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Six wine grape growers in the Charlottesville area of Virginia first petitioned ATF to establish a viticultural area to be known as "Monticello." In response to the petition, ATF published a notice of proposed rulemaking, Notice No. 399 (46 FR 59274), on December 4, 1981, to establish a viticultural area in the Charlottesville, Virginia, area to be known as "Monticello." During the comment period The Jefferson Wine Grape Growers Society petitioned for an enlargement of the Monticello viticultural area boundary. ATF published an amended notice of proposed rulemaking, Notice No. 434 (47 FR 52200), on November 19, 1982. All the comments received favored the enlarged boundary for the Monticello viticultural area.

On January 23, 1984, ATF published T.D. ATF-164 (49 FR 2757) establishing the Monticello viticultural area. On November 9, 1984, a petition was received from Mr. Edward W. Schwab, Managing Partner, Autumn Hill Vineyards, to include Greene County in the Monticello viticultural area. Mr. Schwab said he became aware of the Monticello viticultural area after it was established and he was not aware of the rulemaking process that had taken place.

Greene County is a small county which borders the northern boundary of the Monticello viticultural area. Mr. Schwab submitted a statement and evidence from the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service Agriculture Extension Agent that the petitioned for area has essentially the same topography, soil types, amount of rainfall, elevation and temperatures as found in the bordering Monticello viticultural area. Mr. Schwab amended his petition to exclude a mountainous area in the western part of Greene County so that the revised area would be even more similar to the existing Monticello viticultural area.

The Monticello viticultural area is approximately 1250 square miles and therefore, extends many miles from its namesake and home of Thomas Jefferson in Charlottesville, Virginia. The evidence submitted during the earlier rulemaking process established that the Monticello name extends throughout Central Virginia, to include Albemarle, Orange, Nelson and Greene Counties, because of Thomas Jefferson's dominant influence in the region. Historical publications have numerous references to Jefferson's leasing farm land throughout Central Virginia to expand his Monticello acreage. Other references list Monticello as the primary source of crop experimentation data and planting material (including grapevines) used to start new farms in Central Virginia.

One current example which shows that the name identification extended several miles to the north of Monticello to Orange and Greene Counties is a mansion similar in appearance to Monticello which Jefferson designed for his friend, James Barbour. The mansion burned in 1884, but all the brick structure and columns remain making the structure easily identified with Monticello. This mansion, the Barboursville Ruins, is now a historical landmark and tourist attraction. The eastern boundary of the revised viticultural area is near the Barboursville Ruins.

Comments

No additional information was received during the comment period. A copy of the petition to revise the boundary and supporting evidence is available for inspection during normal business hours at the following location: ATF Reading Room, Rm. 4407, Office of Public Affairs and Disclosure, 12th and Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act relating to a final regulatory flexibility analysis (5 U.S.C. 604) are not applicable to this final rule because it will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The final rule will not impose, or otherwise cause, a significant increase in reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance burdens on a substantial number of small entities. The final rule is not expected to have a significant secondary or incidental effect on a substantial number of small entities.

Accordingly, it is hereby certified under the provisions of section 3 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C.

605(b)), that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Compliance With Executive Order 12291

In compliance with Executive Order 12291 (46 FR 13193 (1981)), ATF has determined that this final rule is not a "major rule" since it will not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; it will not result in a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State or local government agencies, or geographic regions; and it will not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of the United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96-511, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR Part 1320, do not apply to this final rule because no requirement to collect information is imposed.

List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 9

Administrative practice and procedure, Consumer protection, Viticultural areas, Wine.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this document is James A. Hunt, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

Authority and Issuance

Title 27, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 9, American Viticultural Areas is amended as follows:

PART 9—[AMENDED]

Paragraph 1. The authority citation for Part 9 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 27 U.S.C. 205.

Par. 2. Section 9.48(c) is revised to read as follows:

§ 9.48 Monticello.

(c) *Boundaries.* (1) From Norwood, Virginia, following the Tye River west and northwest until it intersects with the eastern boundary of the George Washington National Forest;

(2) Following this boundary northeast to Virginia Rt. 664;

(3) Then west following Rt. 664 to its intersection with the Nelson County line;

- (4) Then northeast along the Nelson County line to its intersection with the Albemarle County line at Jarman Gap;
- (5) From this point continuing northeast along the eastern boundary of the Shenandoah National Park to its intersection with the northern Albemarle County line;
- (6) Continuing northeast along the Greene County line to its intersection with Virginia Rt. 33;
- (7) Follow Virginia Rt. 33 east to the intersection of Virginia Rt. 230 at Stanardsville;
- (8) Follow Virginia Rt. 230 north to the Greene County line (the Conway River);
- (9) Following the Greene County line (Conway River which becomes the Rapidan River) southeast to its intersection with the Orange County line;
- (10) Following the Orange County line (Rapidan River) east and northeast to its confluence with the Mountain Run River;
- (11) Then following the Mountain Run River southwest to its intersection with Virginia Rt. 20;
- (12) Continuing southwest along Rt. 20 to the corporate limits of the town of Orange;
- (13) Following southwest the corporate limit line to its intersection with U.S. Rt. 15;
- (14) Continuing southwest on Rt. 15 to its intersection with Virginia Rt. 231 in the town of Gordonsville;
- (15) Then southwest along Rt. 231 to its intersection with the Albemarle County line.
- (16) Continuing southwest along the county line to its intersection with the James River;
- (17) Then following the James River to its confluence with the Tye River at Norwood, Virginia, the beginning point.

Signed: May 22, 1987.
 W.T. Drake,
Acting Director
 Approved: June 1, 1987.
 John P. Simpson,
Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Regulatory, Trade and Tariff Enforcement.
 [FR Doc. 87-14296 Filed 6-23-87; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 4910-31-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Coast Guard
33 CFR Part 4
[CGD 87-040]
OMB Control Numbers
AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.
ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), requires generally that all regulations which contain recordkeeping or reporting requirements must be approved by the Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Once approved, these regulations are assigned an OMB Control Number. OMB Control Numbers for regulations within certain parts of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations are displayed in a table appearing at 33 CFR 4.02. This document updates the table to display OMB Control Numbers assigned to certain regulations within Title 33.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 24, 1987.
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LT Sandra Sylvester, (202) 267-1534.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This final rule was not preceded by a notice of proposed rulemaking and is being made effective in less than 30 days. This rule merely displays existing OMB Control Numbers pertaining to specific Coast Guard regulations for the public's information. Therefore, the Coast Guard has determined that notice and comment procedures are unnecessary under the Administrative Procedure Act [5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B)]. Since this rule has no substantive effect, good cause exists to make this rule effective in less than thirty days under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

Drafting Information
 This rule was drafted by LT Sandra R. Sylvester, Office of Chief Counsel, Regulations and Administrative Law Division.

Regulatory Evaluation
 This regulation is considered to be non-major under Executive Order 12291, and non-significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979). The economic impact of this final rule has been found to be so minimal that further evaluation is unnecessary. This rule merely displays existing OMB Control Numbers and imposes no new substantive requirements. Since the impact of this rule is expected to be minimal, the Coast Guard certifies that it will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 4
 Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

PART 4—[AMENDED]
 In consideration of the foregoing, Part 4 of Chapter I, Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 4 continues to read as follows:
 Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3507; 49 CFR 1.45(a).

2. The table in § 4.02(b) is amended by adding new entries in numerical order and revising the entry for Part 165 to read as follows:

§ 4.02 Display.

* * * * *	
(b) Display	
* * * * *	
Part 127.....	2115-0552
* * * * *	
Section 140.15.....	2115-0553
* * * * *	
Part 160.....	2115-0540
Part 161.....	2115-0540
* * * * *	
Part 164.....	2115-0540
Part 165.....	2115-0540
* * * * *	

Dated: June 11, 1987.
 J.E. Vorbach,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chairman,
Marine Safety Council.
 [FR Doc. 87-14107 Filed 6-23-87; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
40 CFR Part 180
[PP 4E3112/R892; FRL-3221-5]
Pesticide Tolerance for 4-Amino-6-(1,1-Dimethylethyl)-3-(Methylthio)-1,2,4-Triazin-5(4H)-One

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule establishes a tolerance for the combined residues of the herbicide (4-amino-6-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-3-(methylthio)-1,2,4-triazin-5(4H)-one) (referred to in the preamble as metribuzin), and its triazinone metabolites in or on the raw agricultural commodity carrots. This regulation to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of the herbicide in or on carrots was requested in a petition by the Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4).

EFFECTIVE DATE: Effective on June 24, 1987.
ADDRESS: Written objections, identified by the document control number, [PP 4E3112/R892], may be submitted to: Hearing Clerk (A-110), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.