EPA-APPROVED ARKANSAS SOURCE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Name of source	Permit or order No.	State approval/ effective date	EPA approval date	Comments
Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation Carl E. Bailey Generating Station.	Administrative Order LIS No. 18–071	08/07/2018	09/27/2019, 84 FR 51033	Unit 1.
Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation John L. McClellan Generating Station.	Administrative Order LIS No. 18–071	08/07/2018	09/27/2019, 84 FR 51033	Unit 1.
Southwestern Electric Power Company Flint Creek Power Plant.	Administrative Order LIS No. 18–072	08/07/2018	09/27/2019, 84 FR 51033	Unit 1.
Entergy Arkansas, Inc. Lake Catherine Plant.	Administrative Order LIS No. 18–073	08/07/2018	09/27/2019, 84 FR 51033	Unit 4.
Entergy Arkansas, Inc. White Bluff Plant.	Administrative Order LIS No. 18–073	08/07/2018	09/27/2019, 84 FR 51033	Units 1, 2, and Auxiliary Boiler.
Entergy Arkansas, Inc. Independence Plant.	Administrative Order LIS No. 18–073	08/07/2018	09/27/2019, 84 FR 51033	Units 1 and 2.
Domtar Ashdown Mill	Permit #0287–AOP–R22	08/01/2019	03/22/2021, 86 FR 15104	Approval of plantwide conditions 32 to 43 of section VI from the permit, addressing emission limits for SO_2, NO_X, and PM_{10} and conditions for implementing the BART alternative for Power Boilers No. 1 and 2.
FutureFuel Chemical Company	Administrative Order LIS No. 22–085	08/03/2022	08/27/2026, 91 FR 55268	Three boiler system (SN:6M01–01).

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2026–23686 Filed 11–19–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2025–1444; FRL–13577–01–OCSPP]

Metamitron; Pesticide Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes a tolerance action for residues of metamitron (CASRN 41394–05–2) in or on the raw agricultural commodity (RAC) of beet, sugar, roots. Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), ADAMA Agan Ltd. c/o Makhteshim Agan of North America, Inc. (d/b/a ADAMA) submitted a petition to EPA requesting that EPA establish a maximum permissible level for residues of this pesticide in or on the identified commodity.

DATES: This rule is effective on November 20, 2026. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before January 19, 2027 and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of this document).

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2025–1444, is available online at *https://www.regulations.gov.* Additional information about dockets generally, along with instructions for visiting the docket in person, is available at *https://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Smith, Pesticide Registration Division (7505T), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (202) 566–1030; email address: *RDFRNotices@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Executive Summary

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. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document might apply to them:

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

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. What is EPA's authority for taking this action?

EPA is issuing this rulemaking under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a. FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the tolerance is ''safe.'' FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(A)(ii) 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 in residential settings but does not include occupational exposure. FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(C) requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing 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 . . .''

C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a(g), any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. If you fail to file an objection to the final rule within the time period specified in the final rule, you will have waived the right to raise any issues resolved in the final rule. 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 the docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2025–1444 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 January 19, 2027.

The EPA's Administrative Law Judges Division (ALJD), in which the Hearing Clerk is housed, urges parties to file and serve documents by electronic means only, notwithstanding any other particular requirements set forth in other procedural rules governing those proceedings. *See* ''Order Urging Electronic Filing and Service,'' dated December 3, 2025, which can be found at *https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2025-12/2025-12-03-order-urging-electronic-filing-and-service.pdf.* Although the EPA's regulations require submission via U.S. Mail or hand delivery, the EPA intends to treat submissions filed via electronic means as properly filed submissions; therefore, the EPA believes the preference for submission via electronic means will not be prejudicial. When submitting documents to the ALJD electronically, a person should utilize the ALJD e-filing system at *https://yosemite.epa.gov/oa/eab/eab-alj_upload.nsf.*

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 (excluding any Confidential Business Information (CBI)) for inclusion in the public docket at *https://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. If you wish to include CBI in your request, please follow the applicable instructions at *https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets#rules* and clearly mark the information that you claim to be CBI. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice.

II. Petitioned-For Tolerance

In the **Federal Register** of December 1, 2025 (90 FR 55065) (FRL–12474–09–OCSPP), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP 5F9188) by ADAMA Agan Ltd. c/o Makhteshim Agan of North America, Inc. (d/b/a ADAMA), 8601 Six Forks Rd., Suite 300 Raleigh, NC 27615. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.726 be amended by establishing tolerances for residues of the herbicide metamitron, including its metabolites and degradates, in or on the RAC beet, sugar, roots at 0.01 parts per million (ppm). That document referenced a summary of the petition that was prepared by the petitioner and included in the docket. There was one (1) non-substantive comment received on December 9, 2025, in response to the notice of filing.

III. Final Tolerance Action

A. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), and the factors specified therein, EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action. EPA has sufficient data to assess the hazards of and to make a determination on aggregate exposure for metamitron including exposure resulting from the tolerances established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with metamitron is summarized in this unit.

In an effort to streamline its publications in the **Federal Register**, EPA is not reprinting sections that repeat what has been previously published for tolerance rulemaking of the same pesticide chemical. Where scientific information concerning a particular chemical remains unchanged, the content of those sections would not vary between tolerance rulemaking and republishing the same sections is unnecessary. EPA considers referral back to those sections as sufficient to provide an explanation of the information EPA considered in making its safety determination for the new rulemaking.

EPA has previously published a tolerance rulemaking for metamitron in which EPA concluded, based on the available information, that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm would result from aggregate exposure to metamitron and established tolerances for residues of that chemical. EPA is incorporating previously published sections from this rulemaking as described further in this rulemaking, as they remain unchanged.

B. Toxicological Profile

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered its validity, completeness, and reliability as well as the relationship of the results of the studies 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.

For a discussion of the toxicological profile of metamitron, see Unit III. A. of the March 11, 2025, final rulemaking (90 FR 11670) (FRL–12591–01).

C. Toxicological Points of Departure/Levels of Concern

Once a pesticide's toxicological profile is determined, EPA identifies toxicological points of departure (POD) and levels of concern to use in evaluating the risk posed by human exposure to the pesticide. For hazards that have a threshold below which there is no appreciable risk, the toxicological POD is used as the basis for derivation of reference values for risk assessment. PODs are developed based on a careful analysis of the doses in each toxicological study to determine the dose at which no adverse effects are observed (the NOAEL) and the lowest dose at which adverse effects of concern are identified (the LOAEL). Uncertainty/safety factors are used in conjunction with the POD to calculate a safe exposure level—generally referred to as a population-adjusted dose (PAD) or a reference dose (RfD)—and a safe margin of exposure (MOE). For non-threshold risks, the Agency assumes that any amount of exposure will lead to some degree of risk. Thus, the Agency estimates risk in terms of the probability of an occurrence of the adverse effect expected in a lifetime. For more information on the general principles EPA uses in risk characterization and a complete description of the risk assessment process, see *https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/human-health-risk-pesticides.*

For a discussion of the Toxicological Points of Departure/Levels of Concern for metamitron used for human risk assessment, please reference Unit IV. A. of the July 10, 2024, final rulemaking (89 FR 56669) (FRL–12054–01–OCSPP).

D. Exposure Assessment

Some of the exposure assessment remains the same although updates have occurred to incorporate updated EDWCs (232 ppb and 127 ppb for the acute and chronic assessments, respectively). For a description of the rest of the EPA approach to and assumptions for the exposure assessment, please reference Unit IV. B. of the July 10, 2024, final rulemaking (89 FR 56669) (FRL–12054–01).

Acute and chronic dietary (food and drinking water) exposure and risk assessment was conducted using the Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model software with the Food Commodity Intake Database (DEEM–FCID) Version 4.02, which incorporates 2005–2010 consumption data from the USDA's NHANES/WWEIA. The assessments used combined level of quantification (LOQ) field trial residues from parent

compound metamitron and metabolite desamino-metamitron for all crops and assumed that 100% of the crops were treated with metamitron. The unrefined acute dietary risk estimates are below the Agency's level of concern (<100% aPAD) at the 95th exposure percentile for the general U.S. population (4.1% of the aPAD) and for all infants (<1-year-old) (14% of the aPAD), the most highly exposed population subgroup. Chronic dietary risks are below the Agency's level of concern of 100% of the cPAD (2.9% for the general U.S. population); they are 11% of the cPAD for all infants (<1 year old), the population group with the highest estimated exposure.

E. Safety Factor for Infants and Children

1. *In general.* FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(C) provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold (10X) 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 database on toxicity and exposure unless EPA determines based on reliable data that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. This additional margin of safety is commonly referred to as the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) Safety Factor (SF). In applying this provision, EPA either retains the default value of 10X, or uses a different additional safety factor when reliable data available to EPA support the choice of a different factor.

3. *Conclusion.* EPA continues to conclude that there are reliable data to support the reduction of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) safety factor (SF) from 10X to 1X for all risk scenarios. See Unit IV.C. of the July 10, 2024 final rulemaking (89 FR 56669) (FRL–12054–01) for a discussion of the Agency's rationale for that determination.

F. Aggregate Risk and Determination of Safety

EPA continues to conclude that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the general population, or to infants and children, from aggregate exposure to metamitron residues. See Unit IV.D. of the July 10, 2024, final rulemaking (89 FR 56669) (FRL–12054–01) for the Agency's full explanation of this conclusion.

IV. Other Considerations

A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

For a discussion of the available analytical enforcement method for various crops, see Unit V.A. of the July 10, 2024, final rulemaking (89 FR 56669) (FRL–12054–01).

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 is a joint United Nations 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 an MRL for metamitron on beet, sugar, roots, and therefore, harmonization is not an issue at this time.

V. Conclusion

Therefore, a tolerance is established for residues of metamitron, (4-amino-3-methyl-6-phenyl-1,2,4-triazin-5(4 H)-one), in or on the RAC of beet, sugar, roots at 0.01 ppm.

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at *https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/and-executive-orders.*

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review

This action is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), because it establishes or modifies a pesticide tolerance or a tolerance exemption under FFDCA section 408 in response to a petition submitted to the Agency. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866.

B. Executive Order 14192: Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation

Executive Order 14192 (90 FR 9065, February 6, 2025) does not apply because actions that establish a tolerance under FFDCA section 408 are exempted from review under Executive Order 12866.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the PRA 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.,* because it does not contain any information collection activities.

D. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

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

E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

This action does not contain an unfunded mandate of $100 million or more (in 1995 dollars and adjusted annually for inflation) as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The action imposes no enforceable duty on any State, local, or Tribal governments or on the private sector.

F. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

This action does not have federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

G. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This action does not have Tribal implications as specified in Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because it will not have substantial direct effects on Tribal governments, on the relationship between the Federal Government and the Indian Tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes.

H. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) because tolerance actions like this one are exempt from review under Executive Order 12866. However, EPA's 2026 *Policy on Children's Health* applies to this action. This rule finalizes tolerance actions under the FFDCA, which requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and

children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing 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 . . .'' (FFDCA 408(b)(2)(C)). The Agency's consideration is summarized in Unit III.E.

I. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355) (May 22, 2001) because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

J. National Technology Transfer Advancement Act (NTTAA)

This action does not involve technical standards that would require Agency consideration under NTTAA section 12(d), 15 U.S.C. 272.

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

This action is subject to the CRA, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.,* and EPA will submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This action 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: November 12, 2026.

Charles Smith,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 40 CFR chapter I is amended as follows:

PART 180—TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUES IN FOOD

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

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

■ 2. In § 180.726:

■ a. Amend table 1 to paragraph (a) by adding the entry ''Beet, sugar, roots'' in alphabetically order.

■ b. Remove and reserve paragraph (b).

The addition reads as follows:

§ 180.726 Metamitron; tolerances for residues.

(a) * * *

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (a)

Commodity	Parts per million
* * * * *	
Beet, sugar, roots	0.01
* * * * *	

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2026–23667 Filed 11–19–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 622

[Docket No. 200124–0029; RTID 0648–XG205]

Reef Fish Fishery in the Gulf of America; 2026 Recreational Private Angling Component Closure for Red Snapper in Federal Waters off Texas

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Temporary rule; closure.

SUMMARY: NMFS closes the 2026 recreational fishing season for the red snapper private angling component in Federal waters of the Gulf of America (Gulf) off Texas. The recreational private angling component in Federal waters off Texas is closed on November 21, 2026, and this closure continues through the remainder of 2026. This red snapper closure is necessary to prevent the private angling component from exceeding the annual catch limit (ACL) in the Texas regional management area and to prevent overfishing of red snapper.

DATES: This closure is effective and begins on November 21, 2026, and continues through December 31, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frank Helies, NMFS Southeast Regional Office, telephone: 727–824–5305, email: *frank.helies@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Gulf reef fish fishery includes red snapper and is managed under the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf (FMP). NMFS and the Gulf Fishery Management Council prepared the FMP, which was approved by the Secretary of Commerce, and NMFS implements the FMP under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) by regulations at 50 CFR part 622.

The final rule implementing Amendment 40 to the FMP established two components within the recreational fishing sector for Gulf red snapper: the private angling component and the Federal for-hire component (80 FR 22422, April 22, 2015). Amendment 40 also allocated the red snapper recreational ACL (recreational quota) between the components and established separate seasonal closures for the two components. On February 6, 2020, NMFS published a final rule implementing six FMP amendments (Amendments 50A through F to the FMP), which delegated authority to Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida to establish specific management measures for the recreational harvest of red snapper in Federal waters by the private angling component (85 FR 6819, February 6, 2020). The final rule allocated state a portion of the private angling component quota of red snapper to each state, and each state is required to constrain red snapper landings to its allocation.

As described at 50 CFR 622.23(c), a state with an active delegation may request that NMFS close Federal waters off that state to the harvest or possession of red snapper by private recreational anglers. Under Amendment 50A, the state is required to request the closure by letter to NMFS and to provide dates and geographic coordinates for the closure. If the request is within the scope of the analysis in Amendment 50A, NMFS will publish a notification in the **Federal Register** to implement the closure. Based on the analysis in Amendment 50A, Texas may request a closure of all Federal waters off the state to allow a year-round fishing season in state waters. As described at 50 CFR 622.2, ''off Texas'' means Federal waters west of a rhumb line from 29°32.1′ N latitude, 93°47.7′ W longitude to 26°11.4′ N latitude, 92°53′ W longitude, which line is an extension of the boundary between Louisiana and Texas.

On November 10, 2026, NMFS received a letter from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) requesting that NMFS close Federal waters off Texas to red snapper harvest by the private angling component beginning on November 21, 2026. NMFS has determined that the TPWD request is within the scope of analysis contained within Amendment 50A, which analyzed the potential impacts of a closure of all Federal waters off Texas when a portion of the Texas private angling component ACL has been harvested. As explained in Amendment