

which the United States is a party. EPA may establish a tolerance that is different from a Codex MRL; however, FFDC section 408(b)(4) requires that EPA explain the reasons for departing from the Codex level. There are no Codex MRLs established for residues of halosulfuron-methyl in/on any commodity.

**V. Conclusion**

Therefore, tolerances are established for residues of the herbicide halosulfuron-methyl, methyl 5-[(4,6-dimethoxy-2-pyrimidinyl)amino]carbonylamino sulfonyl]-3-chloro-1-methyl-1H-pyrazole-4-carboxylate, including its metabolites and degradates, in or on the commodities artichoke at 0.05 ppm and caneberry subgroup 13-07A at 0.05 ppm.

**VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

This final rule establishes tolerances under FFDC section 408(d) 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, 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 FFDC section 408(d), 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 FFDC section 408(n)(4). 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. 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) (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*).

This action does not 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) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

**VII. Congressional Review Act**

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), 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 the rule in the **Federal Register**. 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: August 14, 2013.

**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 § 180.479, add alphabetically the following commodities to the table in paragraph (a)(2) to read as follows:

**§ 180.479 Halosulfuron-methyl; tolerances for residues.**

- (a) \* \* \*
- (2) \* \* \*

Commodity	Parts per million
* * * * *	*
Artichoke .....	0.05
* * * * *	*
Caneberry subgroup 13-07A .....	0.05
* * * * *	*

[FR Doc. 2013-20906 Filed 8-27-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 180**

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1018; FRL-9396-8]

**Ethyl-2E,4Z-Decadienoate (Pear Ester); Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of the biochemical pesticide ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (pear ester) in or on all food commodities. This regulation eliminates the need to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (pear ester).

**DATES:** This regulation is effective August 28, 2013. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before October 28, 2013, 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:** The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1018, is available at <http://www.regulations.gov> or at the Office of Pesticide Programs Regulatory Public Docket (OPP Docket) in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West Bldg., Rm. 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305-5805. Please review

the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gina Burnett, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division (7511P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 605-0513; email address: [burnett.gina@epa.gov](mailto:burnett.gina@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. 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 applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

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

*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://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab\\_02.tpl](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl).

*C. How 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-2011-1018 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 28, 2013. 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 (excluding any Confidential Business Information (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 the non-CBI copy of your objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1018, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://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.

- *Mail:* OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001.

- *Hand Delivery:* To make special arrangements for hand delivery or delivery of boxed information, please follow the instructions at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets/contacts.htm>.

Additional instructions on commenting or visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

**II. Background and Statutory Findings**

In the **Federal Register** of March 14, 2012 (77 FR 15012) (FRL-9335-9), EPA issued a notice pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide tolerance petition (PP 1F7901) by Wagner Regulatory Associates, Inc. (the Petitioner), on behalf of Bedoukian Research, Inc., 21 Finance Drive, Danbury, CT 06810. The petition requested that 40 CFR part 180 be amended by establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (pear ester). The notice referenced a summary of the petition prepared by the Petitioner, which is available in the docket, <http://www.regulations.gov>. No relevant comments were received on this notice of filing.

Section 408(c)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish an exemption from the requirement of 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 in

residential settings, but does not include occupational exposure. Pursuant to FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(B), in establishing or maintaining in effect an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance, EPA must take into account the factors set forth in FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(C), which require 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 . . . ." Additionally, FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D) requires that 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 performs a number of analyses to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide residues. First, EPA determines the toxicity of pesticides. Second, EPA examines exposure to the pesticide through food, drinking water, and through other exposures that occur as a result of pesticide use in residential settings.

**III. Toxicological Profile**

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.

*A. Overview of Pear Ester*

Ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (pear ester) is a naturally occurring, volatile substance emitted from mature, ripening fruit, that is attractive to the codling moth (CM), *Cydia pomonella*, a major agricultural pest of pome fruit worldwide. Male and female moths are attracted to pear ester and fly to the ripening fruit, where they mate and lay their eggs. Synthetic pear ester is structurally and functionally identical to the natural compound, and its intended pesticidal use is to disrupt CM mating behavior by attracting the moths away from the fruit, reducing their chances of finding mates and laying eggs in fruit orchards.

*B. Biochemical Pesticide Toxicology Data Requirements*

All applicable mammalian toxicology data requirements supporting the

petition to exempt residues of pear ester from the requirement of a tolerance in or on all food commodities have been fulfilled. No toxic endpoints were identified in studies conducted and data obtained from open technical literature. Moreover, pear ester is not likely a mutagen or developmental toxicant. There are no known effects on endocrine systems via oral, dermal, or inhalation routes of exposure. For a more in-depth synopses of the data upon which EPA relied and its human health risk assessment based on that data can be found in the document entitled, "Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) Considerations for Ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (Pear Ester)," available in the docket for this action as described under **ADDRESSES**.

#### IV. Aggregate Exposures

In examining aggregate exposure, FFDCA section 408 directs EPA to consider available information concerning exposures from the pesticide residue in food and all other non-occupational exposures, including drinking water from ground water or surface water and exposure through pesticide use in gardens, lawns, or buildings (residential and other indoor uses).

##### A. Dietary Exposure

The proposed use patterns may result in dietary exposure to pear ester, although its residues are not expected to be any greater than that of current exposure due to use of pear ester as a flavoring agent. No significant exposure via drinking water is expected when pear ester is used according to the product label directions. The reason for this conclusion is that pear ester is applied at low rates, degrades rapidly, and is not directly applied to water. Should exposure occur, however, minimal to no risk is expected for the general population, including infants and children, due to the low toxicity of pear ester as demonstrated in the data submitted and evaluated by the Agency.

##### B. Other Non-Occupational Exposure

Non-occupational exposure is not expected because pear ester will be applied as a codling moth mating disruptor for agricultural purposes only.

#### 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 determined pear ester to have a non-toxic mode of action, and does not appear to produce any toxic metabolites; therefore, 408(b)(2)(D)(v) does not apply. 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. Determination of Safety for U.S. Population, Infants and Children

FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(C) provides that, in considering the establishment of a tolerance or tolerance exemption for a pesticide chemical residue, EPA shall assess the available information about consumption patterns among infants and children, special susceptibility of infants and children to pesticide chemical residues, and the cumulative effects on infants and children of the residues and other substances with a common mechanism of toxicity. In addition, 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 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 Safety Factor. In applying this provision, EPA either retains the default value of 10X, or uses a different additional or no safety factor when reliable data are available to support a different additional or no safety factor. As part of its qualitative assessment, EPA evaluated the available toxicity and exposure data on pear ester and considered its validity, completeness, and reliability, as well as the relationship of this information to human risk. EPA considers the toxicity database to be complete and has identified no residual uncertainty with regard to prenatal and postnatal toxicity or exposure. No hazard was identified based on the available studies. Based upon its evaluation, EPA concludes that there are no threshold effects of concern to infants, children, or adults when pear ester is applied as a mating disruptor of codling moth and used in accordance with label directions and good agricultural practices. As a result, EPA concludes that no additional margin of exposure (safety) is necessary.

#### VII. Other Considerations

##### A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

An analytical method is not required for enforcement purposes because EPA 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 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 a MRL for ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (pear ester).

#### VIII. Conclusion

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 ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (pear ester). EPA is therefore establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (pear ester) in or on all food commodities when applied as a codling moth mating disruptor and used in accordance with good agricultural practices.

#### IX. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This final rule establishes an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance under FFDCA section 408(d) 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, 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 FFDCA section 408(d), such as the 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, nor does this action alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of FFDCA section 408(n)(4). 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. 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) (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*).

This action does not 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) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

#### X. Congressional Review Act

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), 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 the rule in the **Federal Register**. 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: August 22, 2013.

**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. Add § 180.1323 to subpart D to read as follows:

#### § 180.1323 Ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (Pear Ester); exemption from the requirement of a tolerance.

An exemption from the requirement of a tolerance is established for residues of the biochemical pesticide, ethyl-2E,4Z-decadienoate (pear ester), in or on all food commodities, when used in accordance with label directions and good agricultural practices.

[FR Doc. 2013–21019 Filed 8–27–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

#### 47 CFR Part 73

[FCC 13–105; MB Docket No. 02–266; RM–10557]

#### Radio Broadcasting Services; Chillicothe, Dublin, Hillsboro, and Marion, Ohio

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule; application for review.

**SUMMARY:** This document denies an Application for Review filed by the Committee for Competitive Columbus Radio (“Committee”) of a *Memorandum Opinion and Order* in this proceeding, which denied the Committee’s Petition for Reconsideration of an earlier Bureau action, granting the reallocation, class downgrade, and change of community of license of an Ohio FM station. The document finds that the Bureau

properly applied the Commission’s then-existing policy of not considering compliance with the multiple ownership rule at the allotment stage.

**DATES:** August 28, 2013.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew J. Rhodes, Media Bureau, (202) 418–2700.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission’s *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, MM Docket No. 02–266, adopted July 31, 2013, and released August 1, 2013. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center (Room CY–A257), 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission’s copy contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc., Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone 1–800–378–3160 or [www.BCPIWEB.com](http://www.BCPIWEB.com).

In the *Report and Order* in this proceeding, the Bureau granted a Petition for Rulemaking filed by Clear Channel Communications for the reallocation, downgrade in class of channel, and change of community of license for its Station WCGX(FM) (formerly WMRN–FM) from Channel 295B at Marion, Ohio to Channel 294B1 at Dublin, Ohio, over the objection of the Committee. *See* 70 FR 19337 (April 13, 2005). The Committee had argued that the reallocation to Dublin could not be implemented because it would violate the local radio ownership rule. However, the *Report and Order* rejected this argument, explaining that multiple ownership issues are not considered in FM allotment proceedings. The Committee sought reconsideration on the same ground, and the Bureau denied the petition in the *Memorandum Opinion and Order*. *See* 71 FR 40927 (July 19, 2006).

On review, the Commission finds that, contrary to the Committee’s contention, the Bureau did not err in deferring the issue of compliance with the multiple ownership rule until an implementing application was filed because such an approach is consistent with then-existing policy. Additionally, the Commission concludes that the Bureau did not err in referring to Station WCGX(FM) as formerly licensed to Marion because the *Report and Order* did modify the Station WCGX(FM) license to specify Dublin. However, that modification had no immediate impact on competition in the Columbus radio market as Clear Channel was required to file an implementing application and