with a median lethal dose (LD_{50}) of 81 milligrams (mg)/kilogram (kg) for male rats and 67 mg/kg for female rats; a 21-day delayed neurotoxicity hen study with a no-observed-effect level (NOEL) of 5,000 mg/kg, the highest dose tested (HDT); teratology studies (in rats and rabbits), with a NOEL of 8.0 mg/kg/day (HDT) for rats and a NOEL of 60 mg/kg/day (HDT) for rabbits; a 3-generation rat reproduction study with a NOEL of 30 ppm; 90-day subchronic rat and dog feeding studies with a NOEL of 60 ppm for rats and 150 ppm (HDT) for dogs (HDT); a 24-month rat chronic-feeding/oncogenicity study that resulted in a systemic NOEL of 60 ppm in which no oncogenic effects were noted at dosage levels of 30, 60, and 120 ppm (120 ppm being the highest dosage level tested) under the conditions of the study; an 18-month mouse oncogenic study in which no oncogenic effects were noted at dosage levels of 30, 60, and 120 ppm (120 ppm being the highest dosage level tested) under the conditions of the study; and the following mutagenicity studies: an Ames test at 1,000 micrograms (*ug*)/Plate (HDT) and a rat dominant-lethal test at 10.0 mg/kg (HDT), both negative.

A 1-year dog feeding study previously identified as desirable has been submitted and is being reviewed by the Agency.

The acceptable daily intake (ADI) is calculated to be 0.015 mg/kg/day based on the 3-generation rat reproduction study and its NOEL of 30 ppm (1.50 mg/kg/day) using a 100-fold safety factor. The maximum permissible intake (MPI) is calculated to be 0.900 mg/day for a 60-kg person. Published and pending tolerances result in a theoretical maximum residue contribution (TMRC) of 0.1468 mg/day based on a 1.5-kg diet and utilize 16.31 percent of the ADI. The establishment of these tolerances will not increase the TMRC, resulting in no increase in the total utilization of the percentage of the ADI.

The nature of the residues is adequately understood for this tolerance. An adequate analytical method, gas chromatography, is available for enforcement purposes. There are currently no regulatory actions pending against continued registration of this pesticide, and there are no other relevant considerations in establishing this tolerance.

The pesticide is considered useful for the purpose for which the tolerance is sought. Based on the information cited above, the Agency has determined that the establishment of the tolerance for residues of the insecticide flucythrinate in or on the commodity will protect the public health. Therefore, the tolerance is established as set forth below.

Any person adversely affected by this regulation may, within 30 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, file written objections with the Hearing Clerk, at the address given above. Such objections should specify the provisions of the regulation deemed objectionable and the grounds for the objections. If a hearing is requested, the objections must state the issues for the hearing and the grounds for the objections. A hearing will be granted if the objections are supported by grounds legally sufficient to justify the relief sought.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new tolerances or raising tolerance levels or establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the **Federal Register** of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests.

Dated: May 7, 1985.

Steven Schatzow,

Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR Part 180 is amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 180 continues to read as follows:

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

2. Section 180.400 is amended by adding, and alphabetically inserting, the raw agricultural commodities, to read as follows:

§ 180.400 Flucythrinate; tolerances for residues.

* * * * *

Commodities	Parts per million
* * * * *	
Corn fodder	3.00
Corn forage	3.00
Corn grain	0.05
* * * * *	

[FR Doc. 85-12023 Filed 5-21-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Part 173

[Docket No. HM-149D, Amdt. No. 173-187]

Exceptions for Specified Quantities of Radioactive Materials; Correction

AGENCY: Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB), Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Emergency final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects an emergency final rule published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 1985, under Docket No. HM-149D (50 FR 18667). The emergency final rule published under HM-149D renewed for two years the exceptions (statutory exemptions) for specified quantities of radioactive materials found in 49 CFR 173.4, 173.421-1 and 173.421-2. The effective dates of the exceptions found in these sections were extended until May 2, 1987. The emergency final rule also revised the language contained in §§ 173.448(f) and 175.700(c). This action is necessary to correct an inadvertent editorial change that was made to § 173.448(f) of that document because the change as published would have prohibited the transportation by passenger-carrying aircraft of radioactive materials which the rule change was intended to authorize.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lee Jackson, Office of Hazardous Materials Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590, (202) 426-2075.

PART 173—[AMENDED]

Section 173.448(f) appearing on page (50 FR 18668) is correctly revised to read as follows:

§ 173.448 General transportation requirements.

* * * * *

(f) No person shall offer for transportation aboard a passenger-carrying aircraft any radioactive material unless that material is intended for use in, or incident to, research, medical diagnosis or treatment.

* * * * *

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1803, 1804, 1805, 1807, 1808; 49 CFR 1.53(e).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1985.

L.D. Santman,

Director, Materials Transportation Bureau.

[FR Doc. 85-12239 Filed 5-21-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. 81-11; Notice 13]

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This notice amends Safety Standard No. 108 to allow motor vehicles to be equipped with replaceable bulb headlamp systems consisting of either four lamps with single standardized replaceable light sources, or two lamps each with two such light sources. Currently Standard No. 108 permits replaceable bulk systems only if they are comprised of two lamps with single standardized light sources. The amendment relieves the current replaceable bulb headlamp design restriction that allows only two-lamp single-light source systems.

Notice of the proposed amendment was published on December 7, 1984, and an opportunity afforded for comment (49 FR 47880). The proposal implemented the agency's grant of a petition for rulemaking by General Motors Corporation. It also responded to a petition by Volkswagen of America previously denied.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 22, 1985.

ADDRESS: Petitions for reconsideration of the amendment should refer to the docket number and notice number of this notice and be submitted to: Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jere Medlin, Office of Rulemaking, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Washington, D.C. 20590 (202-426-2720).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 2, 1983, NHTSA amended Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 108, *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment,* to allow the use of a replaceable bulb headlamp system (48 FR 24690). This system is comprised of two headlamps, each with a standardized replaceable light source containing both an upper and lower beam filament.

Among the petitions for reconsideration of the rule was one from Volkswagen of America, asking that a four-lamp system be allowed, each with its own light source, which would be the standard dual-filament light source which the agency has adopted. NHTSA denied this petition (48 FR 44815), commenting that rulemaking which would allow dual-filament light sources in a four-lamp configuration, or two dual-filament light sources in a single cavity, could not be entertained until certain issues could be considered further. As the notice stated, these issues involved whether only two lamps should be illuminated on upper beam (in four-lamp systems all four are presently required) and if so whether it is important that the front corners of the vehicle be otherwise indicated. Other issues concerned simultaneous actuation of light filaments in a headlamp system (this could produce excessive illumination) and uncertainties in the ability to insure correct simultaneous upper beam or lower beam aim if the bulb reflector systems were not separate upper and lower beam units. Subsequently, General Motors Corporation petitioned the agency for rulemaking to allow a two-lamp system with two standard dual-filament light sources in a single cavity. The agency granted that petition and published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on December 7, 1984 (49 FR 47880). As there was a similarity between the system that VW wished the agency to consider, and the one for which a petition was granted, the two systems proposed by the NPRM were simply those incorporating quadruple light sources. The agency reviewed the issues on which the previous denial was based, and presented them for discussion and comment in the NPRM.

GM argued that the two-source system it has requested will allow it greater freedom in designing aerodynamic front ends than the present standard for replaceable bulb headlamps. Under the present standard, considering the possible out-of-focus relationship of the filament to the focal point of the reflector in a current replaceable bulb headlamp, the headlamp's vertical dimensions may be greater than desirable for aerodynamic purposes. By installing two light sources in the same headlamp, a smaller height is possible if the lower and upper beam filament are placed exactly on the focal point of their respective parabolas. Benefits attributable by GM to this intended system of headlamps of lesser height include possible improvements in photometric performance and improved fuel economy through aerodynamic efficiency by lowering the edge of the hood.

As the NPRM noted, another benefit could occur because only one filament would be in use in each dual filament standardized replaceable light source in four-lamp systems and two-bulb systems. For example, should a lower beam filament burn out, the light source could be immediately interchanged with the adjacent upper beam light source, whose lower beam filament would not have been utilized. After the exchange, the burned-out lower filament would become irrelevant as the upper beam filament in that bulb would now be available for use.

Both existing replaceable bulb photometrics and photometrics similar to those proposed for Type F sealed beam headlamps were proposed. Comments were solicited on each photometric option.

GM would aim both bulbs in a single housing by a single adjustment, such as is currently used in the two-lamp round and larger rectangular systems. The GM system can utilize the same aimer adapters that are available for single replaceable bulb headlamps.

Four-headlamp systems such as VW contemplates offer distinctive design possibilities which are similar but not identical to those offered by systems with two bulbs per lamp. NHTSA proposed that four-lamp replaceable bulb headlamp systems consist of two lamps providing upper beam photometrics, and two lamps providing lower beam photometrics. The reflectors of these lamps would be designed to optimize the lower beam filament at the focal point of the lower beam lamp reflector and optimize the lens prescriptions for dedicated lower beam use. The upper beam lamp would be optimized in a similar manner. This type of system has been adopted for the new smaller four-lamp Type F sealed beam system (49 FR 50176). The dedicated lens prescription of each lamp would be marked "U" for upper beam, or "L" for lower beam, as appropriate. In conjunction with the option proposing Type F lamp photometrics, simultaneous use of the upper and lower beam would have been permitted as a manufacturer's option, and new glare limits would be added to the photometric requirements to help minimize potential problems from excessive foreground light during simultaneous use.