Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for EPA 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: March 5, 1997.

Joseph Retzer,

Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 97–6211 Filed 3–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE: 6560–50–P

[FRL–5708–6]

National Guidance on Source Water Protection; Notice of Public Meetings

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Regional Offices are holding public meetings for the purpose of information exchange on various issues related to the development of guidance for State source water assessment and protection programs. Under the new provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1996, States are required to delineate the sources of all public water supplies and identify potential sources of contamination. States may allocate up to 10% of monies available under the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) for this purpose. Additional monies from the Drinking Water SRF can be allocated for non-mandatory protection programs and support for local protection efforts.

The protection of drinking water supplies will require the active participation of a great number of stakeholders who have not traditionally been directly involved with the public water supply program. These include various State agencies, local governments, other Federal agencies, environmental advocates, public health professionals, the agricultural community, watershed activists, developers and many others. EPA is inviting all interested members of the public to attend these meetings and actively provide viewpoints, ideas and suggestions to EPA on its drinking water protection activities. EPA encourages the public's response to EPA's Source Water Assessment and Protection Guidance draft guidance which will be issued in final by August 1996.

We hope you can join us and share your experience and perspectives. We also hope that your early involvement will support the development of strong State assessment and protection programs. Space will be limited so we encourage you to pre-register by calling the Safe Drinking Water Hotline at 1–800–426–4791 (9:00 a.m.–5:30 p.m., Monday–Friday) or send an e-mail message to Hotline-sdwa@epamail.epa.gov.

The meetings are scheduled as follows:

EPA region	Location	Date
1	Worcester, MA.	May 28, 1997.
	Concord, NH	May 29, 1997.
2	Suffern, NY	April 29, 1997.
3 and 4	Raleigh, NC	May 28 & 29, 1997.
3	Pittsburgh, PA.	May 21 & 22, 1997.
4	Atlanta, GA	May 6 & 7, 1997.
	Raleigh, NC	May 6, 1997.
5	Lansing, MI	April 1, 1997.
	Springfield, IL	April 11, 1997.
	St. Cloud, MN	April 22, 1997.
	Indianapolis, IN.	April 28, 1997.
	Fond Du Lac, WI.	To be scheduled.
6	Dallas, TX	April 2 & 3, 1997.
7	Lenexa, KS	May 14, 1997.
8	Denver, CO	April 22 & 23, 1997.
9	Las Vegas, NV.	April 16, 1997.
	Los Angeles, CA.	May 21, 1997.
10	Salem, OR	April 30, 1997.
	Anchorage, AK.	To be scheduled.
	Boise, ID	To be scheduled.
	Lacey, WA	May 6, 1997.

Please call the Safe Drinking Water Hotline 1–800–426–4791 (9:00 a.m.–5:30 p.m. Monday–Friday) for updated information.

For more information about EPA's Source Water Protection efforts and the Regional Stakeholder meetings please visit the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water home page at http://www.epa.gov/OGWDW/swp.html. If you are interested in receiving a copy of the draft guidance and/or attending one of the meetings, please call the EPA Drinking Water Hotline at 1–800–426–4791 (9:00 a.m.–5:30 p.m. Monday–Friday) or send an e-mail message to hotline-sdwa@epamail.epa.gov.

Written comments on the guidance are requested to be sent by June 15, 1997 to EPA's Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, Implementation and Assistance Division, Prevention and Support Branch, 401 M St. SW., Mail Code 4606, Washington, DC. 20460.

Dated: March 4, 1997.

Cynthia C. Dougherty,

Director, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water.

[FR Doc. 97–6212 Filed 3–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE: 6560–50–P

[FRL–5708–1]

Scientific Counselors Board Executive Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended (5 U.S.C., App. 2), notice is hereby given that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Research and Development's (ORD), Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC), will hold its Executive Committee Meeting, April 7–8, 1997, at the Hyatt Arlington Hotel, 1325 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia. On Monday, April 7, the meeting will begin at 1:00 pm and will recess at 5:00 pm, and on Tuesday, April 8, the meeting will begin at 8:00 am and will adjourn at 4:30 pm. All times noted are Eastern time. Agenda items include, but are not limited to, BOSC Operating Principles, Laboratory Peer Review Discussion, ORD Research Plan Evaluation: Methods Development, Use of Peer Review in ORD, and Research Plan for Arsenic in Drinking Water. Anyone desiring a draft BOSC agenda may fax their request to Shirley R. Hamilton (202) 260–0929. The meeting is open to the public. Any Member of the public wishing to make comments at the meeting, should contact Shirley Hamilton, Designated Federal Officer, Office of Research and Development (8701), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460; by telephone at (202) 260–0468. In general, each individual making an oral presentation will be limited to a total time of three minutes.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shirley R. Hamilton, Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, NCERQA (MC8701), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, 202–260–0468.

Dated March 5, 1997.

Henry L. Longest II,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 97–6214 Filed 3–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

[PF–716; FRL–5589–7]

AgrEvo USA Company; Pesticide Tolerance Petition Filing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of filing.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the filing of a pesticide petition proposing regulations establishing tolerances for residues of propamocarb (propyl-3-[dimethyl-amino] propylcarbamate) hydrochloride (hereafter referred to as propamocarb) and its metabolites in or on potatoes and their derived commodities, as well as secondary tolerances in meat and milk. This notice includes a summary of the petition that was prepared by the petitioner, AgrEvo USA Company.

DATES: Comments, identified by the docket control number [PF–716], must be received on or before April 11, 1997.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide 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 22202. Comments and data may also be submitted electronically be sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: 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. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1 file format or in ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by docket control number [PF–716]. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries. Additional information on electronic submissions can be found below this document.

Information submitted as a comments 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, Connie Welch, Product Manager (PM) 21, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location, telephone number, and e-mail address: Rm 227, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202, (703) 305–6226; e-mail: welch.connie@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has received a pesticide petition (PP) 6F4707 from AgrEvo USA Company, Little Falls Centre One, 2711 Centerville Rd., Wilmington, DE 19808. The petition proposes, pursuant to section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a, to amend 40 CFR part 180 by establishing tolerances for the Propamocarb in or on potatoes at 0.5 part per million (ppm). EPA has determined that the petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2); however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficieny of the submitted data at this time or whether the data support granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

As required by section 408(d) of the FFDCA, as recently amended by the Food Quality Protection Act, AgrEvo included in the petition a summary of the petition and authorization for the summary to be published in the Federal Register in a notice of receipt of the petition. The summary represents the views of AgrEvo; EPA, as mentioned above, is in the process of evaluating the petition. As required by section 408(d)(3) EPA is including the summary as a part of this notice of filing. EPA may have made minor edits to the summary for the purpose of clarity.

I. Petition Summary

A. Propamacarb Uses

Propamocarb is a specific pesticide with specific activity against several Oomycete species which cause seed, seedling, root and stem rots and foliar diseases in many edible crops and ornamental plants. The mode of action of propamocarb is different compared to other Oomycete fungicides, which provides for efficacy against strains that have developed resistance to other fungicides.

B. Metabolism and Analytical Method

1. *Analytical method.* A practical analytical method utilizing gas/liquid chromatography and N-FID or MSD is available and has been validated for detecting and measuring levels of propamocarb in or on food. The limit of quantification (LOQ) is 0.05 mg/kg (ppm).

2. *Metabolism.* The absorption, distribution, metabolism and excretion of propamocarb has been evaluated in rats. Propamocarb is rapidly absorbed, extensively metabolized and rapidly eliminated, primarily via the urine, following oral administration. Metabolite profiles were similar following single and repeated oral dosing and following intravenous dosing. The primary route of metabolism is oxidative degradation with hydrolytic cleavage occurring as a secondary pathway.

C. Residues in Plants and Animals

1. *Nature and magnitude of the residue in plants.* The fate of propamocarb in plants is clearly understood. Metabolism studies in cucumbers, potatoes and spinach demonstrated that propamocarb is degraded into carbon dioxide which is reincorporated into natural plant constituents. The primary residue found in all crops, and the only residue of concern, is the parent, propamocarb hydrochloride.

More than 50 residue trials on potatoes have been conducted throughout the world. The results from these studies indicated that residues of propamocarb in raw potatoes from foliar applications were below the LOQ, even when applied at 2.5–times the maximum proposed label rate of 4.5 lb ai/A. No measurable residues of propamocarb were detected in any of the processed commodities following treatment at 2.5–times the maximum proposed label rate and a shorter than proposed pre-harvest interval (3 days vs. the proposed 14 days). An additional processing study at 5–times the proposed label rate (22.5 lb a.i./acre) is now underway. Based on these results, tolerances are proposed for the residues of propamocarb in or on potato at 0.5 ppm.

Six residue trials have been conducted on tomatoes, either in the greenhouse or in arid climates where no rainfall likely occurred. Based on these data, AgrEvo USA expects that residues in tomatoes would not exceed 0.3 ppm when used as proposed. Typical residues are anticipated to be significantly lower.

2. *Nature and magnitude of the residue in animals.* Data are not yet available on the metabolism of propamocarb in livestock. A cow metabolism study was initiated in September, 1996, and will be submitted to the Agency during 1997. However, in a rat metabolism study, propamocarb was extensively degraded and rapidly excreted, with >90 percent excreted in the urine within 24 hours. Therefore, AgrEvo believes that the potential for residues to occur in animal

commodities from ingestion of potato processing wastes which contain propamocarb residues at or below 0.05 ppm is negligible.

C. Toxicological Profile

The toxicity of propamocarb has been evaluated by EPA as part of previous regulatory actions and is summarized below. The conclusions presented are those determined by the Agency as reported by the registrant.

1. *Acute toxicity.* There are no acute toxicity concerns with propamocarb. The acute rat oral LD_{50} was 2,900 mg/kg in males and 2,000 mg/kg in females. The acute rat dermal LD_{50} was ≤3,000 mg/kg. The acute (4–hour) inhalation LC_{50} in rats was >7.9 mg/l. Propamocarb was not a skin sensitizer in guinea pigs. Based on these results, propamocarb hydrochloride was classified as Toxicity Category III for acute oral and dermal toxicity, and eye irritation, and Category IV for acute inhalation toxicity and skin irritation.

2. *Subchronic toxicity.* In a 90–day feeding study, propamocarb was administered to albino rats at concentrations of 0, 20, 50, 100, and 500/1,000 ppm in the diet. The only effects noted were slightly reduced food efficiency and body weight gains at 1,000 ppm.

In a 90–day feeding study in beagle dogs, propamocarb was administered in the diet at concentrations of 0, 50, 100, 500, and 1,000/2,000 ppm. No treatment-related findings were observed.

A 21–day dermal toxicity study was performed with propamocarb in Sprague-Dawley rats at dose levels of 0, 100, 500 and 1,000 mg/kg/day, 6 hours per day, 5 days per week over a 21–day period. No treatment related effects were observed.

A 21–day dermal toxicity study was performed with propamocarb in rabbits at dose levels of 0, 150, 525 and 1,500 mg/kg/day, 6 hours per day, 5 days per week, over a 21–day period. The No Obsereved Effects Level (NOEL) for this study was considered by the Agency to be 150 mg/kg/day based on dose-related skin irritation in mid- and high-dose animals and a decrease in weight gain in mid-dose females.

3. *Chronic toxicity/oncogenicity.* A 2–year feeding chronic toxicity/carcinogenicity study was performed in Sprague-Dawley rats with propamocarb at dietary concentrations of 0, 40, 200 or 1,000 ppm. There was no evidence of carcinogenicity or other treatment-related effect except for a possible reduction in food intake in female rats at the highest level tested. Thus, 1,000 ppm (41 mg/kg/day) was considered to be the NOEL. However, this study did not satisfy the Agency's criteria for a Maximum Tolerated Dose (MTD). A new study at higher dose levels is now in progress.

A 2–year feeding chronic toxicity/carcinogenicity study was performed in CD-1 mice with propamocarb at dietary concentrations of 0, 20, 100 and 500 ppm. No evidence of carcinogenicity or toxicity was noted at any dose level. Thus, 1,000 ppm (53 mg/kg/day for males and females, respectively), was considered to be the NOEL. However, this study did not meet the Agency's criteria for a MTD. A new study at higher dose levels is now in progress.

A 2–year feeding study was performed in beagle dogs with propamocarb at dietary concentrations of 0, 1,000, 3,000, 10,000 ppm. Decreased weight gain, decreased food efficiency and an increased incidence of acute gastric mucosal erosions and/or chronic erosive gastritis were noted in all treated groups. Thus, a NOEL for this study was not determined but was considered to be slightly lower than the lowest dose level tested (33.3 mg/kg/day).

4. *Genotoxicity.* No evidence of genotoxicity was observed in a battery of studies including Salmonella and E. coli gene mutation assays, 2 mouse micronucleus assays, an in vitro mammalian cytogenetic assay using cultured human lymphocytes, a yeast mitotic gene conversion assay and a yeast mitotic recombination assay.

5. *Reproduction and developmental toxicity.* In a developmental toxicity study, rats were administered propamocarb by gavage at dose levels of 0, 74, 221, 740, or 2,210 mg/kg/day on gestation days 6–19. The NOEL for maternal toxicity was 740 mg/kg/day based on mortality, clinical observations and decreased body weight gain at 2,210 mg/kg/day. The NOEL for developmental toxicity was 221 mg/kg/day based on increased post-implantation loss, decreased fetal weights and increased incidence of minor skeletal anomalies (retarded ossification) at 740 and/or 2,210 mg/kg/day.

In another developmental toxicity study, rabbits were administered propamocarb by gavage at dose levels of 0, 15, 45, 150, 300, or 600 mg/kg/day on gestation days 6–18. The NOEL for both maternal toxicity and developmental toxicity was 150 mg/kg/day, based on decreased maternal body weight gain and increased post-implantation loss at 300 mg/kg/day.

A three-generation reproduction study was conducted using rats fed diet containing propamocarb at dietary concentrations of 0, 40, 200, and 1,000 ppm for 100 days and then continuously through 3 successive generations. No treatment-related effects were noted on either the parents or offspring.

6. *Neurotoxicity.* An acute neurotoxicity study was performed in rats at dose levels of 0, 20, 200 and 2,000 mg/kg of propamocarb hydrochloride. The overall NOEL for this study was determined to be 200 mg/kg based on decreased weight gain, soiled fur and decreased motor activity in males and/or females at 2,000 mg/kg.

A 90–day neurotoxicity study was conducted in rats at dietary concentrations of propamocarb hydrochloride of 0, 200, 2,000 and 20,000 ppm. No evidence of neurotoxicity (FOB, motor activity or neuropathology) was observed at any dose level. Plasma, red blood cell and brain cholinesterase levels were also not affected. The NOEL was determined to be 2,000 ppm (142 mg/kg/day) based on decreased weight gain at 20,000 ppm.

7. *Endocrine effects.* No special studies have been conducted to investigate the potential of propamocarb to induce estrogenic or other endocrine effects. However, the standard battery of required toxicity studies has been completed. These studies include an evaluation of the potential effects on reproduction and development, and an evaluation of the pathology of the endocrine organs following repeated or long-term exposure. These studies are generally considered to be sufficient to detect any endocrine effects yet no such effects were detected. Thus, the potential for propamocarb to produce any significant endocrine effects is considered to be minimal.

E. Aggregate Exposure

Propamocarb is registered for non-food uses on turf and ornamental plants (BANOL Fungicide, EPA Reg. No. 45639–88). As such, non-occupational exposure would include exposures resulting from consumption of potential residues in food or water, as well as exposure to residues from applications to golf courses, commercial and ornamental turf, home lawns, sod farms, and ornamental plants. There are no acute toxicity concerns with propamocarb. Thus, only chronic exposures are being addressed here.

1. *Dietary exposure (food).* Potential dietary exposures from food under the proposed tolerances and potential emergency use time-limited tolerances were estimated using the Exposure 1 software system (TAS, Inc.) and the 1977–78 USDA consumption data. For the purposes of this assessment, AgrEvo USA has made the very conservative

assumption that 100 percent of all commodities will contain propamocarb residues and that all of those residues will be at the proposed tolerance levels. (of: 0.05 ppm in potato tubers (whole RAC), and the meat, milk, fat, liver, kidney, and meat by-products of cattle, goats, hogs, horses, and sheep; and for future time-limited tolerances supporting section 18 Emergency Uses, 0.3 ppm in tomatoes (whole RAC); 1.0 ppm in tomato juice, puree, and catsup; 3.0 ppm in tomato paste). Thus, this estimate should result in a gross overestimation of actual human exposure. Copies of these dietary exposure analyses are appended to this document.

2. *Dietary exposure (drinking water).* The potential for propamocarb to leach into groundwater has been assessed in four terrestrial field dissipation studies conducted in several states and on various soil types. These studies were conducted using rates recommended for application to turf, which are approximately 24 lb a.i./acre, six times (6X) higher than the total rate recommended for use in potatoes and tomatoes. The degradation of propamocarb in these studies was rapid, with half-lives ranging from a low of 6 days to a high of 17 days. This compound adsorbs strongly to soil, having a moderately high soil adsorption coefficient (Kads) of 5.2 and a Koc of 359 in sandy loam soil. The compound did not leach under any of the various climatic test conditions, in contrast to it s high solubility in water, and did not exhibit mobility in either acidic or alkaline soil types. Based on these environmental fate data and the anticipated conditions of use, the potential for movement of propamocarb into groundwater is very low, and as such the potential contribution of any such residues to the total dietary intake of propamocarb will be negligible. No Maximum Contaminant Level or Health Advisory Level for residues of propamocarb in drinking water has been established.

3. *Non-dietary exposure.* As a professional use turf and ornamental fungicide, propamocarb is used primarily (>90 percent of use) on golf courses for control of Pythium blight (BANOL Fungicide, EPA Reg. No. 45639–88). Some limited use of BANOL occurs on ornamental plants produced in greenhouses or containers, and to a very limited extent on sod farms or by professional lawn care applicators to commercial turf. The product is rarely used on homeowner turf due to the fact that the diseases it controls (Pythium, Phytophthora) occurs primarily in high fertility, high maintenance turf (e.g. golf courses), not in homeowner turf. Thus, although non-dietary exposures have not been quantified, AgrEvo USA expects them to be minimal since they will occur primarily to golfers who will be wearing shoes and socks and who will not enter previously treated areas until after the grass has dried. Furthermore, based on the limited frequency of use (no more than three applications per year), these non-food uses for propamocarb are not likely to result in potential chronic exposure and thus should not be factored into a chronic exposure assessment.

G. Cumulative Effects

The potential for cumulative effects of propamocarb and other substances having a common mechanism of toxicity must also be considered. The precise mechanism of toxicity for propamocarb is unknown. Although a member of the carbamate group of pesticides, propamocarb is not an *n*-methyl carbamate, and demonstrated no inhibitory effects on blood or brain cholinesterase following either acute or repeated oral administrations to rats and dogs. *In vitro* studies using rat or dog blood plasma showed very slight cholinesterase inhibitory effects only at extremely high dose levels, equivalent to about 2,200 mg/kg bodyweight. This level is 20,000X the established Reference Dose for propamocarb. Thus, AgrEvo USA anticipates no cumulative effects with other substances.

H. Safety Determinations

1. *U.S. population.* The Agency has previously established a Reference Dose (RfD) value of 0.11 mg/kg/day for propamocarb based on a LOEL of 1,000 ppm (33.3 mg/kg/day) from a 2–year dog chronic toxicity study, applying an uncertainty factor of 100 to account for interspecies extrapolation and intraspecies variation, plus an additional factor of 3 to account for the lack of a NOEL. The FAO/WHO/JMPR have recommended an Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI) of 0.1 mg/kg/day.

Using the conservative (worst-case) dietary exposure assumptions described above in paragraph E. 1., chronic dietary exposure will utilize only 1 percent of the RfD for the U.S. population. There is generally no concern for exposures below 100 percent of the RfD since it represents the level at or below which daily aggregate exposure over a lifetime will not pose appreciable risks to human health. Thus, AgrEvo USA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the U.S. population in general from aggregate exposure to propamocarb residues.

2. *Infants and children.* Data from rat and rabbit developmental toxicity studies and rat multigeneration reproduction studies are generally used to assess the potential for increased sensitivity of infants and children. The developmental toxicity studies are designed to evaluate adverse effects on the developing organism resulting from pesticide exposure during prenatal development. Reproduction studies provide information relating to reproductive and other effects on adults and offspring from pre-natal and post-natal exposure to the pesticide.

No treatment-related effects to either parental animals or offspring were noted in a three-generation rat reproduction study at dose levels up to 1,000 ppm (33.3 mg/kg/day). No evidence of teratogenicity was noted in either rat or rabbit developmental toxicity studies, even at maternally toxic dose levels. Increased post-implantation loss was noted in the rabbit study, but only at maternally toxic dose levels. The NOEL for both maternal and developmental toxicity in rabbits was 150 mg/kg/day. Decreased fetal weights, increased post-implantation loss and retarded ossification were noted in rats, and the developmental NOEL of 221 mg/kg/day was lower than the maternal NOEL of 740 mg/kg/day. However, the Agency has concluded that due to the high dose at which fetal toxicity was observed, no definite conclusion can be made regarding developmental toxicity in this study.

FFDCA section 408 provides that the Agency may apply an additional safety factor for infants and children to account for pre- and post-natal toxicity or incompleteness of the database. The toxicology database for propamocarb regarding potential pre- and post-natal effects in children is complete according to existing Agency data requirements and does not indicate any particular developmental or reproductive concerns. Furthermore, the previously established RfD of 0.11 mg/kg/day, which is based on a 33.3 mg/kg/day LOEL from the 2–year dog feeding study, already provides for a safety factor of 1,364 relative to the 150 mg/kg/day developmental NOEL from the rat developmental toxicity study. Thus, AgrEvo USA considers the existing RfD of 0.11 mg/kg/day to be appropriate for assessing potential risks to infants and children and an additional uncertainty factor is not warranted.

Using the conservative assumptions described above, aggregate exposure to propamocarb is expected to utilize 3 percent of the RfD in non-nursing infants and 2 percent of the RfD in children aged 1–6. These numbers

would be significantly lower if anticipated residues were utilized rather than tolerance values. Therefore, AgrEvo concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants or children from aggregate exposure to propamocarb residues.

I. International Tolerances

The Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex) has established tolerances (MRLs) for propamocarb in the following raw agricultural commodities:

Commodity	Part per million
Beetroot	0.2 ppm
Brussels sprouts	1.0 ppm
Cabbage, head	0.1 ppm
Celery	0.2 ppm
Cucumber	2.0 ppm
Cauliflower	0.2 ppm
Lettuce, head	10.0 ppm
Pepper, sweet	1.0 ppm
Radish	5.0 ppm
Strawberry	0.1 ppm
Tomato	1.0 ppm

The FAO/WHO/JMPR have recommended an Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI) of 0.1 mg/kg/day.

J. Conclusions

AgrEvo USA believes that the proposed use of propamacarb on potatoes would not pose a significant risk to human health, including that of infants and children, and is in compliance with the requirements of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996. Moreover, the proposed tolerances for propamocarb in potato commodities, meat and milk, of 0.05 ppm, should be established.

II. Public Record

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on this notice of filing. Comments must bear a notation indicating the docket control number, [PF–716]. All written comments filed in response to this petition will be available in the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, at the address given above from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

A record has been established for this notice under docket control number [PF–716] 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 public record is located in Rm. 1132 of the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Electronic comments can be sent directly to EPA at:
opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov

Electronic comments must be submitted as ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption.

The official record for this notice, as well as the public version, as described above will be kept in paper form. Accordingly, EPA will transfer all comments received electronically into printed, paper form as they are received and will place the paper copies in the official record which will also include all comments submitted directly in writing. The official record is the paper record maintained at the address in ''ADDRESSES'' at the beginning of this document.

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping.

Dated: February 26, 1997.

Peter Caulkins,
Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 97–5681 Filed 3–11–97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[PF–712; FRL–5587–7]

The Cryolite Task Force; Pesticide Tolerance Petition Filing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of filing.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the filing of a pesticide petition proposing regulations establishing tolerances for residues of the insecticidal fluorine compounds cryolite and/or synthetic cryolite (sodium aluminum fluoride or sodium aluminofluoride) in or on potatoes and in processed potato waste. This notice includes a summary of the petition that was prepared by the petitioner, The Cryolite Task Force.

DATES: Comments, identified by the docket control number [PF-712] must be received on or before April 11, 1997.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide 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 22202.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Electronic comments must be submitted either in ASCII format (avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption) or in WordPerfect in 5.1 file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number [PF-712]. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries. The official record for this rulemaking, as well as the public version described above, will be kept in paper form. Additional information on electronic submissions can be found in Unit II. of this document.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). Information so marked will not be