sodium. When the weight of these facts is considered an additional safety factor is not warranted for developmental effects. As stated above, aggregate exposure assessments utilized significantly less than 1% of the RfD for either the entire U.S. population or any of 22 population subgroups including infants and children. Therefore, it may be concluded that there is reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to pyrithiobac sodium residues.

F. International Tolerances

There are no established Codex MRLs for pyrithiobac sodium on cottonseed. An established Mexican tolerance for pyrithiobac sodium on cottonseed is identical to the U.S. tolerance. Compatibility is not a problem at this time.

[FR Doc. 97–25234 Filed 9-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF–761; FRL–5740–9]

Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals Ltd.; Pesticide Tolerance Petition Filing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the initial filing of a pesticide petition proposing the establishment of tolerances for residues of 4,5-Dichloro-1,2-Dithiol-3-one (CASRN 1192–52–5) in or on paper and paperboard.

DATES: Comments, identified by the docket control number PF–761, must be received on or before October 24, 1997.

ADDRESSES: By mail submit written comments to: Information and Records Integrity Branch, Public Information and Services Divison (7506C), Office of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person bring comments to: Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by following the instructions under ''SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.'' No confidential business information should be submitted through e-mail.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this document may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). CBI should not be submitted through e-mail. Information marked as CBI will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132 at the address given above, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Portia Jenkins, Acting Product Manager (34), Antimicrobials Division (7510C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 6C, Crystal Plaza #1, 2800 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, (703) 308–6230; e-mail: jenkins.portia@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has received a pesticide petition ((PP) 7F4902) from Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd., 6–9, Hiranomachi 2-chome, Chuo-ku, Osaka, 541, Japan, proposing pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), to amend 40 CFR 185 ''Tolerances for Pesticides in Food'' by establishing Subpart D ''Tolerance Exemptions for Pesticides in Foods'' and promulgating therein section 185.9000 establishing a tolerance exemption for residues of the slimicide 4,5-Dichloro-1,2-Dithiol-3-one (CASRN 1192–52–5) in or on paper and paperboard resulting from its addition to pulp and paper mill process water to control slime forming organisms. EPA has determined that the petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2); however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data supports granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

The official record for this notice of filing, as well as the public version, has been established for this notice of filing under docket control number [PF–761] (including comments and data submitted electronically as described below). A public version of this record, including printed, paper versions of electronic comments, which does not include any information claimed as CBI, is available for inspection from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The official record is located at the address in ''ADDRESSES''.

Electronic comments can be sent directly to EPA at:

opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov

Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comment and data will also be accepted on disks in Wordperfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket number (PF–761) and appropriate petition number. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Paper and paperboard, Slimicides, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: September 16, 1997.

Frank Sanders,

Director, Antimicrobials Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Summary of Petition

Petitioner summary of the pesticide petition is printed below as required by section 408(d)(3) of the FFDCA. The summary of the petition was prepared by the petitioner and represent the views of the petitioner. The petition summary announces the availability of a description of the analytical methods available to EPA for the detection and measurement of the pesticide chemical residues or an explanation of why no such method is needed.

Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd.

A. Residue Chemistry

This petition is not for residues in or on raw agricultural commodities. It is for residues in or on food contact paper or paperboard. Accordingly, the residue chemistry data submitted are solely for the residues remaining in food contact paper and paperboard when the subject slimicide (4,5-Dichloro-1,2-Dithiol-3-one, CASRN 1192–52–5, hereafter referred to as RYH–86) is used in pulp and paper mill process water to control slime forming organisms.

1. *Residues in paper and paperboard.* GC-MS-SIM analysis of approximately 30 paper and paperboard samples manufactured in a papermill which used RYH–86 amended slurry water revealed no RYH–86 detectable with a detection limit of 100 µg/kilograms (Kg) of paper (i.e., 100 parts per billion (ppb)). Extraction of such samples with

food simulating solvents (FSL's), using standard FDA methods for determining food additive extractives from food-contact materials which allowed for the equilibration of RYH–86 between the paper and paperboard samples and the FSL's for 10–days, revealed no RYH–86 migration into FSL's at detection limits of 10 µg/Kg for aqueous FSL's and 100 µg/Kg for fatty FSL's (using the same GC-MS-SIM method for analysis).

2. *Analytical method.* This is a tolerance exemption petition and, accordingly, no enforcement analytical method is proposed.

B. Toxicological Profile

1. *Acute toxicity.* Technical RYH–86 (99.8% active ingredient) is moderately toxic by the oral route, with acute oral LD_{50} of 350 milligrams/kilograms (mg/kg) in the male rat and 372 mg/kg in the female rat (MRID 41562401). Technical RYH–86 is practically nontoxic by dermal application (acute dermal LD_{50} > 5,000 mg/kg) but was quite irritant to the skin (severe skin irritation and dermal necrosis but no mortalities were observed) in an acute dermal toxicity and irritation study (MRIDs 41531114 & 41562402). The acute inhalation toxicity of RYH–86 was waived by EPA during review of the registration for RYH–86 Slimicide (EPA Reg. No. 63898–1) due to its being applied only by injection into process water and the resulting lack of significant inhalation exposure potential. Guideline 81–4 and 81–5 primary eye and skin irritation studies for RYH–86 manufacturing use product (about 50% RYH–86) showed it to produce severe ocular damage and severe skin irritation (MRIDs 41531115 & 41531116). In these same studies, technical RYH–86 was a severe eye irritant and a moderate skin irritant. Tested at 1% solution (to minimize irritancy effects) RYH–86 was not a dermal sensitizer (MRID 41531117).

2. *Subchronic toxicity.* The evaluation of the subchronic toxicity of RYH–86 has been carried out in 2 separate studies which, together with a bridging analysis of both, constitute one 3-volume data set which was previously reviewed by EPA during the registration review for RYH–86 Slimicide (EPA Reg. No. 63898–1: MRIDs 41531118, 41531119, & 41531120). In these studies, one study used relatively high doses of RYH–86 and the other used lower doses. The principal effect of note in these studies was gastrointestinal irritation exhibiting as a thickening of the gastric mucosa and, at sufficiently high dose, ulceration. The No Observed Effects Level (NOEL) for these effects was 3.8 mg/Kg/day and the Lowest Observed Effects Level (LOEL) was 5.0 mg/Kg/day. Other effects seen included: an increase in relative renal weight in males only (LOEL 5.0 mg/Kg/day, NOEL 3.8 mg/Kg/day); an increase in relative testicular weight and liver weight (LOEL 12 mg/Kg/day, NOEL 5.0 mg/Kg/day); possible GI complications related mortality (LOEL 45 mg/Kg/day, NOEL 15 mg/Kg/day); and miscellaneous effects on clinical chemistry, ketonuria, body weight depression, and clinical signs of distress (LOEL 45 mg/Kg/day, NOEL 15 mg/Kg/day).

3. *Chronic toxicity.* Chronic toxicity studies (2–year rat and 1–year dog) have not been conducted with RYH–86 due to the fact that its intended use pattern: (a) does not involve a potential for chronic occupational exposure; (b) leads to only negligible dietary exposure [see below]; and, (c) the only notable adverse effect observed in subchronic gavage studies with the rat was GI irritation / ulceration [see above]. Accordingly, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. considers that significant chronic exposure is not an issue for RYH–86 as it is to be used and that the subchronic studies do not suggest that any unusual toxicity (other than GI irritation which is likely to be dose-limiting) will likely be seen in chronic toxicity studies. Indeed, the registration of RYH–86 Slimicide (EPA Reg. No. 63898–1) was supported by the Antimicrobials Data Call-in set of requirements and these provide specifically that chronic toxicity and oncogenicity studies for antimicrobial agents are required only if the results of subchronic toxicity or of gene toxicity studies indicate a potential concern or if there will, in fact, be significant chronic exposure.

4. *Oncogenicity.* Oncogenicity studies (2–year rat and 18–months mouse) have not been conducted with RYH–86 due to the fact that its intended use pattern: (a) does not involve a potential for chronic or long term, frequent occupational exposure; (b) leads only to negligible dietary exposure [see below]; (c) the only notable adverse effect observed in subchronic gavage with the rat was GI irritation / ulceration with no evidence for metaplasia, dysplasia, altered foci, or peroxisome proliferation observed[1]; and, (d) RYH–86 is not mutagenic or genotoxic (see No. 6, below). Accordingly, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. considers that significant chronic exposure is not an issue for RYH–86 as it is to be used and that the subchronic studies do not suggest that any unusual toxicity (other than GI irritation which is likely to be dose-limiting) or oncogenicity is likely to be seen in chronic toxicity / oncogenicity studies. Indeed, the registration of RYH–86 Slimicide (EPA Reg. No. 63898–1) was supported by the Antimicrobials Data Call-in set of requirements and these provide specifically that chronic toxicity and oncogenicity studies for antimicrobial agents are required only if the results of subchronic toxicity or of gene toxicity studies indicate a potential concern or if there will, in fact, be significant chronic exposure.

5. *Developmental toxicity.* i. *Rats* - A standard Guideline 83–3 design teratology and developmental effects study (MRID 42680801) was conducted in which maternal toxicity (as evidenced by decreases in body weight, body weight gain, food consumption, and thickening of the stomach mucosa) was observed at 45 mg/Kg/ day. At this dose (the highest dose tested) no developmental or teratological effects were observed. In this study, doses of 15 mg/Kg and lower were not toxic to the dams and there were no developmental or teratological effects at these lower doses. The dose selection for this study was based on the observed GI effects in the rat 90–day gavage study.

ii. *Rabbits or mice* - Based on: (a) the lack of any suggestion of teratological or developmental effects at doses which produced frank maternal toxicity in the rat; (b) that the toxicity of RYH–86 in the rat study appeared to be largely a function of its GI effects; and, (c) the low exposure potential associated with RYH–86 in its intended uses, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. considers that conduct of a second species developmental effect study is not needed to characterize the toxicology of RYH–86. Indeed, the registration of RYH–86 Slimicide (EPA Reg. No. 63898–1) was supported by the Antimicrobials Data Call-in set of requirements and these provide specifically that second species developmental toxicity studies for antimicrobial agents are required only if the results of studies in the first species indicate a potential concern or if there will, in fact, be significant exposure to females of child bearing age. The conclusion that a second species developmental toxicity study for RYH–86 is not needed has been reached to date by the Swedish, Finnish, and Canadian regulatory authorities in addition to EPA.

6. *Genotoxicity.* In the standard Ames test (5-strains), RYH–86 is non-mutagenic with or without metabolic activation (MRID 42897501). In the mouse, *in vivo,* bone marrow

[1] Suggesting that the more typical forms of pre-neoplastic lesions or lesions which have been associated with indirect carcinogenesis, and which can often be observed already within 90–day studies, are not present.

micronucleus test RYH–86 did not induce chromosome aberrations (MRID 41531122). In the rat hepatocyte UDS (unscheduled DNA synthesis) test, RYH–86 did not induce unscheduled DNA synthesis (MRID 41531123). On the basis of this genotoxicity battery, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. concludes that RYH–86 is not mutagenic or genotoxic.

7. *Metabolism*. Specific mammalian metabolism studies with RYH–86 have not been conducted for the following reasons: (a) at the alkaline pH of the small intestine, RYH–86 will hydrolyze rapidly with release of chloride and active chlorine; and, (b) the toxicology profile for RYH–86 indicates that the principle effect of RYH–86 is GI irritancy and that metabolism does not appear to play a significant role in the toxicology of RYH–86. Therefore, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. considers that mammalian metabolism studies in the rat with RYH–86 will not provide additional useful information on the safety of RYH–86 and such studies were not required by EPA to support the registration of RYH–86 Slimicide (EPA Reg. No. 63898–1).

8. *Reference Dose (RfD)*. EPA has not previously set a RfD for RYH–86 since at the time of registration review for RYH–86 Slimicide (EPA Reg. No. 63898–1) the regulation of RYH–86 residues in food contact paper and paperboard was under the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Enactment of the Food Quality Protection Act transferred jurisdiction over these residues to EPA. Based on the subchronic NOEL of 3.8 mg/Kg/day (for gastro-intestinal (GI) irritation effects) and an uncertainty factor (UF) of 100, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. proposes an RfD set at 0.038 mg/Kg/day for RYH–86. Such an RfD leads to the following allowable daily intakes (ADI) for adult males and females and for children: Adult male, 70 Kg, ADI = 2.7 mg/day; Adult female, 60 Kg, ADI = 2.3 mg/day; Child, 20 Kg, ADI = 0.76 mg/day. Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. has considered the possible special sensitivity to RYH–86 of infants and children and, also, of sensitive individuals. The proposed RfD is based on a physico-chemical effect of RYH–86: gastro-intestinal irritation. This, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. suggests is not an effect for which any wide differences between infants / children and adults would be expected on a reasonable scientific basis. The irritant effects of RYH–86 on the GI tract are expected to be a function of the concentration of RYH–86 in the GI tract and this will be a function of amount of RYH–86 per unit of body weight. Thus, an RfD set at 0.038 mg/Kg/day will lead to similar GI tract concentrations of RYH–86 in adults, children, and infants. Also, since the effect of irritation is a physico-chemical effect, the existence of metabolic differences among persons is not reasonably expected to be a factor producing individuals with special sensitivity to RYH–86. Also, since: (a) physico-chemical effects like irritancy usually do not at all occur well below a threshold concentration of irritant; and, (b) the RfD is based on gavage studies in which RYH–86 is directly delivered to the gastric compartment whereas daily dietary consumption of the RfD amount leads to a lower peak GI tract level than would occur after gavage administration of the RfD amount, it can be expected that even for persons with pre-existing conditions such as ulcers, colitis, and similar pathologies that dietary exposures to RYH–86 at levels up to the proposed RfD will not exacerbate such conditions. Therefore, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. believs that the proposed RfD is suitable for adults, children, infants, and persons with pre-existing GI tract disturbances.

C. Aggregate Exposure

1. *Dietary exposure* —— i. *Food*. GC-MS-SIM analysis of approximately 30 paper and paperboard samples manufactured in a papermill which used RYH–86 amended slurry water revealed no detectable RYH–86 with a detection limit of 100 µg/Kg of paper (i.e., 100 ppb). Extraction of such samples with food simulating solvents (FSL's), using standard FDA methods for determining food additive extractives from food-contact materials which allowed for the equilibration of RYH–86 between the paper and paperboard samples and the FSL's for 10-days, revealed no RYH–86 migration into FSL's at detection limits of 10 µg/Kg for aqueous FSL's and 100 µg/Kg for fatty FSL's (using the same GC-MS-SIM method for analysis). Using a standard equation provided by U.S. FDA for estimating dietary exposure to indirect food additives migrating from food packaging[2], the hypothetical worst case potential for dietary exposure to RYH–86 as a result of migration into foods of RYH–86 residuals in food contact paper and paperboard is:

$$\langle M \rangle = f_{\text{aqueous and acidic}} (M_{10\ \text{percent ethanol}}) + f_{\text{alcohol}} (M_{50\ \text{percent ethanol}}) + f_{\text{fatty}} (M_{\text{fatty}})$$

In which, for un-coated food contact paper and paperboard, the food type distribution factors ($f_{\text{food type}}$) are:

$f_{\text{aqueous and acidic}}$ 0.57 + 0.01 = 0.58
f_{alcohol} 0.01
f_{fatty} 0.41

and <M> is the concentration of residues in food when the solvent to sample extraction ratio is 10 ml/sq. inch of sample surface (which was the case for Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd.'s residue migration potential studies).

For the worst case, since no RYH–86 was detected in any of the FSLs, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. has taken the migration values (M) which would result if RYH–86 were present in the FSLs at the limit of detection for the relevant food simulating solvent type:

$M_{10\ \text{percent ethanol}}$ 10 µg/Kg
$M_{50\ \text{percent ethanol}}$ 10 µg/Kg
M_{fatty} 100 µg/Kg

In which case the overall migrant load, <M> is:

$$\langle M \rangle = (0.58 \times 10\ \mu g/Kg) + (0.01 \times 10\ \mu g/Kg) + (0.41 \times 100\ \mu g/Kg) = 47\ \mu g/Kg$$

The above value of <M> can then be used for derivation of the estimated daily intake (EDI) for adults from the following FDA formula:[3]

$$EDI = 3.0\ Kg\ food/day \times \langle M \rangle \times CF$$

where CF is the consumption factor for foods contacted by a given type of material. In the case of paper and paperboard, CF = 0.1 for uncoated paper (see footnote 2). Therefore, as a worst case, the potential adult EDI for RYH–86 which derives from possible residuals in food contact paper and paperboard is:

$$EDI = 3.0\ Kg\ food/day \times 47\ \mu g/Kg\ food \times 0.1 = 14.1\ \mu g/day$$

For children, the daily diet is different in quantity. At 6 months age, the daily caloric requirement is 110 cal/Kg body weight and the mean body weight for 6 months infants is 8 Kg. This equates to an 880 Kg/day diet which at an average of 800 cal/Kg[4] is a 1.1 Kg total diet. In the age interval 4 years to 6 years of age (median body weight 20 Kg), the daily calorie requirement is 1,600 cal/day which equates to a 2 Kg total daily diet. The EDI's for infants and children are based on these total diet amounts:

$$EDI_{INFANT} = 1.1\ Kg\ food/day \times 47\ \mu g/Kg \times 0.1 = 5.2\ \mu g/day$$

$$EDI_{CHILD} = 2.0\ Kg\ food/day \times 47\ \mu g/Kg \times 0.1 = 9.4\ \mu g/day$$

Thus, for a 6 month old infant, for a 20 Kg child (age 4–6), for a 60 Kg

[2] U.S. FDA (1985), ''Recommendations for Chemistry Data for Indirect Food Additive Petitions'', Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, June 1995.

[3] Which considers that ''food'' consists of solid foods as well as beverages consumed.

[4] The adult calorie requirement is 2,400 cal/day for males and females averaged and this in a 3 Kg daily diet provides for calorie density of 800 cal/Kg. For comparison, human breast milk has a calorie density of 700 cal/Kg.

woman, and for a 70 Kg man, the daily intakes associated with the above EDI, expressed as µg/Kg/day and as percent RfD utilization are:

	Dietary Exposure	Percent RfD Utilized
Infant	0.65 µg/Kg/day	1.71
Child	0.47 µg/Kg/day	1.24
Woman	0.24 µg/Kg/day	0.632
Man	0.20 µg/Kg/day	0.526

Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. notes that at 40 CFR 180.1(l) EPA has defined that a ''negligible residue ... Ordinarily ... will add to the diet an amount which will be less than 1/2,000th of the amount that has been demonstrated to have no effect from feeding studies on the most sensitive animal species tested.'' This, for a 100-fold uncertainty factor based RfD, means an RfD utilization of 5% or less. Yoshitomi considers, therefore, that under the hypothetical worst case dietary exposure assessment RYH–86 residues are clearly negligible residues.

i. *Drinking water.* The use of RYH–86 as a slimicide for pulp and paper mills does not provide for entry of RYH–86 into drinking water sources. Spent process water from such sites is treated as waste water, typically on-site, prior to release into surface waters. In a Finnish paper mill, with a use level of 1.5 ppm in the water (as an initial load to the slurry water) no RYH–86 was detected in air or water at sites by the paper making machine (detection limits were 4.5 ng/L in water and 3×10^{-6} mg/dm^3). Water samples which were examined included samples from the waste water holding pond and discharge from the on-site waste water treatment plant.

2. *Non-dietary exposure.* RYH–86 is an industrial-use slimicide whose only other registered use (i.e., aside from slimicide use in pulp and paper mills) is as a slime control agent in re-circulating cooling water. All of the uses of RYH–86 involve only occupational exposures. There are no registrations and no intended uses in residential scenarios. There are, therefore, no Food Quality Protection Act covered non-dietary exposures to RYH–86.

D. Cumulative Effects

There is no reliable information to indicate that RYH–86 has a common mechanism of toxicity with any other chemical compound.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population.* Since the use of RYH–86 as a slimicide in pulp and paper mills is, under hypothetical worst case conditions, anticipated to lead to only negligible adult dietary exposures (i.e., not greater than 0.63% of the RfD for adults with ''negligible'' defined at 40 CFR 180.1(l) as ''ordinarily'' not greater than 5% of the RfD) Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm to the general adult population will result from dietary exposure to RYH–86 residues which could occur in food contact paper and paperboard produced in pulp and paper mills utilizing RYH–86 for slime control in accordance with its FIFRA labeling.

2. *Infants and children.* Since the use of RYH–86 as a slimicide in pulp and paper mills is, under hypothetical worst case conditions, anticipated to lead to only negligible dietary exposures (i.e., not greater than 1.71% of the RfD for infants and not greater than 1.24% of the RfD for children with ''negligible'' defined at 40 CFR 180.1(l) as ''ordinarily'' not greater than 5% of the RfD) Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm to infants and children will result from dietary exposure to RYH–86 residues which could occur in food contact paper and paperboard produced in pulp and paper mills utilizing RYH–86 for slime control in accordance with its FIFRA labeling.

3. *Sensitive individuals.* The RfD for RYH–86 is based on gastro-intestinal irritation as the effect which occurs at lowest dose in animal gavage studies. Since the effect of irritation is a physico-chemical effect, the existence of metabolic differences among persons is not reasonably expected to be a factor producing individuals with special sensitivity to RYH–86. Also, since: (a) physico-chemical effects like irritancy usually do not at all occur well below a threshold concentration of irritant; and, (b) the RfD is based on gavage studies in which RYH–86 is directly delivered to the gastric compartment whereas daily dietary consumption of the RfD amount leads to a lower peak GI tract level than would occur after gavage administration of the RfD amount, it can be expected that even for persons with pre-existing conditions such as ulcers, colitis, and similar pathologies that dietary exposures to RYH–86 at levels up to the proposed RfD will not exacerbate such conditions. Therefore, Yoshitomi Fine Chemicals, Ltd. concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm to persons with pre-existing GI-tract problems will result from dietary exposure to RYH–86 residues which could occur in food contact paper and paperboard produced in pulp and paper mills utilizing RYH–86 for slime control in accordance with its FIFRA labeling.

F. International Tolerances

There are no Codex maximum residue levels (MRLs) established for residues of RYH–86 resulting from the use of RYH–86.

[FR Doc. 97–25338 Filed 9–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Report No. 2225]

Petitions for Reconsideration and Clarification of Action in Rulemaking Proceedings

September 19, 1997.

Petitions for reconsideration and clarification have been filed in the Commission's rulemaking proceedings listed in this Public Notice and published pursuant to 47 CFR Section 1.429(e). The full text of these documents are available for viewing and copying in Room 239, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, ITS, Inc. (202) 857–3800. Oppositions to these petitions must be filed October 9, 1997. See Section 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rule (47 CFR 1.4(b)(1)). Replies to an opposition must be filed within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.

Subject: Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future Development of SMR Systems in the 800 MHz Frequency Band (PR Docket No. 93–144, RMs–8117,8030,8029).

Implementation of Sections 3(n) and 322 of the Communications Act Regulatory Treatment of Mobile Services (GN Docket No. 93–252).

Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act—Competitive Bidding (PP Docket No. 93–253).

Number of Petitions Filed: 6.

Subject: Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future Development of SMR Systems in the 800 MHz Frequency Band (PR Docket No. 93–144, RMs–8117,8030,8029).

Implementation of Sections 3(n) and 322 of the Communications Act Regulatory Treatment of Mobile Services (GN Docket No. 93–252).

Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act—Competitive Bidding (PP Docket No. 93–253).

Number of Petitions Filed: 3.