

longibrachiatum (formerly *T. reesei*). The enzyme, cellulase, catalyzes the endohydrolysis of 1,4-beta-glycosidic linkages in cellulose. It is obtained from the culture filtrate resulting from a pure culture fermentation process.

(b) The ingredient meets the general and additional requirements for enzyme preparations in the monograph specifications on enzyme preparations in the "Food Chemicals Codex," 4th ed. (1996), pp. 129 to 134, which is incorporated by reference in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies are available from the National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW., Box 285, Washington, DC 20055 (Internet "http://www.nap.edu"), or may be examined at the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition's Library, 200 C St. SW., rm. 3321, Washington, DC, or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol St. NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(c) In accordance with § 184.1(b)(1), the ingredient is used in food with no limitation other than current good manufacturing practice. The affirmation of this ingredient as generally recognized as safe (GRAS) as a direct human food ingredient is based upon the following current good manufacturing practice conditions of use:

(1) The ingredient is used in food as an enzyme as defined in § 170.3(o)(9) of this chapter for the breakdown of cellulose.

(2) The ingredient is used in food at levels not to exceed current good manufacturing practice.

Dated: May 17, 1999.

L. Robert Lake,

Director, Office of Policy, Planning and Strategic Initiatives, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition.

[FR Doc. 99-13151 Filed 5-25-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-F

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 914

[SPATS No. IN-144-FOR]

Indiana Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Interior.

ACTION: Final rule; clarification.

SUMMARY: The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) is clarifying its decision and responses to comments it received on an amendment

to the Indiana regulatory program (Indiana program) under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). The amendment concerned revisions to and additions of statutes pertaining to other State and Federal laws and permit revisions. At the request of the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), we are providing clarification of our decision findings and responses to comments for two provisions relating to permit revisions that we disapproved in a previous final rule decision document dated March 16, 1999 (64 FR 12890). This clarification supplements our previous findings made in section III. Director's Findings and our responses to comments made in section IV. Summary and Disposition of Comments of that final rule document, but does not affect our decision made in section V. Director's Decision.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 26, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew R. Gilmore, Director, Indianapolis Field Office, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Minton-Capehart Federal Building, 575 North Pennsylvania Street, Room 301, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1521. Telephone (317) 226-6700. Internet: INFOMAIL@indgw.osmre.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 16, 1999, we published a final rule approving, with certain exceptions, a May 14, 1998, amendment to the Indiana program. The amendment concerned revisions to Indiana Code (IC) 14-8 and several sections of IC 14-34 made by the Indiana House Enrolled Act No. 1074 (HEA 1074). By letter dated May 12, 1999, the IDNR asked us to clarify our disapproval of two revisions to the Indiana Code that were included in HEA 1074. The IDNR was concerned that the language we used in the preamble discussion of the disapproved revisions would have an adverse impact on the existing approved Indiana program. This final rule clarifies the preamble discussion of our final decision and our responses to the comments received on these two revisions. First, we disapproved IC 14-34-5-7-7(a), which defined a permit revision. Second, we disapproved IC 14-34-5-8.2(4), which added a guideline that would require Indiana to approve postmining land use changes, with specified exceptions, as nonsignificant permit revisions.

IC 14-34-5-7(a), Definition of Permit Revision

As proposed, this provision would define a permit revision as a change in mining or reclamation operations from

the approved mining and reclamation plans that adversely affect the permittee's compliance with state statutes and regulations. In the March 16, 1999, **Federal Register** notice disapproving this provision, we cited three problems with the proposed language. The discussion of those three problems is not intended to affect the currently approved regulation at 310 IAC 12-3-121(a)(1) cited by the Indiana Coal Council (ICC) in their comments of June 26, 1998, in support of the proposed change (Administrative Record No. IND-1617). The portion of this regulation cited by the ICC requires revisions to permits for changes in surface coal mining or reclamation operations described in the original application and approved under the original permit, when such changes constitute a significant departure from the method of conduct of mining or reclamation operations contemplated by the original permit. In addition to the portion cited by the ICC, the regulation at 310 IAC 12-3-121(a)(1) goes on to state that changes which constitute a significant departure shall include, but not be limited to, those that could result in an operator's inability to comply with applicable requirements (emphasis added). The proposed statutory change we disapproved would have been in conflict with the current regulation in that it would have imposed a limitation inconsistent with this previous approved regulation. However, we do not intend for our disapproval of IC 14-34-5-7(a) to impact the current discretion that Indiana has within its approved program to determine when a revision is required.

IC 14-34-5-8.2(4) Post-Mining Land Use as Nonsignificant Permit Revisions

As proposed, this provision would classify a revision as nonsignificant that involved a land use change other than those listed in IC 14-34-5-8.1(8). Section 8.1(8) listed, as significant revisions, residential land uses, commercial or industrial land uses, recreational land uses, and developed water resources meeting the size criteria of 30 CFR 77.216(a). In a letter faxed to us on December 21, 1998, responding to our concerns regarding this provision, the IDNR indicated that it interpreted this provision to mean that Indiana would retain discretion to determine that land use changes other than those listed in IC 14-34-8.1(8) could be significant revisions (Administrative Record No. IND-1627). However, we disapproved this proposed revision because we feel that it is clear on its face that the proposed change would remove such discretion. We went on to explain

that we felt there are clearly times when other land use changes could warrant being considered a significant revision. However, it is not our intent to indicate that all other land use changes must be considered a significant revision. Nor is it our intent to alter OSM's position as reflected in other regulatory actions relating to significant permit revisions, such as those for the Federal program in Tennessee. We do feel that it is essential for Indiana to continue to have the discretion to determine, on a case-by-case basis, that other land use changes besides those listed in section 8.1(8) may constitute a significant revision. Therefore, this provision was disapproved.

Dated: May 18, 1999.

Brent Wahlquist,

Regional Director, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 99-13336 Filed 5-25-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

38 CFR Part 36

RIN 2900-A192

Loan Guaranty: Requirements for Interest Rate Reduction Refinancing Loans

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Final rule; correction and delay of effective date.

SUMMARY: This document makes a correction to a final rule amending our loan guaranty regulations concerning the requirements for Interest Rate Reduction Refinancing Loans (IRRRLs). This document also delays for 14 days the effective date of the final rule. Under the final rule, generally to obtain an IRRRL the veteran's monthly mortgage payment must decrease. Also, the final rule provides that the loan being refinanced must not be delinquent or the veteran seeking the loan must meet certain credit standard provisions. The new effective date is June 7, 1999. These actions are needed because of a lawsuit concerning the final rule.

DATES: The final rule published in the *Federal Register* on April 23, 1999 (64 FR 19906), with changes made by this document, is effective June 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: R.D. Finneran, Acting Assistant Director for Loan Policy and Valuation (262), Loan Guaranty Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20420, (202) 273-7368.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the authority of 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, VA guarantees loans made by lenders to eligible veterans to purchase, construct, improve, or refinance their homes (the term veteran as used in this document includes any individual defined as a veteran under 38 U.S.C. 101 and 3701 for the purpose of housing loans). This document amends VA's loan guaranty regulations by revising the requirements for VA-guaranteed IRRRLs.

The IRRRL program was established by Public Law No. 96-385, October 7, 1980. IRRRLs are designed to assist veterans by allowing them to refinance an outstanding VA-guaranteed loan with a new loan at a lower rate. The provisions of 38 U.S.C. 3703(c)(3) and 3710(e)(1)(C) allow the veteran to do so without having to pay any out-of-pocket expenses. The veteran may include in the new loan the outstanding balance of the old loan plus reasonable closing costs, including up to two discount points.

We published a final rule in the *Federal Register* on April 23, 1999 (64 FR 19906), to amend the loan guaranty regulations concerning the requirements for IRRRLs. Under the final rule, generally to obtain an IRRRL the veteran's monthly mortgage payment must decrease. Also, the final rule provides that the loan being refinanced must not be delinquent or the veteran seeking the loan must meet certain credit standard provisions.

We are changing 38 CFR 36.4306a(a)(6) in the final rule to reflect statutory provisions at 38 U.S.C. 3710(e)(1)(D) which state that the dollar amount of guaranty on IRRRLs may not exceed the greater of the original guaranty amount of the loan being refinanced or 25 percent of the loan. Since this change merely restates statutory provisions there is a basis for dispensing with notice-and-comment and delayed effective date provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553.

We are also changing the effective date of the final rule. The effective date for the final rule was scheduled to be May 24, 1999. This document changes the effective date to June 7, 1999.

These actions are needed because of a lawsuit concerning the final rule.

Accordingly, in FR Doc. 99-10146 published on April 23, 1999 (64 FR 19906) make the following correction. On page 19910, in § 36.4306a, paragraph (a)(6) is corrected to read as follows:

§ 36.4306a Interest rate reduction refinancing loan.

(a) * * *

(6) The dollar amount of guaranty on the 38 U.S.C. 3710(a)(8) or (a)(9)(B)(i)

loan may not exceed the greater of the original guaranty amount of the loan being refinanced or 25 percent of the loan; and

* * * * *

Approved: May 21, 1999.

Togo D. West, Jr.,

Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

[FR Doc. 99-13396 Filed 5-21-99; 3:38 pm]

BILLING CODE 8320-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

OPP-300864; FRL-6081-8]

RIN 2070-AB78

Spinosad; Pesticide Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes time-limited tolerances for residues of spinosad in or on sweet corn at 0.02 parts per million (ppm), sweet corn forage at 0.6 ppm, sweet corn stover at 1.0 ppm, and a permanent tolerance for tuberous and corm vegetables (crop subgroup 1C) at 0.02 ppm. The Interregional Research Project Number 4 (IR-4) requested the tolerance for tuberous and corm vegetables (crop subgroup 1C). Dow AgroScience Company requested tolerances for sweet corn. These tolerances were requested under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996.

DATES: This regulation is effective May 26, 1999. Objections and requests for hearings must be received by EPA on or before July 26, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written objections and hearing requests, identified by the docket control number, [OPP-300864], must be submitted to: Hearing Clerk (1900), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. M3708, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Fees accompanying objections and hearing requests shall be labeled "Tolerance Petition Fees" and forwarded to: EPA Headquarters Accounting Operations Branch, OPP (Tolerance Fees), P.O. Box 360277M, Pittsburgh, PA 15251. A copy of any objections and hearing requests filed with the Hearing Clerk identified by the docket control number, [OPP-300864], must also be submitted to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch, Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental