pyridaben, effects from exposure to the pesticide on the reproductive capability of mating animals and data on systemic toxicity.

FFDCA section 408 provides that EPA shall apply an additional ten–fold 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 data base unless EPA determines that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. Margins of safety are incorporated into EPA risk assessments either directly through use of a margin of exposure (MOE) analysis or through using uncertainty (safety) factors in calculating a dose level that poses no appreciable risk to humans. EPA believes that reliable data support using the standard MOE and uncertainty factor (usually 100 for combined interspecies and intraspecies variability) and not the additional ten–fold margin of exposure/uncertainty factor MOE/UF when EPA has a complete data base under existing guidelines and when the severity of the effect in infants or children or the potency or unusual toxic properties of a compound do not raise concerns regarding the adequacy of the standard margin of exposure/safety factor MOE/(SF).

ii. *Developmental toxicity studies—a. Rats*. In a developmental toxicity study in rats, the maternal (systemic) NOAEL was 4.7 mg/kg/day. The maternal LOAEL of 13 mg/kg/day was based on decreases in body weight, body weight gain, and food consumption during the dosing period (GD 6–15). The developmental (fetal) NOAEL was 13 mg/kg/day. The developmental LOAEL of 30 mg/kg/day was based on decreased fetal body weight and increased incomplete ossification in selected bones.

b. Rabbits. In an oral developmental toxicity study in rabbits, the maternal (systemic) NOAEL was not established. The maternal LOAEL of 1.5 mg/kg/day was based on decreases in body weight gain and food consumption. There was no developmental toxicity observed at any dose tested. Therefore, the developmental (fetal) NOAEL is 15 mg/kg/day at the highest dose tested (HDT).

iii. *Reproductive toxicity study—rats*. In the 2–generation reproductive toxicity study in rats, the parental (systemic) NOAEL was 2.3 mg/kg/day. The parental (systemic) LOAEL of 7 mg/kg/day was based on decreased body weight, decreased body weight gains, and decreased food efficiency. The reproductive (pup) NOAEL was 7 mg/kg/day and the LOAEL was 7 mg/kg/day at the HDT.

iv. *Prenatal and postnatal sensitivity*. The toxicological data base for evaluating prenatal and postnatal toxicity for pyridaben is complete with respect to current data requirements. There are no prenatal or postnatal toxicity concerns for infants and children, based on the results of the rat and rabbit developmental toxicity studies as well as the 2–generation rat reproductive toxicity study. Based on the above, BASF Corporation has concluded that reliable data support removing the additional 10X SF for protection of infants and children.

v. *Conclusion*. There is a complete toxicity data base for pyridaben and exposure data are complete or estimated based on data that reasonably account for potential exposures.

a. *Acute risk*. Using the somewhat conservative exposure assumptions described above, the percentage of the acute RfD that will be utilized by dietary (food) exposure to residues of pyridaben maximize to 19% for nursing infants <1–year old. The acute DWLOC does not exceed EPA's level of concern. Taking into account the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data and this conservative exposure assessment, BASF Corporation concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from acute aggregate exposure to pyridaben residues.

b. *Chronic risk*. Using the somewhat conservative exposure assumptions described above, EPA has calculated that the percentage of the RfD that will be utilized by dietary (food) exposure to residues of pyridaben maximizes at 64% of the chronic PAD for the most highly exposed population subgroup, non-nursing infants. The chronic DWLOC does not exceed EPA's level of concern. There are no residential uses for pyridaben.

Taking into account the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data and this conservative exposure assessment, BASF Corporation concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from chronic aggregate exposure to pyridaben residues.

c. *Short-term or intermediate-term risk*. Aggregate exposure takes into account chronic dietary food and water (considered to be a background exposure level) plus indoor and outdoor residential uses. Since the chronic food and chronic DWLOC do not exceed EPA's level of concern and there are currently no indoor or outdoor residential uses of pyridaben, the short-term and intermediate-term aggregate risk does not exceed EPA's level of concern.

d. *Determination of safety*. Based on these risk assessments, BASF Corporation concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to pyridaben residues.

F. International Tolerances

There are no CODEX, Canadian, or Mexican maximum residue levels established for pyridaben on hops or strawberry.

[FR Doc. 02–2986 Filed 2–7–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF–1067; FRL–6821–2]

Notice of Filing Pesticide Petitions to Establish Tolerances for Certain Pesticide Chemicals in or on Food

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 docket control number PF–1067, must be received on or before March 11, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted by mail, electronically, or in person. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number PF–1067, in the subject line on the first page of your response.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Shaja R. Brothers, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 308–3194; e-mail address: brothers.shaja@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected categories and entities may include, but are not limited to:

Categories	NAICS codes	Examples of potentially affected entities
Industry	111 112 311 32532	Crop production Animal production Food manufacturing Pesticide manufacturing

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether or not this action might apply to certain entities. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

B. How Can I Get Additional Information, Including Copies of this Document and Other Related Documents?

1. *Electronically*. You may obtain electronic copies of this document, and certain other related documents that might be available electronically, from the EPA Internet Home Page at http://www.epa.gov/. To access this document, on the Home Page select ''Laws and Regulations'' and then look up the entry for this document under the ''**Federal Register**—Environmental Documents.'' You can also go directly to the **Federal Register** listings at http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/.

2. *In person*. The Agency has established an official record for this action under docket control number PF–1067. The official record consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received during an applicable comment period, and other information related to this action, including any information claimed as confidential business information (CBI). This official record includes the documents that are physically located in the docket, as well as the documents that are referenced in those documents. The public version of the official record does not include any information claimed as CBI. The public version of the official record, which includes printed, paper versions of any electronic comments submitted during an applicable comment period, is available for inspection in the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

C. How and to Whom Do I Submit Comments?

You may submit comments through the mail, in person, or electronically. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number PF–1067 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

1. *By mail*. Submit your comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460.

2. *In person or by courier*. Deliver your comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA. The PIRIB is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

3. *Electronically*. You may submit your comments electronically by e-mail to: opp-docket@epa.gov, or you can submit a computer disk as described above. Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. Avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Electronic submissions will be accepted in Wordperfect 6.1/8.0 or ASCII file format. All comments in electronic form must be identified by docket control number PF–1067. Electronic comments may also be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

D. How Should I Handle CBI That I Want to Submit to the Agency?

Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. You may claim information that you submit to EPA in response to this document as CBI by marking any part or all of that information as CBI. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes any information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public version of the official record. Information not marked confidential will be included in the public version of the official record without prior notice. If you have any questions about CBI or the procedures for claiming CBI, please consult the person identified under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

E. What Should I Consider as I Prepare My Comments for EPA?

You may find the following suggestions helpful for preparing your comments:

1. Explain your views as clearly as possible.

2. Describe any assumptions that you used.

3. Provide copies of any technical information and/or data you used that support your views.

4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate that you provide.

5. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns.

6. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline in this notice.

7. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, be sure to identify the docket control number assigned to this action in the subject line on the first page of your response. You may also provide the name, date, and **Federal Register** citation.

II. What Action is the Agency Taking?

EPA has received a pesticide petition as follows proposing the establishment and/or amendment of regulations for residues of a certain pesticide chemical in or on various food commodities under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a. EPA has determined that this petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2); however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data support granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

List of Subjects

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

Dated: January 26, 2002.

Peter Caulkins,

Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Summaries of Petitions

The 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 Tomen Agro, Inc., the registrant, and represents the view of Tomen Agro. EPA is publishing the petition summaries verbatim without editing them in any way. The petition summaries announce 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.

Interregional Research Project Number 4

PP 1E6339, 1E6341, and 1E6343

EPA has received pesticide petitions (1E6341, 1E6339, and 1E6343), from the Interregional Research Project Number 4 (IR-4), 681 U.S. Highway #1 South, North Brunswick, NJ 08902–3390 proposing, pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), to amend 40 CFR part 180.553 by establishing tolerances for residues of fenhexamid, (N-2,3-dichloro-4-hydroxyphenyl)-1-methylcyclohexanecarboxamide) in or on the following raw agricultural commodities: Caneberry at 20.0 parts per million (ppm), the bushberry subgroup, juneberry, loganberry and Salal at 5.0 ppm, and pistachio at 0.02 ppm. EPA has determined that the petitions contain 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 support granting of the petitions. Additional data may be needed, before EPA rules on the petitions. This notice includes a summary of the petition prepared by Tomen Agro, Inc., 100 First Street, Suite 1700, San Francisco, CA 94105.

A. Residue Chemistry

1. *Plant metabolism*. The qualitative nature of fenhexamid residues in plants is adequately understood.

2. *Analytical method.* An adequate method for purposes of enforcement of the proposed fenhexamid tolerances in plant commodities is available.

3. *Magnitude of residues*. The magnitude of residues for fenhexamid on the proposed commodities is adequately understood.

B. Toxicological Profile

1. *Acute toxicity*. The acute oral toxicity study resulted in a lethal dose (LD_{50}) of > 5,000 milligrams/kilograms (mg/kg) for both sexes. The acute dermal toxicity in rats resulted in an LD_{50} of greater than 5,000 mg/kg for both sexes. The acute inhalation was investigated in two studies in rats. Inhalation by aerosol at the maximum technically possible concentration of 0.322 milligram/liter (mg/L) resulted in no deaths or symptoms lethal concentration (LC_{50}) > 0.322 mg/L). A dust inhalation study resulted in an LC_{50} > 5.057 mg/L. Fenhexamid was not irritating to the skin or eyes after a 4–hour exposure period. The Buehler dermal sensitization study in guinea pigs indicated that fenhexamid is not a sensitizer. Based on these results, fenhexamid technical is placed in toxicity Category IV, and does not pose any acute dietary risks.

2. *Genotoxicity*. The potential for genetic toxicity of fenhexamid was evaluated in six assays, including two Ames tests, an HGPRT forward mutation assay, an unscheduled DNA synthesis (UDS) assay, an *in vitro* chromosomal aberration assay in Chinese hamster ovary (CHO) cells, and a micronucleus test in mice. The compound was found to be devoid of any mutagenic activity in each of these assays; including those tests that investigated the absence or presence of metabolic activating systems. The weight of evidence indicates that fenhexamid technical does not pose a risk of mutagenicity or genotoxicity.

3. *Reproductive and developmental toxicity*—i. In a 2-generation reproduction study (one mating per generation), 30 Sprague-Dawley rats per sex per dose were administered 0, 100, 500, 5,000, or 20,000 ppm of fenhexamid in the diet. The reproductive toxicity no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL) was 20,000 ppm. The neonatal NOAEL was 500 ppm, and the lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) was 5,000 ppm based on decreased pup body weight. The parental toxicity NOAEL was 500 ppm based on lower adult pre-mating body weights at 5,000 and 20,000 ppm, lower gestation body weights at 20,000 ppm, lower lactation body weights at 5,000 and 20,000 ppm, and statistically significant changes in clinical chemistry parameters, terminal body weights, and organ weights at 5,000 and 20,000 ppm. Based on this study, it is clear that the only toxic effects in the neonates occurred at parentally toxic doses.

ii. In rats, fenhexamid was administered by gavage at doses of 0 or 1,000 mg/kg for gestation days 6–15. No maternal toxicity, embryotoxicity, fetotoxicity, or teratogenic effects were observed at the limit dose of 1,000 mg/kg/day. Therefore, the NOAEL for maternal and developmental toxicity was 1,000 mg/kg/day.

iii. In rabbits, fenhexamid was administered by gavage at doses of 0, 100, 300, and 1,000 mg/kg for gestation days 6–18. Body weight gain, and feed consumption of the dams were reduced at the two top doses. One abortion occurred in each of the top two dose groups, and two total resorptions occurred in the top dose group. The placental weights were slightly decreased at 300 mg/kg/day and above. In the 1,000 mg/kg/day group, slightly decreased fetal weights and a slightly retarded skeletal ossification were observed. All other parameters investigated in the study were unaffected. Therefore, the NOAELs for maternal and developmental toxicity were 100 mg/kg/day in this study.

Based on the 2–generation reproduction study in rats, fenhexamid is not considered a reproductive toxicant and shows no evidence of endocrine effects. The data from the developmental toxicity studies on fenhexamid show no evidence of a potential for developmental effects (malformations or variations) at doses that are not maternally toxic. The NOAEL for both maternal and developmental toxicity in rats was 1,000 mg/kg/day, and for rabbits the NOAEL for both maternal and developmental toxicity was 100 mg/kg/day.

4. *Subchronic toxicity*—i. Fenhexamid was administered in the diet to rats for 13 weeks at doses of 0, 2,500, 5,000, 10,000, and 20,000 ppm. The NOAEL was 5,000 ppm (415 mg/kg/day in males and 549 mg/kg/day in females). Reversible liver effects were observed at 10,000 ppm.

ii. Fenhexamid was administered in the diet to mice for approximately 14 weeks at doses of 0, 100, 1,000, and 10,000 ppm. The NOAEL was 1,000 ppm (266.6 mg/kg/day in males and 453.9 mg/kg/day in females). Increased feed and water consumption and kidney and liver effects were observed at 10,000 ppm.

iii. Fenhexamid was administered in the diet to beagle dogs for 13 weeks at doses of 0, 1,000, 7,000, and 50,000 ppm. The NOAEL was 1,000 ppm (33.9 mg/kg/day in males and 37.0 mg/kg/day in females). Increased Heinz bodies were observed at 7,000 ppm.

5. *Chronic toxicity*.—i. Fenhexamid was administered in the feed at doses of 0, 500, 3,500, or 25,000 ppm to 4 male and 4 female beagle dogs per group for 52 weeks. A systemic NOAEL of 500 ppm (an average dose of 17.4 mg/kg/day over the course of the study) was observed based on decreased food consumption, and decreased body weight gain at 25,000 ppm, decreased erythrocyte, hemoglobin and hematocrit values at 25,000 ppm, increased Heinz bodies at 3,500 ppm and above, and a

dose-dependent increase of alkaline phosphatase at 3,500 ppm and above. There were no treatment-related effects on either macroscopic or histologic pathology.

ii. A combined chronic/carcinogenicity study was performed in Wistar rats. Fifty animals/sex/dose were administered doses of 0, 500, 5,000, or 20,000 ppm for 24 months in the feed. A further 10 animals/sex/group received the same doses and were sacrificed after 52 weeks. The doses administered relative to body weight were 0, 28, 292, or 1,280 mg/kg/day for males and 0, 40, 415, or 2067 mg/kg/day for females. The NOAEL in the study was 500 ppm (28 mg/kg/day for males and 40 mg/kg/day for females) based on body weight decreases in females at 5,000 ppm and above, changes in biochemical liver parameters in the absence of morphological changes in both sexes at 5,000 ppm and above, and caecal mucosal hyperplasia evident at 5,000 ppm and above.

The NOAEL in the chronic dog study was 17.4 mg/kg/day based on body weight, hematology and clinical chemistry effects. The lowest NOAEL in the 2–year rat study was determined to be 28 mg/kg/day based on body weight, clinical chemistry parameters in the liver, and caecal mucosal hyperplasia.

6. *Animal metabolism.*—i. A lactating goat was dosed at 10 milligrams (mg) ^{14}C-fenhexamid per kilograms/bodyweight on 3 consecutive days at 24–hour intervals. Fenhexamid was rapidly and almost completely absorbed, distributed and eliminated (24.9% in urine, 38.6% in feces, and 0.03% in milk). The half-life of biliary-fecal elimination (primary pathway) was 0.5 hour. The primary residues in tissues were unreacted fenhexamid, its glucuronide derivative and the 4-hydroxy derivative.

ii. Rats were administered radiolabeled fenhexamid (a single oral low dose of 1 mg/kg, a single oral high dose of 100 mg/kg, or 15 repeated low doses of 1 mg/kg/day). Radiolabeled fenhexamid was rapidly eliminated and tissue residues declined rapidly. After 48 hours the total radioactivity residue in the body excluding the GI tract, was > 0.3% of the administered dose in all dose groups. Excretion was rapid, and almost complete with feces as the major route of excretion. Approximately 62–84% of the recovered radioactivity was found in feces, and 15–36% in urine within 48 hours post-dosing. Metabolite characterization studies showed that the main components detected in excreta were the unchanged parent compound (62–75%) and the glucuronic acid conjugate of the parent compound (4–23%). The proposed major pathway for biotransformation is via conjugation of the aromatic hydroxyl group with glucuronic acid. Identification of radioactive residues ranged from 88% to 99% and was independent of dose and sex.

7. *Metabolite toxicology.* As the primary residues found in rats and goat were the parent compound fenhexamid, and its glucuronic acid conjugate, no additional metabolite toxicology studies are warranted.

8. *Endocrine disruption.* Fenhexamid has no endocrine-modulation characteristics as demonstrated by the lack of endocrine effects in developmental, reproductive, subchronic, and chronic studies.

C. Aggregate Exposure

1. *Dietary exposure*—i. *Food.* Dietary exposure to fenhexamid is limited to the established tolerances for residues of fenhexamid on grapes at 4.0 ppm, raisins at 6.0 ppm, strawberries at 3.0 ppm, almond nutmeat at 0.02 ppm, almond hulls at 2.0 ppm, stone fruit at 5.0 ppm, pear at 15 ppm and the proposed tolerances in the current submission which are as follows: Bushberry at 5.0 ppm, caneberry at 20 ppm, and pistachios at 0.02 ppm.

ii. *Drinking water.* Review of the environmental fate data indicates that fenhexamid is relatively immobile and rapidly degrades in the soil and water. Fenhexamid dissipates in the environment via several processes. Therefore, a significant contribution to aggregate risk from drinking water is unlikely.

2. *Non-dietary exposure.* There is no significant potential for non-occupational exposure to the general public. The proposed uses are limited to agricultural and horticultural use.

D. Cumulative Effects

Consideration of a common mechanism of toxicity is not appropriate at this time since it has a unique mode of action. Moreover, there is no significant toxicity observed for fenhexamid. Even at toxicology limit doses, only minimal toxicity is observed for fenhexamid. Therefore, only the potential risks of fenhexamid are considered in the exposure assessment.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population.* Considering that the percent of the chronic PAD utilized by grape, strawberry and raisin uses was determined to be 1.8% for the U.S. population (May 28, 1999, 64 FR 28917) (FRL–6082–7); considering further the percent contribution to total exposure of grapes, strawberries, caneberry, bushberry, and pistachios (June 1, 2000, 65 FR 35069) (FRL–6559–3), and their set or proposed tolerances (grapes: 4 ppm; caneberry: 20 ppm; bushberry: 5 ppm; pistachio: 20 ppm); the percent of the chronic PAD utilized by caneberry, bushberry, and pistachio is estimated to be = 0.25% for the U.S. population. Therefore, the estimates of dietary exposure clearly indicate adequate safety margins for the overall U.S. population.

2. *Infants and children.* Considering that the percent of the chronic PAD utilized by grape, strawberry and raisin uses were determined to be 6.6% for nursing infants and 4.8 % for children, (May 28, 1999, 64 FR 28917); considering further the percent contribution to total exposure of grapes, strawberries, caneberry, bushberry, and pistachios and their set or proposed tolerances; the percent of the chronic PAD utilized by caneberry, bushberry, and pistachio is estimated to be = 1.1% for infants; and = 0.33% for children.

In assessing the potential for additional sensitivity of infants and children to residues of fenhexamid, the available developmental toxicity and reproductive toxicity studies and the potential for endocrine modulation by fenhexamid were considered.

1. Developmental toxicity studies in two species indicate that fenhexamid does not impose additional risks to developing fetuses and is not a carcinogenic.

2. The 2–generation reproduction study in rats demonstrated that there were no adverse effects on reproductive performance, fertility, fecundity, pup survival, or pup development at non-maternally toxic levels. Maternal and developmental NOAELs and LOAELs were comparable, indicating no increase in susceptibility of developing organisms. No evidence of endocrine effects was noted in any study. It is therefore concluded that fenhexamid poses no additional risk for infants and children and no additional uncertainty factor is warranted.

F. International Tolerances

International caneberry tolerances are in effect in the following countries: Belgium, Slovenia, and Switzerland (3.0 ppm), Netherlands and other EU countries (5.0 ppm). Bushberry (currant and gooseberry) tolerances are as follows: Belgium and Netherlands (3.0 ppm), Slovenia, and other EU countries (5.0 ppm). Austrian tolerances (5.0 ppm) have been drafted for berries, including small fruit. German tolerances (5 ppm)

are in effect for berries, excluding strawberries.

[FR Doc. 02–2987 Filed 2–7–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

Meeting of the Advisory Commission on Drug Free Communities

AGENCY: Office of National Drug Control Policy.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Drug-Free Communities Act, a meeting of the Advisory Commission on Drug Free Communities will be held on March 5 and 6, 2002 at the Office of National Drug Control Policy in the 5th Floor Conference Room, 750 17th Street NW., 7th Floor, Washington, DC. The meeting will commence at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, March 5, 2002 and adjourn for the evening at 5 p.m. The meeting will resume at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, March 6, 2002 and conclude at 3 p.m. The agenda will include: remarks by ONDCP Director, John P. Walters; Report on Reauthorization of the Drug-Free Communities Program; Administrator's Progress Report; Progress Report on National Evaluation; and National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign: Coalition Building initiative. There will be an opportunity for public comment from 11 a.m. until 11:30 on Wednesday, March 6, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda V. Priebe, (202) 395–6622.

Dated: February 4, 2002.

Linda V. Priebe,

Assistant General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 02–3049 Filed 2–7–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3180–02–P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Joint Publicly Observed Meeting of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Federal Emergency Management Agency

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Notice of publicly observed meeting.

SUMMARY: FEMA announces the following joint publicly observed meeting sponsored by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and FEMA.

Name: Exercise Evaluation Methodology and Alert and Notification System-related Issues.

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, February 20, 2002.

Place: FEMA Lobby Conference Room, 500 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20472.

Time: 8:30 am to 4:30 pm.

Proposed Agenda: The proposed agenda is:

(a) NRC/FEMA introductions and statement of purpose.

(b) Discussion of an Exercise Evaluation Methodology for evaluation of capability to notify the public during rapidly developing emergency scenarios.

(c) Change of the Alert and Notification System Reliability Performance Indicator to use availability vice reliability.

(d) Discussion of need to change FEMA–REP–10 surveillance reporting guidance in conformance with a change to the performance indicator.

(e) Future discussions/meetings.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. O.C. Payne, Federal Emergency Management Agency, (telephone) 202–646–2864 or (e-mail) *oc.payne@fema.gov,* or Randy Sullivan, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, (telephone) 301–415–1123 or (e-mail) *rxs3@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: We expect that representatives of the NRC, FEMA, Nuclear Energy Institute, nuclear power industry, States, and public interest groups will participate in the meeting. Our purpose is to collect information to develop performance criteria for evaluating fast-breaking nuclear power plant emergency events. This meeting will be open to the public with limited seating available on a first-come, first-served basis. Members of the general public who want to attend the meeting should contact Mr. O.C. Payne, (telephone) 202–646–2864 or (e-mail) *oc.payne@fema.gov* on or before Monday, February 18, 2002.

Dated: February 5, 2002.

Michael D. Brown,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 02–3134 Filed 2–7–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718–01–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Notice of Request for Additional Information

The Commission gives notice that it has requested that the parties to the below listed agreement provide additional information pursuant to section 6(d) of the Shipping Act of 1984, 46 U.S.C. app. §§ 1701 *et seq.* The Commission has determined that further information is necessary to evaluate the proposed agreement. This action prevents the agreement from becoming effective as originally scheduled.

Agreement No.: 011784.

Title: Indamex/TSA Bridging Agreement.

Parties: The Indamex Agreement, Transpacific Stabilization Agreement.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Dated: February 4, 2002.

Bryant L. VanBrakle,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–3071 Filed 2–7–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisition of Shares of Bank or Bank Holding Companies

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notices also will be available for inspection at the office of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than February 22, 2002.

A.Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City (Susan Zubradt, Assistant Vice President) 925 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64198–0001:

1. Forest Levan Kelly as general partner of LBK Holdings, L.P., Bristow, Oklahoma, and as trustee of (1) the Allison Asbury Kelly Children's Trust, (2) the Dorcas B. Kelly Trust, and (3) the Kelly Family Foundation, all of Bristow, Oklahoma; to retain voting shares of Spirit BankCorp, Inc., Bristow, Oklahoma, and thereby indirectly retain voting shares of Spirit Bank, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, February 4, 2002.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 02–3035 Filed 2–7–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–S