

(1) UL 1191, Components for Personal Flotation Devices.

(2) UL 1517, Standard for Hybrid Personal Flotation Devices (November 12, 1984), incorporation by reference approved for 46 CFR 160.077–5(e)(2); 160.077–11(a)(5)(ii) and (g)(1); 160.077–15(b)(12); 160.077–17(b)(9); 160.077–19(a)(5) and (b)(1) through (18); 160.077–21(c)(1) through (5); 160.077–23(h)(4) through (7); 160.077–27(e)(1) and (4); and 160.077–29(c)(5), (7), and (9), and (d)(1) and (5).

■ 29. Revise § 160.176–4 to read as follows:

§ 160.176–4 Incorporation by reference.

(a) Certain material is incorporated by reference into this part with the approval of the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a). To enforce any edition other than that specified in paragraph (b) of this section, the Coast Guard must publish a notice of change in the **Federal Register** and make the material available to the public. All approved material is on file at the U.S. Coast Guard, Office of Design and Engineering Standards (CG–ENG), 2100 2nd Street SW., Stop 7126, Washington, DC 20593–7126 or at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal_regulations/ibr_locations.html. All material is available from the sources listed below.

(b) ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, P.O. Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428–2959, 877–909–2786, <http://www.astm.org>.

(1) ASTM B 117–97, Standard Practice for Operating Salt Spray (Fog) Apparatus, incorporation by reference approved for §§ 160.176–8; 160.176–13.

(2) ASTM D 751–95, Standard Test Methods for Coated Fabrics, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–13.

(3) ASTM D 975–98, Standard Specification for Diesel Fuel Oils, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–13.

(4) ASTM D1434–82 (Reapproved 2009)e1, Standard Test Method for Determining Gas Permeability Characteristics of Plastic Film and Sheeting—(approved May 1, 2009), incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–13.

(c) Federal Aviation Administration, Aircraft Certification Service, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591, 202–385–6346, http://www.faa.gov/aircraft/air_cert/design_approvals/tso.

(1) TSO–C13d, Federal Aviation Administration Standard for Life Preservers, January 3, 1983, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–8.

(2) [Reserved]

(d) DLA Document Services, 700 Robbins Avenue, Building 4/D, Philadelphia, PA 19111–5094, 215–697–6396, <http://www.asistdocs.com>.

(1) In Federal Test Method Standard No. 191A (dated July 20, 1978) the following methods:

(i) Method 5100, Strength and Elongation, Breaking of Woven Cloth; Grab Method, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–13.

(ii) Method 5132, Strength of Cloth, Tearing; Falling-Pendulum Method, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–13.

(iii) Method 5134, Strength of Cloth, Tearing; Tongue Method, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–13.

(iv) Method 5804.1, Weathering Resistance of Cloth; Accelerated Weathering Method, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–8.

(v) Method 5762, Mildew Resistance of Textile Materials; Soil Burial Method, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–8.

(2) Federal Standard No. 751a, Stitches, Seams, and Stitching, January 25, 1965, incorporation by reference

(3) MIL–L–24611—Life Preserver Support Package For Life Preserver, MK 4, dated May 18, 1982, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–8.

(e) National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) (formerly National Bureau of Standards), c/o Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402, 202.512.1800, <http://www.gpo.gov>.

(1) Special Pub. 440, *Color: Universal Language and Dictionary of Names*;

“The Universal Color Language” and “The Color Names Dictionary”, 1976, incorporation by reference approved for § 160.176–9.

(2) [Reserved]

(f) Underwriters Laboratories Inc. (UL), 12 Laboratory Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709–3995, 919–549–1400, <http://www.ul.com>.

(1) UL 1191, “Components for Personal Flotation Devices”, November 11, 1984, incorporation by reference approved for §§ 160.176–8; 160.176–13.

(2) [Reserved]

PART 162—ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT

■ 30. The authority citation for part 162 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1321(j), 1903; 46 U.S.C. 3306, 3703, 4104, 4302; E.O. 12234, 45

FR 58801, 3 CFR, 1980 Comp., p. 277; E.O. 12777, 56 FR 54757, 3 CFR, 1991 Comp., p. 351; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 31. In § 162.027–1, revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 162.027–1 Incorporation by reference.

* * * * *

(b) ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, P.O. Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428–2959, 877–909–2786, <http://www.astm.org>.

(1) ASTM F1546/F1546 M–96 (Reapproved 2012), Standard Specification for Fire Hose Nozzles (ASTM F 1546) (approved May 1, 2012), incorporation by reference approved for §§ 162.027–2; 162.027–3.

(2) [Reserved]

PART 193—FIRE PROTECTION EQUIPMENT

■ 32. The authority citation for part 193 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 46 U.S.C. 2213, 3102, 3306; E.O. 12234, 45 FR 58801, 3 CFR, 1980 Comp., p. 277; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 33. In § 193.01–3, revise paragraph (b) introductory text and paragraph (b)(1) to read as follows:

§ 193.01–3 Incorporation by reference.

* * * * *

(b) ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, P.O. Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428–2959, 877–909–2786, <http://www.astm.org>.

(1) ASTM F1121–87 (Reapproved 2010), Standard Specification for International Shore Connections for Marine Fire Applications, (approved March 1, 2010), incorporation by reference approved for § 193.10–10.

* * * * *

Dated: February 11, 2013.

Kathryn A. Sinniger,
Chief, Office of Regulations and
Administrative Law U.S. Coast Guard.

[FR Doc. 2013–03724 Filed 2–26–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2012–0308; FRL–9379–9]

Pyroxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of pyroxasulfone

in or on soybeans. K-I Chemical U.S.A., Inc., requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

DATES: This regulation is effective February 27, 2013. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before April 29, 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-2012-0308, 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: Kathryn Montague, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 305-1243; email address: montague.kathryn@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 EPA's tolerance regulations at 40 CFR part 180 through

the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-id?&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-2012-0308 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 April 29, 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-2012-0308, 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. Summary of Petitioned-For Tolerance

In the **Federal Register** of May 23, 2012 (77 FR 30481) (FRL-9347-8), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide

petition (PP 2F8005) by K-I Chemical U.S.A., Inc., c/o Landis International, Inc., 3185 Madison Hwy., P.O. Box 5126, Valdosta, GA 31603-5126. The petition requested that EPA establish tolerances in 40 CFR part 180 for residues of the herbicide pyrooxasulfone, 3-[(5-(difluoromethoxy)-1-methyl-3-(trifluoromethyl) pyrazole-4-yl)methylsulfonyl]-4,5-dihydro-5,5-dimethyl-1,2-oxazole, and its metabolites M-3, 5-difluoromethoxy-1-methyl-3-trifluoromethyl-1H-pyrazol-4-carboxylic acid; M-25, 5-difluoromethoxy-3-trifluoromethyl-1H-pyrazol-4-yl)methanesulfonic acid; and M-28, 3-[1-carboxy-2-(5,5-dimethyl-4,5-dihydroisoxazol-3-ylthio)ethylaminol]-3-oxopropanoic acid, calculated as the stoichiometric equivalent of pyrooxasulfone, in or on soybean, seed at 0.07 parts per million (ppm). The petition also requested that tolerances be established for residues of pyrooxasulfone, 3-[(5-(difluoromethoxy)-1-methyl-3-(trifluoromethyl) pyrazole-4-yl)methylsulfonyl]-4,5-dihydro-5,5-dimethyl-1,2-oxazole, and its metabolites M-1, 5-difluoromethoxy-1-methyl-3-trifluoromethyl-1H-pyrazol-4-yl)methanesulfonic acid; M-3, 5-difluoromethoxy-1-methyl-3-trifluoromethyl-1H-pyrazol-4-carboxylic acid; and M-25, 5-difluoromethoxy-3-trifluoromethyl-1H-pyrazol-4-yl)methanesulfonic acid, calculated as the stoichiometric equivalent of pyrooxasulfone in or on soybean, forage at 1.5 ppm and soybean, hay at 2.0 ppm. That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by K-I Chemical U.S.A., Inc., the registrant, which is available in the docket, <http://www.regulations.gov>. There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

Based upon review of the data supporting the petition, EPA is establishing tolerances for residues of the herbicide pyrooxasulfone and its metabolites as requested by the petitioner, except that the tolerance for residues in or on soybean, forage is lowered to 1.0 ppm and the tolerance for residues in or on soybean, seed is lowered to 0.06 ppm. The reasons for these changes are explained in Unit IV.C.

III. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the tolerance is "safe." Section 408(b)(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. Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to “ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue.” * * *

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

A. Toxicological Profile

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered its validity, completeness, and reliability as well as the relationship of the results of the studies to human risk. EPA has also considered available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers, including infants and children.

Pyrooxasulfone acute toxicity to mammals is low by all routes of exposure. Subchronic and chronic oral toxicity testing of pyrooxasulfone in mice, rats, and dogs produced a variety of adverse effects in several target organs. Effects seen in animal studies included cardiac toxicity (increased cardiomyopathy in mice and rats), liver toxicity (centrilobular hepatocellular hypertrophy, histopathological, and/or clinical pathological indicators), neurotoxicity characterized by axonal/myelin degeneration in the sciatic nerve (dog, mouse, and rat) and spinal cord sections (dog), skeletal muscle myopathy, kidney toxicity (increased incidence of chronic progressive nephropathy in dogs and retrograde nephropathy in mice), urinary bladder mucosal hyperplasia, inflammation, and urinary bladder transitional cell papillomas (rats). Decreased body weight and enzyme changes were noted in some studies. Immunotoxicity studies in rats and mice showed no evidence of

immunotoxic effects from pyrooxasulfone.

Pyrooxasulfone was moderately toxic to rats following a 4-week dermal exposure producing local inflammation and systemic effects of minimal to mild cardiac myofiber degeneration at the limit dose. No adverse effects were noted in a 28-day inhalation study at the highest-dose tested.

Pyrooxasulfone did not exhibit developmental toxicity in the rat developmental toxicity study and exhibited only slight developmental toxicity in rabbits (reduced fetal weight and resorptions) at the limit dose. However, developmental effects were noted in post-natal day (PND) 21 offspring in the rat developmental neurotoxicity (DNT) study characterized as decreased brain weight and morphometric changes. Developmental effects in the rabbit developmental study and DNT study occurred in the absence of maternal toxicity, indicating potential increased quantitative susceptibility of offspring. In a reproductive toxicity in rats reduced pup weight and body weight gains during lactation occurred at similar or higher doses causing pronounced maternal toxicity (reduced body weight, body weight gain, and food consumption and increased kidney weight, cardiomyopathy, and urinary bladder mucosal hyperplasia with inflammation).

In cancer studies in mice and rats, renal tubular adenomas were observed in male mice and urinary bladder transitional cell papillomas were observed in male rats. The kidney adenomas in male mice were determined to be spontaneous and not treatment-related based on the following considerations:

1. Absence of any cytotoxicity (degeneration or individual cell necrosis) in studies ranging from 14 days to 18 months at doses up to 15,000 ppm.
2. Absence of cell regeneration leading to precursor lesions such as atypical tubular hyperplasia at all time points and doses up to 15,000 ppm.
3. Lack of exacerbation of chronic progressive nephropathy, a spontaneous disease in rodents that results in cell regeneration which can result in renal tubule tumors in chronic studies.
4. Lack of a clear dose response in the distribution of tumors between test substance treated groups.

The urinary bladder tumors seen in male rats were determined to be a threshold effect. Pyrooxasulfone exposure causes the growth of crystals in the urinary tract with subsequent calculi formation resulting in cellular

damage. Crystal formation in the absence of calculi is not associated with hyperplasia or urinary bladder tumors; therefore, the formation of urinary bladder calculi is the prerequisite for subsequent hyperplasia and neoplasia. In other words, urinary bladder tumors do not develop at doses too low to produce calculi. There is also a clear threshold of 1,000 ppm (42.55 milligrams/kilogram/day (mg/kg/day)) for development of calculi and tumorigenesis. The point of departure (POD) of 50 ppm (2.0 mg/kg/day) selected for chronic risk assessment is not expected to result in urinary bladder calculi formation, which is a prerequisite for subsequent hyperplasia and neoplasia. Therefore, the Agency has determined that the quantification of risk using a non-linear approach (i.e., Reference dose (RfD)) will adequately account for all chronic toxicity, including carcinogenicity, that could result from exposure to pyrooxasulfone. There is no concern for mutagenicity.

Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the adverse effects caused by pyrooxasulfone as well as the no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) and the lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level (LOAEL) from the toxicity studies can be found at <http://www.regulations.gov> in document “Pyrooxasulfone Human Health Risk Assessment for Use on Soybeans,” p. 34, in docket ID number EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0308.

B. Toxicological Points of Departure/ Levels of Concern

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

general principles EPA uses in risk characterization and a complete description of the risk assessment process, see <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/riskassess.htm>.

A summary of the toxicological endpoints for pyrooxasulfone used for human risk assessment is discussed in Unit III.B. of the final rule published in the **Federal Register** issue of February 29, 2012 (77 FR 12207) (FRL-9334-2).

C. Exposure Assessment

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to pyrooxasulfone, EPA considered exposure under the petitioned-for tolerances as well as all existing pyrooxasulfone tolerances in 40 CFR 180.659. EPA assessed dietary exposures from pyrooxasulfone in food as follows:

i. *Acute exposure.* Quantitative acute dietary exposure and risk assessments are performed for a food-use pesticide, if a toxicological study has indicated the possibility of an effect of concern occurring as a result of a 1-day or single exposure.

Such effects were identified for pyrooxasulfone. In estimating acute dietary exposure, EPA used food consumption information from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, What We Eat in America, (NHANES/WWEIA). As to residue levels in food, EPA assumed 100% of the crop was treated with pyrooxasulfone and that residues of the parent and the relevant metabolites of concern on soybeans are present at tolerance levels.

ii. *Chronic exposure.* In conducting the chronic dietary exposure assessment EPA used the food consumption data from the USDA (NHANES/WWEIA). As to residue levels in food, EPA made the same assumptions as in the acute dietary exposure assessment.

iii. *Cancer.* Based on the data summarized in Unit III.A., EPA has concluded that a non-linear RfD approach is appropriate for assessing cancer risk to pyrooxasulfone. Cancer risk was assessed using the same exposure estimates as discussed in Unit III.C.1.i.

iv. *Anticipated residue and percent crop treated (PCT) information.* EPA did not use anticipated residue and/or PCT information in the dietary assessment for pyrooxasulfone. Tolerance level residues for soybean and 100 PCT were assumed for soybean commodities in the dietary assessment.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* The Agency used screening level water exposure models in the dietary

exposure analysis and risk assessment for pyrooxasulfone in drinking water. These simulation models take into account data on the physical, chemical, and fate/transport characteristics of pyrooxasulfone. Further information regarding EPA drinking water models used in pesticide exposure assessment can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/models/water/index.htm>.

Based on the Pesticide Root Zone Model/Exposure Analysis Modeling System (PRZM/EXAMS) and Pesticide Root Zone Model Ground Water (PRZM GW), the estimated drinking water concentrations (EDWCs) of pyrooxasulfone for acute exposures are estimated to be 17 parts per billion (ppb) for surface water and 210 ppb for ground water. EDWCs of pyrooxasulfone for chronic exposures for non-cancer assessments are estimated to be 3.2 ppb for surface water and 174 ppb for ground water.

Modeled estimates of drinking water concentrations were directly entered into the dietary exposure model. For acute dietary risk assessment, the water concentration value of 210 ppb was used to assess the contribution to drinking water. For chronic dietary risk assessment, the water concentration of value 174 ppb was used to assess the contribution to drinking water.

3. *From non-dietary exposure.* The term "residential exposure" is used in this document to refer to non-occupational, non-dietary exposure. Pyrooxasulfone is not registered for any specific use patterns that would result in residential exposure.

4. *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 not found pyrooxasulfone to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and pyrooxasulfone does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has assumed that pyrooxasulfone does not have a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances. 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>.

D. Safety Factor for Infants and Children

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

2. *Prenatal and postnatal sensitivity.* The prenatal and postnatal toxicity database for pyrooxasulfone includes developmental toxicity studies in rats and rabbits, a DNT study in rats, and a 2-generation reproduction toxicity study in rats. As discussed in Unit III.A., evidence of increased susceptibility of fetuses and offspring was seen in the DNT study and developmental toxicity study in rabbits following in utero or postnatal exposure to pyrooxasulfone. No increased susceptibility was seen in the rat developmental or reproduction toxicity studies. In rabbits, developmental toxicity was only seen at the limit dose of 1,000 mg/kg/day as reduced fetal weight and increased fetal resorptions with a NOAEL of 500 mg/kg/day for these effects, compared to no maternal toxicity at these doses. In a DNT study in rats, offspring toxicity (decreased brain weight and orphometric changes on PND 21) was seen at 300 mg/kg/day compared to no maternal toxicity at 900 mg/kg/day. The degree of concern for the increased susceptibility seen in these studies is low and there are no residual uncertainties based on the following considerations:

i. The increased susceptibility is occurring at high doses.

ii. NOAELs and LOAELs have been identified for all effects of concern, and thus a clear dose response has been well defined.

iii. The PODs selected for risk assessment are protective of the fetal/offspring effects.

3. *Conclusion.* EPA has determined that reliable data show the safety of infants and children would be adequately protected if the FQPA SF were reduced to 1X. That decision is based on the following findings:

i. The toxicity database for pyrooxasulfone is complete.

ii. Pyrooxasulfone is a neurotoxic chemical and there is evidence of increased susceptibility of offspring with regard to neurotoxic effects in the rat DNT study. There is also evidence of increased susceptibility of fetuses/offspring with regard to non-neurotoxic effects in the rabbit developmental toxicity study. However, the concern for the increased susceptibility is low for the reasons stated in Unit III.D.2., and EPA did not identify any residual uncertainties after establishing toxicity endpoints and traditional uncertainty factors (UFs) to be used in the risk assessment for pyrooxasulfone.

iii. There are no residual uncertainties in the exposure database. The dietary food exposure assessments were performed based on 100 PCT and tolerance-level residues), and EPA made conservative (protective) assumptions in the ground and surface water modeling used to assess exposure to pyrooxasulfone in drinking water. These assessments will not underestimate the exposure and risks posed by pyrooxasulfone.

E. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety

EPA determines whether acute and chronic dietary pesticide exposures are safe by comparing aggregate exposure estimates to the acute PAD (aPAD) and chronic PAD (cPAD). Short-, intermediate-, and chronic-term risks are evaluated by comparing the estimated aggregate food, water, and residential exposure to the appropriate PODs to ensure that an adequate MOE exists.

1. *Acute risk.* Using the exposure assumptions discussed in this unit for acute exposure, the acute dietary exposure from food and water to pyrooxasulfone will occupy 3.6% of the aPAD for infants less than 1 year old, the population group receiving the greatest exposure.

2. *Chronic risk.* Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for chronic exposure, EPA has concluded that chronic exposure to pyrooxasulfone from food and water will utilize 48% of the cPAD for infants less than 1 year old, the population group receiving the greatest exposure. There are no residential uses for pyrooxasulfone.

3. *Short-term risk.* Short-term aggregate exposure takes into account short-term residential exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water (considered to be a background exposure level). A short-term adverse effect was identified; however, pyrooxasulfone is not registered for any

use patterns that would result in short-term residential exposure; therefore, no further assessment of short-term risk is necessary.

4. *Intermediate-term risk.* Intermediate-term aggregate exposure takes into account intermediate-term residential exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water (considered to be a background exposure level). An intermediate-term adverse effect was identified; however, pyrooxasulfone is not registered for any use patterns that would result in intermediate-term residential exposure; therefore, no further assessment of intermediate-term risk is necessary.

5. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* As explained in Unit III.A., the Agency has determined that the quantification of risk using a non-linear (i.e., RfD) approach will adequately account for all chronic toxicity, including carcinogenicity, that could result from exposure to pyrooxasulfone. Therefore, based on the results of the chronic risk assessment discussed in Unit III.E.2., pyrooxasulfone is not expected to pose a cancer risk to humans.

6. *Determination of safety.* Based on these risk assessments, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the general population, or to infants and children from aggregate exposure to pyrooxasulfone residues.

IV. Other Considerations

A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

Adequate enforcement methodology (a liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry/mass spectrometry (LC/MS/MS) method) is available to enforce the tolerance expression. The method may be requested from: Chief, Analytical Chemistry Branch, Environmental Science Center, 701 Mapes Rd., Ft. Meade, MD 20755-5350; telephone number: (410) 305-2905; email address: residuemethods@epa.gov.

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 pyrooxasulfone.

C. Revisions to Petitioned-for Tolerances

EPA has revised the tolerance levels for soybean, forage and soybean, seed as based on analysis of the field trial data using the tolerance MRL calculator in accordance with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's "MRL Calculator User Guide Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)." Soybean, forage was decreased from 1.5 ppm to 1.0 ppm for residues of pyrooxasulfone and its metabolites M-1, M-3, and M-25 and soybean, seed was decreased from 0.07 ppm to 0.06 ppm for residues of pyrooxasulfone and its metabolites M-3, M-25, and M-28.

V. Conclusion

Therefore, tolerances are established for residues of the herbicide pyrooxasulfone, 3-[[[5-(difluoromethoxy)-1-methyl-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-yl]methyl]sulfonyl]-4,5-dihydro-5,5-dimethylisoxazole, and its metabolites, 5-(difluoromethoxy)-1-methyl-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-ylmethanesulfonic acid (M-1); 5-(difluoromethoxy)-1-methyl-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-carboxylic acid (M-3); and [5-(difluoromethoxy)-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-yl]methanesulfonic acid (M-25), calculated as the stoichiometric equivalent of pyrooxasulfone, in or on soybean, forage at 1.0 ppm; soybean, hay at 2.0 ppm; and pyrooxasulfone, 3-[[[5-(difluoromethoxy)-1-methyl-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-yl]methyl]sulfonyl]-4,5-dihydro-5,5-dimethylisoxazole, and its metabolites, 5-(difluoromethoxy)-1-methyl-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-carboxylic acid (M-3); [5-(difluoromethoxy)-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-yl]methanesulfonic acid (M-25); and 3-[1-carboxy-2-(5,5-dimethyl-4,5-dihydroisoxazol-3-ylthio)ethylamino]-3-oxopropanoic acid (M-28), calculated as the stoichiometric equivalent of pyrooxasulfone in or on soybean, seed at 0.06 ppm.

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This final rule establishes tolerances 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 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 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).

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: February 20, 2013.

Lois Rossi,

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. In § 180.659:

■ a. Add alphabetically the following commodities to the table in paragraph (a)(2).

■ b. Add a new paragraph (a)(3).

The additions read as follows.

§ 180.659 Pyroxasulfone; tolerances for residues.

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

Commodity	Parts per million
* * * * *	
Soybean, forage	1.0
Soybean, hay	2.0

(3) Tolerances are established for residues of the herbicide pyroxasulfone, including its metabolites and degradates, in or on the commodities in the table below. Compliance with the tolerance levels specified below is to be determined by measuring only the sum of pyroxasulfone, 3-[[[5-(difluoromethoxy)-1-methyl-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-yl]methyl]sulfonyl]-4,5-dihydro-5,5-dimethylisoxazole, and its metabolites, 5-(difluoromethoxy)-1-methyl-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-carboxylic acid (M-3); [5-

(difluoromethoxy)-3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-4-yl]methanesulfonic acid (M-25); and 3-[1-carboxy-2-(5,5-dimethyl-4,5-dihydroisoxazol-3-ylthio)ethylamino]-3-oxopropanoic acid (M-28), calculated as the stoichiometric equivalent of pyroxasulfone, in or on the commodity.

Commodity	Parts per million
Soybean, seed	0.06

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2013-04559 Filed 2-26-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1002; FRL-9379-6]

Pyraflufen-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of pyraflufen-ethyl in or on multiple commodities which are identified and discussed later in this document. Nichino America, Inc. requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

DATES: This regulation is effective February 27, 2013. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before April 29, 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-2011-1002, 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: Bethany Benbow, Registration Division