reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Raytheon Corporate Jets Inc., 3 Bishops Square, St. Albans Road West, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL109NE, United Kingdom. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on October 21, 1994.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on September 14, 1994.

Donald L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 94–23223 Filed 9–20–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94–NM–154–AD; Amendment 39–9028; AD 94–19–06]

Airworthiness Directives; Puritan Bennett Sweep-On Model 2000 Crew Masks

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Puritan Bennett Sweep-On Model 2000 crew masks installed on various transport and commuter category airplanes. This action requires modification of certain crew oxygen masks. This amendment is prompted by reports of difficulty in exhaling into certain crew oxygen masks due to misalignment of the demand diaphragm. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent the flight crew from experiencing difficulty in exhaling into the affected crew oxygen masks in the event oxygen masks are required for the crew, such as during depressurization of the airplane.

DATES: Effective October 6, 1994.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of October 6, 1994.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before November 21, 1994.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94–NM–154–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Puritan Bennett Aero Systems Company, 108000 Pflumm Road, Lenexa, Kansas 66215. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3229 East Spring Street, Long Beach, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Walter Eierman, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–131L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3229 East Spring Street, Long Beach, California 90806–2425; telephone (310) 988–5336; fax (310) 988–5310.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Recently, the flight crews from various transport and commuter category airplanes reported that they experienced difficulty in exhaling into certain Puritan Bennett Sweep-On Model 2000 crew oxygen masks. Investigation revealed that the demand diaphragm on these crew oxygen masks were misaligned, which may have resulted in the seizure of the exhalation valve. This condition, if not corrected, could result in the flight crew experiencing difficulty in exhaling into the affected crew oxygen masks in the event oxygen masks are required for the crew, such as during depressurization of the airplane.

The FAA has reviewed and approved Puritan Bennett Service Bulletin 174250–35–1, dated August 1994, which describes procedures for modification of certain crew oxygen masks. This modification entails aligning the demand diaphragm in the vertical position, which would prevent the seizure of the exhalation valve.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other Puritan Bennett Sweep-On Model 2000 crew oxygen masks that are installed on various transport and commuter category airplanes, this AD is being issued to prevent the flight crew from experiencing difficulty in exhaling into the affected crew oxygen masks. This AD requires modification of certain crew oxygen masks. The actions are required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously.

Since a situation exists that requires the immediate adoption of this regulation, it is found that notice and opportunity for prior public comment hereon are impracticable, and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in less than 30 days.

Comments Invited

Although this action is in the form of a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety and, thus, was not preceded by notice and an opportunity for public comment, comments are invited on this rule. Interested persons are invited to comment on this rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified under the caption **ADDRESSES.** All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered, and this rule may be amended in light of the comments received. Factual information that supports the commenter's ideas and suggestions is extremely helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of the AD action and determining whether additional rulemaking action would be needed.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the rule that might suggest a need to modify the rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report that summarizes each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this AD will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this rule must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket Number 94–NM–154–AD." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

The FAA has determined that this regulation is an emergency regulation that must be issued immediately to correct an unsafe condition in aircraft, and that it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866. It has been determined

further that this action involves an emergency regulation under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979). If it is determined that this emergency regulation otherwise would be significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures, a final regulatory evaluation will be prepared and placed in the Rules Docket. A copy of it, if filed, may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

94-19-06 Puritan Bennett Aero Systems: Amendment 39-9028. Docket 94-NM-154-AD.

Applicability: Sweep-On Model 2000 crew oxygen masks, as listed in Puritan Bennett Service Bulletin 174250-35-1, dated August 1994; as installed on, but not limited to, Dornier Model 228 and 328 series airplanes, Cessna Model 550 and 650 and Citation Model I and II series airplanes, Raytheon Corporate Jets Model HS 125-700A series airplanes, Dassault Mystere Falcon Model 20 series airplanes, Beech Model 400 (Beechjet) series airplanes, and Gulfstream Model G-1159 (G-II) and G-1159A (G-III) series airplanes; certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent the flight crew from experiencing difficulty in exhaling into the affected crew oxygen masks, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 60 days after the effective date of this AD, modify the crew oxygen masks, in accordance with Puritan Bennett Service Bulletin 174250-35-1, dated August 1994.

(b) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(c) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(d) The modification shall be done in accordance with Puritan Bennett Service Bulletin 174250-35-1, dated August 1994. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Puritan Bennett Company, 108000 Pflumm Road, Lenexa, Kansas 66215. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3229 East Spring Street, Long Beach, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on October 6, 1994.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on September 14, 1994.

Donald L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 94-23222 Filed 9-20-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

---

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 94-AWP-15]

Establishment of Class E Airspace; Inyokern Municipal Airport, Inyokern, CA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action establishes Class E airspace at Inyokern, CA. A Global Positioning System (GPS) standard instrument approach procedure (SIAP) has been developed for the Inyokern Municipal Airport. Controlled airspace extending from 700 feet above the surface is needed for aircraft executing the approach. This action will provide adequate Class E airspace for instrument flight rules (IFR) operations at Inyokern Municipal Airport.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 0901 UTC, December 8, 1994.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Speer, System Management Branch, AWP-530, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region, Federal Aviation Administration, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California, 90261, telephone (310) 297-0697.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

On June 24, 1994, the FAA proposed to amend part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) to establish Class E airspace at Inyokern, CA. (59 FR 32669). A Global Positioning System (GPS) standard instrument approach procedure (SIAP) has been developed for the Inyokern Municipal Airport. Controlled airspace extending from 700 feet above the surface is needed for aircraft executing the approach.

Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. One comment was received. China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station requested the exclusion of Class E airspace from Restricted Area R-2505. The Restricted Area was excluded in response to their request.

The coordinates in the proposal are based on North American Datum 83. Class E airspace designations are published in Paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9B dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1.

The Class E airspace designation listed in this document will be published subsequently in this Order.

The Rule

This amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations establishes Class E airspace at Inyokern, CA, to establish controlled airspace from 700 feet above the surface for aircraft executing the GPS SIAP into the Inyokern Municipal Airport at Inyokern, CA.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore, (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a

substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

Adoption of the Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 14 CFR part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. app. 1348(a), 1354(a), 1510; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 14 CFR 11.69.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 6005 Class E Airspace Areas Extending Upward From 700 feet or More Above the Surface of the Earth

* * * * *

AWP CA E5 Inyokern, CA [New]

Inyokern Municipal Airport, CA
(lat. 35°39'32" N., long. 117°49'46" W)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 2-mile radius of Inyokern Municipal Airport and within 2 miles each side of the 211° (T) bearing extending from the 2-mile radius to 10.3 miles southwest of the Inyokern Municipal Airport excluding that airspace within Restricted Area R–2505.

* * * * *

Issued in Los Angeles, California, on September 7, 1994.

Dennis T. Koehler,

Acting Manager, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 94–23335 Filed 9–20–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 176

[Docket No. 89F–0453]

Indirect Food Additives: Paper and Paperboard Components

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the food additive regulations to provide for the safe use of *N, N, N', N', N'', N''*-hexakis(methoxymethyl)-1,3,5-triazine-2,4,6-triamine polymer with stearyl alcohol, α-octadecenyl-Ω-hydroxypoly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), and alkyl (C_{20+}) alcohols as a component of paper and paperboard in contact with aqueous foods. This action responds to a petition filed by PPG Industries, Inc.

DATES: Effective September 21, 1994; written objections and requests for a hearing by October 21, 1994.

ADDRESSES: Submit written objections to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, rm. 1–23, 12420 Parklawn Dr., Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Julius Smith, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–216), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202–418–3091.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a notice published in the **Federal Register** of December 19, 1989 (54 FR 51946), FDA announced that a food additive petition (FAP 9B4172) had been filed by PPG Industries, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA 15146, proposing that § 176.170 *Components of paper and paperboard in contact with aqueous and fatty foods* (21 CFR 176.170) be amended to provide for the safe use of *N, N, N', N', N'', N''*-hexakis(methoxymethyl)-1,3,5-triazine-2,4,6-triamine polymer with stearyl alcohol, α-octadecenyl-Ω-hydroxypoly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), and alkyl (C_{20+}) alcohols as a component of paper and paperboard in contact with aqueous foods.

In its evaluation of the safety of this additive, FDA has reviewed the safety of the additive itself and the chemical impurities that may be present in the additive resulting from its manufacturing process. Although the additive itself has not been shown to cause cancer, it may contain minute amounts of unreacted 1,4-dioxane and ethylene oxide, carcinogenic impurities, resulting from the manufacture of the additive. Residual amounts of reactants and manufacturing aids, such as 1,4-dioxane and ethylene oxide, are commonly found as contaminants in chemical products, including food additives.

I. Determination of Safety

Under Section 409(c)(3)(A) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the act) (21 U.S.C. 348(c)(3)(A)), the so-called "general safety clause" of the statute, a food additive cannot be approved for a particular use unless a fair evaluation of the evidence available to FDA establishes that the additive is safe for that use. FDA's food additive regulations (21 CFR 170.3(i)) define safe as "a reasonable certainty in the minds of competent scientists that the substance is not harmful under the intended conditions of use."

The food additives anticancer, or Delaney, clause (section 409(c)(3)(A) of the act) provides that no food additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal. Importantly, however, the Delaney clause applies to the additive itself and not constituents of the additive. That is, where an additive itself has not been shown to cause cancer, but contains a carcinogenic impurity, the additive is properly evaluated under the general safety clause using risk assessment procedures to determine whether there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from the proposed use of the additive, *Scott* v. *FDA*, 728 F.2d 322 (6th Cir. 1984).

II. Safety of the Petitioned Use

FDA estimates that the petitioned use of the additive, *N, N, N', N', N'', N''*-hexakis(methoxymethyl)-1,3,5-triazine-2,4,6-triamine polymer with stearyl alcohol, α-octadecenyl-Ω-hydroxypoly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), and alkyl (C_{20+}) alcohols, will result in levels of exposure to the additive of no greater than 19 parts per billion in the daily diet (Ref. 1).

FDA does not ordinarily consider chronic toxicological testing to be necessary to determine the safety of an additive whose use will result in such low exposure levels (Ref. 2), and the agency has not required such testing here. However, the agency has reviewed the available toxicological data from acute toxicity studies on the additive. No adverse effects were reported in these studies.

FDA has evaluated the safety of this additive under the general safety clause, considering all available data and using risk assessment procedures to estimate the upper-bound limits of risk presented by the carcinogenic chemicals that may be present as impurities in the additive, 1,4-dioxane and ethylene oxide. This risk evaluation of 1,4-dioxane and ethylene oxide has two aspects: (1) Assessment of the worst-case exposure to the impurities from the proposed use of the additive, and (2) extrapolation of the risk observed in the animal bioassays to the conditions of probable exposure to humans.

A. 1,4-Dioxane

FDA has estimated the hypothetical worst-case exposure to 1,4-dioxane from the petitioned use of the additive in the manufacture of paper and paperboard to be 11 nanograms per person per day (ng/person/day) (Ref. 1). The agency used data from a carcinogenesis bioassay on 1,4-dioxane, conducted for the National Cancer Institute (Ref. 3), to estimate the upper-bound limits of lifetime human risk from exposure to this chemical stemming from the proposed use of the additive (Ref. 3). The results of the bioassay on 1,4-dioxane demonstrated that the material was carcinogenic for female rats under the conditions of the study. The test material caused significantly increased incidence of squamous cell carcinomas and hepatocellular tumors in female rats.

Based on a potential exposure of 11 ng/person/day, FDA estimates that the upper-bound limits of individual lifetime risk from the potential exposure to 1,4-dioxane from the use of the subject additive is $4x10^{-10}$, or less than 4 in 10 billion (Ref. 4). Because of the numerous conservative assumptions used in calculating the exposure estimate, actual lifetime averaged individual exposure to 1,4-dioxane is likely to be substantially less than the worst-case exposure, and therefore, the calculated upper-bound limits of risk would be less. Thus, the agency concludes that there is a reasonable certainty of no harm from the exposure to 1,4-dioxane that might result from the proposed use of the additive.

B. Ethylene Oxide

FDA estimated that the hypothetical worst-case exposure to ethylene oxide from the petitioned use of the additive in the manufacture of paper and paperboard is 11 ng/person/day (Ref. 1). The agency used data from a carcinogenesis bioassay on ethylene oxide conducted for the Institute of Hygiene, University of Mainz, Germany, to estimate the upper-bound level of lifetime human risk from exposure to ethylene oxide stemming from the proposed use of the additive (Ref. 5). The results of the bioassay on ethylene oxide demonstrated that the material was carcinogenic for female rats under the conditions of the study. The test material caused significantly increased incidence of squamous cell carcinomas of the forestomach and carcinoma in situ of the glandular stomach.

Based on a potential exposure of 11 ng/person/day, FDA estimates that the upper-bound limits of individual lifetime risk from the potential exposure to ethylene oxide from the use of the subject additive is $2x10^{-8}$, or less than 2 in 100 million (Ref. 4). Because of the numerous conservative assumptions used in calculating the exposure estimate, actual lifetime-averaged individual exposure to ethylene oxide is likely to be substantially less than the worst-case exposure, and therefore, the calculated upper-bound limits of risk would be less. Thus, the agency concludes that there is a reasonable certainty of no harm from the exposure to ethylene oxide that might result from the proposed use of the additive.

C. Formaldehyde

A review of the petition also indicates that the additive may contain formaldehyde as an impurity at a dietary concentration of 15 micrograms/person/day. The potential carcinogenicity of formaldehyde was reviewed by the Cancer Assessment Committee (the committee) that has been formed by FDA's Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition. The committee noted that for many years formaldehyde has been known to be a carcinogen by the inhalation route, but it concluded that these inhalation studies are not appropriate for assessing the potential carcinogenicity of formaldehyde in food because of the inappropriate route administration and the fact that tumors were observed only locally at the portal of entry (nasal turbinates). The agency has received literature reports of two drinking water studies on formaldehyde: (1) A preliminary report of a carcinogenicity study purported to be positive by Soffritti et al. (1989), conducted in Bologna, Italy (Ref. 7), and (2) a negative study by Til, et al. (1989), conducted in The Netherlands (Ref. 8). The committee reviewed both studies and concluded in a "Memorandum of Conference," dated April 24, 1991 and March 4, 1993, "* * * that data concerning the Soffritti study reported were unreliable and could not be used in the assessment of the oral carcinogenicity of formaldehyde" (Ref. 6). This conclusion is based on a lack of critical details in the study, questionable histopathologic conclusions, and the use of unusual nomenclature to describe the tumors. Thus, the committee concluded that there is no basis to find that formaldehyde is a carcinogen when ingested.

D. Need for Specifications

The agency has also considered whether specifications are necessary to control the amount of 1,4-dioxane and ethylene oxide in the additive. The agency finds that specifications are not necessary for the following reasons: (1) Because of the low levels at which 1,4-dioxane and ethylene oxide may be expected to remain as impurities following production of the additive, the agency would not expect these impurities to become components of food at other than extremely low levels; and (2) the upper-bound limits of lifetime risk from exposure to these impurities, even under worst-case assumptions, is very low, less than 4 in 10 billion and less than 2 in 100 million for 1,4-dioxane and ethylene oxide, respectively.

III. Conclusion

FDA has evaluated the data in the petition and other relevant material and concludes that the proposed uses for the additive in paper and paperboard products in contact with aqueous food are safe. Based on this information, the agency has also concluded that the additive will have the intended technical effect. Accordingly, § 176.170 is amended as set forth below.

In accordance with § 171.1(h) (21 CFR 171.1(h)), the petition and the documents that FDA considered and relied upon in reaching its decision to approve the petition are available for inspection at the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition by appointment with the information contact person listed above. As provided in 21 CFR 171.1(h), the agency will delete from the documents any materials that are not available for public disclosure before making the documents available for inspection.

IV. Environmental Impact

The agency has carefully considered the potential environmental effects of this action. FDA has concluded that the action will not have a significant impact on the human environment, and that an environmental impact statement is not required. The agency's finding of no significant impact and the evidence supporting that finding, contained in an environmental assessment, may be seen in the Dockets Management Branch (address above) between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

V. Objections

Any person who will be adversely affected by this regulation may at any time on or before October 21, 1994, file with the Dockets Management Branch (address above) written objections thereto. Each objection shall be separately numbered, and each numbered objection shall specify with particularity the provisions of the regulation to which objection is made and the grounds for the objection. Each

numbered objection on which a hearing is requested shall specifically so state. Failure to request a hearing for any particular objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing on that objection. Each numbered objection for which a hearing is requested shall include a detailed description and analysis of the specific factual information intended to be presented in support of the objection in the event that a hearing is held. Failure to include such a description and analysis for any particular objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing on the objection. Three copies of all documents shall be submitted and shall be identified with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document. Any objections received in response to the regulation may be seen in the Dockets Management Branch between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

VI. References

The following references have been placed on display in the Dockets Management Branch (address above) and may be seen by interested persons between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

1. FAP 9B4172—PPG Industries (Submission dated 9–8–89) "Water-Repellant Coating for Paper and Paperboard," Memorandum from the Food and Color Additives Review Section (HFF–415) to the Indirect Additives Branch (HFF–335), January 8, 1990.

2. Kokoski, C. J., "Regulatory Food Additive Toxicology," in "Chemical Safety Regulation and Compliance," edited by F. Homburger and J. K. Marquis, S. Karger, New York, NY, pp. 24–33, 1985.

3. "Bioassay of 1,4-Dioxane for Possible Carcinogenicity," National Cancer Institute, NCI–CG–TR–80, 1978.

4. Memorandum, "Report of the Quantitative Risk Assessment Committee," August 1, 1990.

5. Dunkelberg, H., "Carcinogenicity of Ethylene Oxide and 1,2-Propylene Oxide Upon Intragastric Administration to Rats," *British Journal of Cancer*, 46:924, 1982.

6. Memorandum of Conference, "Meeting of the Cancer Assessment Committee," April 24, 1991, and March 4, 1993.

7. Soffritti, et al., "Formaldehyde: An Experimental Multipotential Carcinogen," *Toxicology and Industrial Health*, Vol. 5, No. 5: pp. 699–730, 1989.

8. Til, et al., "Two-Year Drinking-Water Study of Formaldehyde In Rats," *Food Chemical Toxicology*, Vol. 27, No. 2: pp. 77–87, 1989.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 176

Food additives, Food packaging.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, 21 CFR part 176 is amended as follows:

PART 176—INDIRECT FOOD ADDITIVES: PAPER AND PAPERBOARD COMPONENTS

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 176 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 201, 402, 406, 409, 721 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321, 342, 346, 348, 379e).

2. Section 176.170 is amended in the table in paragraph (a)(5) by alphabetically adding a new entry under the headings "List of Substances" and "Limitations" to read as follows:

§ 176.170 Components of paper and paperboard in contact with aqueous and fatty foods.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(5) * * *

List of Substances	Limitations
* * * * * * *	
N,N,N′,N′,N″,N″-Hexakis (methoxymethyl)-1,3,5-triazine-2,4,6-triamine polymer with stearyl alcohol, α-octadecenyl-Ω-hydroxypoly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), and alkyl (C_{20+}) alcohols (CAS Reg. No. 130328–24–4).	For use only as a water-repellent applied to the surface of paper and paperboard at levels not to exceed 1 percent by weight of the finished dry paperboard fibers. The finished paper and paperboard will be used in contact with aqueous foods under conditions of use B through G as described in Table 2 of paragraph (c) of this section.
* * * * * * *	

* * * * *

Dated: September 6, 1994.

William K. Hubbard,

Interim Deputy Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 94–23274 Filed 9–20–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–F

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

24 CFR Part 888

[Docket No. N–94–3741; FR–3686–C–03]

Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program; Contract Rent Annual Adjustment Factors and Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program; Fair Market Rents; Correction

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HUD.

ACTION: Fair Market Rents; correction.

SUMMARY: This action makes a correction to the document on Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program; Contract Rent Annual Adjustments Factors published on April 26, 1994 (59 FR 21832).

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 26, 1994.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael R. Allard, Economic and Market Analysis Division, Office of Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20410, (202) 708–0577 (TDD: (202) 708–0770). (These telephone numbers are not toll-free).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The United States Housing Act of 1937 (1937 Act) requires that the assistance contracts signed by owners participating in the Department's Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments programs provide for annual or more frequent adjustment in the maximum monthly rentals for units covered by the contract to reflect changes based on fair market rents prevailing in a particular market area, or on a reasonable formula. The AAF Notice published on April 26, 1994, announced the revised FY 1994 Annual Adjustment Factors (AAF), but contained a technical error. The state of Nevada should have been identified as being part of HUD Region IX. (Under HUD's reorganization, the designation "HUD Region IX" will be "Pacific/Hawaii" in future AAF publications.)

Accordingly, the AAF document published in the **Federal Register** on April 26, 1994 (59 FR 21832), is corrected at page 21850 as set forth in the following table: