c. Section 18 regulations.
2. Section 18 homepage.
3. Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) Updates:
a. Performance partnerships status.
b. Urban pesticide initiative activities and states funding request.
c. Cooperative agreement issues.
4. Antimicrobial Issues:
a. Definition of pest in the antimicrobial rule.
b. Clarification of state support in the antimicrobial area.
c. Office of Enforcement and Compliance assurance plans for efficacy testing.
d. State lab involvement.
5. Performance Measures:
a. Results of September 1997 workshop.
b. Future activities.
c. OECA's direction regarding measures and GPRA.
6. Policy to address changes to worker risk mitigation measures.
7. Quality assurance/quality control/ national environmental laboratory program.
8. Pesticide regulatory education program course offerings.
9. Regional reports and introduction of issue papers.
10. Other topics as appropriate.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection.

Dated: November 20, 1997.

Jay Ellenberger,

Director, Field and External Affairs Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 97–31129 Filed 11–25–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF–777; FRL–5754–4]

Notice of Filing of Pesticide Petitions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the initial filing of pesticide petitions proposing the establishment of regulations for residues of certain pesticide chemicals in or on various food commodities.

DATES: Comments, identified by the docket control number PF–777, must be received on or before December 26, 1997.

ADDRESSES: By mail submit written comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (7502C), Information Resources and Services Division, 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 to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Follow 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: Joanne Miller (PM 23), Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., S.W., Washington, DC 20460. Office location, telephone number, and e-mail address: Rm. 237, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202, (703 305–6224, e-mail: miller.joanne@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has received pesticide petitions as follows proposing the establishment and/or amendment of regulations for residues of certain pesticide chemicals in or on various food commodities under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Comestic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a. EPA has determined that these petitions contain 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–777] (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'' at the beginning of this document.

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 5.1/6.1 or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number [PF–777] and appropriate petition number. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Agricultural commodities, Food additives, Feed additives, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 4, 1997.

James Jones,

Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Summaries of Petitions

Petitioner summaries of the pesticide petitions are printed below as required by section 408(d)(3) of the FFDCA. The summaries of the petitions were prepared by the petitioners and represent the views of the petitioners. EPA is publishing the petition summaries verbatim without editing them in any way. 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.

BASF Corporation

PP 6F4604, 4F3041 and FAP 4H5428

EPA has received pesticide petitions (PP 6F4604, 4F3041, and FAP 4H5428) from BASF Corporation, 26 Davis Drive, Research Triangle Park, P.O. Box 13528, NC 27709, proposing pursuant to section 408 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), to amend 40 CFR 180.227 by

establishing and amending tolerances for residues of the herbicide dicamba in or on the raw agricultural commodities soybeans, wheat, barley, oats, corn, cotton, grasses and asparagus at the proposed tolerances as described below. The proposed analytical methods involve extraction, partition, clean-up and detection of residues by gas chromatography/electron capture detector (gc/ecd). EPA has determined that the petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2) of the FFDCA; 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.

A. Residue Chemistry

1. *Plant metabolism*. Metabolism is adequately understood on the basis of soybean, asparagus, cotton, sugarcane and published data on grass. In the majority of registered crops, the major metabolite is the 3,6 dichloro-5-OH-*o*-anisic acid. Tolerances are expressed as the dicamba parent plus the respective major metabolite.

2. *Analytical method*. BASF Corp. has provided suitable independently validated analytical methods for detecting and measuring levels of dicamba and its metabolites in or on food with a limit of detection that allows monitoring of food with residues at or above the levels described in these and the existing tolerances. Adequate methods are available in PAM-II for enforcement purposes. The analytical method involves extraction, partition, clean-up and detection of residues by gas chromatography/electron capture detector (gc/ecd).

3. *Magnitude of the residue*—i. *Plant*. Residue trials have been conducted with dicamba on the crops for expanded use requested in the subject petitions. Multiple salts of dicamba were studied in side-by-side testing to confirm that no effect on magnitude of the residues was caused by the salt formulation type of the dicamba. The tolerances listed below are based on the maximum expected residue from geographically representative field trial data:

Proposed tolerances for combined residues of the herbicide dicamba (3,6-dichloro-o-anisic acid) and its metabolite 3,6-dichloro-5-hydroxy-*o*-anisic acid in or on the raw agricultural commodities as follows 40 CFR 180.227(a): Cottonseed 3.0 parts per million (ppm); Corn, forage 3.0 ppm; Corn, fodder 3.0 ppm; Crop Group 17, Grass forage, fodder and hay Forage 125 ppm, Hay 200 ppm; Wheat, forage 80 ppm, Wheat, hay 20 ppm; 21 U.S.C. section 701 MRL Cottonseed meal 5.0 ppm; Wheat grain 2 ppm, Wheat straw 30 ppm; Barley grain 2 ppm; Barley straw 30 ppm.

Proposed tolerances for combined residues of the herbicide dicamba (3,6-dichloro-o-anisic acid) and its metabolite 3,6-dichloro-2-hydroxybenzoic acid in or on the raw agricultural commodities as follows 40 CFR 180.227(b): Soybean grain 4 ppm, Soybean hulls 13 ppm; Asparagus 3.5 ppm.

Only newly generated data, or data not implicated in the CRAVEN Laboratories indictment are used to support the subject petitions.

Dicamba residues concentrate in the following commodities: soybean hulls; sugarcane molasses; cottonseed meal.

ii. *Animal*. The amended uses proposed do not yield secondary residues in meat and milk above the tolerances already published under 40 CFR 180.227. Data from metabolism and feeding studies in poultry have established that the maximum expected dietary burden from crops treated with dicamba will not result in quantifiable residues above the limits of the analytical method.

B. Toxicological Profile

Data are provided that are representative of the mammalian toxicity effects of dicamba and are part of the many studies conducted to support the BASF Corp. assertion of safety of dicamba to humans.

1. *Acute toxicity*—i. Oral Rat LD_{50}: 1,879 mg/kg (m); 1581 mg/kg (f).

ii. Acute Dermal Rat LD_{50}: > 2,000 kg/kg (m/f).

iii. Acute Inhalation Rat LC_{50}: > 9.6 mg/L (m/f).

iv. Primary Eye Irritation: Extremely irritating and corrosive to the eye.

v. Primary Dermal Irritation Rabbits: Not a primary skin irritant.

vi. Dermal Sensitization Guinea Pigs: Moderate potential to cause dermal sensitization.

vii. Acute Neurotoxicity: NOEL <300 mg/kg (lowest dose tested). Neurobehavioral effects were observed at all dose levels but primarily at the initial 1.5 hr post-dose testing only. No neurobehavioral effects were noted by day 14 after treatment and no neuropathological effects were found indicating there are no persistent effects on the nervous system.

2. *Genotoxicity*. Ames: Negative; *In vitro* chromosome aberration in Chinese Hamster Ovary: Negative; Sex-linked recessive lethal in Drosophila: Negative; Chromosome aberrations in rat bone marrow: Negative; Mitotic recombination: Negative; UDH (UDS with WI-38 human lung fibroblasts: Negative; DNA damage as detected with repair deficient prokaryote *E. coli*: Positive; DNA damage as determined with repair deficient eukaryote *S. typhimurium*: Negative; UDS in human lung lymphocytes with activation: Negative; Sister chromatid exchange in human cultured lymphocytes: slight increase. Overall weight of the evidence from all studies indicates that dicamba is not genotoxic.

3. *Reproductive and developmental toxicity*—i. *Rodent developmental toxicity rat*. Oral doses of 0, 64, 160, or 400 mg/kg were administered daily during gestation days 6 to 19. Maternal toxicity occurred at the high dose as evidenced by mortality of four animals, clinical signs and decreased weight gain. The numbers of implantations, resorptions, and fetuses for test animals were similar to those numbers for control animals. No fetal abnormalities were attributed to exposure to dicamba. Therefore, technical dicamba was not found to be teratogenic. Maternal toxicity was found only at the HDT with a NOEL of 160 mg/kg/day. The developmental NOEL was the highest dose tested of 400 mg/kg/day.

ii. *Rabbit developmental toxicity*. Dicamba was administered orally (undiluted) via capsule to groups of 20 artificially inseminated New Zealand White rabbits at dose levels of 0, 30, 150, or, 300 mg/kg on days 6-18 of presumed-gestation. Females were sacrificed on Day 29 of presumed gestation. Maternal toxicity occurred at 150 and 300 mg/kg/day as evidenced by clinical signs and either body weight loss or reduced weight gain. Abortions occurred at 150 and 300 mg/kg/day. No significant differences were obtained in litter averages for corpora lutea, implants, litter sizes, resorption sites, percent male fetuses, fetal body weight, percent resorbed conceptuses or number of does with any resorptions. No gross external, soft tissue or skeletal alterations in fetuses were considered to be related to treatment. Therefore, dicamba was found to be not teratogenic. The maternal no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) for technical dicamba to pregnant rabbits was 30 mg/kg/day. Levels of 150 and 300 mg/kg caused abortions, but were at significant maternally toxic doses. The developmental NOAEL was the highest dose tested, 300 mg/kg/day.

iii. *Two-generation reproduction rat*. Potential effects on growth and reproductive performance were assessed over 2-generations of rats maintained on diets containing Technical Dicamba at concentrations of 0 (control), 500, 1,500,

or 5,000 ppm. Parental toxicity occurred at 5,000 ppm in the form of lower weight gain in females and increased liver weights of both sexes. Exposure at 5,000 ppm was associated with a slower growth rate of F1 pups prior to weaning and resulted in lower initial body weights in those selected as parental animals. The lower body weight was associated with a decrease in both food consumption and water intake. Sexual maturation was slightly delayed among males, but was likely associated with the initial reduced growth rate. F2 pup weights were reduced at 3,000 and 1,500 ppm. There were no treatment-related effects on reproductive ability at any level. The NOEL and LOEL for systemic toxicity were 1,500 (approx. 130 mg/kg/day) and 5,000 ppm, respectively. The NOEL and LOEL for pup toxicity were 500 (approx. 45 mg/kg/day) and 1,500 ppm, respectively.

4. *Subchronic toxicity*—i. *Twenty-one-day Dermal.* Technical dicamba was applied dermally to rabbits for 5 days a week for three weeks at dosage levels of 0, 100, 500 and 2,500 mg/kg/day. There were no systemic effects at any level of treatment. Skin irritation was evident at all treatment levels, but consisted of only a slight erythema at 100 mg/kg/day. The systemic NOEL was the highest dose tested of 2,500 mg/kg/day.

ii. *Thirteen-week rodent feeding (rat).* Rats were offered technical dicamba at dietary concentrations of 0, 1,000, 5,000, or 10,000 ppm. The mean body weight and food consumption values for the high dietary level animals were decreased from the control values. No adverse treatment-related findings were noted in either the blood parameters investigated or necropsy evaluation. Microscopic examinations of the liver revealed an absence or reduction of cytoplasmic vacuolation in the hepatocytes of the high dietary level animals. The NOEL was 5,000 ppm (342 mg/kg/day males, 392 mg/kg/day females).

iii. *Thirty-eight-week non-rodent (dog).* In a dose-range finding study for a subsequent chronic dog study, a small number of dogs were treated via the feed with technical dicamba at dosage levels of 0, 1,000, 2,500 and 5,000 ppm for four to eight weeks. Decreased food consumption occurred in all dose groups during the first week of treatment, and persisted in some dogs at 2,500 and 5,000 ppm. Decreased body weight gains or weight loss were noted in the treatment groups. The NOEL from the one-year dog study discussed below is used to satisfy the requirement for the subchronic dog NOEL.

iv. *Sub-chronic neurotoxicity.* Rats were fed technical dicamba for 13 weeks at dosage levels of 0, 3,000, 6,000 and 12,000 ppm. Body weights were slightly reduced in high dose animals. Neurobehavioral effects were noted at the high dose and consisted primarily of signs associated with rigidity in response to handing. No histopathological effects on the peripheral or central nervous system were noted. The neurotoxicity NOEL was established at 6,000 ppm (401 mg/kg/day males, and 472 mg/kg/day, females).

5. *Chronic toxicity*—i. *Chronic toxicity-dog.* Technical Dicamba was offered orally at dietary concentrations of 0 (Control), 100, 500, or 2,500 ppm to dogs for 1 year. Initially, a decrease in food consumption was noted mainly among males at 500 and 2,500 ppm. This was most notable in a single 2,500 ppm male resulting in almost no food consumed for the 1st 3 weeks of feeding. Following administration of the 2,500 ppm diet in a water slurry during weeks 4-6, this male was placed back on feed and food consumption stabilized. There appears to be a limit to the amount of material that can be added to the feed before dogs will not consume the diet. The 2,500 ppm level was considered close to the maximum that could be employed, as 1 dog failed to consume the diet when offered in the usual form. Due mainly to the aforementioned male, mean body weight of 2,500 ppm males did not increase until week 5. The overall body weight gain for the 1 year period was comparable for all groups. It was concluded that aside from the lower food consumption, there were no effects due to treatment with dicamba. The no-effect level for toxicity was the highest dose tested of 2,500 ppm (approx. 59 mg/kg/day males, 57 mg/kg/day females).

ii. *Chronic feeding/oncogenicity in rat.* Groups of 60 rats/sex were maintained on diets containing technical dicamba at concentrations of either 0, 50, 250, or 2,500 ppm. An interim sacrifice of 10/sex/level was conducted at 12 months. Initially scheduled as a 27 month (108 week) study, males were sacrificed at 115 weeks and females at 118 weeks due to high survival rates.

There were no effects due to treatment on any chronic toxicity parameters investigated. In males, no statistically significant differences in data for all tumors combined, all benign tumors combined, and all malignant tumors combined were obtained. A slight increase in malignant lymphoma was not statistically significant (pairwise comparisons) and was not considered to be toxicologically significant. A slight increase in thyroid parafollicular cell carcinoma in the high treatment group was noted but was not statistically significant in pairwise comparisons. In females, no statistically significant differences were noted in comparisons with all tumors combined, all benign tumors combined, and all malignant tumors combined or in any individual tumor type.

In summary, no signs of toxicity related to administration of dicamba were noted. Dicamba was not oncogenic. Based on the results of the study, the no effect level was considered to be 2,500 ppm (107 mg/kg/day males and 127 mg/kg/day females).

iii. *Oncogenicity in mice.* Groups of mice were fed diets containing dicamba at concentrations of 0, 50, 150, 1,000, or 3,000 ppm. Males were killed following 89 weeks of feeding and females were killed following 104 weeks of feeding. Reduced body weight gain (not statistically different) was noted among 3,000 ppm females. Increased mortality noted among 3,000 ppm males was considered unlikely to be related to treatment but could not be completely excluded. An increased incidence in lymphoid tumors, showing a statistical significance at 150 and 1,000 ppm, occurred in females. However, the incidence at 3,000 ppm did not statistically differ from control. Additionally, there was no significant trend with dosage and the values for treated females were within historical control data. The incidence of benign and malignant tumors in all tissues were similar for treated and control animals. The NOEL was determined to be 1,000 ppm (108 mg/kg/day in males and 121 mg/kg/day in females). However, the RfD best committee chose to establish the NOEL at 3,000 ppm and stated that no LOEL had been established.

6. *Estrogenic or other endocrine effects.* No specific tests have been conducted to determine endocrine-disrupting effects. However, extensive subchronic and chronic tests have been conducted in several species, and results have demonstrated no effects on the endocrine system.

7. *Animal metabolism.* Dicamba has been tested in rats, dogs, cattle, goats and hens. In all cases, dicamba is excreted very rapidly, mainly as unchanged dicamba and to a lesser extent as 3,6-dichloro-2-hydroxybenzoic acid with trace amounts of 3,6-dichloro-5-hydroxy-*o*-anisic acid. The results of these studies demonstrate that dicamba is not persistent and does not accumulate in animals.

8. *Metabolite toxicity.* Toxicity of the metabolites of dicamba to humans is concurrently evaluated during toxicity testing because both plant and animal

metabolites are formed during the course of toxicity tests. Both plant and animal major metabolites are considered not of toxicological concern.

C. Aggregate Exposure

1. *Dietary exposure.* Exposure from the use of Dicamba in the culture of wheat, barley, oats, millet, sorghum, corn, soybeans, grasses, cotton, sugarcane and asparagus crops is discussed under the below topics of food and drinking water.

2. *Food.* The subject petition amends these uses but does not add new crops. The potential dietary exposure of the population to residues of dicamba or its metabolites is calculated based on the Theoretical Maximum Residue Contribution (TMRC) for all crops with dicamba use. The TMRC is a worst case estimate of dietary exposure since it assumes that 100 percent of all crops for which tolerances are established are treated with dicamba, and that pesticide residues are present at the tolerance levels. The resulting dietary exposure estimate therefore overestimates exposure and is considered conservative. The number is then determined to be a percentage of the EPA decided Reference Dose (RfD). Dietary exposure may occur from crop commodities and meat and milk. Based on the EPA DRES model BASF Corp. has estimated that the average US population dietary exposure to dicamba to be only 1.87% percent of the RfD. This number is very low and considered very safe as an active ingredient is allowed up to 100% before less conservative risk assessment measures are initiated.

Acute dietary analysis compared the daily dietary exposure to the lowest NOEL for acute and subchronic studies. EPA's current policy for Tier I analysis uses the conservative assumption that all residues are at a high end estimate or maximum, typically taken as the tolerance value. Acute dietary assessment for dicamba is made by comparing the ratio of exposure and the NOEL from acute neurotoxicity of 300 mg/kg/day to achieve a Margin of Exposure (MOE). A MOE of 300 is required because a NOEL was not reached in the acute neurotoxicity test. The following MOE values are obtained for key population subgroups.

Population Subgroup	Margin of Exposure
US Population	6000
Infants <1 year	3000
Children 1 to 6	3000
Females 13+ years	17000
Males 13+ years	10000

3. *Drinking water.* Dicamba has been used commercially for in excess of 30 years. From available public data, detections in ground water from commercial uses have been very low and infrequent. The typical level found in ground water is less than 5 ppb. This should be compared to the current Health Advisory Level (HAL) of 200 ppb and the anticipated HAL of 3,000 ppb under the newly revised RfD of 0.45 mg/kg/d.

These infrequent and low levels of detection in groundwater demonstrate that significant movement of dicamba is not likely and is not a considerable factor in assessing human health risk.

4. *Non-dietary exposure.* Non-dietary exposure would mainly occur from the use of dicamba for broadleaf weed control on residential or recreational turf. BASF is currently collecting data on the potential exposure from non-dietary sources such as residential turf use. However, no reliable information is currently available for risk assessment at this time. This petition is only related to already approved crop uses and therefore non-dietary route of exposure is not considered to be a factor in assessing additional human risk.

D. Cumulative Effects

Dicamba belongs to the benzoic acid class of compounds. There are no other compounds of this class in significant use and none in food use. Therefore, cumulative effects from dietary or non-occupational exposure from pesticides of similar chemistry are considered unlikely. BASF Corp. does not have reliable data to indicate a common mechanism of toxicity to other compounds. Therefore cumulative effects from common mechanisms of action are also unlikely.

E. Safety Determination

The RfD for dicamba is 0.45 mg/kg/d. The RfD is a level at or below which daily aggregate exposure over a lifetime will not cause appreciable human health risk. The estimates of exposure are based on conservative assumptions that all crops with a tolerance for dicamba are treated and that all residues found are at the maximum or tolerance level.

1. *U.S. population.* Using the conservative assumptions described above, BASF Corp. has estimated that the US population dietary exposure to dicamba is 1.87% percent of the RfD.

2. *Infants and children.* Dicamba was not teratogenic in either rats or rabbits despite testing to maternally toxic doses. No developmental toxicity was observed in rats and the only effect observed in rabbits were abortions at clearly maternally toxic doses. Dicamba produced no effects on reproduction in a 2-generation study in rats. The only effect observed was a decrease in pup body weight at the high dose which also produced parental toxicity, and at the mid-dose that was relatively high (130 mg/kg/day). Based on the weight of evidence from all reproductive and developmental studies, no selective toxic efects on infants and children are expected, and no additional safety factor is warranted.

Using the conservative assumptions described above, BASF Corp. has estimated the dietary exposure to infants and children as percent of the RfD. From the current and new proposed use of dicamba dietary exposure for the most sensitive subgroups are 6.65% for non-nursing infants (<1 yr old) and 4.6% for children 1 to 6 yrs old.

Aggregate exposure due to the combined residues in food, drinking water and non-dietary exposure through direct contact with residues in a residential setting (lawn) should be pursued through the use of a reserve risk approach. The elements for consideration are therefore estimated as follows:

Food: Total Population 1.87%
Non-nursing Infants <6 yrs . . . 6.7%
Water/Lawn: Low human risk. . . . . .
expected to be inconsequential

BASF Corp. believes that the water and non-dietary exposure risk for the most sensitive subgroup is inconsequential due to demonstrated low findings in water relative to the HAL and low toxicity to humans with respect to oral, dermal and inhalation exposure.

Aggregate exposure is therefore estimated to be less than 10% of the RfD for the most sensitive population subgroup. Therefore, BASF Corp. concludes that there is reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure of residues of dicamba or its metabolites including all dietary and other non-occupational exposures.

F. International Tolerances

No international tolerances have been established under CODEX. Therefore there is no need to ensure consistency.

[FR Doc. 97–30813 Filed 11–25–97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF–776; FRL–5753–3]

Notice of Filing of Pesticide Petitions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the initial filing of pesticide petitions proposing the establishment of regulations for residues of certain pesticide chemicals in or on various food commodities.

DATES: Comments, identified by the docket control number PF–776, must be received on or before December 26, 1997.

ADDRESSES: By mail submit written comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (7502C), Information Resources and Services Division, 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 to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Follow 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: The Regulatory Action Leader listed in the table below:

Regulatory Action Leader	Telephone Number/E-mail Address	Office Location/Address
Driss Benmhend	703–308–9525, e-mail: benmhend.driss@epamail.epa.gov.	5th floor CS#1, 2800 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202
Michael Mendelsohn.	703–308–8715, e-mail: mendelsohn.mike@epamail.epa.gov.	Do.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has received pesticide petitions as follows proposing the establishment and/or amendment of regulations for residues of certain pesticide chemicals in or on various food commodities under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Comestic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a. EPA has determined that these petitions contain 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–776] (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'' at the beginning of this document.

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 5.1/6.1 or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number [PF–776] and appropriate petition number. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Agricultural commodities, Food additives, Feed additives, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 18, 1997.

Janet Andersen,

Director, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Summaries of Petitions

Petitioner summaries of the pesticide petitions are printed below as required by section 408(d)(3) of the FFDCA. The summaries of the petitions were prepared by the petitioners and represent the views of the petitioners. EPA is publishing the petition summaries verbatim without editing them in any way. 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.

1. Engelhard Corporation

PP 7E4908

EPA has received a pesticide petition (PP 7E4908) from Engelhard Corporation, 101 Wood Avenue, Iselin, NJ 08830, proposing pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 346a, to amend 40 CFR part 180 by establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of kaolin in or on all food commodities. Pursuant to the section 408(d)(2)(A)(i) of the FFDCA, as amended, Engelhard Corporation has submitted the following summary of information, data, and arguments in support of their pesticide petition.

A. Proposed Use Practices

Kaolin is to be used as an aid in control of damage to plants from insects, mites, fungi, and bacteria. Kaolin is used at the rates of 6.25 to 12.4 lbs/acre for row crop vegetables, 25 to 175 lbs/acre for tree fruit crops, and 12.5 to 37.5 lbs/acre for small fruit crops. Treatment is made prior to leaf or plant emergence and applied to crops at 7 to 10 day