

standard in FFDCA section 408(c)(2), a tolerance exemption is appropriate.

VIII. Conclusions

EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the U.S. population, including infants and children, from aggregate exposure to residues of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strain CL145A. Therefore, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance is established for residues of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strain CL145A in or on all food commodities when applied as a molluscicide.

IX. References

1. Murray PR, Baron E, Jorgensen JH, Pfaller MA, Tenover FC, White
2. U.S. EPA. 2011. *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strain CL145A Biopesticides Registration Action Document dated July 2011 (available as "Supporting & Related Material" within docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0568 at <http://www.regulations.gov>).
3. Garritty GM, Bell JA, Lilburn T, editors. 2005. "Pseudomonadales" in Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology. 2nd ed. New York (NY): Springer.
4. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 1997. Consensus Document on Information Used in the Assessment of Environmental Applications Involving *Pseudomonas*. Available from <http://www.rebeca-net.de/downloads/OECD%20Consensus%20document%20pseudomonas.pdf>.
5. U.S. EPA. 2004. Primer for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Systems. EPA 832-R-04-001.
6. U.S. EPA. 1996. Microbial Pesticide Test Guidelines—Background for Residue Analysis of Microbial Pest Control Agents (OPPTS 885.2000). Available from http://www.epa.gov/ocspp/pubs/frs/publications/Test_Guidelines/series885.htm.

X. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This final rule establishes a tolerance exemption under section 408(d) of FFDCA in response to a petition submitted to EPA. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled *Regulatory Planning and Review* (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Because this final rule has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866, this final rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, entitled *Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use* (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001), or Executive Order 13045, entitled *Protection of Children from*

Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). This final rule does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, nor does it require any special considerations under Executive Order 12898, entitled *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a petition under section 408(d) of FFDCA, such as the tolerance exemption in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) do not apply.

This final rule directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, not States or tribes. As a result, this action does not alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of section 408(n)(4) of FFDCA. As such, EPA has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States or tribal governments, on the relationship between the national government and the States or tribal governments, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government or between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. Thus, EPA has determined that Executive Order 13132, entitled *Federalism* (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), and Executive Order 13175, entitled *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments* (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), do not apply to this final rule. In addition, this final rule does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104-4).

This action does not involve any technical standards that would require EPA consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

XI. Congressional Review Act

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and

other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of this final rule in the **Federal Register**. This final rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: July 29, 2011.

Steven Bradbury,
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR chapter I is amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

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

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

- 2. Section 180.1304 is added to subpart D to read as follows:

§ 180.1304 *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strain CL145A; exemption from the requirement of a tolerance.

An exemption from the requirement of a tolerance is established for residues of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strain CL145A in or on all food commodities when applied as a molluscicide.

[FR Doc. 2011-21249 Filed 8-23-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0430; FRL-8881-5]

2-Propenoic Acid, Polymer With Ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) Benzene, Sodium Salt; Tolerance Exemption

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt when used as an inert ingredient in a pesticide chemical formulation under 40 CFR 180.960. BASF Corporation submitted a petition to EPA under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), requesting an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. This

regulation eliminates the need to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt on food or feed commodities.

DATES: This regulation is effective August 24, 2011. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before October 24, 2011, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under docket identification (ID) number EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0430. All documents in the docket are listed in the docket index available at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available in the electronic docket at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or, if only available in hard copy, at the OPP Regulatory Public Docket in Rm. S-4400, One Potomac Yard (South Bldg.), 2777 S. Crystal Dr., Arlington, VA. The Docket Facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The Docket Facility telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alganesh Debesai, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 308-8353; e-mail address: debesai.alganesh@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected entities may include, but are not limited to:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide

for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in this unit could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether this action might apply to certain entities. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

B. How can I get electronic access to other related information?

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl.

C. Can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0430 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All objections and requests for a hearing must be in writing, and must be received by the Hearing Clerk on or before October 24, 2011. Addresses for mail and hand delivery of objections and hearing requests are provided in 40 CFR 178.25(b).

In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in 40 CFR part 178, please submit a copy of the filing that does not contain any CBI for inclusion in the public docket. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. Submit a copy of your non-CBI objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0430, by one of the following methods.

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- **Mail:** Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) Regulatory Public Docket (7502P), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001.
- **Delivery:** OPP Regulatory Public Docket (7502P), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. S-4400, One

Potomac Yard (South Bldg.), 2777 S. Crystal Dr., Arlington, VA. Deliveries are only accepted during the Docket Facility's normal hours of operation (8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays). Special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The Docket Facility telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

II. Background and Statutory Findings

In the **Federal Register** Wednesday, July 6, 2011 (76 FR 39358) (FRL-8875-6), EPA issued a notice pursuant to section 408 of FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. 346a, announcing the receipt of a pesticide petition (PP 1E7862) filed by BASF Corporation, 100 Campus Drive, Florham Park, NJ 07932. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.960 be amended by establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt; CAS Reg. No. 129811-24-1. That notice included a summary of the petition prepared by the petitioner and solicited comments on the petitioner's request. The Agency did not receive any comments.

Section 408(c)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish an exemption from the requirement for a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the exemption is "safe." Section 408(c)(2)(A)(ii) of FFDCA defines "safe" to mean that "there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information." This includes exposure through drinking water and use in residential settings, but does not include occupational exposure. Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance and to "ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue. * * *" and specifies factors EPA is to consider in establishing an exemption.

III. Risk Assessment and Statutory Findings

EPA establishes exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance only in those cases where it can be shown that the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide chemical residues under

reasonably foreseeable circumstances will pose no appreciable risks to human health. In order to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide inert ingredients, the Agency considers the toxicity of the inert in conjunction with possible exposure to residues of the inert ingredient through food, drinking water, and through other exposures that occur as a result of pesticide use in residential settings. If EPA is able to determine that a finite tolerance is not necessary to ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the inert ingredient, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance may be established.

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action and considered its validity, completeness and reliability and the relationship of this information to human risk. EPA has also considered available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers, including infants and children. In the case of certain chemical substances that are defined as polymers, the Agency has established a set of criteria to identify categories of polymers expected to present minimal or no risk. The definition of a polymer is given in 40 CFR 723.250(b) and the exclusion criteria for identifying these low-risk polymers are described in 40 CFR 723.250(d). 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt conforms to the definition of a polymer given in 40 CFR 723.250(b) and meets the following criteria that are used to identify low-risk polymers.

1. The polymer is not a cationic polymer nor is it reasonably anticipated to become a cationic polymer in a natural aquatic environment.

2. The polymer does contain as an integral part of its composition the atomic elements carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen.

3. The polymer does not contain as an integral part of its composition, except as impurities, any element other than those listed in 40 CFR 723.250(d)(2)(ii).

4. The polymer is neither designed nor can it be reasonably anticipated to substantially degrade, decompose, or depolymerize.

5. The polymer is manufactured or imported from monomers and/or reactants that are already included on the TSCA Chemical Substance Inventory or manufactured under an applicable TSCA section 5 exemption.

6. The polymer is not a water absorbing polymer with a number average molecular weight (MW) greater than or equal to 10,000 daltons.

Additionally, the polymer also meets as required the following exemption criteria specified in 40 CFR 723.250(e).

7. The polymer's number average MW of is greater than 1,000 and less than 10,000 daltons. The polymer contains less than 10% oligomeric material below MW 500 and less than 25% oligomeric material below MW 1,000, and the polymer does not contain any reactive functional groups.

Thus, 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt meets the criteria for a polymer to be considered low risk under 40 CFR 723.250. Based on its conformance to the criteria in this unit, no mammalian toxicity is anticipated from dietary, inhalation, or dermal exposure to 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt.

IV. Aggregate Exposures

For the purposes of assessing potential exposure under this exemption, EPA considered that 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt could be present in all raw and processed agricultural commodities and drinking water, and that non-occupational non-dietary exposure was possible. The number average MW of 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt is 2,863 daltons. Generally, a polymer of this size would be poorly absorbed through the intact gastrointestinal tract or through intact human skin. Since 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt conform to the criteria that identify a low-risk polymer, there are no concerns for risks associated with any potential exposure scenarios that are reasonably foreseeable. The Agency has determined that a tolerance is not necessary to protect the public health.

V. Cumulative Effects From Substances With a Common Mechanism of Toxicity

Section 408(b)(2)(D)(v) of FFDCA requires that, when considering whether to establish, modify, or revoke a tolerance, the Agency consider "available information" concerning the cumulative effects of a particular pesticide's residues and "other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity."

EPA has not found 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-

methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has assumed that 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt does not have a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances. For information regarding EPA's efforts to determine which chemicals have a common mechanism of toxicity and to evaluate the cumulative effects of such chemicals, see EPA's Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/cumulative>.

VI. Additional Safety Factor for the Protection of Infants and Children

Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold margin of safety for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for prenatal and postnatal toxicity and the completeness of the data base unless EPA concludes that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. Due to the expected low toxicity of 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt, EPA has not used a safety factor analysis to assess the risk. For the same reasons the additional tenfold safety factor is unnecessary.

VII. Determination of Safety

Based on the conformance to the criteria used to identify a low-risk polymer, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty of no harm to the U.S. population, including infants and children, from aggregate exposure to residues of 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt.

VIII. Other Considerations

A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

An analytical method is not required for enforcement purposes since the Agency is establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance without any numerical limitation.

B. International Residue Limits

In making its tolerance decisions, EPA seeks to harmonize U.S. tolerances with international standards whenever possible, consistent with U.S. food safety standards and agricultural practices. EPA considers the international maximum residue limits

(MRLs) established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex), as required by FFDCA section 408(b)(4). The Codex Alimentarius is a joint U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization/World Health Organization food standards program, and it is recognized as an international food safety standards-setting organization in trade agreements to which the United States is a party. EPA may establish a tolerance that is different from a Codex MRL; however, FFDCA section 408(b)(4) requires that EPA explain the reasons for departing from the Codex level.

The Codex has not established a MRL for 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt.

IX. Conclusion

Accordingly, EPA finds that exempting residues of 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt from the requirement of a tolerance will be safe.

X. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This final rule establishes a tolerance under section 408(d) of FFDCA in response to a petition submitted to the Agency. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these rules from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled *Regulatory Planning and Review* (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Because this final rule has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866, this final rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, entitled *Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use* (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) or Executive Order 13045, entitled *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks* (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). This final rule does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, nor does it involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of

the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104–113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a petition under section 408(d) of FFDCA, such as the tolerance in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) do not apply.

This final rule directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, not States or tribes, nor does this action alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of section 408(n)(4) of FFDCA. As such, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States or tribal governments, on the relationship between the national government and the States or tribal governments, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government or between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or otherwise have any unique impacts on local governments. Thus, the Agency has determined that Executive Order 13132, entitled *Federalism* (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) and Executive Order 13175, entitled *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments* (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000) do not apply to this final rule. In addition, this final rule does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104–4).

Although this action does not require any special considerations under Executive Order 12898, entitled *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994), EPA seeks to achieve environmental justice, the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of any group, including minority and/or low-income populations, in the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws,

regulations, and policies. As such, to the extent that information is publicly available or was submitted in comments to EPA, the Agency considered whether groups or segments of the population, as a result of their location, cultural practices, or other factors, may have atypical or disproportionately high and adverse human health impacts or environmental effects from exposure to the pesticide discussed in this document, compared to the general population.

XI. Congressional Review Act

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of this rule in the **Federal Register**. This rule is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: August 15, 2011.

Lois Rossi,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR chapter I is amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

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

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. In § 180.960, the table is amended by adding alphabetically the following polymer to read as follows:

§ 180.960 Polymers; exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance.

* * * * *

Polymer	CAS No.
* * * * *	* * * * *
2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenylbenzene and (1-methylethenyl) benzene, sodium salt, minimum number average molecular weight (in amu), 2,800	129811–24–1
* * * * *	* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2011-21371 Filed 8-23-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY****Federal Emergency Management
Agency****44 CFR Part 65****[Docket ID FEMA-2011-0002]****Changes in Flood Elevation
Determinations***Correction*In rule document 2011-20963
appearing on pages 50915-50918 in theissue of Wednesday, August 17, 2011,
make the following correction:**§ 65.4 [Amended]**■ 1. On page 50917, in the untitled
table, the second through the sixth
entries should read:

Colorado:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Adams (FEMA Docket No.: B-1186).	City of Commerce City (10-08-0226P).	February 1, 2011; February 8, 2011; <i>The Commerce City Sentinel Express</i> .	The Honorable Paul Natale, Mayor, City of Commerce City, 7887 East 60th Avenue, Commerce City, CO 80022.	June 8, 2011	080006		
Adams (FEMA Docket No.: B-1191).	City of Thornton (10-08-0748P).	February 17, 2011; February 24, 2011; <i>The Northglenn-Thornton Sentinel</i> .	The Honorable Mack Goodman, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Thornton, 9500 Civic Center Drive, Thornton, CO 80229.	June 24, 2011	080007		
Adams (FEMA Docket No.: B-1191).	Unincorporated areas of Adams County (10-08-0748P).	February 17, 2011; February 24, 2011; <i>The Northglenn-Thornton Sentinel</i> .	The Honorable W.R. "Skip" Fischer, Chairman, Adams County Board of Commissioners, 4430 South Adams County Parkway, Brighton, CO 80601.	June 24, 2011	080001		
Douglas (FEMA Docket No. B-1191).	Unincorporated areas of Douglas County (11-08-0030P).	February 10, 2011; February 17, 2011; <i>The Douglas County News-Press</i> .	The Honorable Jill Repella, Chair, Douglas County Board of Commissioners, 100 3rd Street, Castle Rock, CO 80104.	June 17, 2011	080049		
Douglas (FEMA Docket No.: B-1195).	Unincorporated areas of Douglas County (11-08-0287P).	March 10, 2011; March 17, 2011; <i>The Douglas County News-Press</i> .	The Honorable Jill Repella, Chair, Douglas County Board of Commissioners, 100 3rd Street, Castle Rock, CO 80104.	February 28, 2011	080049		
	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

■ 2. On the same page, in the same
table, the fourteenth entry should read:

Oklahoma: Tulsa (FEMA Docket No.: B-1113).	City of Broken Arrow, (09-06-3069P).	February 23, 2010; March 2, 2010; <i>Tulsa Daily Commerce and Legal News</i> .	The Honorable Mike Lester, Mayor, City of Broken Arrow, 220 South 1st Street, Broken Arrow, OK 74012.	March 18, 2010	400236		
	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

■ 3. On the same page, in the same
table, the twentieth entry should read:

Texas: Bexar (FEMA Docket No.: B-1135).	City of San Antonio (09-06-3107P).	April 23, 2010; April 30, 2010; <i>The San Antonio Express-News</i> .	The Honorable Julian Castro, Mayor, City of San Antonio, P.O. Box 839966, San Antonio, TX 78283.	April 26, 2010	480045		
	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

■ 4. On page 50918, in the same table,
the first through the third entries should
read:

Texas:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Collin (FEMA Docket No.: B-1116).	City of Allen (09-06-3028P).	November 6, 2009; November 13, 2009; <i>The McKinney Courier-Gazette</i> .	The Honorable Stephen Terrell, Mayor, City of Allen, 305 Century Parkway, Allen, TX 75013.	October 28, 2009	480131		