Vol.42—No.7
1-11-77

PAGES
2293-2497

# federal register

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1977


## highlights

PART I:



CONTINUED INSIDE

# reminders

(The items in this list were editorially compiled as an aid to FEDERAL REGISTER users. Inclusion or exclusion from this list has no legal significance. Since this list is intended as a reminder, it does not include effective dates that occur within 14 days of publication.)

**Rules Going Into Effect Today**

NOTE: There were no items eligible for inclusion in the list of RULES GOING INTO EFFECT TODAY.

**List of Public Laws**

NOTE: No public bills which have become law were received by the Office of the Federal Register for inclusion in today's LIST OF PUBLIC LAWS.

## AGENCY PUBLICATION ON ASSIGNED DAYS OF THE WEEK

The six-month trial period ended August 6. The program is being continued on a voluntary basis (see OFR notice, 41 FR 32914, August 6, 1976). The following agencies have agreed to remain in the program:

| Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NRC | USDA/ASCS | | NRC | USDA/ASCS |
| DOT/COAST GUARD | USDA/APHIS | | DOT/COAST GUARD | USDA/APHIS |
| DOT/NHTSA | USDA/FNS | | DOT/NHTSA | USDA/FNS |
| DOT/FAA | USDA/REA | | DOT/FAA | USDA/REA |
| DOT/OHMO | CSC | | DOT/OHMO | CSC |
| DOT/OPSO | LABOR | | DOT/OPSO | LABOR |
| | HEW/FDA | | | HEW/FDA |

Documents normally scheduled on a day that will be a Federal holiday will be published the next work day following the holiday.

Comments on this program are still invited. Comments should be submitted to the Day-of-the-Week Program Coordinator, Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 20408.

**ATTENTION: For questions, corrections, or requests for information please see the list of telephone numbers appearing on opposite page.**

federal register

Area Code 202 Phone 523-5240

Published daily, Monday through Friday (no publication on Saturdays, Sundays, or on official Federal holidays), by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 20408, under the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C., Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The FEDERAL REGISTER provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by Federal agencies. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive orders and Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by Act of Congress and other Federal agency documents of public interest. Documents are on file for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register the day before they are published, unless earlier filing is requested by the issuing agency.

The FEDERAL REGISTER will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $5.00 per month or $50 per year, payable in advance. The charge for individual copies is 75 cents for each issue, or 75 cents for each group of pages as actually bound. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

## INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE

Questions and requests for specific information may be directed to the following numbers. General inquiries may be made by dialing **202–523–5240.**

**FEDERAL REGISTER,** Daily Issue:

| | |
|---|---|
| Subscriptions and distribution | 202–783–3238 |
| "Dial - a - Regulation" (recorded summary of highlighted documents appearing in next day's issue). | 202–523–5022 |
| Scheduling of documents for publication. | 523–5220 |
| Copies of documents appearing in the Federal Register. | 523–5240 |
| Corrections | 523–5286 |
| Public Inspection Desk | 523–5215 |
| Finding Aids | 523–5227 |
| **Public Briefings: "How To Use the Federal Register."** | 523–5282 |
| **Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)** | 523–5266 |
| Finding Aids | 523–5227 |

**PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Executive Orders and Proclamations. | 523–5233 |
| Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents. | 523–5235 |
| Public Papers of the Presidents | 523–5235 |
| Index | 523–5235 |

**PUBLIC LAWS:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Public Law dates and numbers | 523–5237 |
| Slip Laws | 523–5237 |
| U.S. Statutes at Large | 523–5237 |
| Index | 523–5237 |
| **U.S. Government Manual** | 523–5230 |
| **Automation** | 523–5240 |
| **Special Projects** | 523–5240 |

---

### HIGHLIGHTS—Continued

# contents

## CONTENTS

## CONTENTS

# list of cfr parts affected in this issue

The following numerical guide is a list of the parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published in today's issue. A cumulative list of parts affected, covering the current month to date, follows beginning with the second issue of the month.

A Cumulative List of CFR Sections Affected is published separately at the end of each month. The guide lists the parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

**3 CFR**

EXECUTIVE ORDERS:

11490 (Amended by EO 11953) ---- 2491
11724 (Superseded by EO 11954) -- 2297
11921 (See EO 11953) ---- 2291
11952 ---- 2293
11953 ---- 2491
11954 ---- 2297

**5 CFR**

1410 ---- 2299

**7 CFR**

726 ---- 2300
730 ---- 2301
959 ---- 2308
1845 ---- 2308

PROPOSED RULES:

272 ---- 2328
1421 ---- 2328

**10 CFR**

212 ---- 2308

**12 CFR**

PROPOSED RULES:

523 ---- 2328
545 ---- 2328
564 ---- 2328

**14 CFR**

378a ---- 2309

**18 CFR**

PROPOSED RULES:

2 ---- 2329

**19 CFR**

6 ---- 2309
10 (2 documents) ---- 2309, 2310

PROPOSED RULES:

1 ---- 2329
113 ---- 2330

**21 CFR**

558 ---- 2312

PROPOSED RULES:

1 ---- 2330
18 ---- 2330
369 ---- 2330
500 ---- 2330
701 (2 documents) ---- 2330
740 ---- 2330
801 ---- 2330

**26 CFR**

154 ---- 2312
404 ---- 2313

**29 CFR**

94 ---- 2426
95 ---- 2427
96 ---- 2428
98 ---- 2428
99 ---- 2430
511 ---- 2313
1952 ---- 2313

**31 CFR**

1 ---- 2314
51 ---- 2422

**38 CFR**

0 ---- 2314
17 ---- 2316

**40 CFR**

6 ---- 2450
220 ---- 2468
221 ---- 2470
222 ---- 2471
223 ---- 2474
224 ---- 2474
225 ---- 2475
226 ---- 2475
227 ---- 2476
228 ---- 2482

**40 CFR—Continued**

229 ---- 2489
455 ---- 2316

PROPOSED RULES:

201 ---- 2330
202 ---- 2330
260 ---- 2331

**41 CFR**

101-28 ---- 2317

**45 CFR**

PROPOSED RULES:

205 ---- 2445
Ch. II ---- 2440
250 ---- 2331

**49 CFR**

218 ---- 2318
221 ---- 2321

**50 CFR**

260 ---- 2326
261 ---- 2326
262 ---- 2326
263 ---- 2326
264 ---- 2326
265 ---- 2326
266 ---- 2326
267 ---- 2326
268 ---- 2326
269 ---- 2326
270 ---- 2326
271 ---- 2326
272 ---- 2326
273 ---- 2326
274 ---- 2326
275 ---- 2326
276 ---- 2326
277 ---- 2326
278 ---- 2326
279 ---- 2326

## CUMULATIVE LIST OF PARTS AFFECTED DURING JANUARY

**The following numerical guide is a list of parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published to date during January.**

### 1 CFR

PROPOSED RULES:

442 ... 1267

### 3 CFR

EXECUTIVE ORDERS:

11490 (Amended by EO 11953) ... 2491
11651 (Amended by EO 11951) ... 1453
11724 (Superseded by EO 11954) ... 2297
11821 (Amended by EO 11949) ... 1017
11921 (See EO 11953) ... 2291
11949 ... 1017
11950 ... 1451
11951 ... 1453
11952 ... 2293
11953 ... 2491
11954 ... 2297

### 5 CFR

213 ... 1455
1410 ... 2299

### 7 CFR

1 ... 743
26 ... 1019
226 ... 1475
354 ... 1475
722 ... 1476
726 ... 2300
729 ... 749
730 ... 2301
905 ... 1022
907 ... 1230
910 ... 1476
928 ... 1, 2
959 ... 2308
1430 ... 3
1822 ... 1023, 2051
1843 ... 1231
1845 ... 2308

PROPOSED RULES:

270 ... 1479
271 ... 1479
272 ... 780, 2328
275 ... 1479
730 ... 780
1063 ... 1356
1070 ... 1356
1078 ... 1356
1079 ... 1356
1421 ... 2328
1701 ... 1479

### 9 CFR

97 ... 1455
113 ... 750, 1456
319 ... 751

PROPOSED RULES:

92 ... 1483

### 10 CFR

100 ... 2051
140 ... 46
Ch. II ... 1036
212 ... 1036, 1456, 2308

### 12 CFR

16 ... 2200
202 ... 1242
207 ... 968
211 ... 752

### 12 CFR—Continued

213 ... 752
220 ... 752
221 ... 968
224 ... 968
225 ... 752, 1263
226 ... 753, 1264
704 ... 1458

PROPOSED RULES:

226 ... 780, 1268
523 ... 2338
545 ... 2328
564 ... 2328
604 ... 55, 2078

### 13 CFR

309 ... 753

### 14 CFR

25 ... 2052
37 ... 19
39 ... 1217, 1218, 2053–2055
71 ... 300, 2055, 2056
73 ... 300
75 ... 300
97 ... 1219, 2056
221a ... 1220
241 ... 1219
378a ... 2309
385 ... 1220

PROPOSED RULES:

39 ... 1268–1270
71 ... 1270–1271, 2078, 2079
288 ... 1271

### 15 CFR

369 ... 2057
371 ... 1222
377 ... 1222
931 ... 1164

### 16 CFR

13 ... 3–5
1201 ... 1428

PROPOSED RULES:

4 ... 2079
438 ... 1483
450 ... 1038
1301 ... 1484

### 17 CFR

200 ... 753
211 ... 2058
240 ... 753, 754, 2060
241 ... 759

PROPOSED RULES:

240 ... 781, 782
249 ... 782

### 18 CFR

11 ... 1226
141 ... 6

PROPOSED RULES:

1 ... 2079
2 ... 2329
3 ... 2079
154 ... 1272
157 ... 56

### 19 CFR

6 ... 2309
10 ... 2309, 2310

PROPOSED RULES:

1 ... 2329
113 ... 2330
201 ... 805

### 20 CFR

404 ... 2062
405 ... 1028
416 ... 2062
614 ... 1459

PROPOSED RULES:

416 ... 2079

### 21 CFR

2 ... 1459
8 ... 1459
102 ... 761
121 ... 1460, 1461
314 ... 1624, 1638
320 ... 1624, 1638
520 ... 1462
540 ... 1462
558 ... 761, 1463, 2312

PROPOSED RULES:

1 ... 2330
3e ... 1483
11 ... 806
18 ... 2330
121 ... 1483
128d ... 807
369 ... 2330
500 ... 2330
701 ... 2330
740 ... 2330
801 ... 2330

### 23 CFR

625 ... 6
712 ... 7

### 24 CFR

203 ... 762
205 ... 763
207 ... 764
213 ... 764
221 ... 765
231 ... 766
232 ... 763
241 ... 763
242 ... 763
244 ... 763
280 ... 960
1914 ... 2193
1917 ... 2063–2068

PROPOSED RULES:

201 ... 1487
501 ... 1488
1917 ... 2082

### 26 CFR

1 ... 767, 1195, 1463
7 ... 1469, 1471
154 ... 2312
404 ... 1029, 2313

PROPOSED RULES:

1 ... 57
54 ... 1488
301 ... 1038, 1489

## FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATES—JANUARY

| *Pages* | *Date* |
|---|---|
| 1–741 | Jan. 3 |
| 743–1015 | 4 |
| 1017–1194 | 5 |
| 1195–1450 | 6 |
| 1451–2049 | 7 |
| 2051–2291 | 10 |
| 2293–2497 | 11 |

presidential documents

# Title 3—The President

**Executive Order 11952** • **January 7, 1977**

## Conforming the Foreign Service and Civil Service Retirement and Disability Systems

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States of America, including Section 805 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as added by Section 503 of Public Law 94–350 (90 Stat. 835; 22 U.S.C. 1065), and as President of the United States of America, in order to conform the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System to certain amendments to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) The enactment (subsequent to January 1, 1974) of the following laws has affected a provision of general applicability in the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System (subchapter III, chapter 83 of Title 5 of the United States Code) or otherwise affected current or former participants, annuitants, or survivors under that System which, immediately prior to the enactment of such laws, had been substantially identical to a corresponding provision of law affecting participants, former participants, annuitants or survivors under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System:

(1) Section 1 of Public Law 93–260, approved April 9, 1974 (88 Stat. 76).

(2) Section 1 of Public Law 93–273, approved April 26, 1974 (88 Stat. 93).

(3) Section 2 of Public Law 93–273, approved April 26, 1974 (88 Stat. 93).

(4) Public Law 93–474, approved October 26, 1974 (88 Stat. 1438).

(5) Public Law 94–166, approved December 23, 1975 (89 Stat. 1002).

(b) The provisions of the laws cited in subsection (a) above are extended, as provided by Section 805 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1065), to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System in accordance with the provisions of this Order, which provisions shall modify, supersede, or render inapplicable all inconsistent prior provisions of law.

SEC. 2. (a) In accord with Section 1 of Public Law 93–260, Section 804(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1064(b)), is deemed to be amended by striking out "two years" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "one year". This amendment shall apply only in the cases of participants, former participants, or annuitants who died on or after April 9, 1974 but no annuity shall be paid or recomputed, by virtue of this amendment, for any period prior to May 1, 1974.

(b) In accord with Section 1 of Public Law 93–273, and notwithstanding any other provision of Section 821 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1076), said Section 821 shall be deemed to be amended to provide for the payment of a minimum annuity as follows:

(1) The monthly rate of an annuity payable, under said Section 821, to an annuitant, or to a survivor annuitant other than a child, shall not be less than the smallest primary insurance amount, including any cost of living increase added to that amount, authorized to be paid from time to time under Title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 *et seq.*).

(2) The monthly rate of an annuity payable, under said Section 821, to a surviving child shall not be less than the smallest primary insurance amount, including any cost of living increase added to that amount, authorized to be paid from time to time under Title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 *et seq.*), or three times such primary insurance amount divided by the number of surviving children entitled to an annuity, whichever is the lesser.

(3) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to an annuitant or to a survivor who is or becomes entitled to receive from the United States an annuity or retired pay under any other civilian or military retirement system, benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 *et seq.*), a pension, veterans' compensation, or any other periodic payment of a similar nature, when the monthly rate thereof is equal to or greater than the smallest primary insurance amount, including any cost of living increase added to that amount, authorized to be paid from time to time under Title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 *et seq.*).

(4) The provisions of this subsection apply to all annuities, whether commenced before, on, or after August 1, 1974, but no increase in any annuity shall be paid or recomputed under this subsection for any period prior to August 1, 1974.

(c) In accord with Section 2 of Public Law 93–273, Section 821 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1076), shall be deemed to be amended to provide an increase in annuities, which have been computed on the highest five consecutive years of service, as follows:

(1) An annuity payable to a former participant which is based on a separation occurring prior to October 20, 1969, is increased by $240.00.

(2) In lieu of any increase based on an increase under paragraph (1) of this subsection, an annuity to the surviving spouse of a participant or annuitant which is based on a separation occurring prior to October 20, 1969, is increased by $132.00.

(3) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to annuities payable under Section 523(c) of Public Law 94–350 (90 Stat. 847, 22 U.S.C. 1076 note), or any similar prior provision of law, to the surviving spouse of a participant or annuitant.

(4) The monthly rate of an annuity resulting from an increase under this subsection shall be considered as the monthly rate of annuity payable under Section 821 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1076), for purposes of computing the minimum annuity as provided in subsection (b) of this Section.

(5) The provisions of this subsection apply to all annuities, whether commenced before, on, or after August 1, 1974, but no increase in any annuity shall be paid or recomputed under this subsection for any period prior to August 1, 1974.

(d) In accord with Public Law 93–474, Section 221 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1076), shall be deemed to be amended to provide for the recomputation of annuities for nonmarried annuitants, as follows:

"(1) An annuity which is reduced under Section 821(b)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1076(b)(1)), or any similar prior provision of law shall, for each full month during which a retired participant is not married, be recomputed and paid as if the annuity had not been so reduced. Upon remarriage of the retired participant, the annuity shall be reduced by the same percentage reductions which were in effect at the time of retirement or, if such percentage reductions were subsequently adjusted pursuant to law, by the percentage reductions last made pursuant to law.

(2) The provisions of this subsection apply to all annuities, whether commenced before, on, or after November 1, 1974, but no increase in any annuity shall be paid or recomputed under this subsection for any period prior to November 1, 1974.

(e) In accord with Public Law 94–166, Section 864 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1104), is deemed to be amended by adding a subsection (a) and conforming the present Section as subsection (b), to read as follows:

"Sec. 864 (a) An individual entitled to an annuity from the Fund may make allotments or assignments of amounts from such annuity for such purposes as the Secretary in his sole discretion considers appropriate.

"(b) None of the moneys mentioned in this title shall be assignable, either in law or equity, except under the provisions of subsection (a) of this Section or Section 634(c), or subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process, except as otherwise may be provided by Federal laws."

Gerald R. Ford

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*January 7, 1977.*

[FR Doc.77–1098 Filed 1–7–77;4:43 pm]

Executive Order 11954 • January 7, 1977

## Federal Property Review

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States of America, including section 205(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 486(a)), and as President of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) The Federal Property Council (hereinafter referred to as the Council) is hereby reconstituted in the Executive Office of the President. The Council shall consist of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall be its Chairman, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, and such other members as the President may from time to time specify.

(b) Whenever requested by the Administrator of General Services or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Council shall review the reports made by the Administrator of General Services pursuant to section 4 of this order, with particular attention to resolving conflicting claims on, and alternate uses for, any property described in those reports, consistent with laws governing Federal real property. The Council shall submit such recommendations and cause such reports to be submitted to the President as may be appropriate.

SEC. 2. All Executive agencies shall periodically review their real property holdings and conduct surveys of such property in accordance with standards and procedures determined by the Administrator of General Services pursuant to section 206 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 487), and this order.

SEC. 3. The Administrator of General Services shall issue standards and procedures, conduct surveys, and cause surveys to be conducted, to ensure that the real property holdings of Executive agencies shall continually be evaluated with special emphasis on the identification of properties that are not utilized, are under utilized, or are not being put to optimum use. The Administrator shall consult with appropriate Executive agencies in order to (a) identify real property that is excess or surplus to the needs of the Executive agencies, and (b) make such real property available for its most beneficial use under the various laws of the United States affecting such property.

SEC. 4. The Administrator of General Services shall report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget with respect to any property or portion thereof which has not been reported excess to the requirements of the holding agency and which, in the judgment of the Administrator, is not utilized, is under utilized, or is not being put to optimum use, and which he recommends should be reported as excess property.

SEC. 5. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall review Federal real property policies and the objectives of the Executive branch of the Government; and shall review the reports made by the Administrator of General Services pursuant to section 4 of this order, as well as other reports relating to Federal real property. The Director shall submit such recommendations and cause such reports to be submitted to the President as may be appropriate.

SEC. 6. Executive Order No. 11724 of June 25, 1973, is hereby superseded.

Gerald R. Ford

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*January 7, 1977.*

[FR Doc.77-1100 Filed 1-7-77;4:45 pm]

# rules and regulations



## Title 5—Administrative Personnel

## CHAPTER IV—ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL PAY

## PART 1410—RULES AND REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

### Records of Individuals; Determinations and Access

On May 14, 1976, there were published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (40 FR 19973–19974) proposed regulations which set forth the procedures by which an individual could determine whether the Advisory Committee on Federal Pay maintained a system of records which included a record pertaining to the individual, and methods by which the individual could gain access to the record pertaining to him or her for the purpose of review, amendment, and/or correction. Interested parties were given the opportunity to submit comments regarding the proposed regulations by June 14, 1976. No comments were received and the proposed regulations are adopted without amendment this 3rd day of January, 1977.

JEROME M. ROSOW,
*Chairman.*

Title 5 of the CFR is amended by adding a new Chapter IV—Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, consisting of the following Part 1410 to read as follows:

## PART 1410—RULES AND REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

Sec.



AUTHORITY: Pub. L. 93–579; 5 U.S.C. 552a.

### § 1410.1 Purpose and scope.

The purposes of these regulations are to:

(a) Establish a procedure by which an individual can determine if the Advisory Committee on Federal Pay (hereafter known as the Committee) maintains a system of records which includes a record pertaining to the individual; and

(b) Establish a procedure by which an individual can gain access to a record pertaining to him or her for the purpose of review, amendment and/or correction.

### § 1410.2 Definitions.

For the purpose of these regulations—

(a) The term "individual" means a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

(b) The term "maintain" includes maintain, collect, use or disseminate;

(c) The term "record" means any item, collection or grouping of information about an individual that is maintained by the Committee, including but not limited to, his or her employment history, payroll information, and financial transactions and that contains his or her name, or the identifying number, symbol, or other identifying particular assigned to the individual, such as social security number;

(d) The term "system of records" means a group of any records under the control of the Committee from which information is retrieved by the name of the individual or by some identifying number, symbol, or other identifying particular assigned to the individual; and

(e) The term "routine use" means, with respect to the disclosure of a record, the use of such record for a purpose which is compatible with the purpose for which it was collected.

### § 1410.3 Procedures for access of an individual to his or her own records in a record system.

An individual shall submit a request to the Administrative Assistant of the Committee, Suite 205, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006, in person or in writing, to determine if a system of records named by the individual contains a record pertaining to the individual, or if the Committee maintains any systems of records which pertain to the individual. The individual shall submit a request to the Administrative Assistant of the Committee which states the individual's desire to review his or her record. Individuals who require assistance in identifying systems of record, or in preparing requests identifying systems of record for access, or who need assistance in requesting amendments, may address such requests to the Administrative Assistant of the Committee, Suite 205, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

### § 1410.4 Times, places and requirements for the identification of the individual making a request.

An individual making a request to the Administrative Assistant of the Committee pursuant to Section 1410.3 shall present the request at the Committee offices, Suite 205, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006, on any business day between the hours of 8:15 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., or in writing. The individual submitting the request should present himself or herself at the Committee's offices with a form of identification which will permit the committee to verify that the individual is the same individual as contained in the record requested, such as a valid driver's permit, employee identification card, or Medicare card, or a signed statement from the individual asserting his or her identity and stipulating that he or she understands that knowingly or willfully seeking or obtaining access to records about another individual under false pretenses is punishable by a fine of up to $5,000. If the individual seeks access by mail, the Committee will require similar identification as required of those persons requesting access to records in person, or by identifying data such as name, date of birth, or system personal identifier (if known to the individual). Requests for access to systems of record will be acknowledged within ten days of receipt. The acknowledgement will indicate whether or not access can be granted and, if so, that it will be within a 30-day period unless, for good cause shown, the Committee is unable to do so.

### § 1410.5 Grant to an individual of access to his or her own records.

Upon verification of identity either in person or in written form to the Administrative Assistant of the Committee, Suite 205, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006, and in accordance with the identification provisions of § 1410.4, the Committee shall grant access to the individual the information contained in the record which pertains to that individual. The individual may be accompanied for the purpose by a person of his or her choosing. Upon request of the individual to whom the record pertains, all information in the accounting of disclosures will be made available. If, for any unforeseen circumstances, or in an unusual situation when it may be necessary to deny a person access, the individual will be advised of the reasons therefor, and his or her right to judicial review under 5 U.S.C. 552a(f)(4).

§ 1410.6 Access to the accounting of disclosures from records.

The Privacy Act requires that with some limited exceptions individuals may request access to a list of those to whom records about them have been disclosed. Individuals seeking access to the accounting of disclosures from records pertaining to them should follow the same procedures as established above for access to the records themselves (see §§ 1410.3, 1410.4, 1410.5).

§ 1410.7 Request for correction or amendment to the record.

The individual should submit a request to the Administrative Assistant of the Committee which states the individual's desire to correct or to amend his or her record. This request is to be made in accord with the provisions of § 1410.4.

§ 1410.8 Agency review of request for correction or amendment of the record.

Within ten working days of the receipt of the request to correct or to amend the record, the Administrative Assistant of the Committee will acknowledge in writing such receipt and promptly either—

(a) Make any correction or amendment or any portion thereof which the individual believes is not accurate, relevant, timely, or complete; or

(b) Inform the individual of his or her refusal to correct or to amend the record in accordance with the request, the reason for the refusal, and the procedures established by the Committee for the individual to request a review of that refusal. Corrections or amendments will be sent to prior recipients of the record in question, to the extent that the Committee has an accounting of the disclosure of the record of that information.

§ 1410.9 Appeal of an initial adverse agency determination on correction or amendment of the record.

An individual who disagrees with the refusal of the Administrative Assistant of the Committee to correct or to amend his or her record may submit a request for a review of such refusal to the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, Suite 205, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. The Chairman will, not later than thirty working days from the date on which the individual requests such review, complete such review and make a final determination unless, for good cause shown, the Chairman extends such thirty day period. If, after his or her review, the Chairman also refuses to correct or to amend the record in accordance with the request, the individual may file with the Committee a concise statement setting forth the reasons for his or her disagreement with the refusal of the Committee and may seek judicial review of the Chairman's determination under 5 U.S.C. 552a(g)(1)(A). A copy of the corrected record or statement of dispute will be provided to prior recipients of the information in question, to the extent that the Committee has an accounting of the disclosure of that information.

§ 1410.10 Disclosure of record to a person other than the individual to whom the record pertains.

The Committee will not disclose a record to any individual other than to the individual to whom the record pertains without receiving the prior written consent of the individual to whom the record pertains, except as required or permitted under 5 U.S.C. 552a(b).

§ 1410.11 Fees.

If an individual requests copies of his or her record, he or she shall be charged ten cents per page for any copying charges in excess of $25.00. In cases of indigency, the Committee may waive such fees. In cases where copying charges exceed $25.00, advance payment will be required.

[FR Doc.77-821 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## Title 7—Agriculture

### CHAPTER VII—AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE (AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT), DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### SUBCHAPTER B—FARM MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

[Amdt. 8]

### PART 726—BURLEY TOBACCO

### Subpart—Burley Tobacco, 1971-72 and Subsequent Marketing

RECONSTITUTIONS, AVERAGE MARKET PRICE, AND RATE OF PENALTY

This amendment (1) eliminates the requirement that yields for individual tracts during the base period (1966–70) be used in establishing current yields when the farm is divided by the contribution method and such farm was a separate farm during one or more of the base years, (2) removes restrictions on transferring of quotas on federally-owned land, (3) removes requirements that a dealer or buyer obtain prior approval from the Director, PO Division, before being exempt from keeping regular records and making reports on MQ–79, and (4) incorporates the average market price received by producers for 1975–76 marketing and the penalty rate for the 1976–77 marketing year.

Since county offices are now accepting reconstitutions which will be effective for crop year 1977 and tobacco markets are in the process of opening, it is essential that these regulations be made effective at the earliest possible date. It is hereby found and determined that compliance with the notice of proposed rulemaking and public participation procedure in 5 U.S.C. 553 is impracticable and contrary to the public interest. Accordingly, this amendment shall become effective without regard to such procedure.

The following changes and additions to 7 CFR Part 726 are made:

1. The table of contents is amended by revising § 726.55, § 726.60, and § 726.61 to read as follows:

Sec.

* * * * *

726.55 Determining farm yields for old farms.

* * * * *

726.60 Determination of yields for divided farms.

726.61 Determination of quotas for reconstituted farms.

* * * * *

2. Section 726.55 is revised to read as follows:

§ 726.55 Determining farm yields for old farms.

The farm yield for an old farm shall be the same yield as was in effect for such farm in the immediate preceding year but the yield shall not exceed 3,500 pounds per acre.

3. Section 726.56 is amended by revising paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 726.56 Determining preliminary farm marketing quotas.

* * * * *

(b) *Determination.* The preliminary farm marketing quota shall be the farm marketing quota established for the preceding year.

4. Section 726.57 is revised to read as follows:

§ 726.57 Determining farm marketing quotas and effective farm marketing quotas.

(a) *Farm marketing quotas.* The farm marketing quota shall be determined by multiplying the current year's preliminary farm marketing quota by the national factor for the current year plus permanent quota adjustments.

(b) *Effective farm marketing quotas.* The effective farm marketing quota shall be the farm marketing quota plus or minus temporary quota adjustments.

5. Section 726.60 is revised to read as follows:

§ 726.60 Determination of yields for divided farms.

(a) *Contribution method.* Where a tract is separated from the parent farm and the tobacco marketing quota is divided by the contribution method, the farm yield shall be determined as follows:

(1) Where a farm yield was established for the tract prior to the time the tract became part of the parent farm, such yield shall be the farm yield for the tract.

(2) Where the tract is one for which a farm yield has never been established, the farm yield shall be the same as the farm yield for the parent farm.

(b) *Where the contribution method is not used.* When a farm is divided and the quotas are divided by any method other than the contribution method, the farm yield for such tract shall be the same as the farm yield established for the parent farm.

6. Section 726.61 is revised to read as follows:

**§ 726.61 Determination of quotas for reconstituted farms.**

(a) Farm marketing quotas shall be reconstituted pursuant to the provisions of Part 719 of this chapter. Where a farm is being divided, other basic data shall be apportioned among the divided tracts the same as the farm marketing quota.

(b) Where carryover tobacco produced on a parent farm is marketed after the effective date of a reconstitution, such marketing shall be charged to the divided tracts in the same ratio (1) as the marketing quotas are established for the divided tracts or (2) as the county committee determines that (i) the proceeds from such marketing are received by the owner or operator of one or more of the divided tracts or (ii) the owners of the divided tracts agree.

**§ 726.64 [Amended]**

7. Section 726.64 is amended by deleting the last sentence of paragraph (e).

8. Section 726.68 is amended by reserving paragraph (j) to read as follows:

**§ 726.68 Transfer of burley tobacco farm marketing quotas by lease or by owner.**

* * * * *

(j) [Reserved].

* * * * *

9. Section 726.86 is amended by revising paragraph (c) to read as follows:

**§ 726.86 Rate of penalty.**

* * * * *

(c)(1) *Average market price.* The average market price as determined by the Crop Reporting Board for the marketing year specified was:

AVERAGE MARKET PRICE

| Marketing year: | *Cents per pound* |
|---|---|
| 1970–71 | 72.2 |
| 1971–72 | 80.9 |
| 1972–73 | 79.2 |
| 1973–74 | 92.9 |
| 1974–75 | 113.7 |
| 1975–76 | 105.5 |

(2) *Rate of penalty per pound.* The penalty per pound upon marketings of excess tobacco subject to marketing quotas during the marketing year specified shall be:

RATE OF PENALTY

| Marketing year: | *Cents per pound* |
|---|---|
| 1971–72 | 54 |
| 1972–73 | 61 |
| 1973–74 | 59 |
| 1974–75 | 70 |
| 1975–76 | 85 |
| 1976–77 | 79 |

10. Paragraph (a) of § 726.95 is amended to read as follows:

**§ 726.95 Dealers exempt from keeping regular records and making reports on MQ–79 and season report for dealers.**

(a) Any dealer or buyer who acquires tobacco in the form in which tobacco ordinarily is sold by farmers and resells five percent or less of any such tobacco shall not be subject to the requirements of § 726.94 except for the requirements which relate to the reporting or nonauction purchases from producers and the requirements of paragraph (d) of § 726.94. A dealer or buyer whose resales in the form ordinarily sold by farmers exceed five percent of its purchases as a direct result of order buying for another dealer for a service fee may report under paragraph (b) of this section in lieu of § 726.94 (except for requirements which relate to nonauction purchases from producers and requirements of paragraph (d) of § 726.94).

* * * * *

(Secs. 301, 312, 313, 314, 316, 318, 319, 363, 372–375, 377, 378, 52 Stat. 38, as amended, 46, as amended, 47, as amended, 48, as amended, 75 Stat. 469, as amended, 80 Stat. 120, as amended, 52 Stat. 63, as amended, 65, as amended, 66, as amended, 70 Stat. 206, as amended, 72 Stat. 995, as amended, 85 Stat. 23; (7 U.S.C. 1301, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1314b, 1314d, 1314e, 1363, 1372–1375, 1377, 1378). Pub. L. 92–10.)

Effective date: January 11, 1977.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on January 4, 1977.

KENNETH E. FRICK,
*Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.*

[FR Doc.77-891 Filed 1-10-77; 8:45 am]

---

## PART 730—RICE

### Subpart—Rice Program for Crop Years 1976–1977

This subpart, which prescribes the conditions under which rice producers may qualify for 1976 and 1977 program benefits, is issued pursuant to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by the Rice Production Act of 1975, Pub. L. 94–214, 90 Stat. 181. The regulations in 7 CFR 730.1 through 730.87, Subpart—Rice Marketing Quota Regulations for 1967 and Subsequent Crop Years, and Subpart—Regulations for Determination of Acreage Allotments for 1974 and Subsequent Crops of Rice, are revised to read as follows effective as to 1976 and subsequent corp years. The material previously appearing in these subparts remains in full force and effect as to prior crop years.

**Subpart—Rice Program for Crop Years 1976 and 1977**



AUTHORITY: Sec. 101, 63 Stat. 1051 (7 U.S.C. 1441); sec. 352, 385, 52 Stat. 60, 52 Stat. 68 (7 U.S.C. 1352, 1385); sec. 101, 90 Stat. 181 (7 U.S.C. 428c note).

### Subpart—Rice Program for Crop Years 1976–1977

**§ 730.1 General.**

(a) The regulations in this subpart provide terms and conditions for the rice programs for the 1976 and 1977 crops of rice, respectively, under which producers on farms for which a rice allotment is applicable may qualify for payments authorized under the program.

(b) Producers who meet the eligibility requirement in § 730.19(c) may qualify for payments.

(c) In accordance with the Rice Production Act of 1975 and the regulations in Part 795 of this chapter, as amended, the total amount of payments which a person shall be entitled to receive annually under the rice program shall not exceed $55,000.

(d) In accordance with the regulations in Part 796 of this chapter, payments are prohibited to program participants who harvest or knowingly permit to be harvested for illegal use marihuana or other such prohibited drug-producing plants on any part of the lands owned or controlled by them.

(e) The program is applicable in the States of Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

**§ 730.2 Definitions.**

In the regulations in this subpart and in all instructions, forms, and documents in connection therewith, the words and phrases defined in this section shall have the meaning assigned to them herein unless the content or subject matter otherwise requires.

(a) "Annual nonconserving crop" means any annual crop intended for harvest or utilized in any feed form except for the following:

(1) Grasses, regardless of use, including sweet sorghum, millet, and sudan grass.

(2) Legumes, other than peas or beans produced for seed, grain, or processing.

(3) Immature small grains (other than barley or wheat) destroyed by any means or used for other than grain.

(b) "Current year" means the calendar year in which the rice crop with respect to which payment may be made under this subpart would normally be harvested.

(c) "Farm administrative area" means: Each of the States of Arkansas, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and the farm administrative area within the State of Louisiana consisting of the parishes of Union, Lincoln, Jackson, Winn, Grant, Rapides, Avoyelles, St. Landry, St. Martin, Iberia, St. Mary, and all parishes within the State west of such parishes, in which farm allotments are established on the basis of past production of rice on the farm.

(d) "Feed grain program" means the program authorized under Title V of the Agricultural Act of 1970, Part 775 of this chapter, as amended.

(e) "Producer administrative area" means: Each of the States of Arizona, California, Florida, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and the producer administrative area within the State of Louisiana consisting of the parishes of Morehouse, Ouachita, Caldwell, LaSalle, Catahoula, Concordia, West Feliciana, Pointe Coupee, Iberville, Assumption, Terrebonne, and all parishes within the State east of such parishes, in which producer allotments are established on the basis of past production of rice by the producers.

(f) "Rice acreage" means any acreage planted to rice and any acreage of volunteer rice that is harvested, excluding any acreage of sweet, glutenous, or candy rice such as Mochi Gomi.

(g) "Rice operator" means a person who has operational control over the production of a specific acreage of rice, managerial responsibility for making day to day decisions involving the planting, harvesting, and marketing of that rice, and who shares in the crop or crop proceeds.

(h) "Rice planted and considered planted acreage" means the rice acreage defined in paragraph (f) of this section and:

(1) Any acreage which the county committee determines was not planted to rice because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster or condition beyond the control of the operator;

(2) Any acreage credited as rice acreage (except for new farms) under the provisions of Part 719 of this chapter, as amended;

(3) Any allotment acreage temporarily transferred from a farm or producer allotment: *Provided*, That acreage transferred from a producer allotment is allocated to a farm.

(4) Any allotment acreage temporarily released to the county committee.

(5) Any other acreage which is planted to annual nonconserving crops or which the county committee determines was not planted because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster or condition beyond the control of the operator, excluding acreage of allotment crops within the applicable allotment, and which is not used to protect cotton, feed grain, or wheat allotments: *Provided*, That such nonconserving crops shall not be considered as planted to rice for purposes of § 730.6(b)(4)(iii); and

(6) An acreage (except for new farms) equal to the amount that a rice allotment is reduced for the current year as provided in § 730.6(c)(2).

(i) "Upland cotton program" means the program authorized under Title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1970, Part 722 of this chapter, as amended.

(j) "Wheat program" means the program authorized under Title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1970, Part 728 of this chapter, as amended.

(k) In the regulations in this subpart and in all instructions, forms, and documents in connection therewith, all other words and phrases shall have the meanings assigned to them in the regulations governing reconstitution of farms and allotments, Part 719 of this chapter, as amended.

**§ 730.3 Administration.**

(a) The program will be administered under the general supervision of the Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) and shall be carried out in the field by Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation State and county committees (herein called "State and county committees") and the ASCS Data Systems Field Office.

(b) State and county committees, the ASCS Data Systems Field Office, and representatives and employees thereof do not have authority to modify or waive any of the provisions of the regulations in this subpart, as amended or supplemented.

**§ 730.4 Rule of fractions.**

Fractions shall be rounded in accordance with Part 793 of this chapter.

**§ 730.5 National rice allotment.**

The national rice allotment for 1976 and for 1977 is 1.8 million acres.

**§ 730.6 Farm and producer allotments.**

(a) *How obtained.* The national allotment is apportioned to farms in farm administrative areas and to producers in producer administrative areas on the basis of the farm and producer allotments established for the preceding year, adjusted to reflect any reserve established by the State committee for new farms or new producers, appeals, and corrections, to reflect adjustments authorized by the Deputy Administrator for crop rotation practices, and to reflect permanent adjustments made as required or permitted in this subpart.

(b) *New rice allotment*—(1) *Written application.* Each year, the county committee, with the approval of the State committee, shall establish a rice allotment (herein called "new rice allotment") for each eligible farm or producer for which an allotment is requested in writing by February 15 of the current year. Each request shall be made by the farm owner or current year rice operator on Form MQ–25, Application for New Farm or Producer Allotment or Quota, which shall contain data necessary to enable the county committee to determine whether the conditions of eligibility prescribed in paragraph (b)(2) of this section have been met.

(2) *Eligibility requirements for owner or rice operator.* Eligibility for a new rice allotment shall be conditioned upon the following:

(i) *Allotment.* The farm or rice operator does not otherwise qualify for a rice allotment.

(ii) *Interest in another rice allotment.* The owner or rice operator does not for the current year own, have an ownership interest in, or operate rice allotment acreage on any other farm in the United States with a rice allotment.

(iii) *Availability of equipment and facilities.* The rice operator has adequate equipment and other facilities, including irrigation water, readily available for the successful production of the crop on the farm.

(iv) *Income requirement.* The rice operator expects to obtain during the current year more than 50 percent of his income from the production of agricultural commodities or products from farming.

(A) *Computing operator's income.* The following shall be considered in computing operator's income:

(1) *Income from farming.* Income from farming shall include the estimated return from the production of the requested allotment and from home gardens, livestock and livestock products, poultry, or other agricultural products produced for home consumption or other use on the farm(s), but shall exclude payments authorized under the rice program.

(2) *Income from nonfarming.* Nonfarming income shall include but shall not be limited to salaries, commissions, pensions, social security payments and unemployment compensation.

(3) *Spouse's income.* The spouse's farm and nonfarm income shall be used in the computation.

(B) *Operator a partnership.* If the operator is a partnership, each partner must expect to obtain more than 50 percent of his current year income from farming.

(C) *Operator a corporation.* If the operator is a corporation, it must have no major corporate purpose other than ownership or operation of the farm. Farming must provide its officers and general manager with more than 50 percent of their expected income. Salaries and dividends from the corporation shall be considered as income from farming.

(D) *Special provision for low-income farmers.* The county committee may waive the income provisions in this section provided the county committee determines that the rice operator's income, from both farm and nonfarm sources,

will not provide a reasonable standard of living for the operator and his family, and a State committee representative approves such action. In waiving the income provisions the county committee must exercise good judgment to see that such determination is reasonable in the light of all pertinent factors, and that this special provision is made applicable only to those who qualify. In making such determination, the county committee shall consider such factors as size and type of farming operations, estimated net worth, estimated gross family farm income, estimated family off-farm income, number of dependents, and other factors affecting the individual's ability to provide a reasonable standard of living for himself and his family.

(v) *Producer allotment sold by rice operator or reduced to zero at his request.* A rice operator in a producer administrative area is not eligible for a new rice allotment if his allotment was:

(A) Transferred by sale in the previous 5 years beginning with the year in which the transfer became effective.

(B) Reduced to zero at his request within 3 years from the date the request for a new allotment is considered.

(3) *Farm eligibility requirements in a farm administrative area.* Additional eligibility requirements for a new rice allotment for a farm are as follows:

(i) *Available land, type of soil, and topography.* The available land, type of soil, and topography of the land on the farm must be suitable for the production of rice.

(ii) *Allotment reduced to zero at the farm owner's request.* At least 3 years must have elapsed from the date the rice allotment is reduced to zero at the farm owner's request, as authorized in paragraph (c) of this section, to the date the request for a new rice allotment is considered.

(iii) *Eminent domain.* A farm which includes land acquired by an agency having the right of eminent domain for which the total rice allotment was pooled pursuant to Part 719 of this chapter, as amended, which is subsequently returned to agricultural production, shall not be eligible for a new rice allotment for a period of 3 years from the date the former owner was displaced.

(iv) *Entire allotment designated by owner for a reconstitution.* A farm which includes land which has no allotment because the owner did not designate an allotment for such land when the parent farm was reconstituted pursuant to Part 719 of this chapter, as amended, shall not be eligible for a new rice allotment for a period of 3 years beginning with the year in which the reconstitution became effective.

(v) *Entire allotment permanently transferred by sale or transfer.* The farm from which the rice allotment was permanently transferred in the previous 5 years beginning with the year in which the transfer became effective, is not eligible for a new rice allotment.

(4) *Limitations*—(i) *Rice acreage planned.* The county committee shall limit the new rice allotment to the smaller of the allotment requested or the rice acreage planned for the current year.

(ii) *Reserve.* The total new rice allotments approved in a farm or producer administrative area shall not exceed the acreage available for new rice allotments within a reserve established for that purpose and for appeals and corrections by the State committee of not more than one percent of the sum of the reserve and the total old rice allotments in the administrative area.

(iii) *Current year rice acreage.* Notwithstanding any other provision of this subpart, if the rice planted and considered planted acreage for the year a new rice allotment is established is less than 90 percent of the allotment, the allotment for such year shall be reduced to the acreage planted and considered planted to rice and payments computed on the basis of such reduced allotment.

(5) *Cancellation of new allotment.* A new rice allotment shall be cancelled under the following circumstances:

(i) If a new rice allotment is established and it is later determined by the county committee that the applicant unknowingly furnished incomplete or inaccurate information, the allotment shall be cancelled effective for the next crop year. If it is determined that the applicant knowingly furnished incomplete or inaccurate information and the State committee concurs in the county committee determination, the allotment shall be cancelled as of the date issued.

(ii) If a new producer allotment is established for a rice operator, and it is later determined by the county committee that the applicant has not continued as a rice operator for the current crop year, the allotment shall be cancelled as of the date issued.

(c) *Reduced allotments.* Notwithstanding any other provisions of this subpart, rice allotments shall be reduced as follows:

(1) *Permanent reductions.* (i) The allotment shall be reduced to the extent:

(A) Requested in writing by the owner of the farm or by the producer for whom an allotment is established, not later than the date established by the State committee.

(B) Acreage of cropland on the farm in farm administrative areas is permanently removed from agricultural production, as determined by the county committee.

(C) It exceeds the farm cropland in farm administrative areas.

(ii) If the current year's rice planted and considered planted acreage is less than 90 percent of the allotment, the allotment for the succeeding year shall be reduced by the percentage by which the planted and considered planted acreage is less than the allotment for the current year, but such reduction shall not exceed 20 percent of the rice allotment. If the rice planted and considered planted acreage is zero for 2 consecutive years, the allotment shall be reduced to zero. However, no allotment shall be reduced or lost through failure to plant if all producers elect by September 1 of the current year to limit the acres for deficiency payment to the rice planted and considered planted acreage as provided in § 730.21(f).

(2) *Reductions for current year in farm administrative areas.* The following reductions shall be made by reducing the smallest allotment first and continuing in order of the size of the allotment, unless the operator requests in writing that the reduction be in a different order.

(i) Reduce feed grain, wheat, rice, and upland cotton allotments each year to the extent the sum of allotments for all commodities, as adjusted by transfer, release, and reapportionment, exceeds the farm cropland.

(ii) Reduce feed grain, wheat, and rice allotments each year to the extent the sum of feed grain, wheat, and rice allotments, as adjusted by transfer, release, and reapportionment, exceeds the cropland which, under normal conditions, could reasonably be expected to produce an allotment crop.

(d) *Division of partnership allotments in producer administrative areas.* If a partnership is dissolved, the partnership's allotment shall be divided among the partners in such proportion as they agree upon in writing or if they are unable to agree, proportionate to their interest in the partnership.

(e) *Succession of interest in producer allotment in case of death.* A deceased producer's allotment shall be apportioned in whole or in part among his heirs or devisees according to the extent to which they may continue, or have continued, his farming operations, if satisfactory proof of such succession of farming operations is furnished the county committee.

**§ 730.7 Release and reapportionment of rice allotment.**

(a) *Conditions under which allotments cannot be released.* The following allotments shall not be released in whole or in part.

(1) New rice allotments.

(2) A farm allotment for any farm for which the farm owner has filed a written objection at the office of the county committee prior to the release.

(3) Allotments pooled under Part 719 of this chapter for which an application for transfer has been filed.

(b) *Allotments which may be released and reapportioned.*—(1) *Release of allotments for the current year only.* Except as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, all or any part of the allotment for the current year may be voluntarily released in writing to the county committee by the applicable closing date. The release shall be made by the farm operator or producer to whom a producer allotment is issued, except that allotments pooled under Part 719 of this chapter may be released only by the displaced owner.

(2) *Permanent release of allotment.* Except as provided in paragraph (a) of this section and except for pooled allotment, all or any part of the allotment for the current year may be permanently released in writing to the county commit-

tee by the farm owner and operator or producer to whom a producer allotment is issued, by the applicable closing date.

(c) *Application for reapportioned allotment.* To be eligible for a reapportioned allotment, a written request by the farm operator or owner in a farm administrative area or be a rice operator in a producer administrative area shall be filed with the county committee by the applicable closing date.

(d) *Reapportionment by county committee.* Reapportionment shall be limited to allotments released only for the current year and allotments released permanently beginning in the current year. They shall be reapportioned to eligible farms or applicants in the same county in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable pursuant to the standards and guidelines in paragraph (e) of this section.

(e) *Standards and guidelines for reapportionment.* (1) The reapportionment of an allotment to a member of the community or county committee or his employee, or to any farm owned, operated, or controlled by such member or employee, shall be approved by a representative of the State committee.

(2) An allotment shall not be reapportioned to a farm or rice operator from which or from whom an allotment was transferred in the current or prior year in accordance with § 730.8: *Provided,* That exceptional cases may be approved by a representative of the State committee, as when the transferer will not benefit from the reapportioned allotment or the transfer was temporary and the allotment has been returned to the farm or rice operator for the current year.

(3) The State committee shall establish and make available to interested parties other standards and guidelines that assure uniform consideration of land, labor, water, and equipment available for rice production, crop rotation practices, and soil and other physical factors affecting rice production.

(f) *Closing dates.* The State committee shall establish and publicize closing dates for the entire State or for areas consisting of one or more counties in the State, taking into consideration normal planting dates. No closing date for an area shall be later than the date rice planting normally becomes general in that area. The State committee may accept releases or applications for reapportionment which are filed late for reasons beyond the producer's control.

**§ 730.8 General allotment transfer provisions—sale, lease, or by owner.**

(a) All or part of a farm or producer base acreage allotment may be transferred but only within the same administrative area.

(b) Transfers by sale are permanent.

(c) Transfers by lease are for the term of the lease which shall not extend beyond 1977.

(d) Transfers by an owner to any other farm owned or controlled by him in the same farm administrative area may be either permanent or for a term of years designated by the owner which shall not extend beyond 1977.

**§ 730.9 Record of transfer.**

(a) *Filing record of transfer.*—(1) *Sale or lease.* (i) In producer administrative areas, the record of transfer (herein called "Form 375") shall be signed by the producer for whom the allotment is established and by the producer to whom the allotment is transferred. The signatures shall be witnessed by any State or county committee member or employee.

(ii) In farm administrative areas, Form 375 shall be signed by the owner, and operator if different, of the farm for which the allotment is established and by either the owner or operator of the receiving farm. The signature of either the owner or operator of each farm shall be witnessed by any State or county committee member or employee.

(iii) The requirement that signatures be witnessed for producers who are ill, infirm, reside in distant areas, or are in other similar situations or may be unduly inconvenienced may be waived, provided the county office mails Form 375 for the required signature.

(2) *By owner in farm administrative area.* The owner of any farm for which an allotment is or will be established for the year in which the transfer is to take effect is eligible to file a record of transfer of such allotment from the farm to another farm owned or controlled by such owner in the same administrative area. The county committee shall approve a transfer under this subparagraph requested on a nonpermanent basis to a farm controlled but not owned by the applicant only if such applicant will be the operator of the farm to which transfer is to be made for each of the years for which the transfer is requested. However, if the county committee determines that the applicant is prevented from remaining the operator of such farm for which such transfer has been approved due to conditions beyond his control, the transfer shall remain in effect. Conditions beyond his control shall include but are not limited to death, incompetency, or bankruptcy of such person.

(b) *Filing period.* Form 375 may be filed during the period beginning on the date allotments are initially mailed to operators and ending on the date established by the State committee as provided in § 730.7(f). The State committee may accept a Form 375 filed after the closing date upon a finding that the producer was prevented from filing by such date for reasons beyond his control.

(c) *Filing place.* Form 375 shall be filed with the county committee that has administrative control over the rice allotment to the transferred.

**§ 730.10 Amount of allotment transferable.**

(a) *General.* All or part of the rice allotment may be transferred.

(b) *No transfer of reapportioned acreage.* Reapportioned allotments shall not be transferred.

(c) *No transfer of new rice allotment.* New rice allotments shall not be transferred.

(d) *Transfer of pooled allotments.* Allotments pooled under Part 719 of this chapter may be permanently transferred during the 3-year life of the pooled allotment or for a term of years not to exceed the remaining years of such 3-year period.

**§ 730.11 Additional conditions and limitations.**

(a) *Consent of lienholder.* No transfer of a farm allotment shall be made from a farm subject to a mortgage or other lien unless the transfer is agreed to in writing by the lienholder, except that such consent of lienholder shall not be required in the case of a temporary transfer for a 1-year period by lease or by owner.

(b) *Limitation on transfers to and from a farm or producer.* Allotments shall not be transferred to and from a farm or to and from a producer in the same year.

(c) *Additional limitation on permanent transfers.* No permanent transfers by sale or by owner shall be made from any farm or from any producer allotment to which an allotment was permanently transferred by sale or by owner within the three immediately preceding crop years.

**§ 730.12 County committee action.**

(a) *Approval of transfers.* The county committee shall approve allotment transfer when all eligibility requirements for transfer are met. If the transfer is made between counties, the approval of both county committees shall be required. No allotment transfer shall be effective until county committee approval is obtained.

(b) *Cancellation, withdrawal, or revision of transfer agreement*—(1) *Cancellation.* The county committee shall cancel the transfer if it determines that one or more of the eligibility requirements for transfers were not met.

(2) *Withdrawal or minor revisions.* Where the county committee determines that it is clearly in the best interest of all the producers and that effective operation of the program will not be impaired, the county committee may permit withdrawal or minor revisions of transfers upon written request by all parties to the transfer: *Provided,* That (i) temporary transfers may be withdrawn or revised during any year of the agreement before rice is planted, and (ii) permanent transfers may be withdrawn or revised only during the first year of the agreement before rice is planted.

**§ 730.13 Allocation of producer allotments to farms.**

(a) In order to obtain program benefits, producer allotments not released to the county committee must be allocated to farms.

(b) Applications for allocating allotments to farms must be filed by May 1 of the current year, in accordance with instructions issued by the Deputy Ad-

ministrator. Applications may be accepted as timely filed after May 1 if the county committee, with the concurrence of the State executive director, determines from the facts and circumstances that the producer's failure to file previously or his reason for changing an application is because of an error on the part of an employee of the county or State committee, or because of physical reasons beyond the producer's control.

(c) Allotments may be allocated only by a rice operator on the farm or by an owner of the farm and subject to the following conditions:

(1) Rice operators may allocate allotment acreage initially issued to them or that they acquire by sale, lease, or reapportionment.

(2) Farm owners may allocate allotment acreage initially issued to them or which they have purchased, provided they:

(i) Contribute land suitable for rice production that is sufficient to produce the allocated acreage, and

(ii) Share in the rice crop or crop proceeds.

**§ 730.14 Transfer of farm rice acreage affected by a natural disaster.**

(a) *General authority.* The State committee shall determine when a county is affected by a natural disaster or other condition beyond the control of producers, which prevents the timely planting or replanting of rice in the county. The county committee shall post in the county office a notice of any such determination affecting the county and, to the extent practicable, shall give general publicity in the county to such determination.

(b) *Application for transfer.* The owner or rice operator on a farm in a county designated for any year under paragraph (a) of this section may file a written application for transfer of rice acreage within the farm rice allotment acreage for such year to another farm in the same county or nearby county in the same administrative area if such acreage cannot be timely planted or replanted because of the natural disaster or condition beyond the producer's control. The application shall be filed with the county committee for the county in which the farm affected by such disaster or condition is located. If the application involves a transfer to a nearby county, the county committee for the nearby county shall be consulted before action is taken by the county committee receiving the application.

(c) *Amount of transfer.* The acreage to be transferred shall not exceed the smaller of (1) the farm allotment established or allocated under this subpart less such acreage planted to rice and not destroyed by the natural disaster, or (2) the acreage requested to be transferred.

(d) *County committee approval.* The county committee shall approve the transfer if it finds that the following conditions have been met:

(1) All or part of the allotment from which the acreage is to be transferred could not be timely planted or replanted because of the natural disaster or condition beyond the producer's control.

(2) One or more producers of rice on the farm from which the acreage is to be transferred will be a bona fide rice producer on the farm to which the acreage is to be transferred and will share in the rice crop or crop proceeds in the manner customary in the area.

(e) *Cancellation of transfer.* If a transfer is approved under this section and it is later determined that the conditions in paragraph (d) of this section have not been met, the county committee, with approval of the State committee or its representative, shall cancel the transfer.

(f) *Planting credit.* Any acreage transferred under this section shall be deemed planted on the farm from which transferred for the purpose of determining the planted and considered planted acreage. However, the yield established for the farm to which the acreage is transferred shall apply to such acreage for program payment and loan purposes.

(g) *Closing dates.* The closing date for filing applications for transfers with the county committee shall be the end of the normal planting period as determined by the State committee. Notwithstanding such closing date requirement, the county committee may accept applications filed after the closing date upon a determination by the county committee that the failure to timely file an application was the result of conditions beyond the control of the applicant and a representative of the State committee approves such determination.

**§ 730.15 Farm and rice operator yields.**

(a) *Determining yields.* The per acre yield shall be the average yield for the farm (for the rice operator in a producer administrative area) determined on the basis of the actual yields per harvested acre for the 3 preceding years: *Provided,* That the actual yields shall be adjusted by the county committee in accordance with instructions issued by the Deputy Administrator for abnormal yields in any year caused by a natural disaster or other condition beyond the producer's control.

Other provisions are:

(1) For years with no acreage, a yield shall be assigned based on yields established for similar operations.

(2) The actual yield in 1976 and 1977 shall be considered to be zero if either an acreage report or a production report is not filed.

(3) For reconstituted farms:

(i) Determine the actual yield on the farm as constituted in the first year of the 3-year base period.

(ii) If the farm is subsequently divided, assign the farm yield determined for that year to each tract or assign yields which when weighted for all tracts, do not exceed the farm yield determined for that year.

(iii) Repeat steps one and two as necessary for the other 2 base years.

(iv) Compute for each year a yield extension for each tract in the farm as constituted for the current year by multiplying the acreage apportioned to the tract times the yield assigned for that year, total the extensions for all tracts, and divide by the total acreage used to compute the extensions to determine the actual yield for each base year.

(b) *Yield reduction.* For the purpose of determining eligibility for and amount of low yield payment as provided in § 730.23(b), the established yield for the farm shall be reduced in accordance with instructions issued by the Deputy Administrator to reflect any reduction in the current year yield which is due to causes other than a natural disaster or condition beyond the control of the producer, such as a change in farming practices.

**§ 730.16 Payment rates.**

Payment rates shall be established separately for deficiency payments and for disaster payments.

(a) *Deficiency payment rates.* The per pound deficiency payment rate for each crop of rice shall be the amount by which the higher of (1) the national weighted average market price received by farmers for rice during the first 5 months of the marketing year for such crop beginning August 1 or (2) the national average loan rate established for such crop is less than the established price of $0.08 per pound in the case of the 1976 crop adjusted to reflect any change during the period beginning February 16, 1976 and ending July 31, 1976, in the index of prices paid by farmers for production items, interest, taxes, and wage rates, and the established price for the 1976 crop adjusted to reflect any changes during the 12-month period immediately preceding July 31, 1977, in such index in the case of the 1977 crop; *Provided,* That any increase that would otherwise be made in the established price for the 1976 and 1977 crops to reflect a change in the index of prices paid by farmers may be further adjusted to reflect any change in (i) the national average yield per acre of rice for the three calendar years preceding the year for which the determination is made, over (ii) the national average yield per acre for the three calendar years preceding the year previous to the one for which the determination is made. The established price for the 1976 program is $0.0825 per pound.

(b) *Disaster payment rate.* The disaster payment rate for rice shall be equal to the larger of the deficiency payment rate or one-third of the established price. The disaster payment rate for the 1976 program year is $0.0275 per pound.

**§ 730.17 Notice of allotments and yields.**

Each producer for whom a producer allotment is established and each operator for whom a farm allotment is established shall be notified in writing of the allotment and established yield per

acre and any revision required under this subpart: *Provided,* That the notice shall not be mailed to any producer who has filed a written request that he not be furnished the notice but it shall be filed with the producer's request in the county office. The producer may withdraw his request at any time; however, during the period a request is in effect, the producer shall be considered as having been timely and correctly notified of the contents of this notice.

**§ 730.18 Reconstitution of farms.**

Farms shall be reconstituted and rice allotments established therefor in accordance with Part 719 of this chapter, as amended. Yields shall be determined in accordance with § 730.15.

**§ 730.19 Requirements for program participation.**

(a) *General.* A person is eligible for the program if he is a producer on a farm which meets the requirements of paragraph (b) of this section and he fulfills the requirements of paragraph (c) of this section.

(b) *Farm requirements.* (1) For disaster payments, a Claim for Prevented Planting (herein called "Form 574–1") or an Application for Disaster Credit (herein called "Form 574") shall be filed by the operator of an eligible farm with the office of the county committee having jurisdiction over the county where the farm is located. He shall also file (i) a Record of Acreages, Production and Disposition (herein called "Form 658") and (ii) a Summary of Production (herein called "Form 575–1") when the information thereon is needed for program administration. These forms shall be filed within the period authorized and according to instructions issued by the Deputy Administrator.

(2) Land owned by the Federal Government shall be ineligible for participation in the program if it is occupied without a lease, permit, or other right of possession.

(3) Producers on a farm acquired for future development for purposes other than agricultural production shall not be eligible for participation in the program unless the county committee determines that the farm is actively engaged in the production of crops for harvest other than hay, sod, ornamentals, or timber.

(c) *Producer eligibility requirements.* (1) The producer must be a person who as landowner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper shares in the rice produced in the current year (or the proceeds therefrom) on a farm meeting the requirements of paragraph (b) of this section or would have shared in the crop if rice had been produced on such farm in the current year.

(2) A minor will be eligible to participate in the program only if (i) the right of majority has been conferred on him by court proceedings; (ii) a guardian has been appointed to manage his property and the applicable documents are signed by the guardian; or (iii) a bond is furnished under which a surety guarantees to protect the Commodity Credit Corporation from any loss incurred for which the minor would be liable had he been an adult. Notwithstanding the foregoing, payment may be made to a minor after December 31 of the current year upon a determination by the county committee that the minor has met the requirements of the program.

**§ 730.20 Determination of compliance.**

(a) Determination of the acreage devoted to rice and other annual nonconserving crops shall be made in accordance with Part 718 of this chapter, as amended.

(b) A representative of the county committee or the State committee or any authorized representative of the Secretary shall have the right at any reasonable time to enter a farm, concerning which representations have been made on any forms filed under the program, in order to measure the acreage planted to rice and other annual nonconserving crops, to examine any records pertaining thereto, and otherwise to determine the accuracy of a producer's representation and the performance of his obligations under the program.

**§ 730.21 General payment provisions.**

(a) *Issuance.* Payments of any amounts due the producers on a farm shall be made only after they sign an Application for Payment (herein called "Form 516"), and the payments are approved by the county committee or by an authorized representative thereof. A Form 516 signed after May 1 of the year following the current year shall not be accepted by the county committee unless prior approval of the State committee is obtained.

(b) *Failure to fully comply.* Except as otherwise provided herein and in Part 791 of this chapter, as amended, payment shall not be made for a farm or to a producer when there is failure to comply fully with the regulations contained in this subpart, and in Part 718 of this chapter.

(c) *Payment due producer.* Subject to the provisions of the payment limitation regulations in Part 795 of this chapter, as amended, the total earned payment due each eligible producer under the program shall be determined by multiplying the total earned payment for the farm by the producer's share of such payment.

(d) *Payment declined.* If a producer declines to accept all or any part of his share of the payment computed for a farm in accordance with the provisions of this section, such payment or portion thereof shall not become available for any other producer on the farm.

(e) *Idle farms.* Producers on a farm not used for the commercial production of crops or livestock on cropland, or from which only sod, ornamentals, or timber are harvested, shall not be eligible for program payments when the rice allotment is preserved with vegetative cover as authorized by the regulations in Part 719 of this chapter, as amended.

(f) *Allotment protection.* Producers otherwise eligible for payment may elect by September 1 of the current year to limit the acres for deficiency payment to the rice planted and considered planted acreage in order to protect the rice allotment from reduction due to failure to plant.

(g) *Unearned payments.* Payments to any producer which exceed the total payment he earns under the program with respect to any farm shall be refunded to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and, if for any reason such earned payment is zero, he shall pay interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the amount of the refund from the issue dates of the sight drafts to the dates the payments are refunded. The provisions of the foregoing sentence requiring the payment of interest when no payment is earned shall not apply if the producer earns any rice, feed grain, wheat, or upland cotton payments for the farm or receives an unearned payment through no fault of his own.

**§ 730.22 Deficiency payments.**

(a) Deficiency payments shall be determined by multiplying the applicable farm or rice operator's allotment acreage by the yield established as provided in § 730.15 and by the per pound rate determined in accordance with § 730.16(a): *Provided,* That no deficiency payment shall be made for any part of the allotment times the yield for which a disaster payment is made.

(b) Deficiency payments will be made to producers as soon as practicable after December 31 of the current year.

**§ 730.23 Disaster payments.**

Producers may qualify for disaster payments only when the county committee determines that prevented planting or a low yield as hereinafter described in this section occurs because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster or condition beyond the control of the producer. Disaster payments shall be made as soon as practicable after the disaster is reported, the extent of the crop loss is determined, and payment is approved.

(a) *Prevented planting.* (1) The acreage for prevented planting payments shall be determined by grouping the farm's feed grain, rice and wheat allotments together and shall equal the smaller of:

(i) For rice, the acreage of rice the producer is prevented from planting;

(ii) The amount that the sum of feed grain, rice and wheat allotments exceeds the total acreage of annual nonconserving crops, excluding (a) acreage within the applicable allotment of commodities other than feed grains, rice and wheat, (b) acreage disregarded for low yield purposes according to paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, (c) barley or wheat acreage designated solely for grazing or nongrain use in accordance with instructions issued by the Deputy Administrator, (d) failed feed grain, upland cotton, or wheat acreage which could have been replanted but was not, and (e) barley or

wheat acreage planted to a variety bred to produce no grain.

(2) Prevented planting payments shall be determined by:

(i) Crediting the acreage for payment first to the underplanting of the allotment for the crop with the highest per acre payment rate and continuing in order of the size of the payment rate, but limiting the acreage credited to feed grains to the total feed grain underplanting.

(ii) Reducing the acreage otherwise credited to each crop by the acreage of that crop excluded according to paragraphs (a) (i) (ii) (b) through (e) of this section.

(iii) Multiplying the acreage credited to rice by the yield established as provided in § 730.15 and by the rate determined in accordance with § 730.16(b).

(b) *Low yields.* (1) For the purpose of determining eligibility for low yield payments and the total acreage on which such payments will be made, the "disaster allotment" for rice means the effective allotment adjusted downward to the extent it is underplanted. *Provided*, That the planted acreage to be considered for this purpose shall exclude:

(i) Failed rice acreage which could have been replanted but was not, and

(ii) Rice acreage designated solely for wildlife use in accordance with instructions issued by the Deputy Administrator.

(2) For low yield payment purposes, the county committee shall disregard the production from the excluded acreage as well as production from acreage in excess of the disaster allotment which is mechanically destroyed without feed benefit prior to the time most of the rice in the area has headed.

(3) A farm shall not be deemed to have suffered a loss which qualifies it for a low yield payment unless the current year production of rice is less than two-thirds the result obtained by multiplying the disaster allotment by the yield established for the farm. The yield for a farm in a producer administrative area shall be established for disaster payment purposes by multiplying each rice operator's allotment acreage he plants on the farm by his yield established as provided in § 730.15, totaling the results obtained for all rice operators on the farm, and dividing by the total allotment acreage they planted.

(4) The rice production from acreage not harvested shall be appraised and added to the actual production for the purpose of determining eligibility for and amount of low yield payments, in accordance with instructions issued by the Deputy Administrator.

(5) Any rice acreage destroyed without opportunity for appraisal for which the production was not excluded in paragraph (b) (2) of this section shall be charged with the established yield.

(6) Low yield payments shall be determined by multiplying the disaster allotment by the yield established for the farm, subtracting the determined production therefrom, and multiplying the result by the per pound rate determined in accordance with § 730.16(b).

**§ 730.24 Division of payments and additional provisions relating to tenants and sharecroppers.**

The regulations relating to the division of payments and additional provisions relating to tenants and sharecroppers in Part 794 of this chapter, as amended, shall apply to rice.

**§ 730.25 Successors-in-interest.**

(a) In the case of the death, incompetency, or disappearance of any person who had an interest as a producer of rice or would have had an interest as a producer if rice had been planted, the payment due him shall be made to his successor as determined in accordance with the regulations in Part 707 of this chapter, as amended.

(b) When any person who had an interest as a producer of rice or would have had an interest as a producer if rice had been planted (herein called "predecessor") is succeeded on the farm by another producer (herein called "successor"), the payment to the predecessor and successor shall be divided between them on such basis as they agree is fair and equitable. If such persons are unable to agree to a division of the payment, a fair and equitable division shall be determined by the county committee.

(c) In any case where any payment due any successor producer has previously been paid to the producer who filed Form 516, such payment shall not be paid to the successor producer unless it is recovered from the producer to whom it has been paid or payment is authorized by the Deputy Administrator.

**§ 730.26 Misrepresentation and scheme or device.**

(a) A producer who is determined by the county committee or the State committee to have erroneously represented any fact affecting a program determination shall not be entitled to payments under the program for the farm with respect to which the representation was made and shall refund to the Commodity Credit Corporation the payments received by him with respect to such farm.

(b) A producer who is determined by the State committee or the county committee with the approval of the State committee, to have knowingly (1) adopted any scheme or device which tends to defeat the purpose of the program, (2) made any fraudulent representation, or (3) misrepresented any fact affecting a program determination shall not be entitled to payments for any farm under the program and shall refund to the Commodity Credit Corporation all payments received by him with respect to the program.

(c) The provisions of this section shall be applicable in addition to any liability under criminal and civil fraud statutes.

**§ 730.27 Setoffs and assignments.**

(a) *Producer indebtedness.* The regulations issued by the Secretary governing setoffs and withholdings, Part 13 of this chapter, as amended, shall be applicable to this program.

(b) *Assignments.* Any producer who may be entitled to any payment may assign his rights thereto in accordance with the regulations governing assignment of payment as set forth for other programs in Part 709 of this chapter, as amended.

**§ 730.28 Appeals.**

A producer may obtain reconsideration and review of determinations made under this subpart in accordance with the Appeal Regulations, Part 780 of this chapter, as amended.

**§ 730.29 Performance based upon advice or action of county or State committee.**

The provisions of Part 790 of this chapter, as amended, relating to performance based upon action or advice of an authorized representative of the Secretary shall be applicable to this subpart.

**§ 730.30 Supervisory authority of State committee.**

The State committee may take any action required by these regulations which has not been taken by the county committee. The State committee may also (a) correct, or require a county committee to correct, any action taken by such county committee which is not in accordance with the regulations of this subpart, or (b) require a county committee to withhold taking any action which is not in accordance with the regulations of this subpart.

**§ 730.31 Delegation of authority.**

No delegation herein to a State or county committee shall preclude the Administrator, ASCS, or his designee, from determining any question arising under the program or from reversing or modifying any determination made by a State or county committee.

**§ 730.32 Recordkeeping.**

Records of all rice purchased, acquired or received, are to be kept by warehousemen, mill or elevator operators, processors, and buyers in accordance with instructions issued by the Deputy Administrator. Producer's records of evidence tending to show program performance need not to be retained for more than 2 years after the end of the program year as provided by Part 708 of this chapter.

Since these regulations apply to 1976 and planting has occurred, it is hereby found and determined that compliance with the notice and public procedure provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553 is impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

*Effective date:* These regulations shall become effective on January 10,1977.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on January 5, 1977.

KENNETH E. FRICK,
*Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.*

[FR Doc.77-892 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## CHAPTER IX—AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE (MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS; FRUITS, VEGETABLES, NUTS), DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## PART 959—ONIONS GROWN IN SOUTH TEXAS

### Expenses and Rate of Assessment

This document authorizes the South Texas Onion Committee to spend not more than $113,324 for its operations during the fiscal period ending July 31, 1977, and to collect one and one-half cents ($0.015) per 50-pound container of onions, or equivalent quantity, handled by first handlers under the program.

The committee is the administrative agency established under Marketing Agreement No. 143 and Order No. 959, both as amended, regulating the handling of onions grown in South Texas. This program is effective under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

Notice was published in the December 9, 1976, FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 53807) regarding the proposals. It afforded interested persons an opportunity to submit written comments not later than December 28, 1976. None was received.

After consideration of all relevant matters, including the proposals in the notice, it is found that the following expenses and rate of assessment should be approved.

It is further found that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this section until 30 days after publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 553) because this part requires that the rate of assessment for a particular period shall apply to all assessable onions from the beginning of such period.

The regulation follows:

§ 959.217 Expenses and rate of assessment.

(a) The reasonable expenses that are likely to be incurred during the fiscal period ending July 31, 1977, by the South Texas Onion Committee for its maintenance and functioning, and for such purposes as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, will amount to $113,324.

(b) The rate of assessment to be paid by each handler in accordance with the marketing agreement and this part shall be one and one-half cents ($0.015) per 50-pound container of onions, or equivalent quantity, handled by him as the first handler thereof during said fiscal period.

(c) Unexpended income in excess of expenses for the fiscal period ending July 31, 1977, may be carried over as a reserve.

(d) Terms used in this section have the same meaning as when used in the said marketing agreement and this part.

(Secs. 1–19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601–674.)

Dated: January 5, 1977.

CHARLES R. BRADER,
*Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.*

[FR Doc.77-879 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## CHAPTER XVIII—FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### SUBCHAPTER D—GUARANTEED LOANS

[FmHA Instruction 449.1]

## PART 1845—FmHA EMERGENCY LIVESTOCK LINE OF CREDIT GUARANTEES

### Extension of Guarantees

Section 1845.13 of Part 1845, Title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (40 FR 30623) is amended to add paragraph (h) which clarifies the requirements with respect to approving an extension of an emergency livestock line of credit guarantee issued prior to December 20, 1976. Such approval having been made possible by the Emergency Livestock Act as amended by Pub. L. 94–517.

It is the policy of this Department that rules relating to public property, loans, grants, benefits or contracts shall be published for comment notwithstanding the exemption of 5 U.S.C. 553 with respect to such rules. However, this document is being published without notice of proposed rulemaking since such notice would delay approval of new EL advances to indebted borrowers causing possible financial losses, and therefore, is contrary to the public interest.

Accordingly, § 1845.13 is amended to add paragraph (h) which reads as follows:

§ 1845.13 EL line of credit limitations and special provisions.

* * * * *

(h) *Extension of guarantees.* New loan advances to be made after December 31, 1976, will not be automatically covered by "line of credit" guarantees issued before December 20, 1976, under terms of the Emergency Livestock Credit Act of 1974, as amended by Pub. L. 94–35. Any advance(s) under these guarantees after December 31, 1976, requires an extension of the guarantee.

(1) When lenders desire to continue making new advances to borrowers indebted under a guarantee issued prior to December 20, 1976, it will not be necessary to issue a new Form FmHA 449.27: *Provided,* The lender will certify in writing that:

(i) The borrower meets eligibility requirements including a statement that he (the lender) is unable to extend the additional credit without a guarantee,

(ii) The outstanding balance is current,

(iii) Collateral for the new advance(s) will be sufficient to meet EL security requirements,

(iv) The borrower has reasonable repayment ability for the overall guaranteed indebtedness, and

(v) The advance(s) will be within the terms of the existing "line of credit ceiling" previously approved by FmHA.

(2) For cases meeting the criteria stated in paragraphs (h)(1) (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v) of this section the County Supervisor will change the date "December 31, 1976," in the second line of item "a" of the existing contract of guarantee to "September 30, 1978," and initial the change. If the County Supervisor questions the proposal and needs supporting information in addition to that previously furnished by the lender, he will obtain it before initialing the change in the contract guarantee.

(3) When a lender desires to make advance(s) above the previously approved line of credit ceiling, or when the advance(s) will not be within the limits of the "Line of Credit Agreement," or the line of credit loan advances are not paid current, the above method will not be used. In such cases it will be necessary for the lender to prepare a completely new guarantee request with all the supporting forms and information required by this Part 1845 for a contract of guarantee on a new line of credit. If the loan approval official determines that all the requirements for a new guarantee are met, the existing line of credit will be refinanced by the new line of credit, and a new contract of guarantee will be issued. To complete the transaction, the lender must surrender the previous contract of guarantee to the County Supervisor who will mail it to the Finance Office with a new Form FmHA 449–31. The County Supervisor will indicate in his transmittal letter to the Finance Office that the previous contract is being replaced and that the Finance Office records should be adjusted to reflect only the new line of credit guarantee.

Effective date. This document shall become effective on January 11, 1977.

(Sec. 10, Pub. L. 93–357 as amended; delegation of authority by the Secretary of Agriculture (7 CFR 2.23); delegation of authority by Assistant Secretary of Rural Development (7 CFR 2.70))

Dated: January 3, 1977.

FRANK B. ELLIOTT,
*Administrator,*
*Farmers Home Administration.*

[FR Doc.77-950 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## Title 10—Energy

## CHAPTER II—FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

## PART 212—MANDATORY PETROLEUM PRICE REGULATIONS

### Emergency Amendment Adopting Special Rule No. 1 for Subpart F; Correction as to Written Comment Procedures

In FR Doc. 76-38499 appearing at 1037 in the FEDERAL REGISTER of January 5,

1977, the following correction should be made:

On page 1037, column 1, at line 34, the text is corrected by changing the designation of the Box for the filing of written comments to JY.

MICHAEL F. BUTLER,
*General Counsel.*

JANUARY 6, 1977.

[FR Doc.77-932 Filed 1-6-77;3:07 pm]

## Title 14—Aeronautics and Space

## CHAPTER II—CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

### SUBCHAPTER D—SPECIAL REGULATIONS

[Reg. SPR-117, Amdt. 8]

### PART 378a—ONE-STOP-INCLUSIVE TOUR CHARTERS

### Elimination of Certain Post-Tour Reports

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C., January 6, 1977.

Section 378a.50(c) of the Board's Special Regulations (14 CFR 378a.50(c)) currently requires that every direct air carrier and tour operator or foreign tour operator operating One-stop-inclusive Tour Charters (OTC's) jointly file a monthly report, set forth in Appendix C to Part 378a, indicating the number of OTC's listed on the prospectus that were not performed, the number that were performed, and for each tour that was operated indicating the direct air carrier, the month the services were performed, the flight number, points of enplanement and deplanement, and the numbers of passengers enplaned or deplaned at such points.

By ER-949, 41 F.R. 12282, March 25, 1976, and ER-950, 41 F.R. 12281, March 25, 1976, the Board adopted amendments to Parts 217 and 249 of its Economic Regulations (14 CFR Parts 217 and 249) that changed CAB Form 41, Schedule T-6 and CAB Form 217. Those forms set forth the reporting requirements for civilian charters performed by certificated route and supplemental air carriers, and by foreign direct air carriers.

As revised, they require quarterly reports containing substantially the same information as is contained in the monthly reports required under § 378a.50 (c). The receipt of this OTC information on a quarterly basis is now sufficient to meet the Board's needs. CAB Form 41, Schedule T-6, and CAB Form 217 are in the form most useful to the Board; unlike the reports required under § 378a.50(c) they are adaptable to computerized printouts that save valuable staff time in compiling studies from post-tour reports.

The Board has therefore decided to elminate the reporting requirements set forth in § 378a.50(c). Appendix C, *Reporting Form*, will be revoked and reserved. Because this amendment creates no significant additional burden for any member of the public, and because public benefit will be derived from putting it into effect without delay, it is found for good cause that notice and public procedure thereon are unnecessary and that it may become effective January 11, 1977.

Although § 371.50(b) of the advance booking charter (ABC) rule contains reporting requirements that are parallel to those of § 378a.50(c), the Board has decided not to eliminate those requirements at this time. ABC operations are just beginning, and the Board finds it desirable to receive the subject information on a monthly basis so as to enable us to monitor their effects on scheduled service.

In light of the foregoing, the Civil Aeronautics Board hereby amends Part 378a of its Special Regulations (14 CFR Part 378a), effective January 11, 1977, as set forth below.

1. The table of contents is amended by deleting and reserving the reference to Appendix C, *Reporting Form*, so that the table of contents reads as follows:

* * * * *

APPENDIX B—PASSENGER NAME LISTS

APPENDIX C—[RESERVED]

* * * * *

2. Section 378a.50 is revised by revoking paragraph (c), deleting the reserved paragraph (a), and by deleting the letter (b) from the remaining paragraph, so that the section reads:

§ 378a.50 Charter trip reporting.

The direct air carrier shall promptly notify the Board (Supplementary Services Division, Bureau of Operating Rights) regarding any charters covered by a Prospectus filed under § 378a.28, or a Statement of Authorization issued pursuant to § 378a.106, that are later canceled.

APPENDIX C—[RESERVED]

3. Part 378a is amended by revoking and reserving Appendix C, *Reporting Form*.

(Secs. 204, 407, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 72 Stat. 743, 766 (49 U.S.C. 1324, 1377))

By the Civil Aeronautics Board.

PHYLLIS T. KAYLOR,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-948 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## Title 19—Customs Duties

## CHAPTER I—UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

[T.D. 77-24]

### PART 6—AIR COMMERCE REGULATIONS

### Presidio-Lely International Airport At Presidio, Texas

On September 9, 1976, a notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 38187), which proposed to amend § 6.14(e) of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 6.14(e)) by adding the Presidio-Lely International Airport at Presidio, Texas, to the list of designated airports for private aircraft arriving from areas south of the United States. No comments were received regarding the proposal.

Accordingly, the list of designated airports set forth in § 6.14(e) of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 6.14(e)) is amended by inserting "Presidio, Texas" and "Presidio-Lely International Airport" directly after "Nogales, Arizona" and "Nogales International Airport," respectively.

(R.S. 251, as amended, sec. 624, 46 Stat. 759, sec. 1109, 79 Stat. 799, as amended (19 U.S.C. 66, 1624, 49 U.S.C. 1509))

Effective date. This amendment shall become effective on or before February 10, 1977.

VERNON D. ACREE,
*Commissioner of Customs.*

Approved: January 3, 1977.

JERRY THOMAS,
*Under Secretary of the Treasury.*

[FR Doc.77-953 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[T.D. 77-25]

### PART 10—ARTICLES CONDITIONALLY FREE, SUBJECT TO A REDUCED RATE, ETC.

### Withdrawal of Supplies for Vessels

On June 8, 1976, a notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 22952), which proposed to amend paragraph (e) of § 10.59 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 10.59(e)) to require that Customs Form 5125, Application for Withdrawal of Bonded Stores for Fishing Vessel and Certification of Use, be submitted in triplicate, rather than in duplicate as is presently required. The additional copy shall be submitted to the district director at each Customs port along with the original and shall be retained by the withdrawer as evidence of consumption of stores on board or proper landing under Customs supervision.

Interested persons were given 30 days from the date of publication of the notice to submit data, views, or arguments with respect to the proposed amendment. No comments were received and it has been determined that the proposed amendment should be adopted as set forth in the notice of proposed rulemaking.

Accordingly, paragraph (e) of § 10.59 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 10.59(e)) is amended as set forth below:

§ 10.59 Exemption from Customs duties and internal revenue tax.[56]

* * * * *

(e) Vessels of the United States documented to engage in the fisheries and foreign fishing vessels of 5 net tons or over may be allowed to withdraw distilled spirits (including alcohol), wines, and beer conditionally free under section 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, if the district director is satisfied from the quantity requested, in the light of (1) whether the vessel is employed in substantially continuous fishing activities, and (2) the vessel's complement, that none of the withdrawn articles is

intended to be removed from the vessel in, or otherwise returned to, the United States without the payment of duty or tax. Such withdrawal shall be permitted only after the approval by the district director of a special written application, in triplicate, on Customs Form 5125, of the withdrawer, supported by a bond on Customs Form 7603 executed by the withdrawer. Such application shall be filed with Customs Form 7506 or 7512,[57] as the case may be. The original and the triplicate copy or the application, after approval, shall be stamped with the withdrawal number and date thereof and shall be returned to the withdrawer for use as prescribed below. Approval of each such application shall be subject to the condition that the original and the triplicate copy shall be presented thereafter by the withdrawer or the vessel's master to the district director within 24 hours (excluding Saturday, Sunday, and holidays) after each subsequent arrival of the vessel at a Customs port or station and that an accounting shall be made at the time of such presentation of the disposition of the articles until the district director is satisfied that all of them have been consumed on board, or landed under Custom's supervision, and takes up the original application. (The withdrawer shall retain the triplicate copy as evidence of consumption on board or landing under Customs supervision.) The approval shall be subject to the further conditions that any such withdrawn article remaining on board while the vessel is in port shall be safeguarded in the manner and to such extent as the district director for the port or place of arrival shall deem necessary and that failure to comply with the conditions upon which a conditionally free withdrawal is approved shall subject the total quantity of withdrawn articles to the assessment and collection of an amount equal to the duties and taxes that would have been assessed on the entire quantity of supplies withdrawn had such supplies been regularly entered, or withdrawn, for consumption.

(R.S. 251, as amended, sec. 624, 46 Stat. 759 (19 U.S.C. 66, 1624))

Effective date: This amendment shall become effective February 10, 1977.

VERNON D. ACREE,
*Commissioner of Customs.*

Approved: January 3, 1977.

JERRY THOMAS,
*Under Secretary of the Treasury.*

[FR Doc.77-952 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[T.D. 77-23]

## PART 10—ARTICLES CONDITIONALLY FREE, SUBJECT TO A REDUCED RATE, ETC.

## PART 142—SPECIAL PERMITS FOR IMMEDIATE DELIVERY PRIOR TO ENTRY

### Importations by Agencies and Offices of the United States Government

Sections 10.103, 10.104, and 10.105 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 10.103, 10.104, 10.105) presently contain provisions relating to importations made by or for the account of agencies and offices of the United States Government. These sections provide that, with certain exceptions, importations made by or for the account of an agency or office of the United States Government are subject to duty. These sections also set forth immediate delivery procedures for certain specified governmental agencies, waiving the bond otherwise required in support of the immediate delivery application, and provide for the entry or withdrawal from warehouse for consumption by any agency or office of American goods returned. These sections do not contain provisions for the temporary importation of articles for United States Government agencies, although it has been Customs practice to permit all United States Government agencies the privilege of waiving the bond which is normally required for temporary importations made under the procedures set forth in § 10.31 et seq. of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 10.31 et seq.). The Customs Service has also extended to Government offices and agencies generally the privilege of waiving the bond otherwise required in support of an application for immediate delivery.

Accordingly, in order to incorporate in Part 10 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR Part 10) the current practice of extending to all United States Government agencies and offices the privilege of waiving the bond otherwise required in support of an immediate delivery application, to set forth provisions for temporary importations by agencies and offices of the United States Government, and to clarify other aspects of importations by United States Government agencies, the sections under the heading "United States Government Importations" are revised as set forth below. A conforming change is also made to § 142.4 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 142.4) to indicate that the bond otherwise required by that section in suport of an immediate delivery application may not be required in the case of an application filed under § 10.101 of the Customs Regulations.

Part 10 of the Customs Regulations is amended by revising the sections under the heading "United States Government Importations" to read as follows:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IMPORTATIONS

Sec.
10.100 Entry, examination, and tariff status.
10.101 Immediate delivery.
10.102 Duty-free entries.
10.103 American goods returned.
10.104 Temporary importation entries for United States Government agencies.
10.105 [Reserved]

AUTHORITY: R.S. 251, as amended, secs. 448, 623, 624, 46 Stat. 714, as amended, 759, as amended, (19 U.S.C. 66, 1448, 1623, 1624).

### UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IMPORTATIONS

**§ 10.100 Entry, examination, and tariff status.**

Except as otherwise provided for in §§ 10.101, 10.102, 10.104, 141.83(c)(8), 141.102(d), or elsewhere in this chapter, importations made by or for the account of any agency or office of the United States Government are subject to the usual Customs entry and examination requirements. In the absence of express exemptions from duty, such as are contained in item 830.00, 831.00, 832.00, 833.00, 834.00, 835.00, 836.00, or other items in the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) providing for free entry, such importations are also subject to duty.

**§ 10.101 Immediate delivery.**

(a) *Shipments entitled to immediate delivery.* Shipments consigned to or for the account of any agency or office of the United States Government, or to an officer or official of any such agency in his official capacity, shall be regarded for purposes of these regulations as shipments the immediate delivery of which is necessary within the purview of section 448(b), Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1448(b)).

(b) *Immediate delivery applications.* The shipments described in the preceding paragraph may be released upon the filing of immediate delivery applications on Customs Form 3461 as set forth in Subpart A of Part 142, of this chapter. Such applications may be limited to particular shipments or may cover all shipments imported by the Government agency making the application. They may be approved for specific periods of time or for indefinite periods of time, provided in either case they are supported by blanket carrier's certificates and stipulations as provided for in paragraph (c) of this section.

(c) *Blanket carrier's certificates and stipulations.* Before the release of a shipment under an imediate delivery permit, evidence of the right of the applicant to make entry for the articles shall be furnished the district director in accordance with the provisions of §§ 141.11 and 141.12 of this chapter. A blanket carrier's certificate and release order on Customs Form 7529 may be accepted by a district director for all shipments for the same consignee which may be brought to a port by a carrier during any period stated on the form.

(d) *Bond.* No bond shall be required in support of an immediate delivery application provided for in this section if a stipulation in the form as set forth below is filed with the district director in connection with the application:

I, ----------, ----------, a duly authorized
(Title)
representative of the ----------
----------
(Name of United States Government department or agency)

stipulate and agree on behalf of such department or agency that all applicable provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and the regulations thereunder, and all other laws and regulations, relating to the release and entry of merchandise will be observed and complied with in all respects.

----------
(Signature)

(e) *Timely entries required.* If proper entries for consumption for importations

released under these regulations are not filed within a reasonable time, appropriate steps shall be taken to insure the prompt filing of such entries.

**§ 10.102 Duty-free entries.**

(a) *Invoice or declaration.* No invoice or other declaration of the shipper shall be required for shipments expressly exempt from duty as provided in item 830.00, 831.00, 832.00, 833.00, 834.00, 835.00, 836.00, or other items in the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) providing for free entry. However, the importing Government agency or office shall present any invoice, memorandum invoice, or bill pertaining to the merchandise in its possession or available to it, or, if no such invoice or bill is available, a pro forma invoice prepared in accordance with § 141.85 of this chapter, setting forth adequate information for examination and determination of the dutiable status of the merchandise. In addition, the district director shall only admit articles free of duty under item 832.00, 833.00, or 834.00, Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202), upon the receipt of a certificate executed in the manner and form described in paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) *Certification.* One of the following certificates executed by a duly authorized officer or official of the appropriate Government agency or office is required for free entry of articles under item 832.00, 833.00, or 834.00, Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202). The certificates may be printed, stamped, or typewritten on the Customs entry or withdrawal form, Customs Form 7501 or 7506, or on a separate paper attached to the entry or withdrawal form filed by the Government agency or office, provided the certification is clearly and unmistakably identified with the articles covered by the entry or withdrawal.

(1) *Articles for military departments, item 832.00, TSUS.* I certify that the procurement of this material constituted an emergency purchase of war material abroad by the Department of the (name of military department), and it is accordingly requested that such material be admitted free of duty pursuant to item 832.00, Tariff Schedules of the United States.

---
(Name)

---
(Title), who has been designated to execute free-entry certificates for the above-named department.

---
(Grade or Rank) (Organization)

(2) *Articles for the General Services Administration, item 833.00, TSUS.* Pursuant to item 833.00, Tariff Schedules of the United States, I hereby certify that the above-described materials are strategic and critical materials procured under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b).

---
(Name)

---
(Title), General Services Administration, who has been duly authorized to execute the above certificate.

(3) *Articles for the Energy Research and Development Administration, item 834.00, TSUS.* I certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that the above-described materials are source materials purchased abroad, the admittance of which is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, in accordance with item 834.00, Tariff Schedules of the United States.

---
(Name)

---
(Title), who has been authorized to execute free-entry certificates for the Energy Research and Development Administration.

(c) *Release of shipments.* Shipments for which free entry has been or will be claimed under item 832.00, 833.00, or 834.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202), shall be released after only such examination as is necessary to identify them.

(d) *Entry in Government name.* All materials for which free entry is claimed under item 832.00, 833.00, or 834.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202), shall be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in the name of the Government department whose representative executes the certificate set forh in § 10.102(b) unless exemption from this requirement is specifically authorized by the regional commissioner of Customs.

**§ 10.103 American goods returned.**

(a) *Certificate required.* Articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in the name of an agency or office of the United States Government (with the exception of military scrap belonging to the Department of Defense) may be admitted free of duty under item 800.00, Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202), upon the filing of a certificate on the letterhead of the agency or office in the following form in lieu of other entry documentation:

I hereby certify:

1. That the following articles imported in the ---------- at the port of
(Name of Carrier)

---------- on ----------
(Port) (Date)

consist of returned products which are the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, and have been returned to the United States without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means, and that no drawback has been or will be claimed on such articles, and that the articles currently belong to and are for the further use of ----------
(Agency or Office)

| Number of containers | Bill of lading No.[1] | General description of articles |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

[1] If shipment arrives in the United States on a commercial carrier.

2. That the shipment does not contain military scrap.

3. That the shipment is entitled to entry under item 800.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States free of duty.

4. That I am a military installation transportation officer having knowledge of the facts involved in this certificate.

or

I am an officer or official authorized by ---------- to execute this certificate.
(Agency or Office)
(Whichever is applicable.)

---
(Name)

---
(Rank and branch of service or Agency or Office)

(b) *Combined certificate when articles are intermingled.* When articles claimed to be free under item 800.00 and other articles claimed to be free under item 832.00, 833.00, or 834.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202), are intermingled in a single shipment in a manner which precludes separation for the purpose of making claims for free entry under the separate categories, all the articles may be covered by a combined certificate which follows the requirements of § 10.102(b) and paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) *Execution of certificate.* The certificate required by paragraph (a) of this section may be executed by any military installation transportation officer having knowledge of the facts or by any other officer or official specifically designated or authorized to execute such certificates by the importing Government agency or office. If the merchandise arrived on a commercial carrier, the entry shall be supported by evidence of the right to make it.

**§ 10.104 Temporary importation entries for United States Government agencies.**

The entry of articles brought into the United States temporarily by an agency or office of the United States Government and claimed to be exempt from duty under Schedule 8, Part 5C, Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202), shall be made on Customs Form 7501. No bond shall be required if the agency or office files a stipulation in the form set forth in § 141.102(d) of this chapter. In those cases in which the provisions of Schedule 8, Part 5C, Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202), are not met, however, the district director will proceed as if a bond had been filed to cover the particular importation. Articles temporarily imported by

a Government agency or office under this section are entitled to immediate delivery under the procedures set forth in § 10.101.

Footnotes 95, 96, 97 and 98, to § 10.103 are deleted.

§ 10.105 [Reserved]

§ 10.105 is deleted and reserved for future use.

(R.S. 251, as amended, secs. 448, 623, 624, 46 Stat. 714, as amended, 759, as amended (19 U.S.C. 66, 1448, 1623, 1624))

The first sentence of § 142.4 is amended to read as follows:

§ 142.4 Bond.

Except as provided in § 10.101(d) of this chapter, no special permit for immediate delivery shall be issued until there has been filed a bond, with an approved corporate surety, of one of the following types:

* * * * *

(R.S. 251, as amended, secs. 448, 623, 624, 46 Stat. 714, as amended, 759, as amended (19 U.S.C. 66, 1448, 1623, 1624))

Because these amendments merely relax present requirements and involve only agencies or offices of the United States Government, and require no public initiative, notice and public procedure thereon is found to be unnecessary, and good cause exists for dispensing with a delayed effective date under the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553.

Effective date. These amendments shall be effective on January 11, 1977.

VERNON D. ACREE,
*Commissioner of Customs.*

Approved: January 4, 1977.

JERRY THOMAS,
*Under Secretary of the Treasury.*

[FR Doc.77-954 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## Title 21—Food and Drugs

### CHAPTER I—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

### SUBCHAPTER E—ANIMAL DRUGS, FEEDS, AND RELATED PRODUCTS

### PART 558—NEW ANIMAL DRUGS FOR USE IN ANIMAL FEEDS

### Decoquinate; Correction

In FR Doc. 76-34959 appearing at page 53002 in the FEDERAL REGISTER for Friday, December 3, 1976, in § 558.195 *Decoquinate* (21 CFR 558.195) in the table in paragraph (g)(1) on page 53003, the entry for decoquinate 27.2 grams per ton (0.003 pct.) in combination with roxarsone 11 to 45 grams per ton (0.0012-0.005 pct.) is corrected to read "Roxarsone 11 to 45 (0.0012-0.005 pct.) plus Bacitracin 12 to 50."

Dated: January 5, 1977.

C. D. VAN HOUWELING,
*Director,*
*Bureau of Veterinary Medicine.*

[FR Doc.77-895 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## Title 26—Internal Revenue

### CHAPTER I—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### SUBCHAPTER D—MISCELLANEOUS EXCISE TAXES

[T.D. 7460]

### PART 154—TEMPORARY REGULATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE AIRPORT AND AIRWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1970

### Temporary Regulations Relating to Tax-Free Sales of Liquid for Use by Certain Aircraft Museums.

This document contains amendments to the Temporary Regulations in Connection With the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970 (26 CFR Part 154) to implement one provision of the Act of October 17, 1976 (Pub. L. 94-530, 90 Stat. 2487).

The Act of October 17, 1976, provides, among other things, that, under Treasury regulations, the retailers excise tax on certain fuels is not to apply to liquid sold for use or used after September 30, 1976, by an aircraft museum in an aircraft or vehicle that is owned by the museum and used exclusively for the procurement, care, and exhibition of aircraft of the type used for combat or transport in World War II.

This document amends the regulations so that present rules relating to registration, exemption certificates, etc. in the case of other exempt sales of aviation fuel will also apply to exempt sales to such museums.

ADOPTION OF REGULATIONS

In order to prescribe temporary rules for tax-free sales of liquid for use by an aircraft museum in an aircraft or vehicle owned by such museum and used exclusively for the procurement, care, and exhibition of aircraft of the type used for combat or transport in World War II, as permitted by the Act of October 17, 1976 (Pub. L. 94-530, 90 Stat. 2487), the Temporary Regulations in Connection With the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970 (26 CFR Part 154) are amended as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Section 154.1 is amended by revising the section title and the introductory material, by adding a new subsection (h) to section 4041, by redesignating the present subsection (h) as subsection (i), and by revising the historical note. These revised and added provisions read as follows:

**§ 154.1 Statutory provisions; imposition of tax; noncommercial aviation; additional tax; exemption for use by certain aircraft museums; registration.**

Section 4041 (c), (d), (h), and (i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as added by section 202(a) of the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970 and the Act of October 17, 1976 (Pub. L. 94-530, 90 Stat. 2487):

Sec. 4041. *Imposition of tax.* * * *

(h) *Exemption for use by certain aircraft museums*—(1) *Exemption.* Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed under this section on any liquid sold for use or used by an aircraft museum in an aircraft or vehicle owned by such museum and used exclusively for purposes set forth in paragraph (2)(C) of this subsection.

(2) *Definition of aircraft museum.* For purposes of this subsection, the term "aircraft" [*sic*] means an organization—

(A) Described in section 501(c)(3) which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a),

(B) Operated as a museum under charter by a State or the District of Columbia, and

(C) Operated exclusively for the procurement, care, and exhibition of aircraft of the type used for combat or transport in World War II.

(i) *Registration.* * * *

[Sec. 4041 (c), (d), (h), and (i) as added by sec. 202(a), Airport and Airway Revenue Act 1970 (84 Stat. 237), and Act of Oct. 17, 1976 (Pub. L. 94-530, 90 Stat. 2487)]

PAR. 2. Section 154.1-1 is amended (1) by striking out "section 4041(h)" from the first sentence of paragraph (d)(5) and substituting "section 4041(i)" in lieu thereof, and (2) by revising the last two sentences of paragraph (a)(1) to read as follows:

**§ 154.1-1 Tax-free sales and purchases of fuel under section 4041(c); registration.**

(a) *Purpose of this section.* (1) * * * This section sets forth rules, as authorized by section 4041(i) and other provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, under which aircraft fuel that is used, in whole or in part, in other than noncommercial aviation may be purchased tax free when delivered by a seller into a fuel supply tank of an aircraft. In addition, the provisions of this section apply to sales or purchases of fuel, delivered into a fuel supply tank of an aircraft, which are exempt from the tax under section 4041(c) by reason of section 4041(f) (relating to exemption for farm use), section 4041(g)(1) (relating to exemption for use as supplies for vessels or aircraft), section 4041(g)(2) (relating to State and local government exemption), section 4041(g)(4) (relating to exemption for nonprofit educational organizations), and section 4041(h) (effective October 1, 1976, and relating to exemption for use by certain aircraft museums).

* * * * *

Because of the need for immediate guidance with respect to the provisions contained in this Treasury decision, it is found impracticable to issue it with notice and public procedure thereon under subsection (b) of section 553 of title 5 of the United States Code or subject to the effective date limitation of subsection (d) of that section.

(Secs. 4041(h), 7805, Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (90 Stat. 2487, 68A Stat. 917; (26 U.S.C. 4041 (h), 7805)).)

DONALD C. ALEXANDER,
*Commissioner of Internal Revenue.*

Approved: January 5, 1977.

CHARLES M. WALKER,
*Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.*

[FR Doc.77-1025 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

SUBCHAPTER F—PROCEDURE AND ADMINISTRATION

[T.D. 7453]

## PART 404—TEMPORARY REGULATIONS ON PROCEDURE AND ADMINISTRATION UNDER THE TAX REFORM ACT OF 1976

### Temporary Regulations Relating to Disclosures of Return Information by Internal Revenue Officers and Employees for Investigative Purposes

*Correction*

In FR Doc. 76-38384 appearing on page 56795 in the issue for Thursday, December 30, 1976, in the 8th line of § 404.6103 (k)(6)-1 (c) should have read "of 1954, including enforcement of any".

---

Title 29—Labor

## CHAPTER V—WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## PART 511—WAGE ORDER PROCEDURE FOR PUERTO RICO, THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND AMERICAN SAMOA

### Compensation of Committee Members

Pursuant to authority in section 5 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1062, as amended; 29 U.S.C. 205) and Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1950 (3 CFR 1949-53 Comp. p. 1004), I hereby amend 29 CFR 511.4 to read as set forth below. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the compensation of each member of an industry committee from $114 to $122 for each day spent in the work of the committee.

As this amendment concerns only a rule of agency practice, and is not substantive, notice of proposed rule making, opportunity for public participation, and delay in effective date are not required by 5 U.S.C. 553. It does not appear that such participation or delay would serve a useful purpose. Accordingly, this revision shall be effective immediately.

**§ 511.4 Compensation of committee members.**

Each member of an industry committee will be allowed a per diem of $122 for each day actually spent in the work of committee, and will, in addition, be reimbursed for necessary transportation and other expense incident to traveling in accordance with Standard Government Travel Regulations then in effect. All travel expenses will be paid on travel vouchers certified by the Administrator or his authorized representative. Any other necessary expenses which are incidental to the work of the committee may be incurred by the committee upon approval of, and shall be paid upon certification of, the Administrator or his authorized representative.

(Sec. 5, 52 Stat. 1062, as amended; 29 U.S.C. 205)

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 5th day of January, 1977.

RONALD J. JAMES,
*Administrator,*
*Wage and Hour Division.*

[FR Doc.77-963 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## CHAPTER XVII—OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## PART 1952—APPROVED STATE PLANS FOR ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STANDARDS

### Vermont; Approval of Plan Supplements

1. *Background.* Part 1953 of Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, prescribes procedures under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 667) (hereinafter called the Act) for review of changes and progress in the development and implementation of State plans which have been approved in accordance with Section 18(c) of the Act and 29 CFR Part 1902. On October 16, 1973, a notice was published in FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 28658) of the approval of the Vermont plan and the adoption of Subpart U of Part 1953 containing the decision and describing the plan. By letters dated January 30, July 1, and June 17, 1976, from Louis Lavin, Commissioner, Vermont Department of Labor and Industry to Edwin J. Riley, Jr., Assistant Regional Administrator for Federal and State Operations (Region I), the State of Vermont submitted evaluation change, State initiated change and developmental change supplements (See Subparts D, E and B of 29 CFR Part 1953) which fulfill the corresponding commitments in Vermont's developmental schedule, as outlined in 29 CFR 1952.273.

2. *Description of the supplements.* (a) Standards Advisory Council. In accordance with item (f) of the State's developmental schedule, the Vermont advisory committee was established in January 1974, and commenced operations on June 12, 1974. This committee, under the title Safety Advisory Council, functions in the capacity as both a Standards Board and an Advisory Board.

(b) Enforcement Program. The health and safety enforcement program in the State of Vermont, including enforcement of the State's occupational safety and health standards and regulations, was implemented on November 12, 1973.

(c) Review Board Operations. The Vermont Occupational Safety and Health Review Board has been in operation since October 1973, under rules and regulations formally promulgated on February 4, 1974, and approved on December 16, 1974 (39 FR 44201, December 23, 1974).

(d) Recordkeeping. Recordkeeping and reporting requirements were implemented for both the private and public sectors on November 12, 1973.

(e) Coordination Between State Safety and Health Divisions. Written procedures for coordination between Vermont's Division of Occupational Safety and Division of Occupational Health were formulated in June 1975, and revised in September 1975. These procedures include the courses of interaction between the divisions on such items as administrative policies, standard enforcement, and voluntary compliance.

(f) Corrections in Vermont Regulations. These amendments and changes to Vermont Occupational Safety and Health Administration Regulations 1903, 1904, and 1905 reflect minor clerical corrections.

3. *Location of the plan and its supplements for inspection and copying.* A copy of these supplements, along with the approved plan, may be inspected and copied during normal business hours at the following locations: Directorate of Federal Compliance and State Programs, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Room N-3608, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; Technical Data Center, Room N-3620, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; Office of the Regional Administrator, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Room 1804, John F. Kennedy Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203; Department of Labor and Industry, State Office Building, Montpelier, Vermont 05602.

4. *Public participation.* Under § 1953.2 (c) of this chapter, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health (hereinafter called the Assistant Secretary) may prescribe alternative procedures to expedite the review process or for any other good cause which may be consistent with applicable law. The Assistant Secretary finds that the Vermont plan supplements described above are consistent with commitments contained in the approved plan, and are substantially similar to parallel Federal Regulations and procedures. Accordingly, it is found that further public comment and notice is unnecessary.

5. *Decision.* After careful consideration, the Vermont plan supplements outlined above are hereby approved under 29 CFR Part 1953 of this Chapter. This decision incorporates the requirements of the Act and implementing regulations applicable to State plans generally. In addition, Subpart U of 29 CFR Part 1952 is hereby amended to reflect the completion of a developmental step.

Sections 1952.274(c)(d) are added as follows:

**§ 1952.274 Completed developmental steps.**

* * * * *

(c) In accordance with 29 CFR 1952.-273(f), the Vermont Standards Advisory Council was established in January 1974.

(d) In accordance with 29 CFR 1952.-273(g), the following developmental steps have been implemented.

(1) The health and safety enforcement program in the State of Vermont including enforcement of the State's occupational safety and health standards and regulations, was implemented on November 12, 1973.

(2) The Vermont Occupational Safety and Health Review Board has been in operation since October 1973, under rules and regulations formally promulgated on February 4, 1974, and approved on December 16, 1974 (39 FR 44201, December 23, 1974).

(3) Recordkeeping and reporting requirements, as approved on October 1, 1973, (38 FR 28658), were implemented for both the private and public sectors on November 12, 1973.

(4) Written procedures for coordination between Vermont's Division of Occupational Safety and Division of Occupational Health were formulated in June 1975, and revised in September 1975.

(Sec. 18, Pub. L. 91-596, 84 Stat. 1608 (29 U.S.C. 667))

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 4th day of January 1977.

MORTON CORN,
*Assistant Secretary of Labor.*

[FR Doc.77-958 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## Title 31—Money and Finance: Treasury

## SUBTITLE A—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

## PART 1—DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS

### Regulations Governing Fees; Correction

In the FEDERAL REGISTER of November 22, 1976, at page 51396, there was published the adoption, in final form, of amendments to the Department of the Treasury's regulations, at 31 CFR Part 1, governing fees for services rendered in connection with the disclosure of records. As so published the amendment to 31 CFR 1.6(g)(3)(i) lent itself to the interpretation that there would be no fee imposed for any record search unless such search consumed in excess of one hour. That was not intended. Rather it was and is intended that a search fee be imposed if the search consumes one hour or more. The language of 31 CFR 1.6(g)(3)(i) has therefore been corrected to make this clear. No other change has been made to the amendments published on November 22, 1976. Nevertheless, the entire text of such amendments are republished hereby for clarity.

§ 1.6 [Amended]

In consideration of the foregoing, the notice of the adoption of final rules published on November 22, 1976, is hereby corrected to read as follows:

1. 31 CFR 1.6(g)(1)(i) and (g)(3)(i) are amended to read as follows:

(g) * * *

(1) *Duplication.* (i) photocopies, per page up to 8½" by 14", $0.10 each, except that no charge will be imposed for copying 10 pages or less when less than one hour is consumed in locating the records requested.

* * * * *

(3) *Search services.* (i) The fee charged for services of personnel involved in locating records shall be $5.00 for each hour or fraction thereof, except that no charge shall be imposed for a search consuming less than one hour.

3. 31 CFR 1.6(g)(3)(ii) is amended by changing $3.50 to read $5.00.

The Department further finds that notice and public procedure concerning this correction is unnecessary under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), inasmuch as the correction of text is for clarification only and the overall effect of the amendments is to lower the cost of the public for services in connection with disclosure of records. Consequently, the correction and the amendments themselves are made effective immediately.

Dated: January 6, 1977.

HENRY C. STOCKELL, JR.,
*Acting General Counsel.*

[FR Doc.77-925 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## Title 38—Pensions, Bonuses, and Veterans' Relief

## CHAPTER I—VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

## PART 0—STANDARDS OF ETHICAL CONDUCT AND RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES

### Statement of Employment and Financial Interest Acceptance of Honorariums

As provided by Pub. L. 94-283 (90 Stat. 475), enacted May 11, 1976, the acceptance by an officer or employee of any branch of the Federal Government of any honorarium of more than $2,000 (excluding amounts accepted for actual travel and subsistence expenses for such person and his or her spouse or an aide to such person, and excluding amounts paid or incurred for any agents' fees or commissions) for any appearance, speech, or article, or honorariums aggregating more than $25,000 in any calendar year is prohibited. Section 0.735-12(c) is amended to extend this prohibition to provide that employees of the Veterans Administration may not engage in outside employment or other activities not compatible with full and proper discharge of their Government employment. Also amended is § 0.735-16(a) which gives special emphasis to the intent of Executive Order 11222 (30 FR 6469) that it is the responsibility of all employees to pay Federal, State or local taxes. The list of positions which requires incumbents of the positions to file statements of employment and financial interests is also amended. In addition editorial changes have been made to reflect agency policy of using precise terms denoting gender.

Compliance with the provisions of § 1.12 of this Chapter, as to notice of proposed regulatory development and delayed effective date, is unnecessary since the amendment is merely internal procedure and practice.

1. In § 0.735-12, paragraphs (b), (c), (d)(5), (e) and (f) are revised to read as follows:

§ 0.735-12 Outside employment, activity or compensation.

* * * * *

(b) An employee shall not receive any salary or anything of monetary value from a private source as compensation for his or her services to the Government. This does not apply to employees working without compensation. (18 U.S.C. 209)

(c) Employees are encouraged to engage in teaching, lecturing, and writing not prohibited by law, Executive Order 11222, part 735 of the Civil Service Regulations (5 CFR Part 735), the conduct regulations of this part or other agency policy. An employee shall not, however:

(1) Engage, with or without compensation, in teaching, lecturing or writing, including teaching, lecturing, or writing for the purpose of the special preparation of a person or class of persons for an examination of the Civil Service Commission or of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, that depends on information obtained as a result of his or her Government employment, except when that information has been made available to the general public or will be made available on request, or when the Administrator gives written authorization for the use of nonpublic information on the basis that the use is in the public interest;

(2) If he or she is a Presidential appointee covered by section 401(a) of Executive Order 11222, receive compensation, an honorarium, or anything of monetary value for any consultation, lecture, discussion, writing or appearance, the subject matter of which is devoted substantially to the responsibilities, programs, or operations of his or her agency, or which draws substantially on official data or ideas which have not become part of the body of public information.

(3) Accept any honorarium of more than $2,000 (excluding amounts accepted for actual travel and subsistence expenses for such person and his or her spouse or an aide to such person, and excluding amounts paid or incurred for any agents' fees or commissions) for any appearance, speech, or article, or honorariums aggregating more than $25,000 in any calendar year. (Pub. L. 94-283 (90 Stat. 475), Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1976)

(d) Employees are not prevented from:

* * * * *

(5) Taking part as a citizen of his or her community in civic, charitable, religious and other community efforts.

(e) Employees are encouraged to take part in service organization activities that do not conflict with, or give the appearance of conflicting with, Veterans Administration employment. Thus, an employee may hold an office or position at any level, provided that the combination of Veterans Administration position and service organization position cannot be construed as giving advantage to that organization, and if the employee agrees to disqualify himself or herself from taking part in any activities directed at the Veterans Administration, its policies, procedures or programs, or claims for benefits administered by the Veterans Administration. An employee may not act as a service officer preparing and presenting claims against the Government. Each employee is responsible for assuring that his or her intended actions are proper and, when in doubt, shall use the interpretation and advisory service established by § 0.735-3. As used in this paragraph, a service organization is an organization usually composed of exservicemen, which presents claims from veterans and their dependents for benefits under laws administered by the Veterans Administration.

(f) An employee who engages in any outside work while on sick leave is required to report that fact to his or her supervisor.

* * * * *

2. In § 0.735–13, paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) are revised to read as follows:

**§ 0.735–13 Financial interests.**

(a) An employee shall not have a direct or indirect financial interest that conflicts substantially, or appears to conflict substantially, with his or her Government duties and responsibilities.

(b) An employee shall not engage directly or indirectly, in a financial transaction as a result of, or primarily relying on, information obtained through his or her Government employment.

(c) An employee called upon to participate in an official capacity in any matter in which the employee, spouse, minor child, outside business associate, or person with whom he or she is negotiating for employment, has a financial interest, should disqualify himself or herself or make full disclosure of the financial interest to the appointing officer (appropriate personnel officer). The employee should take no further action pending receipt of a written determination that no conflict exists.

* * * * *

3. In § 0.735–14, the introductory portion of paragraph (a) preceding subparagraph (1) is revised to read as follows:

**§ 0.735–14 Use of Government property.**

* * * * *

(a) Each employee shall protect and conserve Government property, including equipment, supplies, and other property entrusted or issued to him or her.

* * * * *

4. In § 0.735–15, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

**§ 0.735–15 Disclosure or misuse of information.**

(a) An employee shall not, except as provided in § 0.735–12(c), directly or indirectly use for the purpose of furthering a private interest, or allow such use of, official information obtained through or in connection with his or her Government employment which has not been made available to the general public.

* * * * *

5. In § 0.735–16, paragraph (a)(1) is revised to read as follows:

**§ 0.735–16 Indebtedness.**

(a) An employee shall pay each just financial obligation in a proper and timely manner (E.O. 11222, May 8, 1965 and 5 CFR 735).

(1) For the purpose of this section, a "just financial obligation" means one acknowledged by the employee or reduced to judgment by a court or one imposed by law such as Federal, State, or local taxes, and "in a proper and timely manner" means in a manner which the Veterans Administration determines does not, under the circumstances, reflect adversely on the Government as his or her employer.

* * * * *

6. In § 0.735–73, paragraph (e) is revised to read as follows:

**§ 0.735–73 Employees required to submit statements.**

* * * * *

(e) The following positions, which are classified at GS–13 or above except as otherwise indicated, are considered to meet the criteria of paragraph (a), (b), (c) or (d) of this section and have not been excluded under § 0.735–74; all appointees to these positions must file statements of employment and financial interests, except where an individual position in an included category may be exempted under § 0.735–74(a):

LIST OF POSITIONS REQUIRING FILING OF STATEMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Deputy Administrator
Associate Deputy Administrator
Assistant Deputy Administrator
Chief Medical Director
Chief Benefits Director
General Counsel
Chief Data Management Director
Manager, Administrative Services
Controller
Assistant Administrator for Construction
Chairman and Members, Contract Appeals Board
Assistant Manager, Administrative Services, Central Office
Director, Central Office Building and Supply Service
Assistant Director, Central Office Building and Supply Service
Director, Central Office Publications Service
Assistant Director, Central Office Publications Service
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Construction
Director, Program Control and Analysis Staff (Construction)
Area Projects Directors (Construction)
Director of Architecture and Engineering
Director of Planning and Development (Construction)
Chairman, Architect-Engineer Evaluation Board (Construction)
Utilities Contracting Officer
Director, Research Staff (Construction)
All Service Directors in Office of Construction
Resident Engineers (Construction) with authority to issue change orders, GS–11 and above
Deputy Chief Data Management Director
Director, Field Operations Service (DDM)
Chief, Equipment Planning and Evaluation Division (DDM)
Center Directors, Department of Data Management
Deputy Chief Medical Director
Executive Assistant to Deputy Chief Medical Director
Assistant Chief Medical Director for Policy and Planning
Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director for Operations
Deputy for Operations
Executive Assistant to Chief Medical Director
Director, Operations Review and Analysis Staff
Director, Resources Staff
Director, Regionalization and Sharing Staff
Director, Management Support and Facilities Staff
Director, Planning Service
Assistant Chief Medical Director for Extended Care
Director, Health Services Research and Development Service
Deputy Director, Health Services Research and Development Service
Associate Directors, Health Services Research and Development Service
Deputy Assistant Chief Medical Director for Academic Affairs
Deputy Assistant Chief Medical Director for Extended Care
Assistant Chief Medical Director for Professional Services
Deputy Assistant Chief Medical Director for Clinical Services
Deputy Assistant Chief Medical Director for Clinical Support Services
Director, Dietetic Service
Director, Medical Service
Director, Nuclear Medicine Service
Director, Nursing Service
Director, Pathology Service
Director, Pharmacy Service
Director, Rehabilitation Medicine Service
Director, Mental Health and Behavioral Sciences Service
Deputy Director (Prosthetics Division), Surgical Service
Director, Radiology Service
Director, Surgical Service
Assistant Chief Medical Director for Administration
Director, Spinal Cord Injury Service
Director, Building Management Service
Director, Engineering Service
Director, Manpower Grants Service
Assistant Chief Medical Director for Academic Affairs
Assistant Chief Medical Director for Dentistry
Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Development
Director, Veterans Canteen Service
Deputy Director, Veterans Canteen Service
Field Directors, Veterans Canteen Service
Supervisory Buyers, Merchandising Division, Veterans Canteen Service
Director, Supply Service
Supply Management Officers (Class Title) GS–13 and up
Supply Management Representatives (Class Title) GS–13 and up
Contract Specialists (Class Title) GS–13 and up
Chiefs, Supply Services, All Field Stations, GS–11 and above
Chiefs, Business Services Divisions, DM&S Field Stations, GS–10 and above
Directors of Field Stations, DM&S
Assistant Directors of Field Stations, DM&S
Chiefs of Staff, DM&S Field Stations
Deputy Chief Benefits Director
Director, Education and Rehabilitation Service
Director, Compensation and Pension Service
Director, Loan Guaranty Service
Deputy Director, Loan Guaranty Service
Field Directors, Area Field Offices
Directors, DVB Field Stations
Assistant Director for Insurance, VAC, Philadelphia
Assistant Directors, DVB Centers
Loan Guaranty Officers, Field Stations
Assistant Loan Guaranty Officers, Field Stations
Chiefs, Construction and Valuation Sections (Field Stations), GS–11 and above
Chiefs, Loan Processing Sections (Field Stations), GS–11 and above
Chiefs, Property Management Sections (Field Stations), GS–11 and above
Director, National Cemetery System
Executive Assistant to the Director, National Cemetery System.
Deputy Director, National Cemetery System.
Director, Headstone Service.

Director, Cemetery Service.
Chief, Contract and Special Audit Division (Planning and Evaluation).
Director, Contract Compliance Service.
Deputy Director, Contract Compliance Service.
Supervisory Equal Opportunity Specialists (Contract Compliance).
Equal Opportunity Specialists (Contract Compliance).

• • • • •

7. In § 0.735–75, paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

**§ 0.735–75 Time and place for submission of employees' statements; reviewing officials.**

An employee required to submit a statement of employment and financial interests under this part shall submit that statement to the Reviewing Official: Station head for field positions; department, staff office, or National Cemetery System head, as appropriate, for all other positions (including station heads); Administrator for the heads of departments, staff offices, and National Cemetery System, and all positions in the Office of the Administrator. The statement shall be submitted not later than:

• • • • •

(b) Thirty days after his or her entrance on duty, but not earlier than 90 days after the effective date, if appointed after that effective date.

8. Sections 0.735–78 and 0.735–79 are revised to read as follows:

**§ 0.735–78 Information not known by employees.**

If any information required to be included on a statement of employment and financial interests or supplementary statement, including holdings placed in trust, is not known to the employee but is known to another person, the employee shall request that other person to submit information in his or her behalf.

**§ 0.735–79 Information not required.**

An employee is not required to submit in a statement of employment and financial interests or supplementary statement any information relating to the employee's connection with, or interest in, a professional society or a charitable, religious, social, fraternal, recreational, public service, civic, or political organization or a similar organization not conducted as a business enterprise. For the purpose of this section, educational and other institutions doing research and developmental or related work involving grants of money from or contracts with the Government are deemed "business enterprises," and an employee shall include them in his or her statement of employment and financial interests or supplementary statement.

9. In § 0.735–81, paragraphs (a), (c) and (d) are revised to read as follows:

**§ 0.735–81 Reviewing statements of interest.**

(a) Whenever the reviewing official, with the aid of the deputy counselor, determines from the statement of employment and financial interests, supplement, or other information that there may be a conflict of interest or appearance of conflict of interest between the interest of an employee or special Government employee and the performance of his or her services for the Government, he or she shall disclose the existence of the possible conflict to the selecting official for the position involved.

• • • • •

(c) Where the reviewing official thereafter decides that no conflict-of-interest problem exists, the matter will be documented and considered settled. Where the reviewing official finds that such a problem does exist, he or she shall refer the information to the deputy counselor (legal) having jurisdiction.

(d) Where the deputy counselor (legal) decides that no conflict-of-interest problem exists, the matter will be documented and considered settled. Otherwise, he or she shall refer the information to the Administrator for final decision and remedial action, through the Counselor for the Veterans Administration, furnishing a copy to the department concerned.

(E.O. 11222 of May 8, 1965, 30 FR 6469, 3 CFR, 1965 Supp.; 5 CFR 735.104.)

These amendments were approved by the Civil Service Commission on November 9, 1976, and are effective January 11, 1977.

Approved: January 5, 1977.

By direction of the Administrator.

ODELL W. VAUGHN,
*Deputy Administrator.*

[FR Doc.77-907 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## PART 17—MEDICAL

### STATE HOME FACILITIES FOR FURNISHING NURSING HOME CARE

### Facilities for Veterans: Maximum Number of Beds

Appendix A is revised to establish the maximum number of beds allowed by 38 U.S.C. 5034(1) to provide adequate nursing home care to veterans residing in each State.

Compliance with the provisions of § 1.12 of this chapter, as to notice of proposed regulatory development and delayed effective date, is unnecessary in this instance and would serve no useful purpose. This amendment merely adjusts the bed quotas in each State to reflect the current veteran population.

Immediately following § 17.176, Appendix A is revised to read as follows:

APPENDIX A (SEE § 17.171)

STATE HOME FACILITIES FOR FURNISHING NURSING HOME CARE

The maximum number of beds, as required by 38 U.S.C. 5034(1), to provide adequate nursing home care to veterans residing in each State is established as follows:

| State | Veteran population[1] | Number of beds |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 421,000 | 1,053 |
| Alaska | 41,000 | 103 |
| Arizona | 300,000 | 750 |
| Arkansas | 261,000 | 653 |
| California | 3,267,000 | 8,168 |
| Colorado | 357,000 | 893 |
| Connecticut | 461,000 | 1,153 |
| Delaware | 79,000 | 198 |
| District of Columbia | 104,000 | 260 |
| Florida | 1,192,000 | 2,980 |
| Georgia | 623,000 | 1,558 |
| Hawaii | 94,000 | 235 |
| Idaho | 101,000 | 253 |
| Illinois | 1,557,000 | 3,893 |
| Indiana | 722,000 | 1,805 |
| Iowa | 372,000 | 930 |
| Kansas | 309,000 | 773 |
| Kentucky | 409,000 | 1,023 |
| Louisiana | 449,000 | 1,123 |
| Maine | 147,000 | 368 |
| Maryland | 615,000 | 1,538 |
| Massachusetts | 868,000 | 2,170 |
| Michigan | 1,188,000 | 2,970 |
| Minnesota | 549,000 | 1,373 |
| Mississippi | 244,000 | 610 |
| Missouri | 698,000 | 1,745 |
| Montana | 101,000 | 253 |
| Nebraska | 198,000 | 495 |
| Nevada | 92,000 | 230 |
| New Hampshire | 124,000 | 310 |
| New Jersey | 1,099,000 | 2,748 |
| New Mexico | 136,000 | 340 |
| New York | 2,513,000 | 6,283 |
| North Carolina | 616,000 | 1,540 |
| North Dakota | 63,000 | 158 |
| Ohio | 1,493,000 | 3,733 |
| Oklahoma | 397,000 | 993 |
| Oregon | 366,000 | 915 |
| Pennsylvania | 1,752,000 | 4,380 |
| Rhode Island | 151,000 | 378 |
| South Carolina | 325,000 | 813 |
| South Dakota | 78,000 | 195 |
| Tennessee | 532,000 | 1,330 |
| Texas | 1,611,000 | 4,028 |
| Utah | 145,000 | 363 |
| Vermont | 63,000 | 158 |
| Virginia | 649,000 | 1,623 |
| Washington | 589,000 | 1,473 |
| West Virginia | 235,000 | 588 |
| Wisconsin | 579,000 | 1,448 |
| Wyoming | 47,000 | 118 |

[1] Estimate as of June 30, 1976.

SOURCE: Reports and Statistics Service, Office of the VA Controller. (Based on last available Bureau of the Census data.)

(72 Stat. 1114 (38 U.S.C. 210)).

This VA Regulation is effective January 3, 1977.

Approved: January 3, 1977.

By direction of the Administrator.

ODELL W. VAUGHN,
*Deputy Administrator.*

[FR Doc.77-721 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## Title 40—Protection of Environment

### CHAPTER I—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### SUBCHAPTER N—EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND GUIDELINES

[FRL 668-7]

### PART 455—PESTICIDE CHEMICALS MANUFACTURING POINT SOURCE CATEGORY

### Extension of Comment Period and Notice of Availability

On November 1, 1976 the Environmental Protection Agency published a notice of interim final rulemaking (41 FR 48088) establishing effluent limitations and guidelines for the pesticide chemicals manufacturing point source category, based upon use of best practicable control technology currently available.

The due date for comments provided in the notice was December 30, 1976.

The Agency anticipated that the document entitled "Development Document for Interim Final Effluent Limitations Guidelines for the Pesticide Chemicals Manufacturing Point Source Category," which contains information on the analyses undertaken in support of the regulations, would be available to the public throughout the comment period. Production difficulties delayed the availability of this document. Copies of the document are now available and have been forwarded to those persons having submitted written requests to the Environmental Protection Agency. A limited number of additional copies are available for distribution from the Environmental Protection Agency, Effluent Guidelines Division, Washington, D.C. 20460, Attention: Distribution Officer, WH-552.

Accordingly, the date for submission of comments is hereby extended to February 10, 1977.

Dated: December 30, 1976.

ANDREW W. BREIDENBACH,
*Assistant Administrator for Water and Hazardous Materials.*

[FR Doc.77-903 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## Title 41—Public Contracts and Property Management

## CHAPTER 101—FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

### SUBCHAPTER E—SUPPLY AND PROCUREMENT

[FPMR Amendment E-201]

### PART 101-28—STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION

### Warehousing and Self-Service Stores

This regulation provides current policy and procedures concerning efficient management of warehousing activities and establishment of self-service stores.

The table of contents for Part 101-28 is amended by deleting §§ 101-28.100 through 101-28.101-22, 101-28.204 through 101-28.208, 101-28.305-3, 101-28.305-4, and 101-28.308 and by adding or revising the following entries:



The text of Subpart 101-28.1 is deleted and the subpart is reserved as follows:

### Subpart 101-28.1 [Reserved]

### Subpart 101-28.2—Interagency Cross-Servicing in Storage Activities

1. Section 101-28.201(b) is revised as follows:

**§ 101-28.201 Applicability.**

* * * * *

(b) The provisions of this Subpart 101-28.2 do not apply to ocean terminals, Government storage activities financed under industrial funds, activities concerned with the storage and handling of bulk fuels (petroleum products), and storage functions performed by GSA for the Federal Preparedness Agency.

2. Sections 101-28.202 and 101-28.202-1 through 101-28.202-4 are revised as follows:

**§ 101-28.202 GSA/DOD Cross-Servicing Agreement.**

An agreement between GSA and DOD has established procedures to be followed in the cross-servicing of storage and warehousing services between Government agencies. Copies of the agreement, containing a listing of minimum services to be provided, responsibilities of agencies operating storage facilities, responsibilities of requesting agencies, and agency contact points to determine storage availability, may be obtained from the General Services Administration (FFN), Washington, D.C. 20406.

**§ 101-28.202-1 Request for services.**

Requests for storage and warehousing services shall be in accordance with the procedures set forth in the GSA/DOD cross-servicing agreement. Arrangements incident to the furnishing of services, specific limitations, terms, and conditions shall be agreed to directly by the activities concerned.

**§ 101-28.202-2 Cancellation of cross-servicing arrangements.**

(a) Accepted requests may be canceled by the requesting agency prior to delivery of supplies, material, and equipment to the storage activity when logistical developments make cancellation necessary or cancellation is in the best interest of the Government. The agency which accepted the request shall be informed of the cancellation in writing as soon as possible.

(b) Cancellation of arrangements in facilities to be inactivated or disposed of by an operating agency may be made as provided for in the GSA/DOD agreement. Also, after supplies, material, and equipment have been received at a storage activity, cancellation may be made when unforeseen emergencies arise which justify such cancellation. Advice of these necessary cancellations shall be in writing to the agency owning the material sufficiently in advance to allow the owning agency the maximum amount of time to make other arrangements for their property.

(c) When a facility in which cross-servicing is being accomplished is to be transferred from an operating agency to another agency, the operating agency shall inform the agency owning the property at least 90 days before the transfer. The agency owning the property shall negotiate with the agency gaining the facility for continued cross-servicing of the property at the facility. The agency gaining the facility shall continue the cross-servicing arrangements unless they are contrary to the best interest of the Government.

**§ 101-28.202-3 Cross-servicing rates.**

Normally, charges for services rendered will be based upon the standard rates established by the agency for internal use. However, special rates may be negotiated to cover actual or estimated costs for large, bulk lots of material when the applicable rates appear inequitable, subject to the approval of the appropriate program official for the civilian agency, and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I&L) when DOD is involved.

**§ 101-28.202-4 Reimbursement for services.**

Reimbursement for services rendered shall be made promptly after receipt of billing. The frequency for billing and reimbursement shall be established by the activity providing warehousing and storage services; however, billing and reimbursement shall be made not less frequently than quarterly nor more frequently than monthly.

3. Section 101-28.203 is revised as follows:

**§ 101-28.203 Definitions.**

As used in this Subpart 101-28.2, the following term shall apply.

**§ 101-28.203-1 Government storage activity.**

A Government activity or facility utilized for the receipt, storage, and issue of supplies, materials, and equipment, including storage of reserve or excess stocks or intransit storage. The activity may be either Government owned or leased, and it may be either Government operated or contract operated.

**§ 101-28.203-2 [Reserved]**

**§ 101-28.203-3 [Reserved]**

**§ 101-28.203-4 Contact point.**

The point within the headquarters of a military service or civilian agency to which requests should be forwarded. Coordination necessary with various organizational elements within a military service or civilian agency shall be accomplished by the contact point.

4. Sections 101-28.204 through 101-28.208 are deleted.

Subpart 101-28.3 is revised to read as follows:

### Subpart 101-28.3—Self-Service Stores

**§ 101-28.300 Scope of subpart.**

This subpart provides policy, procedures, and guidelines for the establishment of self-service stores and for Federal agency participation in the services provided.

**§ 101-28.301 Applicability.**

This subpart is applicable to all executive agencies assigned space in a building for which GSA has responsibility for its operation and maintenance in addition to space management.

§ 101–28.302 Self-service stores.

Self-service stores are established by the General Services Administration and provide expeditious and convenient distribution facilities in support of Federal agencies for common-use administrative, custodial, and maintenance supplies, forms, and other selected items. Modern self-service merchandising techniques, with simplified billing methods, are utilized for the benefit of using activities. Limited mail-order and buying service and advice on methods and sources of items not stocked in the self-service stores are provided at these outlets upon request.

§ 101–28.303 Use of self-service stores.

Self-service stores are immediate sources of supply for executive agencies which are occupants of buildings in which the stores are located and are available for use by other Federal activities in the vicinity. Supplies purchased in these stores comply with requirements for use of GSA sources set forth in § 101–26.301. Articles stocked in self-service stores are for official use only and may be purchased only by holders of valid shopping plates. Agencies and activities to which GSA has issued shopping plates shall be responsible for the acquisition, control, and use of the items purchased to ensure that these purchases are used in the best interest of the Government.

§ 101–28.304 Establishment of self-service stores.

GSA, in conjunction with other appropriate agencies, will conduct studies to determine the feasibility of activating a self-service store and the extent of services required. The studies shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of § 101–28.305.

§ 101–28.305 Feasibility studies.

§ 101–28.305–1 Initiation and scheduling.

GSA may initiate feasibility studies to determine whether self-service stores should be established in existing or proposed new Federal buildings or leased space or in a complex of Federal and/or leased buildings. Studies will be based on the size and type of agencies and the number of Federal personnel occupying or scheduled to occupy the space, and the total Federal population in the immediate vicinity, under the provisions of § 101–5.104. All studies will be scheduled by the appropriate GSA Regional Administrator and coordinated with potential user activities in the area of the proposed location.

§ 101–28.305–2 Findings and determinations.

(a) The study data, including any objections or limitations submitted or expressed by the agencies involved in the study, will be accumulated, analyzed, and summarized by the GSA regional office and submitted with findings and recommendations to the Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, for transmittal to the Administrator of General Services. In accordance with the provisions § 101–5.104–7, the Administrator will determine whether the establishment of the self-service store meets the criteria for increased economy, efficiency, and service of the agencies to be served.

(b) The appropriate Regional Administrator will inform the affected agencies of the Administrator's decision. If approval is announced, additional information will be furnished, as appropriate, including:

(1) Location of the proposed self-service store and approximate date of activation;

(2) Categories of items to be stocked or otherwise made available;

(3) Services which will be available, including technical supply assistance and procurement service; and

(4) Instructions for obtaining supply service.

§ 101–28.306 Consolidation of functions.

After it has been determined to establish a self-service store, the appropriate GSA regional office will:

(a) Arrange for transfer to GSA, without reimbursement, all available equipment which will become excess by reason of the establishment of the self-service store; dispose of any equipment transferred which is not needed; and provide, when necessary, for transfer of inventory.

(b) Not assign space in a building for the operation of a supply outlet which would duplicate the functions and services performed in connection with items handled through a self-service store.

(c) Activate the self-service store in sufficient time to preclude interruption of supply services to agencies.

§ 101–28.307 Responsibility for operation.

The appropriate GSA region will be responsible for the operation of the self-service store.

(Sec. 205(c), 63 Stat. 390; 40 U.S.C. 486(c))

NOTE.—The General Services Administration has determined that this document does not contain a major proposal requiring preparation of an Inflation Impact Statement under Executive Order 11821 and OMB Circular A–107.

Effective date. January 11, 1977.

Dated: January 4, 1977.

JACK ECKERD,
*Administrator of General Services.*

[FR Doc.77–826 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

---

## Title 49—Transportation

## CHAPTER II—FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Docket No. RSOR–3; Notice 5]

## PART 218—RAILROAD OPERATING RULES

### Blue Signal Protection of Workmen

On November 2, 1976, a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 48126) stating that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) was considering several amendments to the blue signal protection provisions of Part 218. The amendments were intended to clarify the existing rules with respect to certain questions raised as to the applicability of the standards to train and yard crews and to operations within locomotive servicing facilities and car repair areas. In addition, the NPRM proposed specific regulatory language to respond to the provision of the Federal Railroad Safety Authorization Act of 1976 (Pub. L. 94–348) which required the Secretary to issue regulations to assure that all manually operated switches providing access to tracks on which railroad employees are working on, under, or between rolling equipment will be lined against movement and secured with an effective locking device. Interested persons were invited to participate in this rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments before December 6, 1976, and by appearing at a public hearing on November 23, 1976 in Washington, D.C., and a number of comments were received.

One commenter raised a preliminary point taking issue with FRA's determination that the portion of the proposed rules having to do with the locking of manually operated switches did not require an evaluation of the regulatory impact in accordance with the policies of the Secretary of Transportation since that provision was required by statute. This commenter expressed the opinion that "the only instance in which implementary rulemaking proceedings do not require evaluation of regulatory impact is that rare case wherein Congress leaves no discretion." The FRA does not agree entirely with this narrow interpretation of the policies established by the Secretary. The purpose of the regulatory impact evaluation required by the Secretary's policies is to assure that all of the potential costs and benefits of a proposed rulemaking action are adequately assessed and considered by the rulemaking entity in an effort to improve the effectiveness of the proposed regulation and minimize its impact upon affected parties. In this instance, where a statute requires the issuance of a rule on a particular matter, the Secretary does not have the discretion to withhold rulemaking action even if it were shown that the possible benefits of the rule did not outweigh its potential costs. The result or impact of the rulemaking at hand is in effect prescribed in legislation while FRA is granted discretion only as to how the prescribed result of the rule might be most reasonably achieved through regulation. Accordingly, the comprehensive regulatory impact evaluation normally required of all proposed rulemaking actions is not required by the Secretary's policies in this case. FRA has consulted with the Office of the Secretary on this matter and received concurrence in this interpretation.

Nevertheless, FRA feels, and the Office of the Secretary concurs, that an appropriate application of the Secretary's poli-

cies in this instance is to assess the relative costs of alternative means of achieving the results of the statutorily mandated rules in an effort to develop an effective and reasonable implementing regulation. Therefore, in the rulemaking action at hand, FRA has analyzed the costs of alternative regulations it might adopt and believes that this final rule does not impose any unreasonable costs in excess of those necessary to comply with the minimum requirements of the statute.

Another commenter criticized FRA for not having evaluated the inflationary impact of the switch locking requirements and stated that it believed the provision requiring all manually operated switches to be locked whenever workmen were working on, under or between rolling equipment was extreme and unjustified. DOT Order 2050.4 definies what actions are to be considered major proposals for purposes of determining whether an inflationary impact analysis must be undertaken pursuant to Executive Order 11821. For purposes of regulations which impact upon a single industry, the threshold level at which a particular action is to be considered "major" is an action which will result in increased expenses of $50 million in one year, or $75 million in any two consecutive years. The FRA's analysis of the costs of this rule shows that the impact on the industry will not reach this threshold level.

The same commenter also stated that the switch locking requirement could not be justified in view of its operating experience. Since the switch locking requirement is prescribed by statute, the FRA does not have the discretion to make an independent analysis as to whether or not the railroad industry's accident experience provides adequate justification for the proposed rule. Rather, the agency must issue a rule which complies with the statutory mandate. Through the provisions permitting the use of locked derails as an alternative to a locked manually operated switch, the FRA believes that the proposed rules provide the broadest degree of flexibility which is possible within the meaning and intent of the statutory requirement. This flexibility should alleviate the more burdensome or costly impacts.

Another general comment submitted in response to the NPRM expressed concern over the relationship between the blue signal provisions of Part 218 and OSHA and hazardous materials regulations which also require the display of a blue signal when railroad cars are spotted for loading or unloading at an industrial site. This commenter stated that operating difficulties would result because FRA regulations prohibit movement onto a track containing blue flag equipment. A carrier would be required to locate a qualified employee of the industrial customer in order to remove the blue signals before the track could be switched. This commenter requested clarification which would allow cars to be spotted on a track occupied by equipment under industrial blue flag protection, provided such cars are stopped short of the protected equipment.

The FRA has reviewed the OSHA and hazardous materials regulations and discovered that the scope of the problem is restricted. OSHA regulations pertaining to a blue flag requirement presently apply to pulp, paper and paperboard mills only. Hazardous materials regulations require application of a blue flag only during the loading and unloading operation while the connection is engaged.

The provisions of the blue flag rules included in Part 218 were intended to apply to blue flags applied by railroad employees for the protection of railroad employees. The blue flags to which this commenter referred are applied by inrailroad employees. While the FRA recognizes that these operations may require a greater degree of coordination between the railroad and the industrial customer, safety requires some precaution for the protection of the industrial employees who are working around the equipment. If the switch which provides access to the industrial siding is not locked and blue flagged, the train crew can assume that the track is clear and may enter the siding. Once on the siding, if it is discovered that there is equipment under blue flag protection on the same track, the train crew may not set out cars so as to cover up the blue flag and must remove them from the siding if the blue flag cannot be removed. Because these industrial blue flags are required to be displayed under limited conditions—during loading and unloading or on certain lading—FRA does not believe that these standard precautions will prove unnecessarily burdensome.

A final general comment on the existing blue flag regulation as well as the proposed changes included in the NPRM was submitted by a terminal operator who alleged that the existing and proposed rules would totally disrupt operations causing long delays to trains and inefficient utilization of its facility. This commenter expressed the belief that blue signal protection was designed primarily for freight operations and did not take into consideration the switching and servicing of occupied passenger equipment.

The blue signal regulation issued by FRA, and the amendments proposed in the NPRM, were intended to provide protection to railroad employees who are required to work on, under or between rolling equipment. An employee may be just as severely injured by the unexpected movement of passenger equipment as he would be by a similar movement of freight equipment. Therefore, the FRA does not believe there is a reasonable basis to exempt passenger terminal operations from the scope of this rule.

This particular commenter has also filed a petition for waiver of the regulatory provisions governing certain aspects of its operation. The FRA believes that this is the appropriate method by which to address the special problems of an individual carrier or a particular operation. Through the waiver procedure, the facts can be established, the safety of alternate procedures can be evaluated and specific conditions can be designed to assure the safety of railroad workmen on a case by case basis.

With respect to the proposed amendment of the definition of "workmen" contained in § 218.5, one commenter expressed the opinion that the extension of blue flag protection to train and yard crews under certain conditions would be unduly restrictive. On the other hand, several commenters complained of abuse of the original exclusion by the reassignment of work from mechanical department employees, who must be provided protection, to train and yard crews who were exempted. Through investigation of complaints, the FRA found that such abuses were occurring. The FRA has, therefore, concluded that the additional amplification provided in the NPRM was necessary. Where train or yard crew personnel are assigned to inspect, test, repair or service equipment which is not part of the train or yard movement to which they are assigned as operating crew members, the exemption will not apply and protection in accordance with Part 218 must be provided.

Two commenters expressed concern with the definition of an "effective locking device" which was proposed in § 218.5 (d). One commenter suggested that it may not be technically possible to develop a "tamper-proof" locking device, and that it would be more appropriate and consistent for FRA to require a "tamper-resistant" device, as well as a "vandal resistant" one as was proposed in paragraph (d)(1). The FRA's intent was to assure that the device could not be inadvertently or easily removed by unauthorized personnel, be they railroad employees or non-railroad employees. The use of the consistent language suggested by the commenter will convey this intent, and FRA has decided to make such a change. Therefore, the "effective locking device" must be both vandal resistant and tamper resistant.

One commenter disagreed with the interpretation which FRA has made of the statutory requirement for an "effective locking device". This commenter alleged that the congressional intent to provide an "effective locking device" would be satisfied by the existence of an operating rule prohibiting the movement of the switch. The FRA cannot agree with this commenter's interpretation of the congressional intent.

Operating rules prohibiting unauthorized personnel from moving a switch which is protected by a blue flag are presently in effect, and Congress was well aware of the recent issuance of FRA's blue flag regulation. The inclusion of this "locking" requirement in the statute is clear evidence that Congress believed some additional protection is necessary. The FRA believes that the Congress intended to mandate the use of a device which would secure the switch in a position that assures the safety of the employees working on the equipment. In

drafting the proposed rules, the FRA intended to require the use of the padlock type of device which has long been used by the industry, with specific locks for various crafts or uses. Such locks will assure the type of security intended by Congress and are of sufficient strength and intricacy so as to prevent vandalism by non-railroad employees or tampering by railroad employees of crafts other than the craft which routinely applies the lock.

This commenter also suggested that FRA should permit a test period during which non-padlock switch "locking" devices could be used as an option. At the end of such a test, FRA could then decide whether such devices could be accepted as an alternative to the switchstand padlock. The FRA believes that the proposed provision is the minimum which would comply with the statutory mandate since the traditional switch lock will assure that the switch is secured. This provision must be issued within 180 days of the enactment of the statute. Under the authority of the Federal Railroad Safety Act, FRA could institute a "test" program to determine the effectiveness of other devices which we believe might possibly meet the minimum statutory standard. Such a test would have to be conducted in a controlled environment and under controlled conditions. The FRA is not, at this point, prepared to undertake such a test, since the use of the switch padlock does not depart from already established and recognized industry practice.

Section 218.23(a) as proposed provided that rolling equipment could not be placed on a track where it would block or reduce the view of the blue signal. One exception was specifically provided for movements into a locomotive servicing area in compliance with § 218.25(f). One commenter suggested that an additional exception should be clearly stated. This commenter properly interpreted the proposed rules as permitting the use of a derail in accordance with § 218.25(b) to divide a long track into two work areas. Without a specific provision, this commenter questioned whether equipment could be placed on such a track from the opposite ends, since any such movement would block or reduce the view of the blue flag displayed at the locked derail. It was the intent of FRA to permit this type of operation, and § 218.23(a) has been modified to clearly state this intent. A long track may thus be used as two separate work areas, provided the derail is employed as required in § 218.25(b).

Another commenter suggested that an exception be included in the provisions of § 218.25(a) which refer to the display of blue signals on track other than humpyard track. This commenter felt that provision should be made to enable a train to be worked on the main line in a terminal when there was a change of crew. In addition, he felt the rule should permit the set out of a block of cars and the pick up of a block of cars without the use of blue signals. Activities involved in each of these operations may include inspection and testing of the equipment involved. These are specific activities which were intended to be included within the protection of the blue signals when workmen are required to be positioned on, under, or between the equipment where there is the danger of personal injury should the equipment be moved. Any exclusion such as that suggested would significantly weaken the effectiveness of the rule in protecting workmen who are exposed to this danger of personal injury. Therefore, FRA does not believe such a change is in the interest of safety and will not make the suggested amendment.

One commenter took exception to the the proposed language of § 218.25(a) which would require the blue signal to be displayed at the entrance to the track, rather than at the ends of the equipment. The existing blue signal regulations (49 CFR 218.25(a)) provide that the blue signal can be displayed either at each end of the equipment or at the entrance to the track. Several questions have been raised as to the proper display of signals. The FRA believes that this wording clarifies the original version and removes any ambiguity as to the proper location for the signal. With the signal at the entrance to the track, the likelihood of a blind movement onto a track occupied by workmen will be greatly reduced, thus further assuring the effectiveness of the regulation.

A commenter complained about what was characterized as the "redundancy" of the proposed rule in that both a lock and a blue signal are required at the manually operated switch. This provision of the regulation was intended to provide a visible warning of and locked protection for the workmen directly assigned to inspect, test, repair or service railroad rolling equipment. While the FRA recognizes that this commenter has identified a valid issue in relation to the redundancy of the lock and signal requirements, it is not an issue which was appropriately focused in this proceeding so as to provide adequate opportunity for public comment. Therefore, FRA believes any change at this time would be beyond the scope of this proceeding. We will, however, initiate a new proceeding in the immediate future to address this issue directly.

One commenter requested a clarification of the preamble discussion concerning the locking of manual switches to divert movements away from the ends of equipment under blue signal protection. The discussion referred to an exception for crossover switches which are occupied by equipment under blue signal protection. It is the intent of the regulation that any crossover switch which is occupied by rolling equipment which is under blue signal protection, as well as the next switch on the crossover providing access to the track, must be lined against movement through the crossover and the unoccupied switch be effectively locked. In this particular situation, however, a blue signal need not be displayed at either end of the crossover. Such a procedure will avoid taking multiple tracks out of service when only a single track is occupied by workmen, and at the same time will not jeopardize the safety of the workmen involved. A new § 218.23(d) has been added to clearly state this exception to the general rule for the display of blue signals.

Finally, a commenter suggested that the proposed § 218.25(b) provision for the use of a locked derail in lieu of a locked switch be revised to require that the derail be located at least 150 feet from the end of the closest car under blue signal protection. Such a provision would reduce the likelihood of collision with another car or cars if a derail should occur. The FRA believes that this suggestion has merit since 150 feet will provide a buffer zone and, in the event of a movement through the derail, it would allow sufficient distance for the movement to be stopped short of the protected equipment. The appropriate change has been made in § 218.25(b).

Due to the addition of a new provision in § 218.27(a) a previous crossreference located in § 218.29, remotely-controlled switches, was discovered to be inaccurate. Therefore, this final rule includes a revision of § 218.29(a) so as to refer properly to § 218.27(a)(4) rather than § 218.27(a)(3). In addition, this subsection includes a requirement that remotely-controlled switches governing movement to a track on which workmen are working be locked with an "effective locking device". FRA does not intend to apply the definition of an "effective locking device" in § 218.5(d) to devices used to secure remotely-controlled switches, and has amended the definition to clearly limit its application to manually operated switches and derails.

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 218 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

1. By revising § 218.5(a) and adding a new (d) to read as follows:

**§ 218.5 Definitions.**

As used in this part—

(a) "Workmen" means railroad employees assigned to inspect, test, repair or service railroad rolling equipment, or their components including brake systems. Train and yard crews are excluded, except when assigned to perform such work on railroad rolling equipment that is not part of the train or yard movement they have been called to operate.

* * * * *

(d) "Effective locking device" when used in relation to a manually operated switch or a derail means one which is:

(1) Vandal resistant;

(2) Tamper resistant; and

(3) Locked and unlocked only by the class or craft of employee applying the lock.

2. By revising § 218.23 (a) and (b) and adding a new (d) to read as follows:

**§ 218.23 Blue Signal Display.**

(a) A blue signal displayed in accordance with § 218.27 signifies that workmen are on, under, or between the equip-

ment and that it may not be coupled to nor moved except as provided for in § 218.25 (f), (g) and (h). Other rolling equipment may not be placed on the same track so as to block or reduce the view of the blue signals except as provided in § 218.25(f) or when a derail is used in compliance with § 218.25(b) to divide a track into separate work areas.

(b) A blue signal displayed at one or both ends of a track signifies that workmen are on, under, or between rolling equipment on the track and that other rolling equipment may not enter the track, except as provided for in § 218.25(f).

* * * * *

(d) Whenever one switch of a crossover is located beneath rolling equipment which is under blue signal protection as provided in § 218.25 or § 218.27, the next switch on the crossover providing access to the track must be lined and locked against movement to that crossover. A blue signal need not be displayed at either crossover switch.

3. By revising § 218.25(a), redesignating (b) and (c) as (c) and (d), and adding new (b), (e), (f), (g), and (h) to read as follows:

**§ 218.25 Workmen on a track other than a hump-yard track.**

(a) When workmen are on, under, or between rolling equipment on a track other than a hump-yard track, a blue signal must be displayed at each entrance to the track and each manually operated switch, including any crossover switch, providing aceess to the track on which such equipment is located must be lined against movement to that track and secured by an effective locking device which may not be removed except by the class or craft of workmen performing the work.

(b) A derail capable of restricting access to that portion of a track on which such equipment is located will fulfill the requirements of a manually operated switch in compliance with this section when positioned at least 150 feet from the end of the rolling equipment to be protected by the blue signal and when locked with an effective locking device in a derailing position. A blue signal must be displayed at each such derail.

* * * * *

(e) Workmen may work on, under, or between a locomotive on designated locomotive servicing area tracks under the exclusive control of mechanical forces after—

(1) The manually operated switches providing entrance to and departure from the designated locomotive servicing area are lined for movement to another track and secured by an effective locking device; and

(2) A blue signal has been placed at or near each of those switches; and

(3) A blue signal has been attached to the controlling locomotive at a location where it is readily visible to the engineman or operator at the controls of that locomotive.

(f) A locomotive may not be moved onto or off a designated locomotive servicing area track under the exclusive control of mechanical forces unless the blue signal is first removed—

(1) From the entrance switch to the area and the locomotive which is placed on the track is stopped short of coupling to another locomotive; or

(2) From the controlling locomotive to be moved and from the area departure switch, before the locomotive is removed from the track.

(g) A locomotive protected by blue signals may be moved on a track within the designated locomotive servicing area under the exclusive control of mechanical forces when operated by an authorized employee under the direction of the employee in charge of the workmen after the blue signal has been removed from the controlling locomotive to be repositioned and the workmen on the track have been notified of the movement.

(h) Rolling equipment protected by blue signals on car-shop repair tracks, which are under the exclusive control of car department forces, may be repositioned with a car mover when operated by an authorized employee under the direction of the employee in charge of the workmen after the workmen on the track have been notified of the movement.

4. By revising § 218.27 to read as follows:

**§ 218.27 Workmen on hump-yard track.**

(a) Workmen may not work on, under, or between rolling equipment on a hump-yard track unless—

(1) Each manually operated switch, including crossover switches providing access to that track is lined against movement to that track and secured by an effective locking device; and

(2) A blue signal has been placed at or near each manually operated switch; or

(3) A derail capable of restricting access to that portion of a track on which such equipment is located will fulfill the requirements of a manually operated switch in compliance with this section when positioned at least 150 feet from the end of the rolling equipment to be protected by the blue signal and when locked with an effective locking device in a derailing position. A blue signal must be displayed at each such derail.

(4) The person in charge of the workmen has notified the operator of the remotely-controlled switches of the work to be performed, and has been informed by the operator that each remotely-controlled switch providing access to the track has been lined against movement to that track and locked as prescribed by § 218.29(a).

5. By revising § 218.29(a) to read as follows:

**§ 218.29 Remotely-controlled switches.**

(a) After the operator of the remotely-controlled switches has received the notification required by § 218.27(a)(4), he must line each remotely-controlled switch against movement to that track and apply an effective locking device to the lever, button, or other device controlling the switch before he may inform the employee in charge of the work to be performed that protection has been provided.

* * * * *

(Sec. 202, 84 Stat. 971, 45 U.S.C. 431 and § 1.49(n) of the regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, 49 CFR 1.49(n))

This amendment is effective July 1, 1977.

Earlier compliance with these regulations is authorized as of the date of publication of this notice (1-11-77).

Issued in Washington, D.C. on January 5, 1977.

ASAPH H. HALL,
*Administrator.*

[FR Doc.77-1043 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. RSRM-1, Notice 2]

## PART 221—REAR END MARKING DEVICE—PASSENGER, COMMUTER AND FREIGHT TRAINS

On November 17, 1976, a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 50701) stating that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) was proposing regulations in response to the provisions of the Federal Railroad Safety Authorization Act of 1976 (Pub. L. 94-348, "the Act") concerning highly visible markers on the rear car of all passenger, commuter and freight trains.

Interested persons were invited to participate in this rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments before December 17, 1976, and by appearing at a public hearing on December 3, 1976, in Washington, D.C., and a number of comments were received.

### GENERAL COMMENTS

Two commenters raised a preliminary issue based upon FRA's determination that this rulemaking proceeding does not require an evaluation of the regulatory impact of the proposed rules in accordance with the policies of the Department of Transportation as stated in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 16200, April 16, 1976) since the issuance of these regulations is required by statute. In addition, these commenters questioned the apparent absence of consideration of the inflationary impact as required by Executive Order No. 11812 and of the environmental impact required by section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The basic position stated by these commenters with respect to the Secretary's regulatory impact policies, is that, notwithstanding the exemption of regulations expressly mandated by statute, the only instance in which a statutorily mandated rulemaking proceeding is exempt from the impact evaluation procedure required by the Secretary's policies is where the agency has no discretion

in issuing the rules. The FRA does not agree entirely with this narrow interpretation of the policies established by the Secretary. The purpose of the regulatory impact evaluation required by the Secretary's policies is to assure that all of the potential costs and benefits of a proposed rulemaking action are adequately assessed and considered by the rulemaking entity in an effort to improve the effectiveness of the proposed regulation and minimize its impact upon affected parties. In this instance, where a statute requires the issuance of a rule on a particular matter, the Secretary does not have the discretion to withhold rulemaking action even if it were shown that the possible benefits of the rule did not outweigh its potential costs. The result or impact of the rulemaking at hand is in effect prescribed in legislation while FRA is granted discretion only as to how the prescribed result of the rule might be most reasonably achieved through regulation. Accordingly, the comprehensive regulatory impact evaluation normally required of all proposed rulemaking actions is not required by the Secretary's policies in this case. FRA has consulted with the Office of the Secretary on this matter and received concurrence in this interpretation.

Nevertheless, FRA feels, and the Office of the Secretary concurs, that an appropriate application of the Secretary's policies in this instance is to assess the relative costs of alternative means of achieving the results of the statutorily mandated rules in an effort to develop an effective and reasonable implementing regulation. In this instance. FRA has adopted a performance specification for rear end markers that is based upon the minimum visibility requirements necessary to assure compliance with the statute. The least costly design which the Administrator determines will meet this specification will be acceptable under the regulation. Accordingly, FRA believes that this final rule does not impose any unreasonable costs in excess of the minimum costs necessary to comply with the minimum requirements of the statute.

With respect to the inflationary impact evaluation required by Executive Order No. 11821 and Office of Management and Budget Circular A–107, the FRA does not believe that the rules included in the NPRM constitute a "major proposal" within the scope of the inflationary impact process. Department of Transportation Order DOT 2050.4 establishes the threshold for determining what constitutes a major proposal. For purposes of a regulation that applies to a single industry, that threshold is $50 million in a single fiscal year or $75 million in any two consecutive fiscal years. Assuming that approximately 20,000 cars will need to be retrofitted to meet the standards established in this Part for highly visible marking devices, the cost per car would have to exceed $2,500 in order to reach the $50 million threshold level for inflationary impact. That per car cost far exceeds the FRA's estimates of the per-car costs that will be incurred to meet the prescribed performance standards. We have received no evidence in any of the comments submitted of an industry wide cost impact in excess of the threshold amounts. An additional analysis has been made with respect to the final rule to the extent that it differs from the NPRM. Once again, FRA's estimates are that the costs to the industry resulting from compliance with this rule will not reach the threshold level and therefore, the inflationary impact procedures do not apply to this proceeding.

With respect to consideration of the environmental impact of the proposed regulations, the FRA has performed a general environmental assessment of the potential effects of safety regulatory actions and has determined that, as a class, they do not constitute major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Furthermore, the FRA does not believe that the particular rules included within this Part will have a foreseeably significant impact upon the quality of the human environment, and neither commenter who raised this issue suggested any evidence that such impact does or might in fact exist.

One commenter took exception to the basic concept of the proposed regulation, and also noted that other parties at the public hearing had expressed opposition to final promulgation of the proposal. This commenter suggested that the FRA should issue a regulation in this proceeding which simply restates the statutory language, and that a cooperative effort between the railroads, railroad labor organizations and the FRA be undertaken to "arrive at a reasoned solution to a common problem." The FRA does not agree with this commenter that the mere promulgation of the statutory language within the specified time period would satisfy the congressional mandate. The inclusion of the regulatory directive is a clear indication that the Congress intended the FRA to utilize its expertise in railroad safety to define further what marking devices are necessary to accomplish the congressional intent to enhance the visibility of the rear end of trains. The FRA believes that it can fully comply with the statutory mandate only by the issuance of substantive rules which respond to and implement the congressional intent. Nevertheless, while FRA is issuing this rule in accordance with its statutory mandate, we will welcome at any time a specific proposal meeting the statutory test that constitutes a "reasonable solution" to the problem of the marking of the rear car of trains.

### Subpart A

One commenter suggested that the language of § 221.1 defining the scope of this part be amended to incorporate the statutory term "highly visible" in modifying the term "marking devices". The FRA agrees that the provisions of this part are intended to define requirements for "highly visible marking devices" in response to the Act, and has amended this section as suggested by the commenter.

One commenter raised a question in relation to section 211.3 which proposed the limits of the application of the provisions of this Part. This commenter expressed the opinion that all train movements should be included per se, and that exceptions should be made on the basis of specific waiver proceedings which can address the issues on a case-by-case basis. In the proposed rules, the FRA included specific exclusions for trains consisting of historical equipment, trains operating within installations and rapid transit railroads.

The statutory mandate provided the Secretary with the authority to determine what rules, regulations, orders or standards "may be necessary" to accomplish the intended results. The FRA may determine that certain operating situations do not involve the potential safety hazards which the provisions of the Act were intended to reduce. Therefore, we believe that an express exclusion of those types of operations is fully justified and well within the intent and spirit of the Act.

FRA has modified slightly the exclusion included in the NPRM for trains consisting of historical equipment in order to state more clearly the intended scope of the exclusion. It was FRA's intent to exclude railroads that operate only that type of historical equipment, and not to exclude the occasional operation of such equipment by carriers that are also engaged in providing regular passenger or freight service.

Other commenters also expressed views concerning the exclusions proposed in the NPRM. One of these stated that the provisions of this Part should apply to rapid transit railroads. As stated in the NPRM (41 FR 50703), the FRA believes that inclusion of rapid transit operations in this proceeding would extend the proceeding beyond the statutory mandate inasmuch as rapid transit operations were not specifically identified in the statute. For this reason, FRA has maintained the rapid transit exclusion in the final rule.

Several commenters questioned the rationale of requiring rear end marking devices on the trailing end of trains which operate on smaller railroads where there is normally no following train movement. These commenters argued that without a following movement there is no possibility of a rear end collision. Therefore, rear end marking devices would not add to safety and would, in fact, be an unnecesary expense. Several other commenters expressed the same view with respect to branch line operations on the properties of larger carriers.

While the FRA has the authority to make determinations as to the justification for excluding given operations from the applicability of Part 221, this authority must be exercised narrowly so as not to compromise the safety intended by the statutory mandate. The FRA be-

lieves that an exclusion for railroads on whose property only one train is operated at any given time is justified inasmuch as the threat of rear end collisions is virtually nonexistent. A new subsection has been added to provide such an exclusion for railroads which operate only one train at a time.

FRA does not believe, however, that branch line operations should be treated in the same manner as operations on railroads having only one train operating at a given time since these branch line operations often include the use of equipment which must operate on main lines as well as on low density branch lines. Other bases were suggested for exemption of light density operations such as "absolute block" systems, or separation based on time or distance specified in operating rules or other operating controls. We do not believe that an adequate case has been shown for exemption of these operations per se. The established waiver procedure is available, and FRA believes this process to be the proper method for assuring that exemption of any particular operation is made on sound grounds. It should be emphasized that FRA believes this waiver authority must also be exercised judiciously so as to assure that the intent of the regulations will not be compromised. A railroad requesting a waiver must, therefore, demonstrate a similar degree of protection against rear end collisions.

Several questions were raised as to the meaning of some of the definitions included in section 211.5 of the NPRM. One commenter stated that the definition of a "train" should clearly exclude self-propelled maintenance-of-way and high rail inspection equipment. The intent of the regulation is to reach line-haul train operations. It was not intended to include the operation of the various types of work or maintenance-of-way equipment which might also be self-propelled, and for purposes of this Part, such equipment shall not be considered to be a "train".

Another commenter expressed the opinion that work and wreck trains ought to be expressly excluded from the definition of a "train" for purposes of this Part. The FRA does not believe that such movements should be excluded from the requirement for rear end marking devices. Both work and wreck train operations occupy main lines during prolonged periods of time under all types of weather conditions and varying degrees of visibility. We intend the definition to be read broadly enough to include work and wreck train movements.

There was disagreement among commenters as to the exclusion of yard and transfer movements from the definition of a "train". Some wanted a clearer definition of what was meant by "transfer movement", while another believed that transfer movements should not be excluded at all. By this provision, FRA intended to exclude movements of individual cars and cuts of cars within yard limits which have traditionally not been considered "train" movements. All movements within yard limits are subject to the controls of Rule 93 with respect to speed and being able to "stop short" of obstructions on the track. Because yard movements characteristically involve frequent pick up and set out of cars, a requirement that a permanently marked car be maintained at the rear of the movements, or that portable marking devices be switched to the rear car as cars are picked up or set out, would be unduly burdensome and is not warranted by the safety purpose of this regulation.

The FRA now recognizes that the inclusion of the term "transfer movement" was confusing and may have resulted in the extension of the exclusion beyond its intended limits. The FRA believes that the exclusion must be restricted to movements within yard limits, where adequate protection is provided by the fact that all movements are made subject to the same strict operating restrictions, that is, operating at the prescribed speed for that track and prepared to stop short of an obstruction.

Another question was raised concerning the definition of "locomotive" included in § 221.5(c) of the NPRM. This commenter questioned whether this definition was intended to include that equipment which draws its power from third-rail or catenary systems. The definition was designed and intended to be broad enough to take within its scope all self-propelled equipment designed for moving other equipment in usual line-haul train operations regardless of its power source.

One commenter stated that the definition of a "train order" should be expanded to include a radio transmission used to communicate directions to a train crew. The FRA recognizes that the transmission of "train order" type directives by radio is a common practice within the railroad industry and has expanded the definition accordingly. It should be noted that FRA published an NPRM that proposed uniform procedures for the use of radio in railroad operations, including the transmission of train orders by radio (40 FR 33682). These procedures when issued will govern radio transmission of train orders.

One commenter expressed the opinion that the proposed § 221.11 concerning State regulation implied that States cannot enforce more stringent requirements than those issued by FRA. The language of this section was derived directly from the Act. Under the general provisions of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (45 U.S.C. 434), any regulation issued by the FRA automatically preempts all State laws, rules, regulations, orders or standards concerning the same subject matter. The intent of this section of the proposed regulation was to incorporate the statutory provision which will, in effect, act as an exception to that general provision on preemption of State jurisdiction. It will allow a State to continue to enforce any State law, rule, regulation, order or standard which was in effect on July 8, 1976, and which requires lighted markers on freight trains. The only restriction on such State regulations is that they may not be enforced if they would cause a railroad to be in violation of the Federal rules prescribed in this Part.

### SUBPART B

Subpart B of the NPRM contained the requirements which FRA was proposing in response to the statutory mandate for "highly visible markers". These proposed rules included performance standards for lighted marking devices on passenger and commuter trains and for retro-reflective marking devices on freight trains. Virtually all commenters took issue with the FRA's definition of what devices constitute highly visible markers as well as the decision to use a clear weather testing standard to define marking device performance under night or inclement weather conditions, although the bases for disagreement differed from commenter to commenter.

In view of the several major issues raised by the many commenters who submitted views on Subpart B, the FRA has decided to make significant changes in the provisions which define what devices constitute "highly visible markers" in compliance with the statute.

After analysis of the options for "highly visible markers", and consideration of the many issues raised by the commenters, the FRA has decided to revise the requirements for marking devices which were proposed in this Part. Instead of defining two separate systems of marking devices, one for passenger and commuter trains, and one for freight trains, FRA has determined what are the minimum requirements to satisfy the "highly visible" standard on a day with restricted visibility, although retaining the statutory requirement that the rear end markers on passenger and commuter trains must be lighted notwithstanding the availability of other types of markers which could meet these minimum requirements. This performance standard has been developed with reference to inclement weather conditions, rather than extrapolating inclement weather performance from clear weather conditions as was proposed in the NPRM.

The basic premise that forms the foundation of the logic upon which this revised standard was developed remains the same as that expressed in the NPRM. That is that "highly visible markers" must be defined in relation to the operating environment in which they will be used as warning devices. The FRA continues to believe that marking devices such as those contemplated by the statute must be regarded as backup safety systems to the present systems of signals and operating rules. Under those present systems, whenever two trains are in a situation in which the following train may overtake the leading train, the following train should be operating at restricted speed taking into account prevailing weather conditions, prepared to stop short of another train, and the crew

should be in an alerted condition, looking for an obstruction on the track.

Given this restricted speed, FRA has reviewed several comments as well as other data on stopping distances which can be expected for trains. Due to the range of factors involved (speed, tonnage, train make-up, braking capability, grade) these estimates vary. FRA has considered these factors and, for purposes of this rule, has determined that 1000 feet is a reasonable distance within which an alerted train crew could normally stop a train moving at restricted speed. Based upon this determination, and assuming a day of ¼ mile restricted visibility, which would approximate the visibility under heavy rain, snow or fog conditions, the FRA has further determined that a marking device must have a minimum intensity of 100 candela, or 100 effective candela for flashing lights, in order to be "highly visible" for purposes of this rule. FRA has expressed this minimum intensity for "highly visible" marking devices in terms of a performance standard. This standard may be met by use of any device or system, lighted or non-lighted, which meets the intensity and other performance standards and is approved by the Administrator. FRA is aware that existing types of lighted systems will meet the requirements. FRA to date has not determined specific types or combinations of non-lighted materials which could meet this visibility standard during inclement daylight hours. Because of the statutory deadline for issuance of a substantive rule, this minimum performance standard must be issued in advance of additional testing. A railroad wishing to use such a non-lighted device will have to demonstrate to the Administrator that the device, be it retroreflective, fluorescent, or a combination, will meet the performance standard. For purposes of such a demonstration, the Administrator will assume an external light source with the intensity and beam width of the high beam of a locomotive headlight at a distance of 1000 feet from the device. FRA intends to supplement this final rule promptly with an appendix listing all approved devices, and from time to time thereafter will add to the appendix any additional devices approved by the Administrator as meeting the required performance standard.

The final performance specification includes a location requirement of at least 48 inches above top of rail as proposed in the NPRM. FRA has decided to retain this requirement although one commenter expressed the opinion that marking devices should be mounted as high as possible on the rear car. While FRA believes that marking devices will generally be mounted on the upper half of the car, we have decided that this provision is justified in order to permit mounting of a device on the coupler of the rear car, if a caboose is not used as the rear car of the train.

There were also questions concerning the NPRM provision specifying the range of acceptable colors for marking devices. The acceptable color range for the marking devices has been redefined in terms of the red-orange-amber range of the spectrum. These colors have been chosen over others suggested by some commenters because of their traditional use in safety systems as indications of warning or hazards.

Several commenters expressed the opinion that whatever standards are issued as final rules, they should be flexible enough to incorporate a number of existing devices which were alleged to be "highly visible". FRA recognizes that some degree of flexibility will be beneficial in encouraging the development of improved and more efficient marking devices. For this reason the rule has been written in terms of a general standard setting a minimum performance requirement. FRA has decided not to require the use of any specific type of material as proposed in the NPRM, so as not to preclude the use of any device which meets the performance specifications. Thus, the fullest range of lighted and non-lighted devices, including strobe lights, is available provided they meet the visibility, illumination and color specifications. In addition, since this is a minimum standard, nothing in this Part should be construed as preventing the use of additional systems to further enhance conspicuity.

One commenter criticized the proposed rules as being inadequate since they spoke only of visibility in terms of tangent track, and did not take into consideration curves, cuts, hills, or other obstructions to visibility along the right-of-way. FRA has considered the problem posed by curves and other obstructions, and has concluded that a marking device will not be in the line of sight of the crew on a following train and cannot be said to be "highly visible" under such conditions. This commenter suggested that a lighted marking device would be "highly visible" since the light would reflect or "bounce" off trees, buildings or other objects along the right-of-way so as to alert the crew of the following train before the rear car is actually in the line of sight. The FRA believes that reliance on this type of "reflection" with anything other than strobe lights is far too speculative to be considered "highly visible" as was intended by the statute. FRA does not believe there is a reasonable assurance that such reflections would alert the crew since they would often be so dim or would not be readily distinguishable from the myriad of other primary and secondary light sources existing in the wide variety of railroad operating environments. If a light of such high intensity as to be highly visible in most such situations were prescribed, it would in many other situations also constitute such a distraction as actually to become a potential safety hazard.

FRA's research demonstrates that strobe lights may be alerting in curved territory without adverse effects when used to indicate an emergency condition—that the lead train has stopped or slowed down below prescribed speed in an area with restricted visibility. This alerting effect is diminished if such lights are used continuously rather than as an emergency warning. Such an emergency provision has not been incorporated into the minimum requirements of this Part because the FRA believes that to do so would exceed the scope of the statutory mandate. We believe that the Congress intended these regulations to respond to normal operating condition at night and in restricted visibility and thus required the prescribed marking devices to be in operation in all such conditions. Nowhere in the Act is there a requirement to devise special emergency procedures. Any railroad may, of course, choose to utilize strobes as such an additional emergency warning system in areas of restricted visiblity to indicate a stopped or slow train.

Several commenters raised a number of issues having to do with questions of reliability of the marking devices. The FRA has decided to address the reliability question by including an inspection requirement. Lighted markers need not be activated, nor non-lighted markers displayed on a clear day. Section 221.13 (b) defines the conditions of darkness and inclement weather under which marking devices must be displayed. Inspection of the devices must be made by the train crew at each crew change location to assure that lighted systems are working, that non-lighted systems are clean and in good condition, or that portable systems are working and available on the train for display in accordance with these regulations should visibility conditions require. Section 221.15 (b) sets forth this inspection requirement.

Several commenters also raised questions concerning procedures to be used if lighted marking devices failed, when a portion of a train needed to be moved after a derailment, or when other defective equipment could only be moved at the rear of a train. The FRA believes that each of these conditions constitutes an operational emergency which justifies special consideration in these rules. For this reason, such movements will be allowed to be made without the display of marking devices prescribed in this Part, but only as far as the next forward location at which the devices can be repaired or other devices can be substituted, or where the defective equipment moving at the rear of the train can be repaired.

A question was also raised concerning the requirement of the NPRM calling for dual power sources and wiring in parallel. Commenters expressed the opinion that these requirements resulted in an unnecessary redundancy in that they, in effect, provided a back-up to what was already identified as a back-up system. There also appeared to be some question as to whether FRA intended to permit the use of a battery power source. The FRA recognizes merit in the argument that providing a back-up system to what is essentially already a back-up system may result in additional costs

which are unnecessary to accomplish the purpose of the regulation. Since an inspection requirement has been added to the rule, a reasonable degree of reliability of lighted devices can be expected, and, in the event of a malfunction, further operation is restricted by the provision that the train may only move to the next forward repair point. Under these conditions, the FRA does not believe that stringent power source requirements are necessary, and has eliminated those provisions of the NPRM. Railroads using lighted marking devices may choose whatever power source they believe to be the most effective in relation to the specific lighting system, be it generator or battery.

A further question in relation to lighted systems concerns the acceptability of flashing devices. This commenter noted the economics in battery life which can be realized with a flashing system. The FRA agrees that flashing lights can be used to fulfill the requirement for "highly visible" marking devices. For purposes of this regulation, FRA has prescribed an effective candela intensity and an acceptable range of flash rates so as to assure alerting effect and at the same time avoid undesirable side effects caused by too rapid a flash. The range is expressed in terms of flashes per second so as to assure an evenely distributed flashing effect.

One commenter raised an issue with respect to the proposed compliance date of December 31, 1977 stating that this date did not provide adequate time for modification of existing equipment. The FRA believes that the final rule incorporated in this notice provides a broad enough range of choices between lighted and non-lighted devices, as well as among various types of lighted devices so as to reduce the burden of retrofit. While we recognize that some systems existing today will need modifications, the majority of locomotives and cabooses already are equipped with hardware capable of being upgraded to meet the prescribed visibility requirements. In addition, removable or portable devices such as battery operated lights may also be used. Furthermore, we believe that the postponement of an effective date for compliance with the rules would not be in keeping with the spirit or intent of the Act. After weighing all the concerns expressed and the intent of the Act, the FRA believes the one year retrofit period provided in section 221.13(a) to be a reasonable one.

Other commenters inquired as to whether the locomotive headlight shining to the rear could be considered a "highly visible marker" when an engine was running light, or was used as a helper at the rear of a train. The FRA recognizes that there are operating conditions in which it is common to place a locomotive at the rear of a train such as in push-pull operations or helper operations in mountainous territory. In addition, unusual operating conditions may require a locomotive to be operated light on the main track outside of yard limits. Traditionally, an illuminated headlight has been used to indicate that a locomotive is occupying the track. In addition, the majority of locomotives are also equipped with classification lights which can display a variety of colors and which are presently used under some conditions to show red to the rear. The FRA believes that the use of the locomotive headlight shining to the rear, or of the classification lights, provided the latter meet the color and illumination requirements of the performance standard would constitute "highly visible" marking devices within the meaning of the Act and this regulation. These options for compliance have been provided in § 221.15.

Several commenters expressed the concern that train crews come to rely upon seeing the "highly visible markers" and would become lax in their compliance with operating rules and signal indications. The FRA does not believe that the mere existence of marking devices will result in widespread disregard of longstanding operating practices. Compliance of train crews with the requirements of the operating rules will continue to be an obligation of the carrier. The FRA believes that continued compliance can be assured through adequate rules instruction and proper efficiency testing programs.

In light of the foregoing, Title 49 CFR is amended by the addition of a new Part 221 as set forth below:

**Subpart A—General**

Sec.
221.1 Scope.
221.3 Application.
221.5 Definitions.
221.7 Civil penalty.
221.9 Waivers.
221.11 State Regulation.

**Subpart B—Marking Devices**

221.13 Marking device display.
221.15 Marking devices.
221.17 Movement of defective equipment.

AUTHORITY: Section 202, 84 Stat. 971, 45 U.S.C. 431 and Section 1.49(n) of the regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, 49 CFR 1.49(n).

## Subpart A—General

### § 221.1 Scope.

This part prescribes minimum requirements governing highly visible marking devices for the trailing end of the rear car of all passenger, commuter and freight trains. So long as these minimum requirements are met, railroads may adopt additional or more stringent requirements for rear end marking devices.

### § 221.3 Application.

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, this part applies to passenger, commuter and freight trains when operated on a standard gage main track which is part of the general railroad system of transportation.

(b) This part does not apply to:

(1) A railroad that operates only trains consisting of historical or antiquated equipment for excursion, educational, or recreational purposes;

(2) A train that operates only on track inside an installation which is not part of the general railroad system of transportation;

(3) A rapid transit railroad that operates only on track used exclusively for rapid transit passenger service in a metropolitan or suburban area;

(4) A railroad that operates only one train at any given time.

### § 221.5 Definitions.

As used in this part:

(a) "Train" means a locomotive unit or locomotive units coupled, with or without cars, involved in a railroad operation conducted on a main track. It does not include yard movements.

(b) "Commuter train" means a short haul passenger train operating on track which is part of the general railroad system of transportation, within an urban, suburban or metropolitan area. It includes a passenger train provided by an instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof.

(c) "Locomotive" means a selfpropelled unit of equipment designed for moving other equipment in revenue service and includes a selfpropelled unit designed to carry freight or passenger traffic, or both.

(d) "Main track" means a track, other than an auxiliary track, extending through yards or between stations, upon which trains are operated by timetable or train order or both, or the use of which is governed by a signal system.

(e) "Train order" means mandatory directives issued as authority for the conduct of a railroad operation outside of yard limits.

(f) "Red-orange-amber color range" means those colors defined by chromaticity coordinates, as expressed in terms of the International Commission on Illumination's 1931 Colormetric System, which lie within the region bounded by the spectrum locus and lines defined by the following equations:

$$X+Y=.97 \text{ (white boundary)}$$
$$Y=X-.12 \text{ (green boundary)}$$

(g) "Administrator" means the Federal Railroad Administrator, the Deputy Administrator, or any official of the Federal Railroad Administration to whom the Administrator has delegated his authority under this Part.

(h) "Effective intensity" means that intensity of a light in candela as defined by the Illuminating Engineering Society's Guide for Calculating the Effective Intensity of Flashing Signal Lights, November, 1964.

### § 221.7 Civil penalty.

Any railroad that operates a train to which this part applies in violation of any requirements prescribed in this part is liable to a civil penalty of at least $250, but not more than $2500, for each violation. Each day of each violation constitutes a separate offense.

### § 221.9 Waivers.

(a) A railroad may petition the Federal Railroad Administrator for a waiver

of compliance with any requirement prescribed in this Part.

(b) Each petition for a waiver under this section must be filed in the manner and contain the information required by Part 211 of this chapter.

(c) If the Administrator finds that a waiver of compliance is in the public interest and is consistent with railroad safety, he may grant the waiver subject to any condition he deems necessary. Notice of each waiver granted, including a statement of the reasons therefor, will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

**§ 221.11 State regulation.**

Notwithstanding the provisions of this part, a State may continue in force any law, rule, regulation, order, or standard that was in effect on July 8, 1976, relating to lighted marking devices on the rear car of freight trains except to the extent that such law, rule, regulation, order, or standard would cause such cars to be in violation of this part.

**Subpart B—Marking Devices**

**§ 221.13 Marking device display.**

(a) After December 31, 1977, each train to which this part applies that occupies or operates on a main track shall be equipped with marking devices loacted on the trailing end of the rear car of the train as prescribed in this subpart.

(b) The marking devices prescribed in this subpart shall be displayed continuously during the hours between one hour before sunset and one hour after sunrise, and during all other hours when weather conditions so restrict visibility that the end silhouette of a standard box car cannot be seen from ½ mile on tangent track by a person having 20/20 corrected vision.

(c) The centroid of the marking device must be located at a minimum of 48 inches above top of rail.

**§ 221.15 Marking devices.**

(a) Passenger, commuter and freight trains shall be equipped with at least one marking device which the Administrator approves as having an intensity of not less than 100 candela nor more than 1000 candela (or an effective intensity of not less than 100 candela nor more than 1000 candela for flashing lights) as measured at the center of the beam.

(1) a horizontal beam with a minimum arc width of fifteen (15) degrees each side of the vertical center line, and a vertical beam with a minimum arc width of five (5) degrees each side of the horizontal center line as defined in terms of the 50 candela intensity points;

(2) a color defined by the red-orange-amber color range; and

(3) if a flashing light is used, a flash rate of not less than once every 1.3 seconds nor more than once every .7 seconds.

(b) Marking devices used on passenger and commuter trains in compliance with paragraph (a) of this section shall be lighted under the conditions prescribed in § 221.13(b).

(c) When a locomotive is operated singly, or at the rear of a train, highly visible marking devices may be provided by the use of:

(1) at least one marking device which complies with paragraph (a) of this section;

(2) at least one illuminated red or amber classification light on the rear of the locomotive, provided it complies with paragraph (a) of this section; or

(3) the rear headlight of the locomotive illuminated on low beam.

(d) After December 31, 1977, marking devices displayed in compliance with this part shall be inspected by the train crew at each crew change point to assure that they are in proper operating condition.

**§ 221.17 Movement of defective equipment.**

(a) Whenever the marking device prescribed in this part becomes inoperative en route, the train may be moved to the next forward location where the marking device can be repaired or replaced.

(b) Defective rolling equipment which, because of the nature of the defect, can be placed only at the rear of a train for movement to the next forward location at which repairs can be made need not be equipped with marking devices prescribed in this part.

(c) When a portion of a train has derailed, and a portable marking device is not available, the remainder of the train may be moved to the nearest terminal without being equipped with the marking device prescribed in this part.

This part is effective on February 15, 1977. Earlier compliance with these regulations is authorized as of the date of publication of this notice.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on January 6, 1977.

ASAPH H. HALL,
*Administrator.*

[FR Doc.77-1044 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

**Title 50—Wildlife and Fisheries**

**CHAPTER II—NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE, NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATON, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**SUBCHAPTER G—PROCESSED FISHERY PRODUCTS, PROCESSED PRODUCTS THEREOF, AND CERTAIN OTHER PROCESSED FOOD PRODUCTS**

**Grade Standards for Fishery Products; Recodification**

The Inspection and Certification Regulations and U.S. Grade Standards for Fishery Products contained in Part 260 through Part 279 of 50 CFR are being recodified. The recodification will (1) improve the organization and presentation of grade standards for fishery products and (2) facilitate subsequent amendments thereto.

It is the general policy of the Department of Commerce to allow time for interested parties to participate in the rulemaking process. However, the changes are editorial in nature and, therefore, the public rulemaking process is waived and the recodification will become effective on January 11, 1977.

This recodification is made pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 742e; D.O.O.25-5A, subsection 3.01K(a); and D.O.O.25-5B, section 12.

Accordingly, the newly designated Parts 260 through 279 together with the old counterparts of 50 CFR are set forth below.

| *New Part Numbers* | *Old Part Numbers* |
|---|---|
| Part 260—Inspection and Certification | Part 260, § 260.1–260.201. |
| Subpart A—Inspection and Certification of Establishments, and Fishery Products for Human Consumption. | |
| Subpart B—Inspection and Certification of Fish Meal Establishments and Products. | No corresponding part and section. |
| Subpart C—Inspection and Certification of Establishments, and Fishery Products as Food for Animals. | Do. |
| Part 261—United States Standards for Grades Whole or Dressed Fish. | Part 275, § 275.1–275.5. |
| Subpart A—United States Standards for Grades of Whole or Dressed Fish § 261.100–149. | |
| Subpart B—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Headless Dressed Whiting § 261.150–199. | Part 271, § 271.1–271.25. |
| Part 262—United States Standards for Grades of Fish Steaks. | No corresponding part and section. |
| Subpart A—[Reserved] | Do. |
| Subpart B—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Halibut Steaks §§ 262.150–199. | Part 265, §§ 265.1–265.25. |
| Subpart C—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Salmon Steaks §§ 262.200–249. | Part 268, §§ 268.1–268.31. |
| Part 263—United States Standards for Grades of Fish Fillets. | No corresponding part and section. |
| Subpart A—(Reserved) | Do. |
| Subpart B—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Cod Fillets §§ 263.150–199. | Part 267, §§ 267.1–267.31. |
| Subpart C—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Flounder and Sole Fillets §§ 263.200–249. | Parts 274, §§274.1–274.25. |
| Subpart D—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Haddock Fillets §§ 263.250–299. | Part 264, §§ 264.1–264.31. |
| Subpart E—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Ocean Perch and Pacific Ocean Perch Fillets §§ 263.300–349. | Part 269, §§ 269.1–269.31. |
| Part 264—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Fish Blocks and Products Made Therefrom. | No corresponding part and section. |
| Subpart A—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Fish Blocks §§ 264.100–149. | Part 263, §§ 263.1–263.25. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Subpart B—Proposed Interim United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Minced Fish Blocks §§ 264.150–199. | Proposed Part 278 (40 F.R. 11729, March 13, 1975), §§ 278.1–278.6. |
| Subpart C—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Raw Fish Portions §§ 264.200–249. | Part 279, §§ 279.1–279.25. |
| Subpart D—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Raw Breaded Fish Sticks §§ 260.250–299. | Part 277, §§ 277.1–277.25. |
| Subpart E—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Raw Breaded Fish Portions §§ 264.300–349. | Part 266, §§ 266.1–266.25. |
| Subpart F—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Fish Sticks §§ 264.350–399. | Part 261, §§ 261.1–261.25. |
| Subpart G—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Fried Fish Portions §§ 264.400–449. | §§ 276.1–276.25. |
| Part 265—United States Standards for Grades of Crustacean Shellfish Products. | No corresponding part and section. |
| Subpart A—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Raw Headless Shrimp §§ 265.100–149. | Part 272, §§ 272.1–272.31. |
| Subpart B—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Raw Breaded Shrimp §§ 265.150–199. | Part 262, §§ 262.1–262.25. |
| Part 266—United States Standards for Grades of Molluscan Shellfish Products. | No corresponding part and section. |
| Subpart A—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Raw Scallops §§ 266.100–266.149. | Part 273, §§ 273.1–273.25. |
| Subpart B—United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Fried Scallops §§ 266.150–199. | Part 270, §§ 270.1–270.25. |
| Parts 267–279—[Reserved] | |

Dated: January 4, 1977.

ROBERT W. SCHONING,
*Director,*
*National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc.77–731 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

# proposed rules

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Food and Nutrition Service

### [ 7 CFR Part 272 ]

[Amdt. No. 92]

### FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

### Extension of Comment Period

A proposed amendment to the Food Stamp Program Regulations was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 16, 1976, 41 FR 50454. The proposal was for the purpose of (1) requiring firms which are authorized to accept food coupons to update any or all of the information submitted on original applications for authorization; (2) providing that failure by an authorized firm to update information on its original application may result in the withdrawal of a firm's approval to participate in the program; (3) specifying that authorized firms shall not impose expiration dates on the redemption of credit slips or tokens issued to recipients by such firms; (4) more specifically detailing procedures which authorized wholesale food concerns shall follow in accepting coupons for redemption from authorized retail food stores and meal services; (5) providing that retailers, wholesalers, and meal services may respond to letters of charges of violations within 10 days of their receipt date; (6) providing that FNS shall not be liable for losses or thefts of food coupons from authorized firms.

In order to give interested parties an adequate opportunity to comment on these proposed changes, the Department has decided to extend the comment period until January 16, 1977.

(78 Stat. 703, as amended; (7 U.S.C. 2011–2026))

Dated: January 5, 1977.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs, No. 10.551, National Archives Reference Services)

RICHARD L. FELTNER,
*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-893 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

### Commodity Credit Corporation

### [ 7 CFR Part 1421 ]

### LOAN AND PURCHASE PROGRAM FOR 1977-CROP RICE

### Proposed Determinations

Notice is hereby given that the Department of Agriculture proposes to make determinations and issue regulations relative to a loan and purchase program for 1977-crop rice.

Such regulations are necessary to carry out the loan and purchase program for 1977 and include, but are not limited to, determinations regarding (1) premiums and discounts for grades, classes, other qualities, and location differentials, (2) CCC minimum resale price, (3) storage requirements, (4) commodity eligibility and (5) such other provisions as may be necessary to carry out this program.

Prior to issuing the related regulations, consideration will be given to any recommendations, views and comments received not later than February 10, 1977. Recommendations, views and comments should be submitted in writing to the Director, Grains, Oilseeds and Cotton Division, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20013.

All written submissions made pursuant to this notice will be made available for public inspection from 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m. Monday through Friday, in Room 3741 South Building, 14th and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on January 5, 1977.

KENNETH E. FRICK,
*Executive Vice President,*
*Commodity Credit Corporation.*

[FR Doc.77-849 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

### [ 12 CFR Part 564 ]

[No. 77-7]

### SETTLEMENT OF INSURANCE

### Withdrawal of Proposed Amendment Relating to Insurance of Pension Funds

JANUARY 5, 1977.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, by Resolution No. 74-999, dated September 25, 1974, proposed to amend paragraph (c) (1) of § 564.2 of the Rules and Regulations for Insurance of Accounts (12 CFR 564.2(c)(1)) for the purpose of providing separate insurance coverage for non-vested interests in pension and other trusteed employee benefit funds. Notice of such proposed rulemaking was duly published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 10, 1974 (39 FR 36494-36495), with an invitation to interested persons to submit written comments by November 11, 1974.

On the basis of its consideration of all relevant material presented by interested persons and otherwise available, the Board considers it desirable to withdraw the proposed amendment for further study.

Accordingly, the Board hereby withdraws from consideration the proposed amendment to Part 564 of the Rules and Regulations for Insurance of Accounts (12 CFR Part 564) contained in said Resolution No. 74-999.

(Secs. 401, 402, 403, 405, 48 Stat. 1255, 1256, 1257, 1259, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724, 1725, 1726, 1728). Reorg. Plan No. 3 of 1947, 12 FR 4981, 3 CFR 1943-48 Comp. 1071)

By the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

J. J. FINN,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-1007 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

### [ 12 CFR Parts 523 and 545 ]

[No. 77-11]

### FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM; FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN SYSTEM

### Proposed Amendments Relating to Savings Deposits in Other Institutions

JANUARY 5, 1977.

SUMMARY

The following summary of the amendments proposed by this Resolution is provided for the reader's convenience and is subject to the full explanation in the following preamble and to the specific provisions of the regulations.

I. *Present Regulations*—prohibit investment by Federal associations in savings accounts and savings deposits of other institutions.

II. *Proposed Amendments*—would remove such prohibition regarding savings deposits in commercial banks and qualify such deposits in insured banks as liquid assets and short-term liquid assets to the extent time deposits are already so qualified.

III. *Reason for Proposal*—to provide for more flexible investment and liquidity.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board considers it desirable to propose to amend § 523.10 of the Regulations for the Federal Home Loan Bank System (12 CFR 523.10) and § 545.9-2 of the Rules and Regulations for the Federal Savings and Loan System (12 CFR 545.9-2) for the purpose of providing for more flexible investment and liquidity.

Present § 545.9-2 prohibits investment by a Federal association in the savings accounts or savings deposits of other institutions and defines a "savings account" as any withdrawable monetary interest of an investor in any savings and loan, building and loan, or homestead association or cooperative bank and a "savings deposit" as any deposit in a bank that is not a demand deposit or a time deposit. Such prohibition, when it became effective May 17, 1965, was con-

sistent with the Federal Reserve Board's then current regulations which prohibited savings deposits in member banks by corporations operated for profit, but those regulations were modified, effective November 10, 1975, to allow corporate deposits in limited amounts. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board perceives no further need to prohibit investment by Federal associations in savings deposits in commercial banks and therefore proposes to revise § 545.9–2 to remove such prohibition.

Consistent with such revision, and in accordance with its authority under section 5A of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to create more meaningful and flexible liquidity, the Board proposes to qualify savings deposits in commercial banks as liquid assets and short-term liquid assets to the extent time deposits are already so qualified. The Board also proposes to substitute the more descriptive term "unsecured day(s) funds" for the term "Federal funds" throughout paragraph (h)(3) of § 523.10 in conformity with the language of paragraph (g)(4) thereof.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments to the Office of the Secretary, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, 320 First Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20552, by February 11, 1977, as to whether this proposal should be adopted, rejected, or modified. Written material submitted will be available for public inspection at the above address.

Accordingly, the Board hereby proposes to amend § 523.10 and § 545.9–2 to read as set forth below.

**§ 523.10 Definitions.**

For the purposes of this section, § 523.11, and § 523.12:

* * * * *

(g) The term "liquid assets" means the total of cash, accrued interest on unpledged assets which qualify as liquid assets under this paragraph, or would so qualify except for their maturities, and the book value of the following unpledged assets (including such assets held subject to repurchase agreement), as long as principal and interest on such assets are not in default:

* * * * *

(4) Time and savings deposits in an insured bank, including time deposits held subject to a repurchase agreement and loans of unsecured day(s) funds (Federal funds or similar unsecured loans to insured banks) to an insured bank if:

(i) The total of all savings and time deposits, including loans of unsecured day(s) funds of the same member, in the same bank does not exceed the greater of (a) one-fourth of 1 percent of the total deposits of such bank (calculated on the basis of total deposits of such bank as shown by its last published statement of condition preceding the date each deposit is made or acquired by a member), or (b) $40,000;

* * * * *

(iii) Except for loans of unsecured day(s) funds, such time deposits are (a) negotiable and have remaining periods to maturity of not more than 1 year, (b) not negotiable and have remaining periods to maturity of not more than 90 days, or (c) not withdrawable without notice and the notice periods do not exceed 90 days;

* * * * *

(h) The term "short-term liquid assets" means the total of cash, accrued interest on unpledged assets which qualify as liquid assets under paragraph (g) of this section, or would so qualify except for their maturities, and the book value of the following unpledged assets (including such assets held subject to a repurchase agreement):

* * * * *

(3) Savings deposits and time deposits, including loans of unsecured day(s) funds, which qualify as liquid assets pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (g)(4) of this section and, in the case of such time deposits, except for loans of unsecured day(s) funds, are (i) negotiable and have remaining periods to maturity of not more than 6 months, (ii) not negotiable and have remaining periods to maturity of not more than 90 days or (iii) not withdrawable without notice and the notice periods do not exceed 90 days;

* * * * *

**§ 545.9–2 Prohibition against investments in other institutions.**

(a) No Federal association shall invest in the savings accounts of any other institution.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "savings accounts" means the withdrawable monetary interest of an investor in any savings and loan, building and loan, homestead association, cooperative bank, or savings bank.

(Sec. 5A, 47 Stat. 727, as added by Sec. 1, 64 Stat. 256, as amended, Sec. 17, 47 Stat. 736, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1425a, 1437); Sec. 5, 48 Stat. 132, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1464). Reorg. Plan No. 3 of 1947, 12 F.R. 4981, 3 CFR 1941–48 Comp., p. 1071)

By the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

J. J. FINN,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77–1006 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

**[ 18 CFR Part 2 ]**

[Docket No. RM77–1]

**EQUITY FOR NATURAL GAS PIPELINE COMPANIES AND PUBLIC UTILITIES**

**Just and Reasonable Rate of Return**

JANUARY 4, 1977.

On December 16, 1976, the City of Gardner, Kansas, and the City of Falmouth, Kentucky, filed a late notice of intention to respond to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the captioned docket, issued October 15, 1976, and published October 22, 1976 (41 FR 46618). By Notice issued December 9, 1976, the Commission extended the comment period to and including February 28, 1977; therefore, the admission of these parties will in no way delay the proceedings.

Upon consideration, notice is hereby given that the City of Gardner, Kansas, and the City of Falmouth, Kentucky, are permitted to become parties to the captioned rulemaking proceeding.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77–354 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

**Customs Service**

**[ 19 CFR Part 1 ]**

**CUSTOMS FIELD ORGANIZATION**

**Proposed Change in Customs Region IX Consolidating Customs Ports of Ashtabula, Ohio, and Conneaut, Ohio, Into One Customs Ports of Entry**

In order to provide better Customs service to carriers, importers, and the public in the Cleveland, Ohio, Customs district (Region IX), it is considered desirable to consolidate the ports of Ashtabula and Conneaut, Ohio, into one Customs port of entry to be known as the Ashtabula/Conneaut Customs port of entry.

Accordingly, by virtue of the authority vested in the President by section 1 of the Act of August 1, 1914, 38 Stat. 623, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2), and delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury by Executive Order No. 10289, September 17, 1951 (3 CFR, 1949–1953 Comp., Ch. II), and pursuant to authority provided by Treasury Department Order No. 190, Rev. 12 (41 FR 47970), it is hereby proposed to establish a consolidated Ashtabula/Conneaut Customs port of entry in the Cleveland, Ohio, Customs district (Region IX).

The geographical limits of the proposed consolidated port of entry will include all of the territory within the corporate limits of Ashtabula and Conneaut, Ohio, as well as all the territory located between Ohio State Route 531, also known at Lake Road, and Lake Erie from the western city limits of Conneaut to the eastern city limits of Ashtabula.

Data, views or arguments with regard to the foregoing proposal may be addressed to the Commissioner of Customs, Attention: Regulations Division, Washington, D.C. 20229. To ensure consideration of such communications they must be received on or before February 10, 1977.

Written material or suggestions submitted will be available for public inspection in accordance with § 103.8(b) of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 103.8(b)) at the Regulations Division,

Headquarters, United States Customs Service, Washington, D.C., during regular business hours.

Dated: January 3, 1977.

JERRY THOMAS,
*Under Secretary of the Treasury.*

[FR Doc.77-956 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[ 19 CFR Part 113 ]

## CUSTOMS BONDS

### Proposed Amendment to Customs Regulations Increasing Minimum Amount of Proprietor's Warehouse Bond, Customs Form 3581 From $5,000 to $10,000, Rescinded

On November 5, 1975, a notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (40 FR 51445), which proposed to amend § 113.14(a) of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 113.14(a)) to increase the minimum amount of the Proprietor's Warehouse Bond from $5,000 to $10,000. The purpose of the amendment was to provide a more adequate protection to secure the payment of reimbursable costs or the revenue due the United States in view of the substantial increase in both the quantity and value of imported merchandise since 1921 when the minimum amount of $5,000 was established.

However, after consideration of the issue, it has been determined that the public interest would not be served by proceeding with the proposed amendment at this time.

Accordingly, the notice is hereby rescinded.

VERNON D. ACREE,
*Commissioner of Customs.*

Approved: January 3, 1977.

JERRY THOMAS,
*Under Secretary of the Treasury.*

[FR Doc.77-955 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

## Food and Drug Administration

[ 21 CFR Part 18 ]

[Docket No. 76N-0175]

## MILK

### Standards of Identity for Lowfat and Skim Milk; Use of Stabilizers and Emulsifiers

*Correction*

In FR Doc. 76-31203 appearing on page 46873 in the issue for Tuesday, October 26, 1976, on page 46874, in § 18.20 (e)(1)(v), the second line should have read "eners" when stabilizers are added to increase the viscosity".

[ 21 CFR Parts 1, 369, 500, 701, 740, 801 ]

[Docket No. 76N-0460]

## FLUOROCARBONS AND OTHER HALOCARBONS IN FOODS, DRUGS, ANIMAL DRUGS, BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS, COSMETICS, AND MEDICAL DEVICES

### Notice of Intent to Propose Rules; Request for Information

*Correction*

In FR Doc. 76-34835, appearing at page 52070 in the issue for Friday, November 26, 1976, make the following changes:

1. In the 15th line from the bottom of the second column, "halogews", should read "halogens".

2. In the 5th line of the second full paragraph of the 3rd column, the chemical formula "($CH_2CC_2$)", should be "($CH_2CCl_2$)".

3. Wherever the word "strateosphere" appears in this document, it should actually be "stratosphere".

[ 21 CFR Part 701 ]

[Docket No. 76P-0405]

## COSMETIC INGREDIENT LABELING

### Establishing of Names of Fluorocarbons (Halocarbon) Propellant Ingredients

*Correction*

In FR Doc. 76-34834, appearing at page 52078 in the issue of Friday, November 26, 1976, make the following changes:

1. The next to the last line of the third full paragraph in the second column should read "chlorofluorocarbon 22," "hydrochlorofluorocarbon 142B," and "hydrofluoro-.

2. In the table in § 701.3 on page 52079, the 5th line should read as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1,2-dichloro-1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethane | |
| $CClF_2CClF_2$ | Chlorofluorocarbon 114 |

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ 40 CFR Part 201 ]

[FRL 669-6]

## RAILROAD NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS

### Special Local Determinations; Extension of Docket Closure Date

Pursuant to the authority of section 17(c) of the Noise Control Act of 1972, 42 U.S.C. section 4916(c), the Environmental Protection Agency published a notice of proposed rulemaking in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 29, 1976, (41 FR 52317), to amend the Interstate Railroad Noise Emission Regulations, 40 CFR Part 201, by adding a new Subpart D concerning special local determinations for waiver by the EPA Administrator of the preemption of certain State and local railroad noise regulations.

The Federal railroad noise regulations of 40 CFR Part 201 were published by the Agency on January 14, 1976, as required by section 17(a) of the Noise Control Act. The purpose of the proposed amendments is to clarify the preemptive effect of section 17(c)(1) of the Act, and to provide procedures for the implementation of the waiver authority of section 17(c)(2) of the Act.

The notice of November 29, 1976, solicited public participation in the development of the proposed amendments, and allowed 45 days for official written comment, i.e. until January 13, 1977. By this notice the Environmental Protection Agency extends the official comment period to January 27, 1977, in response to a request by the affected industry.

Written comments should identify the regulatory docket number and be submitted with five copies to: Director, Standards and Regulations Division, Office of Noise Abatement and Control (AW-471), Attention: Docket No.: 76-10, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460.

All comments submitted will be available for public inspection during normal business hours at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Public Information Reference Unit, Room 2922, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460.

Dated: January 6. 1977.

EDWARD F. TUERK,
*Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Waste Management.*

[FR Doc.77-1027 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[ 40 CFR Part 202 ]

[FRL 669-5]

## INTERSTATE MOTOR CARRIER NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS

### Special Local Determinations; Extension of Docket Closure Date

Pursuant to the authority of section 18(c) of the Noise Control Act of 1972, 42 U.S.C. section 4917(c), the Environmental Protection Agency published a notice of proposed rulemaking in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 29, 1976, (41 FR 52320), to amend the Interstate Motor Carrier Noise Emission Regulations, 40 CFR Part 202, by adding a new Subpart C concerning special local determinations for waiver by the EPA Administrator of the preemption of certain State and local motor carrier noise regulations.

The Federal motor carrier noise regulations of 40 CFR Part 202 were published by the Agency on October 29, 1974, as required by section 18(a) of the Noise Control Act. The purpose of the proposed

amendments is to clarify the preemptive effect of section 18(c)(1) of the Act, and to provide procedures for the implementation of the waiver authority of section 18(c)(2) of the Act.

The notice of November 29, 1976, solicited public participation in the development of the proposed amendments, and allowed 45 days for official written comment, i.e. until January 13, 1977. By this notice the Environmental Protection Agency extends the official comment period to January 27, 1977, in response to a request by a member of the affected industry.

Written comments should identify the regulatory docket number and be submitted with five copies to: Director, Standards and Regulations Division, Office of Noise Abatement and Control (AW-471), Attention: Docket No.: 76-11, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460.

All comments submitted will be available for public inspection during normal business hours at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Public Information Reference Unit, Room 2922, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

Dated: January 6, 1977.

EDWARD F. TUERK,
*Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Waste Management.*

[FR Doc.77-1026 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[40 CFR Part 260]

[FRL 669-2]

## ENVIRONMENTAL RADIATION PROTECTION CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR RADIOACTIVE WASTES

### Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Public Workshops

Notice was given (41 FR 53363, December 6, 1976) that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency intends to develop environmental radiation protection standards for high-level radioactive waste to assure protection of the public health and the general environment. This development will focus initially on two major outputs: general environmental protection criteria for all radioactive waste and numerical standards for high-activity, long-lived radioactive waste. These criteria and standards will be developed under the broad authorities transferred to the Agency from the former Atomic Energy Commission and the former Federal Radiation Council by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970.

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED

The Agency will develop its general environmental protection criteria and the numerical standards for high-level waste over the next year. During the period, there will be frequent interactions with the public through workshops, public availability of draft documents, and public hearings. Through these mechanisms, information and viewpoints will be sought on social and policy issues as well as technical background. The following opportunities for public involvement are currently planned, listed in the general sequence they are expected to occur.

1. Requests for viewpoints and technical information (41 FR 235, December 6, 1976) to assist the Agency in developing general environmental protection criteria applicable to all radioactive waste and numerical standards for high activity, long-lived radioactive waste.

2. Public workshops of about three days duration each to: (a) Define key terms associated with the waste problem, and examine the basic concepts for criteria selection, and (b) consider available information on the risks with wastes and the long-term implications of radioactive waste management and/or disposal. Special emphasis will be given to the social and policy questions.

3. A draft criteria document announced for public review and comment.

4. Proposed criteria for environmental protection for radioactive wastes for public review and comment.

5. Public hearings on proposed environmental protection criteria.

6. Public availability of a technical document analyzing expected environmental impacts from disposal of high-level radioactive wastes.

7. Public review of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and proposed standard for high-level radioactive waste.

8. Public hearings on the proposed standard for high-level radioactive waste.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF WORKSHOP ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION CRITERIA

The EPA plans to hold a workshop entitled, "Issues Pertinent to Development of Environmental Protection Criteria for Radioactive Wastes," on February 3-5, 1977, at the Sheraton Inn/International Conference Center, Reston, Virginia. A second workshop is tentatively scheduled for early March in Albuquerque, New Mexico. No fee will be charged for attendance at either workshop although advance registration is requested. Most of the first day will consist of a plenary session during which invited speakers will provide their opinions on key issues in each of the topical areas. The speakers have been selected to provide a well-balanced approach to the working sessions. Additionally, if any individual or member of the organization wishes to present a formal statement, the Agency will accept a written statement of no more than 1000 words submitted no later than January 25, 1977. There has been limited time allotted for oral presentation of these formal statements on the afternoon of February 3, 1977. Selection for oral presentation (limited to 10 minutes) will be on a first-come basis; however, all submitted statements will be included in the published proceeding of the workshop. The remaining day and a half will be devoted to smaller participative working sessions, each addressing a specific issue. Each working group will be expected to prepare a summary report on the issue, including minority or dissenting opinions, for inclusion in the record. The topical areas are:

1. *Topic 1: Approaches to Criteria Development:* This session will describe the various methodologies by which one may approach the question of setting criteria which would govern the management and disposal of radioactive wastes, including specific subjects for criteria development. Radioactive wastes would be treated in the broad context.

2. *Topic 2: Risk Considerations of Radioactive Waste:* This session will describe the actual risks involved with the various kinds of radioactive wastes. The description will deal with radioactive wastes in general and the various conditions wherein the wastes may potentially affect a member of the public.

3. *Topic 3: Long-Term Implications of Radioactive Waste:* This session will place in perspective the long-term implications of radioactive wastes, particularly high-level waste. Emphasis will be on questions of institutional dependence and longevity and dose commitments to future generations, and the bearing these considerations will have on the waste management criteria.

*Address.* Statements, comments, information, or other requests should be addressed to: Manager, Waste Environmental Standards Program (AW-460), Office of Radiation Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

Dated: January 4, 1977.

ROGER STRELOW,
*Assistant Administrator for Air and Waste Management.*

[FR Doc.77-904 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

### Social and Rehabilitation Service

[45 CFR Part 250]

## MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

### Reimbursement for Medical Services, Supplies, and Equipment

Notice is hereby given that the regulations set forth in tentative form below are proposed by the Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The proposal amends regulations on reimbursement for noninstitutional services under the Medicaid program, title XIX of the Social Security Act.

Under current regulations (45 CFR 250.30(b)(4)), payments for noninstitutional services (other than individual practitioner services) may be made up to a ceiling established on the basis of "prevailing charges in the locality for comparable services under comparable circumstances." Payments under Medicare (title XVIII) and other third-party insurers are among the criteria to be considered in determining the reasonableness of prevailing charges.

The purpose of this proposed change is to revise these upper limits under Medicaid to be the reasonable charge recognized under Medicare. Procedures for determining reasonable charges under title XVIII are specified in 20 CFR 405.501-511. In addition, the Medicare

program will publish from time to time more specific limitations relating to particular services, supplies, and equipment, which will apply under Medicaid as well.

Authority for the proposal is based on sections 1902(a) (4) and (30), and 1903 (i) (1) of the Social Security Act which require that:

1902(a) A State plan for medical assistance must * * * (4) provide (a) such methods of administration * * * as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan * * *;

* * * * *

(30) Provide such methods and procedures relating to the utilization of, and the payment for, care and services available under the plan * * * as may be necessary to safeguard against unnecessary utilization of such care and services and to assure that payments * * * are not in excess of reasonable charges consistent with efficiency, economy, and quality of care;

* * * * *

1903(i)(1) Payment under the preceding provisions of this section shall not be made * * *

(1) With respect to any amount paid for items or services furnished under the plan after December 31, 1972, to the extent that such amount exceeds the charge which would be determined to be reasonable for such items or services under the fourth and fifth sentences of section 1842(b)(3).

The fourth sentence pertains to physicians' services. The fifth sentence of section 1842 (b)(3) states:

In the case of medical services, supplies, and equipment (including equipment servicing) that, in the judgment of the Secretary, do not generally vary significantly in quality from one supplier to another, the charges incurred after December 31, 1972, determined to be reasonable may not exceed the lowest charge levels at which such services, supplies, and equipment are widely and consistently available in a locality except to the extent and under the circumstances specified by the Secretary.

The Department has reason to believe that an upper limit for payment of medical services, supplies, and equipment which is based on prevailing charges in the locality for comparable services is not sufficient to assure that payment for such services will not be "in excess of reasonable charges consistent with efficiency, economy, and quality of care." This belief is based on investigations of the laboratory industry in several States which found practices such as the following being used to obtain Medicaid patient referrals:

1. Laboratories "renting" space at highly excessive rates in sites owned by physicians.
2. Laboratories supplying physicians with free equipment, personnel, and billing services.
3. Laboratories paying consultant fees to "salesmen" for brokering Medicaid business to the laboratory.

To mitigate such practices, to assure that payment does not exceed reasonable charges consistent with efficiency and economy and quality of care, and to meet statutory requirements, rules are proposed which will limit payment for medical services (including laboratory services), medical supplies, and equipment (including equipment servicing), to the reasonable charge recognized under Part B, title XVIII.

Medicare has recently issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (See 41 FR 40495, September 20, 1976) which implements requirements of section 1842 (b)(3) of the Social Security Act. These regulations provide for (1) application of the lowest charge level provisions of section 1842(b)(3) to selected medical services, supplies, and equipment; (2) imposition of ceiling amounts for injection services plus the cost of ingredients and supplies used in providing such services; and (3) use of a negotiated rate for diagnostic laboratory services.

A proposed list of specific laboratory services and items of durable medical equipment which would initially be subject to the lowest charge level criteria was also published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. (See 41 FR 40533, September 20, 1976) The list included the following:

*Commonly Performed Laboratory Services* (with identifying codes as listed in the 1964 edition of the California Relative Value Studies).

(1) Cholesterol, Blood Test (8652).
(2) Complete Blood Count (8628).
(3) Hemoglobin (8622).
(4) Hematocrit (8681).
(5) Prothrombin Time (8712).
(6) Sedimentation Rate (8718).
(7) Blood Sugar (Glucose) (8722).
(8) Cytologic Study (Papanicolaou type) (8911).
(9) Urinalysis (8936).
(10) Blood Uric Acid (8747).
(11) Blood Urea (8745).
(12) Leukocyte Count (8624).

*Durable Medical Equipment.*

(1) Standard Wheelchair
(2) Standard Hospital Bed

As more items, services, and equipment (including equipment servicing) are brought under the lowest charge level provision, notices with respect to such coverage will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER by Medicare, and State Medicaid agencies will be informed.

Thus, under the proposed regulations the Medicaid upper limits for noninstitutional services not elsewhere covered in 45 CFR 250.30 would be:

(a) The lowest charge levels at which such services are widely and consistently available in a locality, according to specific notices for the Medicare program published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. These lowest charge levels represent "reasonable charges" under Part B of title XVIII for such services and items;

(b) For all others, the reasonable charge under Medicare (Part B, title XVIII), as determined according to the principles set forth in 20 CFR 405, 501–511.

Prior to the adoption of the proposed regulations, consideration will be given to written comments, suggestions, or objections thereto received by the Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, P.O. Box 2366, Washington, D.C. 20013, on or before February 25, 1977. In order to assure prompt handling of comments, please refer to MSA–185–P. Agencies and organizations are requested to submit their comments in duplicate.

Such comments will be available for public inspection in Room 5225 of the Department's offices at 330 C Street, SW., Washington, D.C., beginning approximately two weeks after publication of this Notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER, on Monday through Friday of each week from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. (area code 202–245–0950). Answers to specific questions can be obtained by calling James Houdek, 202–245–0256.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 13.714, Medical Assistance Program)

(Sec. 1102, 49 Stat. 647 (42 U.S.C. 1302)

NOTE.—The Social and Rehabilitation Service has determined that this document does not require preparation of an Inflationary Impact Statement under Executive Order No. 11821 and OMB Circular A–107.

Dated: December 2, 1976.

ROBERT FULTON,
*Administrator,*
*Social and Rehabilitation Service.*

Approved: December 29, 1976.

DAVID MATHEWS,
*Secretary.*

Section 250.30(b)(4), Part 250, Chapter II, Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, is revised as set forth below:

§ 250.30 Reasonable charges.

* * * * *

(b) *Upper limits* * * *

* * * * *

(4) *Other noninstitutional services, including laboratory services.* The upper limit for payment of medical services, supplies, and equipment shall be the reasonable charge recognized under Part B, title XVIII.

* * * * *

[FR Doc.77–852 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

# notices

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

## CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Dockets Nos. 28213, 28955, 29373, 29431, 29512, 29618, 29984]

### JAPANESE AIRFREIGHT FORWARDER OPERATIONS

#### Superceding Previous Notice of Prehearing Conference

Notice is hereby given of the revision of the Notice of Prehearing Conference, 41 FR 56683, December 29, 1976, issued in the above matters to show the correct Docket Numbers. Otherwise the notice stands. The prehearing conference in all of the above-docketed cases is scheduled to be held before the undersigned Judge on January 26, 1977, at 9:30 a.m. (local time), in Room 1003, Hearing Room C, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C.

The Bureau, on or before January 11, 1977, shall submit to each party (one copy) and to the Judge (four copies) of (1) the proposed statement of issues as to said party's application; (2) proposed stipulations; (3) proposed requests for information and evidence; and (4) the proposed hearing date. Each party other than the Bureau will respond by January 21, 1977, as to any requested data with which it differs or with which it will be unable to comply, and will explain all objections.

It is contemplated that these cases will be heard in one consolidated hearing.

Ordinary transcript will be adequate for the proper conduct of this proceeding.

Dated at Washington, D.C., January 3, 1977.

FRANK M. WHITING,
*Administrative Law Judge.*

[FR Doc.77-947 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. 27701]

### PACIFIC GROUP FARES INVESTIGATION

#### Hearing

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, that a hearing in the above-entitled proceeding will be held on February 1, 1977, at 9:30 a.m. (local time) in Room 1003, Hearing Room C, Universal North Building, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., before the undersigned.

For information concerning the issues involved and other details in this proceeding, interested persons are referred to the documents which are in the docket of this proceeding on file in the Docket Section of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Dated at Washington, D.C., January 4, 1977.

ALEXANDER N. ARGERAKIS,
*Administrative Law Judge.*

[FR Doc.77-946 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. 27914]

### TOURIST ENTERPRISES CORPORATION "ORBIS" D/B/A ORBIS POLISH TRAVEL BUREAU, INC., AND D/B/A PARGIELLO SERVICES, INC.

#### Prehearing Conference

Notice is hereby given that a further prehearing conference in this proceeding is assigned to be held on February 4 1977 at 10:00 a.m. (local time), in Room 1003, Hearing Room B, Universal Building North, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., before the undersigned.

Parties are instructed to submit one copy to each party and four copies to the Judge of revised (1) proposed statements of issues; (2) proposed stipulations; (3) proposed requests for information and for evidence; and (4) proposed procedural dates. The Bureau of Operating Rights will circulate its material on or before January 13, 1977, and other parties on or before January 24, 1977. The submissions of other parties shall be limited to points on which they differ with the Bureau, and shall follow the numbering and lettering used by the Bureau to facilitate cross-referencing.

Dated at Washington, D.C., January 3, 1977.

RONNIE A. YODER,
*Administrative Law Judge.*

[FR Doc.77-945 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Domestic and International Business Administration

### ADELPHI UNIVERSITY

#### Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Article

The following is a decision on an application for duty-free entry of a scientific article pursuant to section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897) and the regulations issued thereunder as amended (15 CFR 301).

A copy of the record pertaining to this decision is available for public review during ordinary business hours of the Department of Commerce, at the Office of Import Programs, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.

Docket Number: 76-00528. Applicant: Adelphi University, South Avenue, Garden City, New York 11530. Article: Flow Jet Mixer. Manufacturer: Funken and Co., Ltd., Japan. Intended use of article: The article is intended to be used for the study of the emulsification of water in fuel oils, Nos. 2, 4, and 6. The stability of these emulsions, as well as their micro structure will be studied. Experiments will also be conducted on the viscosity of these emulsions. In addition, the article will be used for the training of Ph. D. candidates on the use of these emulsions, as well as the participation of undergraduate students.

Comments: No comments have been received with respect to this application.

Decision: Application approved. No instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign article for such purposes as this article is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Reasons: This application is a resubmission of Docket Number 76-00435 which was denied without prejudice to resubmission on August 13, 1976 for informational deficiencies. The foreign article provides a technique of centrifuging a liquid as it flows across a high-speed rotating conical surface after which the atomized liquid, with high tangential and radial velocities, is mixed with a second liquid which is falling by gravity in a nearby liquid (annular) column. The National Bureau of Standards advises in its memorandum dated December 9, 1976 that (1) the specification of the article described above is pertinent to the applicant's intended use and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparticle described above is pertinent to the foreign article for the applicant's intended use.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 11.105, Importation of Duty-Free Educational and Scientific Materials.)

RICHARD M. SEPPA,
*Director, Special Import Programs Division.*

[FR Doc.77-846 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

### COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

#### Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Article

The following is a decision on an application for duty-free entry of a scientific article pursuant to section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897) and the regulations issued thereunder as amended (15 CFR 301).

A copy of the record pertaining to this decision is available for public review during ordinary business hours of the Department of Commerce, at the Office of Import Programs, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.

Docket Number: 76–00525. Applicant: Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colorado 80401. Article: Electron Microscope, Model EM 400, with High Tilt (±60°) Goniometer Stage. Manufacturer: Philips Electronic Instruments NVD, The Netherlands. Intended use of article: The article is intended to be used to evaluate changes in the micro and fine structure produced by corrosion experiments, mechanical testing and heat treatment of thin metal foils. Sections will be removed from various test speciments and electrolytically polished to render them suitable for transmission electron microscopy. Correlations relating mechanical properties and/or material deformation behavior to the observed fine structures will be made. The article will also be used in a course for advanced undergraduates to introduce students to the techniques of specimen preparation electron optics and the contrast mechanisms operating during the examination of thin foils by transmission electron microscopy.

Comments: No comments have been received with respect to this application.

Decision: Application approved. No instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign article, for such purposes as this article is intended to be used, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the foreign article was ordered (August 19, 1976).

Reasons: The foreign article provides a goniometer stage with ±60° degree eucentric tilt and 7 Angstroms point to point resolution guaranteed, accelerating voltages up to 120 kilovolts, and a wide magnification range (50× to 320,000× in 32 steps). The National Bureau of Standard's advises in its memorandum dated December 9, 1976 that (1) the specifications of the article described above are pertinent to the applicant's intended purposes and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign article for the applicant's intended use which was available at the time the article was ordered.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 11.105, Importation of Duty-Free Educational and Scientific Materials.)

RICHARD M. SEPPA,
*Director, Special*
*Import Programs Division.*

[FR Doc.77–844 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION; NATIONAL OCEAN SURVEY

### Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Article

The following is a decision on an application for duty-free entry of a scientific article pursuant to section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897) and the regulations issued thereunder as amended (15 CFR 301).

A copy of the record pertaining to this decision is available for public review during ordinary business hours of the Department of Commerce, at the Office of Import Programs, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.

Docket Number: 76–00531. Applicant: NOAA-National Ocean Survey, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin., Rockville, Md. 20852. Article: Stereoviewer, Model AS–11A–1 Modified. Manufacturer: Ottico Meccanica Italiana, Italy. Intended use of article: The article is a photogrammetric instrument designed to generate in digital and graphical form accurate delineations and positions of topographic, cultural and near offshore surface and subsurface features from stereomodels formed from aerial photographs. It will be internally combined into a fully analytical plotter system comprised of a two-stage stereoscopic viewer, a coordinatograph table, an electronic controller and peripherals, and interfaces for electronically coupling the coordinatograph and viewer to the electronic controller. The system is to be used for research and development of advanced techniques for compiling and editing data from aerial photographs. Typical software investigations to be pursued are photogrammetric bathymetry, photogrammetric geodesy, tidal current surveying, on-line strip adjustment and many other photogrammatric studies. In addition, research and development for classified activities will be conducted.

Comments: No comments have been received with respect to this application.

Decision: Application approved. No instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign article, for such purposes as this article is intended to be used, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the foreign article was ordered (June 30, 1976).

Reasons: The foreign article provides (1) two independently movable stages which provide a mensuration area no smaller than 10 x 19 inches, (2) continuously variable magnification over a minimum range of 1 to 6x with the capability of stereoviewing any type photograph from any source at up to 6x image scale differences between any two photographs and (3) a stereoviewer which will retain constant size measuring mark throughout the zoom magnification range. The National Bureau of Standards advises in its memorandum dated December 10, 1976 that the specifications of the article described above are pertinent to the applicant's intended use. NBS further advises that it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign article for the applicant's intended use which was available at the time the article was ordered.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 11.105, Importation of Duty-Free Educational and Scientific Materials.)

RICHARD M. SEPPA,
*Director, Special*
*Import Programs Division.*

[FR Doc.77–845 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## National Bureau of Standards

## FEDERAL INFORMATION PROCESSING STANDARDS TASK GROUP 15, COMPUTER SYSTEMS SECURITY

### Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. 1 (Supp. V, 1975), notice is hereby given that the Federal Information Processing Standards Task Group 15 (FIPS TG–15), "Computer Systems Security," will hold a meeting from 9:00 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Wednesday, February 16, 1977 in Room B–27, Building 225 at the National Bureau of Standards in Gaithersburg, Maryland.

The purpose of this meeting will be to continue discussion of the development of guidelines in the management and technological areas of information processing security.

The meeting will be open to the public. To the extent that the meeting time and agenda permit, interested persons may make oral statements and participate in the discussions. Written statements or inquiries may be addressed to Miss Susan K. Reed, Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C. 20234 (phone: 301–921–3861).

Dated: January 5, 1977.

ERNEST AMBLER,
*Acting Director.*

[FR Doc.77–886 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## LAW ENFORCEMENT EQUIPMENT

### Availability of Voluntary Performance Standards

The National Bureau of Standards announces the availability of voluntary performance standards for equipment used by law enforcement agencies, and for equipment purchased by the general public for the detection and deterrence of burglary. In addition to the 24 standards which have been published by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), NBS has prepared two user guidelines, 25 technical reports, and several reference materials for use by forensic science laboratories. The publications cover such items as protective equipment, communications equipment, door and window security, night vision equipment, burglar alarm systems, weapon and bomb detectors, patrol cars, and emergency warning devices. These documents are available from either the LEAA National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Washington, D.C. 20531, or the Superintendent of Documents,

U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Requests for lists of the standards and for any specific information should be addressed to the Law Enforcement Standards Laboratory, Room B150, Building 221, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C. 20234. This work is supported by LEAA's National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Dated: January 5, 1977.

ERNEST AMBLER,
*Acting Director.*

[FR Doc.77-837 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS VISITING COMMITTEE

### Meeting

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C., App. I (Supp. V, 1975), notice is hereby given that the National Bureau of Standards Visiting Committee will meet on Monday, February 14, 1977, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in Lecture Room B, Administration Building, National Bureau of Standards, Gaithersburg, Maryland, and Tuesday, February 15, 1977, from 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. in the 11th Floor Conference Room, Administration Building, National Bureau of Standards, Gaithersburg, Maryland.

The NBS Visiting Committee is composed of five members prominent in the fields of science and technology and appointed by the Secretary of Commerce.

The purpose of the meeting is to review the efficiency of the Bureau's scientific work and the condition of its equipment in order to assist the Committee in reporting to the Secretary of Commerce as required by law.

The public is invited to attend and the Chairman will entertain comments or questions at an appropriate time during the meeting. Any persons wishing to attend the meeting should inform Ms. Elaine D. Bunten, Office of Programs, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C. 20234, telephone (301) 921-3131.

ERNEST AMBLER,
*Acting Director.*

JANUARY 5, 1977.

[FR Doc.77-831 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## Economic Development Administration

## ARTVOGUE OF CALIFORNIA

### Petition for Determination of Eligibility to Apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance

A petition by Artvogue of California, 560 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94105, a producer of men's shirts, was accepted for filing on January 3, 1977, pursuant to section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-618) and § 315.23 of Adjustment Assistance Regulations for Firms and Communities (13 CFR Part 315).

Consequently, the United States Department of Commerce has initiated an investigation to determine whether increased imports into the United States of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm contributed importantly to total or partial separation of the firm's workers, or threat thereof, and to a decrease in sales or production of the petitioning firm.

Any party having a substantial interest in the proceedings may request a public hearing on the matter. A request for a hearing must be received by the Chief, Trade Act Certification Division, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230, no later than the close of business of the tenth calendar day following the publication of this notice.

JACK W. OSBURN, Jr.,
*Chief, Trade Act Certification Division, Office of Planning and Program Support.*

[FR Doc.77-908 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

## GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

### Public Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council established by section 302 of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Pub. L. 94-265).

The Gulf Council will have authority, effective March 1, 1977, over fisheries within the fishery conservation zone adjacent to Alabama, west coast of Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas. The Council will, among other things, prepare and submit to the Secretary of Commerce fishery management plans with respect to the fisheries within its area of authority, prepare comments on applications for foreign fishing, and conduct public hearings.

This is the fifth in a series of organizational meetings of the Council. The meeting will be held Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, February 2, 3 and 4, 1977, in the Fortress Room of the Fort Brown Motor Hotel, 1900 East Elizabeth Street, Brownsville, Texas. The meeting will convene at 1:30 p.m. on February 2 and adjourn at about noon on February 4, 1977. The daily sessions will start at 8:30 a.m. and adjourn at 5:00 p.m., except as otherwise noted. The meeting may be extended or shortened depending on progress on the agenda.

PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Management Plans.
2. Personnel and Administration Categories.
3. Other Business.

This meeting is open to the public and there will be seating for a limited number of public members available on a first come, first served basis. Members of the public having an interest in specific items for discussion are also advised that agenda changes are at times made prior to the meeting. To receive information on changes, if any, made to the agenda, interested members of the public should contact on or about January 25, 1977:

Mr. Paul D. Fulham, Special Assistant to the Regional Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Duval Building, 9450 Gandy Boulevard, St. Petersburg, Florida 33702.

At the discretion of the Council, interested members of the public may be permitted to speak at times which will allow the orderly conduct of Council business. Interested members of the public who wish to submit written comments should do so by addressing the Special Assistant to the Regional Director at the above address. To receive due consideration and facilitate inclusion of these comments in the record of the meeting, typewritten statements should be received within 10 days after the close of the Council meeting.

Dated: January 3, 1977.

WINFRED H. MEIBOHM,
*Associate Director, National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc.77-936 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## NEW ENGLAND FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

### Public Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a meeting of the New England Fishery Management Council established by section 302 of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Pub. L. 94-265).

The New England Fishery Management Council will have authority effective March 1, 1977, over fisheries within the fishery conservation zone adjacent to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. The Council will, among other things, prepare and submit to the Secretary of Commerce fishery management plans with respect to fisheries within its area of authority, prepare comments on applications for foreign fishing, and conduct public hearings.

This meeting of the Council will be held on February 1 and 2, 1977, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., and 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. respectively, at the Holiday Inn, Junction of Routes 1 and 128, Peabody, Massachusetts.

PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Discussion of Canadian boundary issue.
2. Review of foreign permit applications, if any.
3. Other fisheries management business.

This meeting is open to the public and there will be seating for approximately 30 public members available on a first-come, first-serve basis. Members of the public having an interest in specific items for discussion are also advised that agenda changes are at times made prior to the meeting. Interested members of the public should contact: Mr. Donald G. Birkholz, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service, State Fish Pier, Gloucester, Mass. 01930 on or about 10

days before the meeting to receive information on changes in the agenda, if any.

At the discretion of the Council, interested members of the public may be permitted to speak at times which will allow the orderly conduct of Council business. Interested members of the public who wish to provide written comments should do so by submitting them to Mr. Birkholz at the above address. To receive due consideration and facilitate inclusion of these comments in the record of the meeting, typewritten statements should be received within 10 days after the close of the Council meeting.

Dated: January 6, 1977.

WINFRED H. MEIBOHM,
*Associate Director,*
*National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc.77-937 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## NEW ENGLAND FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

### Public Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a meeting of the New England Fishery Management Council established by section 302 of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Pub. L. 94-265).

The New England Fishery Management Council will have authority, effective March 1, 1977, over fisheries within the fishery conservation zone adjacent to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. The Council will, among other things, prepare and submit to the Secretary of Commerce fishery management plans with respect to fisheries within its area of authority, prepare comments on applications for foreign fishing, and conduct public hearings.

This meeting of the Council will be held on January 25 and 26, 1977, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., and 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., respectively, at the Holiday Inn, Junction of Routes 1 and 128, Peabody, Massachusetts.

PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Discussion of foreign fee schedules and fishing regulations.
2. Status of emergency management plans.
3. Review of foreign permit applications, if any.
4. Staff recruitment and operations.
5. Other matters related to fisheries management.

This meeting is open to the public and there will be seating for approximately 30 public members available on a first-come, first-serve basis. Members of the public having an interest in specific items for discussion are also advised that agenda changes are at times made prior to the meeting. Interested members of the public should contact:

Mr. Donald G. Birkholz, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, State Fish Pier, Gloucester, Massachusetts.

on or about 10 days before the meeting to receive information on changes in the agenda, if any.

At the discretion of the Council, interested members of the public may be permitted to speak at times which will allow the orderly conduct of Council business. Interested members of the public who wish to provide written comments should do so by submitting them to Mr. Birkholz at the above address. To receive due consideration and facilitate inclusion of these comments in the record of the meeting, typewritten statements should be received within 10 days after the close of the Council meeting.

Dated: January 6, 1977.

WINFRED H. MEIBOHM,
*Associate Director,*
*National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc.77-935 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

### Amendment to Notice of Public Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a change in the convening and adjournment of the meeting January 25-27, 1977, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., in the Polk Room at the Howard Johnson's Motor Lodge, Motor Inn Plaza, Lake Buena Vista, Florida, of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council which was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER January 6, 1977, Volume 42, Number 4.

The meeting will now convene at noon on January 25 and at 9 a.m. on January 26 and 27. The meeting will adjourn each day at 5 p.m. with the exception of January 27 at which time the meeting will adjourn at noon. An additional item to the proposed agenda is also added, "3. Review of foreign fishing applications, if any." The location remains unchanged.

Dated: January 5, 1977.

WINFRED H. MEIBOHM,
*Associate Director,*
*National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc.77-934 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## TRANSFER OF A FISHING VESSEL TO A COMPANY UNDER FOREIGN CONTROL

### Receipt of Application for Approval

Notice is hereby given that on November 26, 1976, the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce received an application from Robert G. Earl, 1537 E. Roy Road, Freeland, Washington 98249, for approval of the sale of the 32.1' registered length vessel *Honey B.*, O.N.560373, and three undocumented vessels (*Jenny Wren*, WN-485-W, *Polly Ann II*, WN-176-W, and an unnamed vessel, WN-175-W) to Pacific Sea-Pro, Inc., 2321 58th Avenue E., Tacoma, Washington 98404. Such approval is required by sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended (46 U.S.C. 808,835), because 100 percent of the stock of Pacific Sea-Pro, Inc., a U.S. corporation, is owned by Mrs. Sachiko Otsuha, a Japanese citizen, and the contemplated sale of the vessels, therefore, would be to a company under foreign control. Pacific Sea-Pro, Inc., has informed the National Marine Fisheries Service that the vessels will be operated primarily for horse clam and geoduck.

The Maritime Administration is the Federal agency responsible for the approval or disapproval of applications submitted pursuant to sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act. However, the Maritime Administration customarily solicits the views of the National Marine Fisheries Service before deciding on an application relating to a fishing vessel, and has sought the views of the Service with regard to this application. Accordingly, the Service solicits the written comments of interested persons in regard to this application.

Such comments should be addressed to the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Washington, D.C. 20235, and received no later than February 10, 1977. All communications received by such date will be considered before action is taken with respect to this application. No public hearing is contemplated at this time.

Dated: January 4, 1977.

JACK W. GEHRINGER,
*Deputy Director,*
*National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc.77-919 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## WESTERN PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

### Public Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council established by section 302 of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Pub. L. 94-265).

The Western Pacific Council will have authority, effective March 1, 1977, over fisheries within the conservation zone adjacent to the State of Hawaii, American Samoa and Guam. The Council will, among other things, prepare and submit to the Secretary of Commerce fishery management plans with respect to the fisheries within its area of authority, prepare comments on applications for foreign fishing, and conduct public hearings.

The meeting will be held on February 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1977, in the Marianas Room of the Guam Hilton Hotel, Agana, Guam. The daily sessions will commence at approximately 9 a.m. and adjourn at 5 p.m.

PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Administrative report.
2. Review of budget estimates.
3. Status of preliminary fishery management plans.
4. Proposed regulations and fees for foreign fishing in the region.
5. Review of foreign fishery applications, if any.
6. Fishery problems of the Marianas.
7. Review of fishery development priorities in the western Pacific.
8. Other matters related to fisheries management.

This meeting is open to the public and there will be seating for approximately

30 public members on a first-come, first-serve basis. Members of the public having an interest in specific items for discussion are also advised that agenda changes are at times made prior to the meeting. To receive information on changes, if any, made to the agenda, interested members of the public should contact:

Mr. Wilvan G. Van Campen, Executive Director, Western Pacific Fishery Management Council, 1164 Bishop Street, Room 1596, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

on or about 10 days before the meeting.

At the discretion of the Council, interested members of the public may be permitted to speak at times which will allow the orderly conduct of Council business. Interested members of the public who wish to submit written comments should do so by submitting them to Mr. Van Campen at the above address. To receive due consideration and facilitate inclusion of these comments in the record of the meeting, typewritten statements should be received within 10 days after the close of the Council meeting.

Dated: January 6, 1977.

WINFRED H. MEIBOHM,
*Associate Director,*
*National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc.77-938 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

### MEETING

JANUARY 5, 1977.

The Commission of Fine Arts will meet in open session on Tuesday, January 25, 1977 at 10 a.m. in the Commission offices at 708 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20005 to discuss various projects affecting the appearance of Washington, D.C.

Other meetings of the Commission during 1977 are scheduled for 22 February, 22 March, 26 April, 24 May, 28 June, 26 July, 23 August, 27 September, 25 October 22 November, and 27 December, 1977.

Inquiries regarding the agenda and requests to submit written or oral statements should be addressed to Charles H. Atherton, Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts, at the above address.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-920 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 663-2]

### CALIFORNIA STATE MOTOR VEHICLE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS

#### Waiver of Federal Preemption

I. INTRODUCTION

On July 23, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), by notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 30383), announced a public hearing pursuant to section 209(b) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (hereinafter the "Act") (42 U.S.C. 1857f-6a(b)). That hearing was called to consider a request by the State of California that the Administrator waive application of section 209(a) of the Act with respect to a number of actions taken to revise California's motor vehicle emissions control program. Section 209(b) of the Act requires the Administrator to grant such waiver, after opportunity for a public hearing, unless he finds that the State of California does not require standards more stringent than applicable Federal standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions, or that such State standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are not consistent with section 202(a) of the Act. State standards and enforcement procedures are deemed not to be consistent with section 202(a) if there is inadequate lead time to permit the development and application of the requisite technology, giving appropriate consideration to the cost of compliance within that time frame. In addition, in those instances where the same vehicles or engines are subject to both Federal and California standards, the California standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are deemed not to be consistent with section 202(a) if any testing required to demonstrate compliance of a vehicle or engine with the California standard would not satisfy a comparable testing requirement for demonstrating compliance with the applicable Federal standard.

The public hearing was held in Los Angeles, California, on August 25 and 26, 1976, and the following three issues were addressed:

(i) Exhaust emission standards and test procedures for 1978 model year medium duty vehicles;

(ii) Application of the fuel evaporative emission standard and test procedure (SHED test) to 1978 and subsequent model year medium duty vehicles and heavy duty vehicles; and

(iii) Fill pipe and opening specifications for 1977 and subsequent model year gasoline-powered motor vehicles. The record was kept open until September 10, 1976, for the submission of written material, data or arguments by interested persons.

This decision will deal solely with the first item above, exhaust emission standards and test procedures for 1978 model year medium duty vehicles. The second item is still under consideration and a decision will be published as soon as a determination has been made. A decision on the third item, fill pipe and opening specifications, has recently been published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

With respect to California's exhaust emission standards and test procedures for 1978 model year medium duty vehicles, I have determined that I cannot make the findings required for denial of the waiver under section 209(b), and therefore I am compelled to grant the requested waiver of Federal preemption. The record of the hearing and the other information available time clearly indicate that California requires standards more stringent than applicable Federal standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions, that the requisite technology is currently available, and that there appears to be adequate lead time to permit the application of this technology to 1978 model year medium duty vehicles. For the 1978 model year the EPA will accept the data used to successfully certify any medium duty vehicle under the California test procedure as demonstrating that the engine in such vehicle complies with applicable Federal standards, and a Federal certificate for this engine will be issued on this basis.

II. BACKGROUND

The need for better methods for determining emissions from vehicles in the 6000 to 8500 pound gross vehicle weight class has long been recognized by both the Federal government and California. On February 12, 1976, the EPA published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (41 FR 6279) to expand the light duty truck class by changing the upper weight limit from 6,000 to 8,500 pounds GVWR. These regulations were recently promulgated in final form, with the expanded light duty truck definition applicable to 1979 and subsequent model years. On March 31, 1976, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) established a new classification of motor vehicles known as "medium duty vehicles." On the same day the CARB adopted exhaust emission standards and test procedures for these medium duty vehicles for the 1978 model year. The California test procedures were subsequently amended on June 30, 1976.

A medium duty vehicle is defined by the CARB as a subset of the heavy duty vehicle class, and is any motor vehicle (except a passenger car) with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of between 6000 and 8500 pounds. The California exhaust emission standards applicable to these vehicles for the 1978 model year are 0.9 grams per vehicle mile (g/m) hydrocarbons (HC), 17 g/m carbon monoxide (CO), and 2.3 g/m oxides of nitrogen ($NO_x$). The testing will be performed on a chassis dynamometer, under a procedure which is basically the same as the Federal light duty truck procedure.

As noted above, according to the CARB definition, medium duty vehicles are a subset of the California heavy duty ve-

hicle class. If the medium duty vehicle category had not been established, these vehicles would continue to be classified as heavy duty vehicles, and would therefore be regulated by having engine exhaust emissions measured on an engine dynamometer under the heavy duty engine test procedure. The medium duty vehicle category was established in recognition of the fact that the majority of vehicles between 6,000 and 8,500 pounds GVWR are used more for personal transportation than for transporting goods, and are consequently driven in an urban environment similar to light duty trucks. As a result, the emissions characteristics of these vehicles would be more appropriately measured and regulated under the light duty truck procedure rather than the heavy duty engine procedure.

As stated above, Federal regulations have recently been promulgated for 1979 and subsequent model years to expand the light duty truck class by changing the upper weight limit from 6000 to 8500 pounds GVWR. The new EPA definition of light duty truck, however, does not include vehicles which have an actual curb weight of greater than 6000 pounds, because EPA has determined that a substantial portion of vehicles with curb weights greater than 6000 pounds are commercial, and not personal transportation vehicles. As a result the expanded Federal light duty truck class does not encompass every vehicle in CARB's medium duty vehicle class (i.e., those vehicles whose curb weight is greater than 6000 pounds and whose GVWR is between 6000 and 8500 pounds). This Federal expanded light duty truck class, though, is only applicable to 1979 and subsequent model years. With regard to the 1978 model year, therefore, all vehicles within the CARB medium duty vehicle class will be heavy duty vehicles for Federal purposes, and thereby subject to Federal heavy duty engine regulations.

### III. Discussion

*Stringency.* In order for California to receive a waiver for its medium duty vehicle standards, it must "require standards more stringent than applicable Federal standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions." In this instance the applicable Federal standards are the Federal heavy duty engine standards. The Federal standards currently applicable to 1978 model year heavy duty engines are 16 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-h) HC plus NOx (as $NO_2$), and 40 g/bhp-h CO, as measured under the engine dynamometer procedure.

California standards are considered to be more stringent if they may result in some further reduction in air pollution over what would be achieved with the Federal standards. It is difficult to quantitatively compare the 1978 model year California and Federal standards applicable to vehicles in the 6000 to 8500 pound GVWR class, due to the radically different test procedures involved in determining compliance with these standards. However, it is generally agreed that the California standards will require manufacturers of medium duty vehicles to use additional emission control hardware over what was required to meet the Federal standards. Specifically, manufacturers will be adding catalytic converters and exhaust gas recirculation in order to meet the California requirements. See Transcript of Public Hearing on California's Request for Waiver of Federal Preemption with Respect to Medium Duty Vehicles, Application of SHED Test Procedure, and Fill Pipe and Opening Specifications, August 25 and 26, 1976, at 52, 128, 135 (hereinafter "Tr."). The emission control hardware is required to reduce emissions in operating modes embodied in the CARB's medium duty test procedure (including the driving cycle) that are not emphasized in the engine dynamometer test procedure. In addition, data gathered by the CARB indicate that exhaust emission reductions over that obtained under the Federal standards will be achieved under the California medium duty standards, as a result of the application of additional emission control technology. See Tr. at 174–75. The only manufacturer who questioned the relative stringency of the California standards was the American Motors Corporation (AMC). See Tr. at 149. However, in response to EPA's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking concerning expansion of the light duty truck class, AMC stated in their comments dated April 9, 1976, that additional emission control devices and systems (catalytic converters, transmission controlled spark, and in some cases air injection) would have to be installed on vehicles between 6000 and 8500 pounds GVWR in order to meet the proposed Federal standards of 1.7 g/m HC, 18 g/m CO, and 2.3 g/m NOx.

Based upon all the information available to me, and the technical judgment of my staff, I conclude that the California 1978 model year medium duty vehicle exhaust emission standards are more stringent than applicable Federal standards.

*Technology and Lead Time.* The technology required to meet the California standards is currently available, and includes the use of oxidation catalysts, air pumps and exhaust gas recirculation. See Tr. at 12, 87, 128, 135–36. The question is whether there is sufficient lead time available to apply this technology to 1978 model year medium duty vehicles and certify these vehicles for sale in California.

The question of lead time will be discussed with respect to the California medium duty vehicle standards alone, and will not consider the time required for a single engine configuration to meet both the Californina standards as tested in a vehicle on a chassis dynamometer, and the Federal heavy duty engine standards as tested on an engine dynamometer. In order to simultaneously meet the Federal and California standards, the information provided by various manufacturers at the hearing indicates that there is insufficient lead time to apply the requisite technology to 1978 model year vehicles. See Tr. at 39, 40–41, 51–53, 104. Information provided by the Ford Motor Company explained the complexity of the "cross testing" that would be required to design a vehicle that would meet both the California standards on the vehicle dynamometer test cycle and the Federal standards on the engine dynamometer test cycle. See Tr. 54–60. Furthermore, as will be discussed later, the Congressional intent behind section 209(b) concerning whether the California standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are "consistent with section 202(a)" strongly implies that a manufacturer should not be subjected to a testing requirement to determine compliance with California standards which does not satisfy a comparable testing requirement for demonstrating compliance with applicable Federal standards. In this case, EPA intends to accept the California test data for the purposes of issuing Federal certificates of conformity.

With regard to the lead time necessary to meet the California requirements, two actions taken by the CARB reduce the lead time burden for various manufacturers. On June 30, 1976, the CARB adopted certain changes to the certification vehicle selection process. The purpose of these changes is to minimize the certification effort and lead time problems by reducing the need for special medium duty durability vehicles, provided that the medium duty and light duty truck emission control systems are essentially the same. See Tr. at 13. As stated by representatives of the Ford Motor Company, these changes permit "carryover" and "carry-up" of California light duty truck engine codes into the medium duty class, and use of carry-over light duty truck deterioration factors. The changes also limit certification and quality audit testing to high volume transmission/inertia weight/axle combinations of unique medium duty engine codes. See Tr. at 37. These amendments will permit Ford to significantly reduce the number of unique, new engine codes or calibrations which will have to undergo certification testing. See id. The General Motors Corporation and the American Motors Corporation, however, stated that they would not be able to take advantage of the carryover and carry-up provisions. See Tr. at 130–31, 152–53.

The second action taken by the CARB to eliminate lead time problems for certain manufacturers was to provide an exemption from the 1978 model year medium duty vehicle requirements to any manufacturer who did not produce any 1977 model year light duty vehicles for sale in California. See Tr. at 29–31. At the present time International Harvester is the only manufacturer who is expected to take advantage of this exemption. See Tr. at 30. Since the requisite technology to meet the medium duty standards generally consists of the application of existing light duty truck

technology, the purpose of the CARB exemption provision was to reduce the lead time problem for a manufacturer who has not had experience with emission control hardware on light duty trucks.

In light of these actions taken by California and due to the fact that the EPA will accept California certification data for Federal purposes,[1] it appears that there is sufficient lead time for manufacturers to meet the California requirements by the 1978 model year. Statements made by the Ford Motor Company indicate that although Ford agrees with this conclusion, they nevertheless expect there to be a two month delay in the start of 1978 model year medium duty vehicle production. See Tr. at 39, 46.[2] The General Motors Corporation indicated that based upon the actions taken by the CARB, and assuming that EPA will accept California data for Federal purposes, they expect to be able to certify a full line of 1978 model year medium duty vehicles for sale in California, in spite of the fact that General Motors will not be able to take advantage of the carryover and carry-up provisions discussed earlier. However, General Motors further stated that compromises would have to be made in areas of development testing other than emissions, such as fuel economy. See Tr. at 116–23, 126–27. The Chrysler Corporation stated that they expect to market nearly a full line of 1978 medium duty vehicles in California, although there would have to be some compression of their model line offerings and there is insufficient time to permit a normal development and certification program. See Tr. at 138–40. The American Motors Corporation initially stated that there was insufficient time to purchase the required test equipment and undertake the necessary development and certification programs in order to market the medium duty vehicles they would otherwise expect to sell in California (this amounts to a total of approxiately 3000 units). See Tr. at 150–51. However, upon being questioned with regard to this statement, American Motors stated that if the waiver were granted, they would market a single line of Jeep vehicles for sale in California. See Tr. at 155–56. From all the statements made by various manufacturers at the hearing, it appears that there is sufficient lead time to permit manufacturers to meet the California 1978 model year medium duty vehicle exhaust emission standards and to certify a sufficient variety of medium duty vehicles to satisfy the basic market demand in California.

With regard to the cost of compliance with the medium duty vehicle exhaust emission standards for the 1978 model year, the CARB has estimated that the incremental cost of applying the necessary additional emission control hardware (beyond that already in use to comply with the current heavy duty engine standards) will be $100 per vehicle. See CARB Staff Report 76–6–2 "Public Hearing to Consider Proposed Changes to Regulations Regarding Approval of 1978 and Subsequent Model Light-Duty Trucks and Heavy-Duty Engines," March 31, 1976, at 9. Very little cost information was provided at the EPA hearing. None of the manufacturers at the EPA hearing indicated any disagreement with the CARB estimates. Although there may be some additional costs due to the development and certification programs required to be undertaken by the manufacturers, no specific cost information was provided.

Based upon all the information available to me, I cannot conclude that with respect to medium duty vehicles, the technology required to meet the California exhaust emission standards and test procedures cannot be applied to the 1978 model year.

*Objections to Granting the Waiver.* Certain manufacturers objected to the California medium duty vehicle exhaust emission standards and test procedures on the grounds that these requirements are not consistent with section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act. See Tr. at 76–77, 92–96, 137–38, 150. These manufacturers argued that it would be inconsistent with section 202(a) to require a single vehicle or engine to undergo both vehicle dynamometer certification testing to meet the California medium duty vehicle requirements, and engine dynamometer certification testing to meet the Federal heavy duty engine standards. As a result, the manufacturers contend that under the criteria of section 209(b) of the Act the waiver request must either be denied, or EPA must be willing to accept California medium duty vehicle certification data for Federal purposes. As mentioned above, I have decided that for the 1978 model year EPA will accept the data used to successfully certify any medium duty vehicle under the California test procedure as demonstrating that the engine in such vehicle complies with applicable Federal standards, and a Federal heavy duty engine certificate for this engine will be issued on this basis.[3]

Various manufacturers also objected to section 18 (formerly section 15) of the California medium duty vehicle exhaust emission standards and test procedures, which provides an exemption from the 1978 model year medium duty vehicle requirements to any manufacturer who did not produce any 1977 model year light duty vehicles for sale in California. See Tr. at 29–31, 39–40, 69–71, 90–92. In order for a manufacturer to take advantage of this exemption, the manufacturer must demonstrate to the CARB that there is inadequate lead time to apply or purchase the hardware needed to meet the 1978 standards, and must state that an additional year of lead time will allow such hardware to be applied or purchased. Objections to this exemption provision were raised both on grounds of being inconsistent with section 202(a), and on constitutional grounds as being in violation of the equal protection guarantees of both the United States and California Constitutions. See Tr. at 69–71, 90–92.

I have determined that I cannot agree with the manufacturers' position. Concerning the constitutional claim, regardless of the validity of this argument, the EPA waiver hearing is not the proper forum in which to raise it. Cf. 41 FR 44209, 44212 (October 7, 1976) (motorcycle exhaust emission waiver). Questions concerning the constitutionality of the California regulations are beyond the scope of my review under section 209(b).

With regard to whether the exemption provision is inconsistent with section 202(a), the concept of consistency with section 202(a) only involves EPA inquiry into the burden that compliance with the California requirements will have on the affected manufacturers. Similarly, questions as to whether EPA could adopt this exemption provision at the Federal level are beyond my scope of review in a California waiver situation.

The authority of California to adopt and enforce regulations arguably includes that administrative flexibility to exempt from or waive applicability of the requirements for whatever purpose is appropriate to California. The mere inclusion of an exemption provision should have no bearing on this inherent flexibility. As was noted in the previous waiver decision for fill pipe standards, the inclusion of an exemption provision was strongly supported by the manufacturers.

*Findings.* Having given due consideration to the record of the public hearing, all material submitted for the record, and other relevant information, I hereby make the following findings.

1. The State of California had, prior to March 30, 1966, adopted standards

[1] Automatic issuance of a Federal Certificate of Conformity for an engine family which includes medium duty vehicles certified for sale in California will occur only if all California requirements have been met. This may not always be the case. For example, if in a single engine family a manufacturer elects to qualify for sale in California only three discrete engine codes, and desires to sell nationwide (except in California) additional engine codes in that same family, he will have to qualify the entire engine family, including those additional engine codes, for a Federal Certificate of Conformity under either the currently existing Federal heavy duty engine certification procedures, or optionally under the 1979 light duty truck procedures at the level of the 1978 light duty truck standards. The latter option has been provided to the industry, for other purposes, under the new 40 CFR 86.078–1(b). If such additional qualification is necessary, EPA will accept to the degree relevant under Federal procedures data from any vehicle that was tested for the purpose of obtaining the California certificate.

[2] Ford also conditioned their estimates on certain changes being required to California's evaporative emission testing program for medium duty vehicles (SHED test). California's medium duty SHED waiver request is currently under consideration, and the concerns raised by Ford will be discussed in the forthcoming SHED waiver decision.

[3] This presumption of compliance with Federal standards includes the smoke standard applicable to Diesel heavy duty engines.

(other than crankcase emission standards) for the control of emissions from new motor vehicles.

2. The California exhaust emission standards for 1978 model year medium duty vehicles are more stringent than applicable Federal standards, which are the Federal heavy duty engine standards.

3. Compelling and extraordinary conditions continue to exist in the State of California. The State oxidant pollution problem remains the worst in the nation. The testimony of the representatives of the CARB revealed that unless a virtual shutdown of Los Angeles is assumed, no current projections indicate that compliance with the ambient air quality standards can be achieved for California's South Coast Air Basin, a region which contains five percent of the nation's population.

4. With respect to 1978 model year medium duty vehicles, I cannot find that the California exhaust emission standards and test procedures, and accompanying enforcement procedures, are not consistent with section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act. Taking into account the cost of compliance, I find that the requisite technology is currently available and that there appears to be adequate lead time to permit the application of this technology so as to achieve compliance with the California requirements by the 1978 model year.

### IV. Decision

Based upon the above discussion and findings, I hereby waive application of section 209(a) of the Act to the State of California with respect to its exhaust emission standards and test procedures for 1978 model year medium duty vehicles, as found in section 1959 of Title 13, California Administrative Code, adopted March 31, 1976, as amended June 30, 1976, and "California Exhaust Emission Standards and Test Procedures for 1975 Through 1978 Model Passenger Cars, Light-Duty Trucks, and Medium-Duty Vehicles," as amended June 30, 1976.[4] For the 1978 model year EPA will accept the data used to successfully certify any medium duty vehicle under the California test procedures as demonstrating that the engine in such vehicle complies with applicable Federal standards, and Federal certificates of conformity for this engine will be issued on this basis.

A copy of the above standards and procedures, as well as the record of the hearing and those documents used in arriving at this decision, is available for public inspection during normal working hours (8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Public Information Reference Unit, Room 2922 (EPA Library), 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. Copies of the standards and test procedures are also available upon request from the California Air Resources Board, 1102 Q Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

Dated: January 4, 1977.

John Quarles,
*Acting Administrator.*

[FR Doc.77-820 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[4] Although this decision deals solely with medium duty vehicles, an implicit waiver is included for the June 30 test procedure amendments as they relate to 1978 model year light duty trucks.

---

[FRL 663-7]

## MANAGEMENT ADVISORY GROUP TO THE MUNICIPAL CONSTRUCTION DIVISION

### Renewal and Name Change

Pursuant to section 7(a) of the Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-63, Transmittal Memorandum No. 1, dated July 19, 1974, it is hereby determined that renewal of the Management Advisory Group to the Municipal Construction Division (formerly the Technical Advisory Group to the Municipal Construction Division) is in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the Agency by law. The charter which continues the Management Advisory Group to the Municipal Construction Division through December 1, 1977, unless otherwise sooner terminated, will be filed at the Library of Congress.

John Quarles,
*Acting Administrator.*

January 4, 1977.

[FR Doc.77-905 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[FRL 668-6; OPP-00040]

## STATE-FEDERAL FIFRA IMPLEMENTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SFFIAC)

### Open Meeting

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), notice is hereby given that a two-day meeting of the State-Federal FIFRA Implementation Advisory Committee (SFFIAC) will be held from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, January 27, and from 8:30 a.m. to approximately 12:30 p.m. on Friday, January 28. The meeting will be held in Room 3906-3908 of the Environmental Protection Agency, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

This will be the sixth meeting of the full Committee. A complete agenda has not, as yet, been developed. However, the agenda will contain items relating to implementation of key sections of the amended Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. A considerable portion of the available time will also be devoted to Regional reports and to reports by the chairmen of the five Working Groups responsible to SFFIAC. In addition, the chairman of the Working Group on Training, responsible primarily to the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, will present his report.

The meeting will be open to the public. All communications regarding this meeting should be addressed to P. H. Gray, Jr., SFFIAC Executive Secretary, Operations Division, Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. (202) 755-7014.

Dated: January 5, 1977.

Edwin L. Johnson,
*Deputy Assistant Administrator for Pesticide Programs.*

[FR Doc.77-906 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

# FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

## AMERICAN EXPORT LINES, INC. AND UNITED STATES LINES, INC.

### Agreement Filed

Notice is hereby given that the following agreement has been filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended (39 Stat. 733, 75 Stat. 763, 46 U.S.C. 814).

Interested parties may inspect and obtain a copy of the agreement at the Washington office of the Federal Maritime Commission, 1100 L Street, NW., Room 10126; or may inspect the agreement at the Field Offices located at New York, N.Y., New Orleans, Louisiana, San Francisco, California and San Juan, Puerto Rico. Comments on such agreements, including requests for hearing, may be submitted to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C. 20573, on or before January 31, 1977. Any person desiring a hearing on the proposed agreement shall provide a clear and concise statement of the matters upon which they desire to adduce evidence. An allegation of discrimination or unfairness shall be accompanied by a statement describing the discriminations or unfairness with particularity. If a violation of the Act or detriment to the commerce of the United States is alleged, the statement shall set forth with particularity the acts and circumstances said to constitute such violation or detriment to commerce.

A copy of any such statement should also be forwarded to the party filing the agreement (as indicated hereinafter) and the statement should indicate that this has been done.

Notice of agreement filed by:

James N. Jacobi, Esq., Kurrus and Ash, 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007.

Agreement 10276 would permit American Export Lines, Inc., Farrell Lines Incorporated and United States Lines, Inc., to interchange "* * * cargo containers, chassis, trailers and/or related equipment * * *" as circumstances may require in accordance with the terms of the agreement.

Dated: January 4, 1977.

By order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Francis C. Hurney,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-942 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## PACIFIC/INDONESIAN CONFERENCE

### Agreement Filed

Notice is hereby given that the following agreement has been filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended (39 Stat. 733, 75 Stat. 763, 46 U.S.C. 814).

Interested parties may inspect and obtain a copy of the agreement at the Washington office of the Federal Maritime Commission, 1100 L Street, N.W., Room 10126; or may inspect the agreement at the Field Offices located at New York, N.Y., New Orleans, Louisiana, San Francisco, California and San Juan, Puerto Rico. Comments on such agreements, including requests for hearing, may be submitted to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C. 20573, on or before January 31, 1977. Any person desiring a hearing on the proposed agreement shall provide a clear and concise statement of the matters upon which they desire to adduce evidence. An allegation of discrimination or unfairness shall be accompanied by a statement describing the discrimination or unfairness with particularity. If a violation of the Act or detriment to the commerce of the United States is alleged, the statement shall set forth with particularity the acts and circumstances said to constitute such violation or detriment to commerce.

A copy of any such statement should also be forwarded to the party filing the agreement (as indicated hereinafter) and the statement should indicate that this has been done.

Notice of agreement filed by:

H. R. Rollins, Secretary, Pacific/Indonesian Conference, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, California 94111.

Agreement No. 6060–21, entered into by the member lines of the Pacific/Indonesian Conference, modifies the conference agreement by adding language to Article 11 to provide the Conference Secretary with permanent authority to sign on behalf of the Conference membership and file for approval with the Federal Maritime Commission any amendments or additions to the agreement previously approved by the Conference. The additional language reads as follows:

Each of the parties hereto, hereby expressly authorize the Conference Secretary to sign on its behalf and to file for approval with the Agency charged with administering the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, any amendments to this agreement and to the appendix to this agreement which have been duly adopted by the Conference by the vote and procedures prescribed by this agreement or by the appendix to this agreement. Any person, by the act of becoming a party to this agreement shall thereby authorize the Secretary to sign and file amendments on its behalf as provided hereinabove.

Dated: January 5, 1977.

By order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

FRANCIS C. HURNEY,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-941 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## PUERTO RICO PORTS AUTHORITY AND SEA-LAND SERVICE, INC.

### Agreement Filed

Notice of agreement filed by:

Gary R. Edwards, Esquire, Ragan & Mason, The Farragut Building, 900 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Agreement No. T–3199–2, which is between the Puerto Rico Ports Authority (Port) and Sea-Land Service, Inc. (Sea-Land), modifies the parties' basic agreement providing for Sea-Land's preferential rights at and the lease of land adjacent to Berth E, Puerto Nuevo, San Juan, Puerto Rico. The purpose of the modification is to: (a) Correct a miscalculation in the square footage of the parcel to be leased by Sea-Land under the basic agreement; and (b) adjust accordingly the rental Sea-Land is to pay for its share of the facility. The basic agreement is the subject of Federal Maritime Commission Docket No. 76–46, "Agreements Nos. T–3191, et al."

The August 24, 1976, Order of Investigation and Hearing instituting Docket No. 76–46 provides that, in the event that any modification of Agreement No. T–3199 is filed with the Commission, such modification shall be made subject to Docket No. 76–46 for approval, disapproval or modification under the standards of section 15 of the Shippng Act, 1916.

Dated: January 5, 1977.

By order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

FRANCIS C. HURNEY,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-939 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## WEST INDIAN COMPANY, LTD.

### Agreement Filed

Notice is hereby given that the following agreement has been filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended (39 Stat. 733, 75 Stat. 763, 46 U.S.C. 814).

Interested parties may inspect and obtain a copy of the agreement at the Washington office of the Federal Maritime Commission, 1100 L Street, NW., Room 10126; or may inspect the agreement at the Field Offices located at New York, N.Y., New Orleans, Louisiana, San Francisco, California, and Old San Juan, Puerto Rico. Comments on such agreements, including requests for hearing, may be submitted to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., 20573, on or before January 31, 1977. Any person desiring a hearing on the proposed agreement shall provide a clear and concise statement of the matters upon which they desire to adduce evidence. An allegation of discrimination or unfairness shall be accompanied by a statement describing the discrimination or unfairness with particularity. If a violation of the Act or detriment to the commerce of the United States is alleged, the statement shall set forth with particularity the acts and circumstances said to constitute such violation or detriment to commerce.

A copy of any such statement should also be forwarded to the party filing the agreement (as indicated hereinafter) and the statement should indicate that this has been done.

Notice of consent of assignment filed by:

Donald O'Malley, Director, Tariff & Regulatory Affairs, Interisland Intermodal Lines, Inc., P.O. Box 2110, Jacksonville, Florida 32203.

Agreement No. T–2449–1 provides for the consent of The West Indian Company, Ltd. to an assignment whereby Berwind Lines, Ltd. assigned all its right, title and interest in Agreement No. T–2449 to Interisland Intermodal Lines, Inc., pursuant to paragraph 11 of the basic lease.

Dated: January 5, 1977.

By order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

FRANCIS C. HURNEY,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-940 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

# FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

## ARBITRATION SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Arbitration Services Advisory Committee, in accordance with section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of October 6, 1972 (Pub. L. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770–776), will meet on Thursday, January 27 and Friday, January 28, 1977 at 9:30 a.m. in the national office at 2100 K Street, Room 411, Washington, D.C.

The agenda is as follows:

1. Regional library of arbitrator awards.
2. Review of roster for comparison with 29 CFR 1404 standards.
3. 1977 arbitrator symposia and arbitration conferences.
4. Current status of Office of Arbitration Services.

This meeting shall be open to the public.

Communications regarding this meeting should be addressed to:

Mr. John Canestraight, Assistant Director, Office of Arbitration Services, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Washington, D.C. 20427.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this third day of January 1977.

JAMES F. SCEARCE,
*National Director.*

[FR Doc.77-899 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

# FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Docket No. ER77–125]

## ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO.

### Change to Cost of Money Adjustment Clauses

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that Arkansas Power & Light Company (AP&L) on December 23,

1976, tendered for filing proposed changes in the rates collected under the cost of money adjustment clauses contained in its Rate Schedules B4 and U4 for service to municipalities and rural electric cooperatives, respectively, and in its contracts for service to the City of Jonesboro, Arkansas, and Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation (AECC). The proposed changes would decrease revenues from service to all the customers except AECC by approximately $104,244, based on the 12 month period ending October, 1976. Revenues from service to AECC would increase approximately $272,898 during the same time period.

AP&L states that its current long-term embedded debt cost is 7.31%. Under the cost of money adjustment clauses with all customers except AECC, the base cost of long-term debt is 7.67%, calling for a reduction in the load charge for service to these customers of $20.03 per kilowatt of billing load. The base embedded long-term debt cost in the contract for service to AECC is 5.24%, thereby calling for an increase in the rate for service to that customer of $0.20 per kilowatt per month states AP&L. AP&L requests that these changes be made effective retroactively to November 15, 1976. AECC has stated that it does not object to the imposition of the increased charge as of that date.

Copies of the applicable portions of the filing were served upon AP&L's municipal and cooperative customers, Jonesboro, AECC and upon the Arkansas Public Service Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said application should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 17, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this application are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-866 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. ER77-109]

## DUKE POWER CO.

### Supplement to Electric Power Contract

DECEMBER 30, 1976.

Take notice that Duke Power Company tendered on December 13, 1976, a supplement to Duke Power Rate Schedule FPC No. 143 which is to become effective on January 19, 1977. The customer affected by the supplement is Broad River Electric Cooperative, Inc. (customer). Duke Power's contract supplement, agreed to by the customer, provides for increases in designated demand as follows:

| | Designated (kilowatts) | |
|---|---|---|
| | From | To |
| Delivery point No.: | | |
| 1 | 1,700 | 2,000 |
| 4 | 3,600 | 6,000 |
| 5 | 2,500 | 2,800 |

These figures were based on estimates of sales and revenues for the 12 months immediately preceding and for the 12 months immediately succeeding the effective date.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 11, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-858 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. E-9577]

## FITCHBURG GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.

### Acquisition of Facilities

JANUARY 3, 1977.

Take notice that on December 23, 1976, the Fitchburg Gas and Electric Company (FG&E) filed an application, pursuant to section 203 of the Federal Power Act, seeking authorization to purchase certain electric facilities now owned by the New England Power Company (NEP).

FG&E is an operating public utility providing electric and natural gas service to the communities of Fitchburg, Ashby, Lunenburg and Townsend and natural gas service only to the communities of Gardner and Westminster. The service area encompasses approximately 170 square miles in Northcentral Massachusetts.

The facilities to be purchased by FG&E consist of two substations, two 13.8 kV feeders, two 69 kV taps and miscellaneous customer metering and service equipment. The above described facilities were constructed by NEP to provide electric service to six industrial customers in and around the City of Fitchburg and to supply FG&E with wholesale electric service. These facilities are currently owned and operated by NEP.

NEP's wholesale service to FG&E over those facilities was terminated in 1972 when FG&E joined the New England Power Pool and made alternative arrangements to meet its requirements. Presently, these facilities serve as an interconnection between FG&E and the rest of the New England Power Pool and also in connection with transmission by NEP under contract of power to FG&E from the Boston Edison Company.

Upon implementation of the purchase and sale agreement, FG&E will own and operate these facilities and will be responsible to provide service to the six industrial customers.

FG&E requests waiver of the filing requirements of 18 CFR 33.1 and 18 CFR 33.3 (relating to filing of exhibits D, G and I). It states that waiver of the above requirements will not affect the content of required substantive information provided. FG&E further states its position that the instant acquisition is not subject to Federal Power Commission jurisdiction, claiming that the facilities involved are solely distribution facilities and hence outside the provisions of the Federal Power Act.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to such application should, on or before January 17, 1977, file with the Federal Power Commission, in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Persons wishing to become parties to the proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file petitions to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules. The application is on file with the Commission and is available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-864 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. ER77-121]

## GULF STATES UTILITIES CO.

### Filing

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that on December 20, 1976, in accordance with the agreements between Gulf States Utilities Company (Gulf States) and Sam Rayburn Dam Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Rate Schedule No. 98) and Gulf States and Sam Houston Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Rate Schedule No. 69), Gulf States filed the following change in the Blanchard point of delivery:

DISCONTINUED POINT OF SERVICE:

**Delivery Point: Blanchard temporary point.**
**Effective: December 7, 1976.**
**Location: North of Livingston, Texas on Line 419.**
**Voltage: 13.2 KV.**

AN ADDITIONAL POINT OF SERVICE:

**Delivery Point: Blanchard permanent point.**
**Effective: November 24, 1976.**

Location: 4.7 miles east of the junction of FM 356 and Highway 190 on Line 419.
Voltage: 13.2 KV.
Load: 7,500 KVA.

The Company states that copies of the filing have been mailed to the Sam Rayburn Dam Electric Cooperative, Inc. and to the Sam Houston Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 17, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-874 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. ER76-716]

## INDIANA & MICHIGAN ELECTRIC CO.

### Intention To Serve

DECEMBER 30, 1976.

Take notice that Indiana & Michigan Electric Company ("I&M") on December 1, 1976 tendered for filing an unsigned agreement with the City of Richmond, Indiana ("Richmond"). I&M states that the instant filing is made pursuant to the Company's filed FPC Electric Tariff WS, as amended, and filed with the Commission, as amended, on May 28, 1976.

I&M states that the reason for the proposed changes is to place Richmond on Tariff WS upon the termination on December 31, 1976 of the existing agreement with Richmond. I&M requests an effective date for the filing so made of January 1, 1977. In an order issued June 25, 1976 the Commission accepted I&M's proposed changes in its FPC Electric Tariff WS, suspended the same for one month and permitted such changes to become effective, subject to refund on and after July 27, 1976.

I&M states that copies of the filing were served upon the City of Richmond and upon the Public Service Commission of Indiana.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said application should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 17, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this application are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-865 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. ES76-60]

## IOWA SOUTHERN UTILITIES CO.

### Application

JANUARY 3, 1977.

Take notice that on December 21, 1976, Iowa Southern Utilities Company (Applicant) filed an application for an order pursuant to Section 204 of the Federal Power Act authorizing the issuance of $10,000,000 principal amount of First Mortgage Bonds.

Applicant is incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal business office at Centerville, Iowa and is engaged in the electric utility business in 24 counties in Iowa.

The Bonds will be dated February 1, 1977 and will mature on or before February 1, 2007 and will bear interest at a rate corresponding to the rate payable on pollution control bonds to be issued by the City of Chillicothe, Iowa for use in the construction of pollution control facilities which will be a part of the Ottumwa Generating Station, a plant jointly owned by Applicant and Iowa Power and Light Company, Iowa Public Service Company and Iowa-Illinois Gas and Electric Company. The Applicant proposes to issue its first Mortgage Bonds as additional security for the repayment of the principal and interest of the City of Chillicothe pollution control bonds which bonds are not general obligation bonds of the City of Chillicothe or in any way guaranteed by or the obligation of the City of Chillicothe, Iowa.

The proceeds from the sale of the pollution control bonds will be used to construct a portion of the pollution control facilities at the Ottumwa Generating Station which the Applicant is required to construct. There will be no proceeds from the First Mortgage Bonds of the Applicant since such bonds will be used for security purposes only.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to the application should on or before January 19, 1977, filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, petitions or protests in accordance with the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). The application is on file with the Commission and is available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-863 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. E-9485]

## KANSAS GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

### Refund Report

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that on December 6, 1976, Kansas Gas & Electric Company (KG&E) tendered for filing a report in compliance with Paragraph C of the Commission's Order Approving Settlement Agreement issued in the captioned docket on July 21, 1976. In its report, KG&E states that on November 24, 1976, it made refunds of all revenues collected in excess of the settlement rates plus interest at 9.7 per annum.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said report should file comments with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, on or before January 17, 1977. Comments will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken. Copies of this report are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-873 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. CP77-98]

## MONTANA-DAKOTA UTILITIES CO.

### Application

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that on December 16, 1976, Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. (Applicant), 400 North Fourth Street, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501, filed in Docket No. CP77-98 an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act and Section 157.7(b) of the Regulations thereunder (18 CFR 157.7(b)) for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the construction, during the twelve-month period beginning April 1, 1977, and ending March 31, 1978, and operation of facilities to enable Applicant to take into its certificated main pipeline system natural gas which would be purchased from producers and other similar sellers thereof, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The stated purpose of this budget-type application is to augment Applicant's ability to act with reasonable dispatch in connecting to its pipeline system supplies of natural gas which may become available from various producing areas generally co-extensive with its pipeline system or the systems of other pipeline companies which may be authorized to transport gas for the account of or exchange gas with Applicant.

Applicant states that the total cost of the proposed facilities would not exceed $2,900,000 and that the cost of any single project would not exceed $725,000.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before Janu-

ary 21, 1977, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, of if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-869 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket Nos. RP72-154; PGA76-5; RP74-72; DCA76-3; RP73-109 and RP74-95; AP76-1]

## NORTHWEST PIPELINE CORP.

### Certification of Settlement To the Commission

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that on December 10, 1976, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest) submitted a Stipulation and Agreement (Stipulation) in the above-styled proceeding for certification to the Federal Power Commission by the Presiding Administrative Law Judge. The Stipulation, along with the prepared testimony of Tim J. Hausler, Manager of Rates, and Exhibits 1 through 4 sponsored by Mr. Hausley in support thereof, were introduced into the record at the December 10, 1976, hearing. If approved, the proposed Stipulation will resolve all issues in Docket Nos. RP73-109 and RP74-95 (AP76-1) relating to the lawfulness of Northwest's proposed rate increase attributable to advance payments.

On December 13, 1976, the Presiding Administrative Law Judge certified to the Commission the Stipulation, the testimony of Mr. Hausler, and Exhibits 1 through 4.

Any person desiring to comment upon the Stipulation should file comments with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, on or before January 21, 1977.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-868 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. ER77-126]

## PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.

### Tariff Change

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that on December 27, 1976, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) tendered for filing a notice of change in contract provisions increasing charges for certain electric energy exchange services for the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) under its Original Volume No. 4. The proposed effectve date for the contract amendment is December 31, 1976. PG&E states that the proposed contract amendment has been agreed to by USBR in an amendment agreement executed December 22, 1976.

Copies of the filing were served upon the United States Department of the Interior and the California Public Utilities Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 and 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 19, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to this proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this application are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-871 Filed 1-10-76;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. ER77-124]

## PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF NEW MEXICO

### Agreement

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that Public Service Company of New Mexico (Company) on December 22, 1976 tendered for filing an agreement to provide surplus electric energy to the City of Farmington, New Mexico (Farmington).

This agreement was initiated to permit Company to furnish Farmington with electric energy that is surplus to Company as return energy to be delivered to the United States Bureau of Reclamation Colorado River Storage Project to be credited to the account of Farmington. The Company states that the agreement is to become effective on October 1, 1976 subject to FPC approval and has, therefore, requested a waiver of the notice requirements. The Company further states that the proposed rate for the contract period has been agreed upon by the parties and that copies of the filing have been mailed to the Mayor of the City of Farmington, New Mexico and the New Mexico Public Service Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said application should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commisson's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, and 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 17, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this application are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-872 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. ER77-122]

## PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF NEW MEXICO

### Supplement to Interconnection Agreement

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that on December 22, 1976, Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM) tendered for filing a supplement to an Interconnection Agreement (designated PNM Rate Schedule FPC No. 9) with El Paso Electric Company (El Paso). The supplement is in the form of a Service Schedule providing surplus transmission capacity for the delivery of El Paso's electrical energy.

PNM requests waiver of the notice requirement pursuant to § 35.11. PNM states that the proposed rate has been agreed upon by the parties and that copies of the filing have been mailed to El Paso Electric Company and the New Mexico Public Service Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said application should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in acordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 and 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 17, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this application are on file

with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-876 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. ER77-123]

## PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF NEW MEXICO

### Supplemental Agreement

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that Public Service Company of New Mexico (Company) tendered for filing on December 22, 1976 a Supplemental Agreement to a Transmission Service Agreement between Company and the United States Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) which will supplement Company's Rate Schedule FPC No. 23 and which provides for transmission service over Company facilities for ERDA power and energy.

This Supplemental Agreement reflects that ERDA has succeeded to all rights and duties of the Atomic Energy Commission under the subject agreement and ERDA's contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation Colorado River Storage Project (CRSP) for peaking power purchases which require increased transmission capacity. The Company states that the rate for service remains unchanged and that the effective date of the Supplemental Agreement has been established by the parties to be December 1, 1975. The Company has requested a waiver of the notice requirements. Copies of the filing have been mailed to jurisdictional customers and the New Mexico Public Service Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said application should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 and 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 17, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this application are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-875 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket Nos. ER76-308, and ED76-366]

## PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF NEW MEXICO

### Filing

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that Public Service Company of New Mexico (Company) on December 22, 1976, tendered for filing an agreement to provide power and energy for the Energy Research and Development Administration, Albuquerque, New Mexico. The Company states that the agreement incorporates the charges previously approved by this Commission as Supplement No. 7 to the Company's Rate Schedule FPC No. 10 by order dated September 8, 1976 in Docket Nos. ER76-308 and ER76-386.

The Company states that the electric service agreement was initiated to continue to provide the Energy Research and Development Administration with electric service at Los Alamos, New Mexico. The Company states that it did not submit this agreement in the original filing as it had not been approved by ERDA. ERDA's approval was obtained November 26, 1976, and the Company, therefore, now submits an agreement as approved by ERDA.

The Company states that copies of the filing were served upon the public utility's jurisdictional customer being served under this agreement and the New Mexico Public Service Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 and 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 17, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-867 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. CP77-88]

## STANDARD PACIFIC GAS LINE INC.

### Notice of Application

JANUARY 4, 1977.

Take notice that on December 13, 1976, Standard Pacific Gas Line Incorporated (Applicant), 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, California 94106, filed in Docket No. CP77-88 an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the replacement of an 8.9-mile portion of its existing pipeline between its Los Medanos Junction and its Los Medanos Storage Field Tap with facilities of larger capacity, the construction of pressure limiting facilities, and the operation of these facilities at 600 psig, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Applicant states that it was granted authority to operate the subject existing facilities by order of the Commission issued January 24, 1958. Applicant states that it has been engaged in an ongoing replacement program in order to replace those portions of its existing pipeline system which have deteriorated and which no longer meet the safety standards prescribed by the California Public Utilities Commission and the Department of Transportation. It also stated that portions of its pipeline system have been replaced in order to facilitate numerous public and private construction projects. In accordance with this replacement program, it is indicated, pipeline of a heavier wall gauge and in some cases larger diameter have been installed on occasion. It is indicated that the purpose of the replacements proposed herein is to upgrade further portions of the existing pipeline so as to allow for operation at 600 psig rather than the current maximum of 315 psig and to establish a uniform diameter of 26-inches for the whole 8.9 miles of pipeline.

Applicant proposes to replace the following pipeline segments as indicated:

| Mile post to mile post | Length (feet) | Diameter (inches) | | Pressure (pounds per square inch gage) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Existing | Future | Existing | Future |
| 167.5 to 168.1 | 3,528 | 26 | 26 | 315 | 600 |
| 169.0 to 169.3 | 1,525 | 26 | 26 | 315 | 600 |
| 174.2 to 174.4 | 1,427 | 24 | 26 | 315 | 600 |
| 175.6 to 176.2 | 2,907 | 22 | 26 | 315 | 600 |

In addition, Applicant proposes to install pressure limiting facilities at Los Medanos Junction (Mile Post 167.3) and Los Medanos Storage Field Tap (Mile Post 176.2) and to operate its pipeline at 600 psig between those points.

Applicant estimates that the total cost of its proposal would be $1,298,000. Applicant further states that the proposal would be financed by capital contributions from Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Pacific) and Standard Oil Company of California in a ratio of their capital interests in the Applicant or six-sevenths and one-seventh, respectively.

It is stated that the proposed replacement is required to enable Applicant to deliver increased volumes to Pacific for storage at Pacific's Los Medanos gas storage field in Contra Costa County, California.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before January 24, 1977, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) and

the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commisson on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-870 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. CP77-108]

## TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE CO., A DIVISION OF TENNECO INC.

### Application

DECEMBER 30, 1976.

Take Notice that on December 23, 1976, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, a Division of Tenneco Inc. (Tennessee), filed an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act, for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the transportation of natural gas for United Gas Pipe Line Company (United) all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

By its application, Tennessee requests authorization to transport up to 300,000 Mcfd of natural gas for United through Tennessee's Sabine-Kinder pipeline in Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana. The purpose of the proposed transportation is to enable United to receive into its pipeline system gas which will be available to United from the High Island Offshore System (HIOS), upon completion of the facilities authorized in Docket No. CP75-81, et al.

Tennessee proposes to take receipt of such volumes from Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco), for the account of United, at a proposed point of interconnection of the facilities of Tennessee and Transco on Tennessee's Sabine-Kinder pipeline located at Tennessee's MP 820 —+15.11 miles near Starks, Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana.

Tennessee proposes to deliver equivalent daily quantities of natural gas to United at various existing delivery points to United in Louisiana and Mississippi.

For the volumes of gas transported and delivered at each delivery point, Tennessee will charge a rate based upon its then effective 100 Mcf-Mile charge, computed on the basis of a 100 percent load factor and utilizing Tennessee's then current system average transmission cost of service applied to the distance in miles between the receipt point and the applicable delivery point.

Tennessee states that it has sufficient existing capacity in its Sabine-Kinder pipeline and in its gas supply area facilities to render the transportation service for United up to the volumes proposed without the need for any additional facilities. Tennessee further states that the proposed service will not impair Tennessee's service to any of its other customers.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before January 25, 1977, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in the subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-859 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. RI77-17]

## TEXAS ENERGIES, INC.

### Petition for Special Relief

JANUARY 3, 1977.

Take notice that on December 9, 1976, Texas Energies, Inc., Suite 306, Bank of the Southwest Building, Amarillo, Texas 79109, filed a petition for special relief in Docket No. RI77-17 pursuant to § 2.76 of the Commission's General Policy and Interpretations (18 CFR 2.76).

Petitioner seeks authorization to charge $1.15 per Mcf for the sale of gas to Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company from a well located on section 15-33S-33W, in Seward County, Kansas, in consideration for the installation of compression equipment. The subject gas is currently being sold at the rate of 35 cents per Mcf.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said petition should on or before January 26, 1977 file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. 1.8 or 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any party wishing to become a party to the proceeding, or to participate as a party in any hearing therein, must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-856 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. RI77-16]

## TEXAS ENERGIES, INC.

### Notice of Petition for Special Relief

JANUARY 3, 1977.

Take notice that on December 9, 1976, Texas Energies, Inc., Suite 306, Bank of the Southwest Building, Amarillo, Texas 79109, filed a petition for special relief in Docket No. RI77-16 pursuant to § 2.76 of the Commission's General Policy and Interoretations (18 CFR 2.76).

Petitioner seeks authorization to charge $1.25 per Mcf for the sale of gas to Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company from a well located on section 21-33S-29W, in Meade County, Kansas, in consideration for reworking the well and installing compression and artifical lift equipment. The subject gas is currently being sold at the rate of 35 cents per Mcf.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said petition should on or before January 26, 1977 file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. 1.8 or 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any party wishing to become a party to a proceeding, or to participate as a party in any hearing therein, must

file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-857 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. RP72-156 (PGA 77-3) and RP 72-64 (DCA 77-1); RP 76-17 (AP 77-1)]

## TEXAS GAS TRANSMISSION CORP.

### Proposed Changes in FPC Gas Tariff

DECEMBER 30, 1976.

Take notice that Texas Gas Transmission Corporation, on December 15, 1976, tendered for filing proposed changes in the following sheets:

THIRD REVISED VOLUME NO. 1

Eighteenth Revised Sheet No. 7

ORIGINAL VOLUME NO. 2

Ninth Revised Sheet No. 333
Eighth Revised Sheet No. 362
Ninth Revised Sheet No. 363
Eighth Revised Sheet No. 365

These sheets are being issued to reflect changes in the cost of purchased gas pursuant to Texas Gas' Purchased Gas Adjustment Clause. Also reflected are changes in the costs associated with advance payments and offshore transportation pursuant to the provisions of the Stipulation and Agreement approved by the Commission in Docket No. RP76-17.

Copies of the filing were served upon the company's jurisdictional customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 and 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before January 12, 1977. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-861 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. RP75-74]

## TRANSWESTERN PIPELINE CO.

### Certification of Settlement Agreement

JANUARY 3, 1977.

Take notice that on December 21, 1976, Presiding Administrative Law Judge Israel Convisser certified to the Commission a proposed settlement agreement in the above-captioned proceeding. In his memorandum of certification, Judge Convisser states that certain issues arising in this proceeding (set forth at pages 8-9 of the agreement) have been reserved for hearing, now scheduled to commence January 18, 1977. The rate of return issue has also been reserved; parties are to file their comments on this issue directly with the Commission.

Any person desiring to file comments or to protest any aspect of the proposed settlement agreement, including comments on the reserved rate of return issue, should file same with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, on or before February 11, 1977. Reply comments should be filed on or before March 11, 1977. Comments will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken. Copies of this agreement are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-855 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Docket Nos. ER76-303 and ER76-399]

## WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER CO.; WISCONSIN MICHIGAN POWER CO.

### Filing of Settlement Agreement

JANUARY 3, 1977.

Take notice that on December 13, 1976, a Settlement Agreement filed in the captioned proceedings by Wisconsin Electric Power Company and Wisconsin Michigan Power Company was filed with the Commission. According to the companies, based on a Period II test year ended July 1976, the two rates filed in this proceeding produced a total increase of $3,496,000 over the then effective rates filed in Docket No. E-8619. On the same test year basis, the Settlement Agreement would reduce that increase to $2,072,000.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said settlement agreement should file comments with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426 on or before January 10, 1977. Comments will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken. Copies of this agreement are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-860 Filed 1-10-77; 8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. RP72-133; PGA Nos. 77-1 and 77-1a]

## UNITED GAS PIPE LINE CO.

### Order Accepting for Filing and Suspending Proposed Tariff Sheets, Subject to Conditions

DECEMBER 29, 1976.

On November 15, 1976, United Gas Pipe Line Company (United) tendered for filing Thirty-Fifth Revised Sheet No. 4 to its FPC Gas Tariff, First Revised Volume No. 1. This proposed sheet reflects an 11.57¢ per Mcf semi-annual purchased gas adjustment (PGA) increase which would allow United to collect approximately $66 million in revenues.[1] United tendered for filing on November 24, 1976, Thirty-Sixth Revised Sheet No. 4 to its FPC Gas Tariff, First Revised Volume No. 1. This filing reflects an additional 14.11¢ per Mcf PGA increase pursuant to Opinion No. 770-A which would allow United to collect approximately $103 million per year in additional revenues. For the reasons stated below, the Commission shall accept the Thirty-Fifth Revised Sheet and suspend its operation for one day, accept the Thirty-Sixth Revised Sheet, and set forth the conditions upon which this acceptance is granted.

The proposed PGA adjustment tendered by these two filings is based upon a rolled-in systemwide average cost of gas. United's average cost of gas includes emergency purchases at rates in excess of Opinion No. 770-A and certain alleged non-jurisdictional purchases. With regard to the non-jurisdictional purchases, the Commission notes that the justness and reasonableness of these purchases has been raised as an issue in Docket Nos. RP74-20 and RP74-83 and CP76-238. There cases are presently before the Commission pending decision. Accordingly, the inclusion of costs associated with such purchases in the instant filing shall be subject to the final decision on this issue in the cited dockets.

The emergency purchases included in United's average cost of gas for this filing are in excess of the amounts allowed by Opinion No. 770-A. To assist the Commission's review of these emergency purchases to determine what further action is necessary, United shall file and serve on all its customers and interested state commissions within thirty days of the issuance of this order, evidence showing: (1) its need for the gas; (2) availability of other gas supplies; (3) the amount of gas purchased under each transaction; (4) a comparison of the price for each emergency purchase with appropriate market prices in the same or nearby areas; and (5) the relationship between the buyer and seller in each transaction. Upon receipt of this information and after comments concerning this information are received, the Commission shall review the entire matter to determine what further action is necessary and appropriate.

The proposed rate increases tendered for filing by United in this proceeding have not been shown to be just and reasonable and, therefore, they may be unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential, or otherwise unlawful. Accordingly, the Commission shall accept United's Thirty-Fifth Revised Sheet No. 4 for filing and suspend its operation for one day and shall accept Thirty-Sixth Revised Sheet No. 4 for filing as of January 2, 1977. Such acceptance is subject to the conditions set forth in this order.

The Commission orders: (A) United's Thirty-Fifth Revised Sheet is hereby ac-

[1] This includes $38.5 million for increased purchased gas costs and $27.5 million in deferred costs.

cepted for filing and the use thereof suspended for one day, that is, until January 2, 1977, at which time it shall be permitted to become effective, subject to refund, pending a final Commission decision in this proceeding.

(B) United's Thirty-Sixth Revised Sheet No. 4 is hereby accepted for filing and is permitted to go into operation on January 2, 1977.

(C) The acceptance ordered in (A) and (B), above, is subject to these conditions: (1) United shall file a downward revision of these rates if it does not incur all anticipated producer increases by January 1, 1977; and, (2) the inclusion of costs related to non-jurisdictional purchases is subject to the outcome of the proceedings in Docket Nos. RP74–20 and RP74–83 and CP76–238.

(D) United shall file and serve on all its customers and interested state commissions evidence relating to the specific issues raised in this order regarding the emergency purchases United seeks to have included in the instant rates.

(E) United shall be permitted to file a revised sheet to be effective January 1, 1977, reflecting only that portion of the proposed adjustment including costs other than those related to emergency purchases at rates in excess of the levels established in Opinion No. 770–A and non-jurisdictional purchases.

(F) The Secretary shall cause prompt publication of this order to be made in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77–862 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

[H.2, 1976 No. 51]

### ACTIONS OF THE BOARD

### Applications and Reports Received During the Week Ending December 18, 1976

ACTIONS OF THE BOARD

Structural adjustment in reserve requirements on demand deposits (Docket No. R–0069).

Regulation Z, Truth in Lending, supplement specifying the procedures and criteria under which States may be granted exemptions under the Fair Credit Billing Act (Docket No. R–0067).

Regulation T, Credit by Brokers and Dealers, notice of proposed rulemaking; credit to exchange specialists in options; the Board requested comment on the proposed amendment through January 17, 1977 (Docket No. R–0054).

Amendment of Board's Rules Regarding Delegation of Authority to delegate to any member of the Board designated by the chairman the authority to approve amendments to notices of charges, proposed orders to cease and desist, and temporary cease-and-desist orders, previously approved by the Board pursuant to the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act (Docket No. R–0068).

Mark Twain Bancshares, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri, Board letter determining to accept the revised financial plan as an alternative to the commitment to make a public equity offering.

Central State Bank, Connersville, Indiana, issuance of subordinated capital notes.

Corpus Christi Bank and Trust, Corpus Christi, Texas, issuance of subordinated capital notes.

Texas Bank & Trust Company of Dallas, Dallas, Texas, issuance of subordinated capital notes.

First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Syracuse, Syracuse, New York, proposed merger with The New York Bank for Savings, New York, New York; report to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation on competitive factors.[1]

Eastpoint Savings Bank, Eastport, Maine, proposed merger with Bangor Savings Bank, Bangor, Maine, report to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation on competitive factors.[1]

First City Bancorporation of Texas, Inc., Houston, Texas, extension of time to March 15, 1977, within which to consummate and complete the opening of Red Bird National Bank, Dallas, Texas.[1]

Deseret Bancorporation, Pleasant Grove, Utah, extension of time to March 19, 1977, within which to acquire shares of the successor by merger to Bank of Pleasant Grove, Pleasant Grove, Utah; State Bank of Lehi, Lehi, Utah; Mountain View Bank, American Fork, Utah, existing banks; and Geneva State Bank of Orem, Orem, Utah, a proposed new bank.[1]

State Bank of Raritan Valley, Raritan, New Jersey, extension of time within which to establish a branch at intersection of Amwell Road and South Branch Road, Hillsborough Township, New Jersey.[1]

Detroit Bank—Troy, Troy, Michigan, extension of time to April 24, 1977, within which to establish branches at the southwest corner of Crooks and Maple Roads, and at the southeast corner of the intersection of Maple and John R. Roads, both of Troy, Michigan.[1]

First Mason Bank, Mason, Ohio, investment in bank premises.[1]

Central State Bank, Muscatine, Iowa, investment in bank premises.[1]

First State Bank, Porter, Indiana, investment in bank premises.[1]

### To Establish a Domestic Branch Pursuant to Section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act.

APPROVED

Central State Bank, Muscatine, Iowa. Branch to be established at 401 Grandview Avenue, Muscatine, Muscatine County.[2]

Union Bank & Trust Company, Evansville, Wisconsin. Branch to be established at the corner of North Madison and Mills Streets, Evansville.[2]

Union California Bank, Los Angeles, California. Branch to be established in the vicinity of the intersection of Imperial Highway and the Orange Freeway, City of Brea, Orange County.[2]

* * * * *

### To Become a Member of the Federal Reserve System Pursuant to Section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act.

APPROVED

Bradford Trust Company, New York, New York.[2]

---

[1] Application processed on behalf of the Board of Governors under delegated authority.

[2] Application processed by the Reserve Bank on behalf of the Board of Governors under delegated authority.

Northwestern Trust Company, New York, New York.[2]

* * * * *

### International Investments and Other Actions Pursuant to Sections 25 and 25 (a) of the Federal Reserve Act and Sections 4(c)(9) and 4(c)(13) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended.

APPROVED

Citibank Overseas Investment Corporation: Investment—to acquire Trinkaus & Burkhardt (International) S.A., Luxembourg, a de novo Bank.

Marine Midland Western International Corporation: Investment add'l in MM Builders Funds Limited, Canada, increasing its ownership to 100 percent.

Bamerical International Financial Corporation: Investment—to acquire BankAmerica Representacao E Servicos Limitada, Sao Paulo, Brazil.

Security Pacific Overseas Corporation: Investment—add'l in Banco Denasa de Investimento S.A., Brazil, to maintain 20 percent interest.

* * * * *

### To Form a Bank Holding Company Pursuant to Section 3(a)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

DENIED

Gaylord Bankshares, Inc., Gaylord, Kansas, for approval to acquire 80 percent or more of the voting shares of the First National Bank of Gaylord, Gaylord, Kansas.

APPROVED

Boyden Bancorp, Boyden, Iowa, for approval to acquire 81.7 percent of the voting shares of Farmers Savings Bank, Boyden, Iowa.

The First Arabian Corporation, Paris, France, for approval to acquire 77.4 percent or more of the voting shares of Bank of the Commonwealth, Detroit, Michigan.

First Company, Powell, Wyoming, for approval to acquire 80 percent or more of the voting shares of The First National Bank of Powell, Powell, Wyoming.[2]

Osborn Bancshares, Inc., Osborn, Missouri, for approval to acquire 100 percent (less directors' qualifying shares) of the voting shares of The Bank of Osborn, Osborn, Missouri.[2]

Fredericksburg Financial Corporation, Fredericksburg, Texas, for approval to acquire 81 percent or more of the voting shares (less directors' qualifying shares) of Fredericksburg National Bank, Fredericksburg, Texas.[2]

### To Expand a Bank Holding Company Pursuant to Section 3(a)(3) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

APPROVED

Dakota Bancorporation, Rapid City, South Dakota, for approval to acquire 80 percent of the voting shares of First National Bank of Crosby, Crosby, North Dakota, a proposed new bank.

* * * * *

### To Retain Bank Shares Acquired in a Fiduciary Capacity Pursuant to Section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

APPROVED

First Chicago Corporation, Chicago, Illinois, for approval to retain the shares of Marco Capital Corporation, Wilmington, Delaware and indirectly acquire Marshall County Bank & Trust Company, Plymouth, Indiana.[2]

* * * * *

To Expand a Bank Holding Company Pursuant to Section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

WITHDRAWN

Fidelity Union Bancorporation, Newark, New Jersey, notification of intent to engage in ience insurance) at Lebanon Valley Mall, *de novo* activities (casualty and convenience insurance) at Lebanon Valley Mall, Route 422, West Lebanon, Pennsylvania, through its subsidiary, Suburban Finance Company and its subsidiary, Sentry Consumer Discount Company (11/9/76 and 11/22/76).[2]

REACTIVATED

First Pennsylvania Corporation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (making, acquiring, or servicing for its own account or for the account of others, loans or other extensions of credit in particular commercial lending related to lease transactions and conditional sales financing) at Centre Square West, 16th and Market Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, through its subsidiary, First Pennsylvania Leasing, Inc. (12/17/76).[2]

PERMITTED

Fidelity Union Bancorporation, Newark, New Jersey, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (making loans in the present maximum amount of $5,000 or less under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Consumer Discount Company Act; and making available to customers, credit life insurance and disability insurance covering the unpaid balance of loans outstanding, and fire and theft insurance to protect household goods held at collateral during the periods of credit extensions) at Lebanon Valley Mall, Route 422, West Lebanon, Pennsylvania, through its subsidiary, Suburban Finance Company and its subsidiary, Sentry Consumer Discount Company (12/16/76).[2]

St. Joseph Bank and Trust Company and St. Joseph Agency, Inc., both of South Bend, Indiana, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (originating, acquiring, selling, and servicing of residential, commercial, and industrial mortgage loans) in the vicinity of 86th and Virginia, Merrillville, Indiana, through its subsidiary, St. Joseph Mortgage Co., Inc. (12/12/76).[2]

Rainier Bancorporation, Seattle, Washington, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (making or acquiring, for its own account or for the account of others, loans and other extensions of credit including the making of consumer installment loans, purchasing consumer installment sales finance contracts, and making of loans to small businesses; leasing personal property and equipment or acting as agent, broker, or adviser in leasing of such property where at the inception of the initial lease the effect of the transaction (and, with respect to governmental entities only, reasonably anticipated future transactions) will yield a return that will compensate the lessor for not less than the lessor's full investment in the property plus the estimated total cost of financing the property over the term of the lease, from rentals; estimated tax benefits, investment tax credit, net economic gain from tax deferral from accelerated depreciation, and other tax benefits with a substantially similar effect; the estimated residual value of the property at the expiration of the initial term of the lease which in no case shall exceed 20 per cent of the acquisition cost of the property to the lessor and in the case of a lease of not more than 7 years in duration, such additional amount, which shall not exceed 60 per cent of the acquisition cost of the property as may be provided by an unconditioned guarantee by a lessee, independent third party, or manufacturer which has been determined by the lessor to have the financial resources to meet such obligation that will assure the lessor recovery of its investment and cost of financing; acting as insurance agent or broker with regard to credit life and disability insurance relating only to extensions of credit by Rainier Credit Company, secured or unsecured, with the limitation that the initial amount of such insurance issued with respect to any debtors may at no time exceed the amount owed by debtors and with regard to consumer credit related property and casualty insurance on personal property subject to security agreements with Rainier Credit Company) at 10080 North Wolfe Road, Cuperinto, California, through its subsidiary, Rainier Credit Company (12/16/76).[2]

Rainier Bancorporation, Seattle, Washington, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (making or acquiring, for its own account or for the account of others, loans and other extensions of credit including the making of consumer installment loans, purchasing consumer installment sales finance contracts, and making of loans to small businesses; leasing personal property and equipment or acting as agent, broker, or adviser in leasing of such property where at the inception of the initial lease the effect of the transaction (and, with respect to governmental entities only, reasonably anticipated future transactions) will yield a return that will compensate the lessor for not less than the lessor's full investment in the property plus the estimated total cost of financing the property over the term of the lease, from rentals; estimated tax benefits, investment tax credit, net economic gain from tax deferral from accelerated depreciation and other tax benefits with a substantially similar effect; the estimated residual value of the property at the expiration of the initial term of the lease which in no case shall exceed 20 per cent of the property to the lessor and in the case of a lease of not more than 7 years in duration, such additional amount, which shall not exceed 60 per cent of the acquisition cost of the property as may be provided by an unconditional guarantee by a lessee, independent third party, or manufacturer which has been determined by the lessor to have the financial resources to meet such obligation that will assure the lessor of recovery of its investment and cost of financing; acting as insurance agent or broker with regard to credit life and disability insurance relating only to extensions of credit by Rainier Credit Company secured or unsecured with the limitation that the initial amount of such insurance issued with respect to any debtors may at no time exceed the amount owed by debtors and with regard to consumer credit related property and casualty insurance on personal property subject to security agreements with Rainier Credit Company) at 1241 East Shaw Avenue, Fresno, California, through its subsidiary, Rainier Credit Company (12/16/75).[2]

Rainier Bancorporation, Seattle, Washington, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (making or acquiring, for its own account or for the account of others, loans and other extensions of credit including the making of consumer installment loans, purchasing consumer installment loans, purchasing consumer installment sales finance contracts, and making of loans to small businesses; leasing personal property and equipment or acting as agent, broker, or adviser in leasing of such property where at the inception of the initial lease the effect of the transaction (and, with respect to governmental entities only, reasonably anticipated future transactions) will yield a return that will compensate the lessor for not less than the lessor's full investment in the property plus the estimated total cost of financing the property over the term of the lease, from rentals; estimated tax benefits, investment tax credit, net economic gain from tax deferral from accelerated depreciation and other tax benefits with a substantially similar effect; the estimated residual value of the property at the expiration of the initial term of the lease which in no case shall exceed 20 per cent of the acquisition cost of the property to the lessor and in the case of a lease of not more than 7 years in duration, such additional amount, which shall not exceed 60 per cent of the acquisition cost of the property as may be provided by an unconditional guarantee by a lessee, independent third party, or manufacturer which has been determined by the lessor to have the financial resources to meet such obligation that will assure the lessor of recovery of its investment and cost of financing; acting as insurance agent or broker with regard to credit life and disability insurance relating only to extensions of credit by Rainier Credit Company, secured or unsecured, with the limitation that the initial amount of such insurance issued with respect to any debtors may at no time exceed the amount owed by debtors and with regard to consumer credit related property and casualty insurance on personal property subject to security agreements with Rainier Credit Company) at 8888 S.W. Canyon Road, Portland, Oregon, through its subsidiary, Rainier Credit Company (12/16/76).[2]

APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

To Establish a Domestic Branch of a Member Bank Pursuant to Section 25 of the Federal Reserve Act.

United American Bank, Memphis, Tennessee. Branch to be established at 5384 Poplar Avenue, Memphis.

• • • • •

The following was typed in error in H.2 No. 48, the correct listing is below:

To Establish an Overseas Branch of a Member Bank Pursuant to Section 25 of the Federal Reserve Act.

Citibank N.A.: Branch—two in Liberia, one each in Monrovia and Yekepa.
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.: Branch—Singapore, Republic of Singapore.

• • • • •

Thirty Day Notice of Intention to Establish an Additional Branch of a Member Bank in a Foreign Country.

Citibank N.A.: Branch—two in Egypt, one each in Alexandria and Port Said.

• • • • •

[2] 4(c)(8) and 4(c)(12) notifications processed by Reserve Bank on behalf of the Board of Governors under delegated authority.

### To Form a Bank Holding Company Pursuant to Section 3(a)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

Manufacturers Bancorp., Inc., Leavenworth, Kansas, for approval to acquire 90.1 percent of the voting shares of The Manufacturers State Bank, Leavenworth, Kansas, Leavenworth, Kansas.

### To Expand a Bank Holding Company Pursuant to Section 3(a)(3) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

T.N.B. Financial Corp., Springfield, Massachusetts, for approval to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of the successor by merger to The First National Bank of Athol, Athol, Massachusetts.

Pacesetter Financial Corporation, Grand Haven, Michigan, for approval to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of the successor by consolidation to First Security Bank of Grand Blanc, Grand Blanc, Michigan.

Fort Sam Houston BankShares, Incorporated, San Antonio, Texas, for approval to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares (less directors' qualifying shares) of Northern Hills Bank of San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas.

* * * * *

### To Expand a Bank Holding Company Pursuant to Section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

Industrial National Corporation, Providence, Rhode Island, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (consumer finance and insurance agency for any insurance directly related to an extension of credit or provision of other financial services or otherwise sold as a matter of convenience to the purchaser) at 715 W. Oglethorpe Boulevard, Albany, Georgia, through a subsidiary, Southern Discount Company, a subsidiary of Industrial National Corporation (12/13/76).[2]

Citicorp, New York, New York, notification of intent to relocate *de novo* activities (making consumer installment personal loans, purchasing consumer installment sales finance contracts; and acting as broker for the sale of consumer credit related life/accident and health insurance; the insurance which the establishment offers to sell is group credit life/accident and health insurance to cover the outstanding balances of loans to borrowers in the event of their death, or, to make the contractual monthly payments on the loans in the event of the borrowers' disability; individual physical damage insurance on personal property subject to security agreements including liability only when such insurance is sold as part of an insurance package on such property is also offered; the additional activities are as follows: consumer home equity lending secured by real estate, making loans for the account of others such as one-to-four family unit mortgage loans; the offering to sell of level (in the case of single payment loans) term life insurance to cover the outstanding balances of consumer credit transactions, singly or jointly, with their spouses or co-signers in the event of death, or, to make the contractual monthly payments on the consumer credit transactions in the event of the obligators' disability to the extent permissible under applicable State insurance laws and regulations; further, in regard to the sale of credit related insurance, the subsidiary will not act as a general insurance agency) from 221 East Camelback Road, Phoenix, Arizona to Town & Country Shopping Center, 2077 East Camelback Road, Phoenix, Arizona; from 3832 E. Thomas Road, Phoenix, Arizona to Miller Plaza Shopping Center, Scottsdale, Arizona; and from 3826 W. Indian School Road, Phoenix, Arizona to Metro Center Shopping Center, 9861 Metro Parkway West, Phoenix, Arizona, through its subsidiary, Nationwide Financial Services Corporation and its subsidiary, Nationwide Financial Corporation of Arizona (12/14/76).[2]

First Amtenn Corporation, Nashville, Tennessee, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (making or acquiring, for its own account or for the account of others, loans and other extensions of credit such as would be made by a finance company including secured and unsecured loans to individuals, discounting of installment sales contracts, and secured commercial financing such as dealer floor-plan financing and lease financing; and acting as agent or broker in selling the following types of insurance to borrowing customers: Credit life insurance, accident and health insurance, and property damage insurance on collateral supporting loans made by Atlantic Discount Company, Inc.) at 3375 34th Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida, through a subsidiary, Atlanta Discount Company, Inc. (12/13/76).[2]

First Alabama Bancshares, Inc., Montgomery, Alabama, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (to engage in the activities of leasing personal property and equipment, or acting as agent, broker, or adviser in leasing of such property where at the inception of the initial lease the expectation is that the effect of the transaction and reasonably anticipated future transactions with the same lessee as to the same property will be to compensate the lessor for not less than the lessor's full investment in the property) at 182 St. Francis Street, Mobile, Alabama, through a subsidiary, First Alabama Leasing, Inc. (12/16/76).[2]

Flagship Banks Inc., Miami Beach, Florida, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (acting as agent for the sale of credit life and credit accident and health insurance and other credit related insurance that is directly related to extensions of credit by the bank holding company and/or its banking and non-banking subsidiaries) at West Bay Street, Davenport, 120 South Lake Shore Way, Lake Alfred, and Jones Avenue at 6th Street, Haines City, all located in Florida, through a subsidiary, Seaforth Inc. (12/13/76).[2]

Commercial National Corporation, Peoria, Illinois, for approval to acquire all of the shares of Commercial National Management Consulting Company, Peoria, Illinois (engaged in providing management consulting advice to nonaffiliated commercial banks with respect to auditing, marketing, mergers and acquisitions, site planning, financial planning, computer applications, capital adequacy, security measures and procedures and personnel evaluation and compensation).

The First National Bancorporation, Inc., Denver, Colorado, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (acting as agent for the sale of credit life, credit accident and health insurance on borrowers who have been extended credit by a bank or bank-related firm which is a member of The First National Bancorporation, Inc. system) at The First National Bank of Montrose, 400 Main Street, Montrose Colorado, through a subsidiary, First Denver Insurance Agency, Inc. (12/17/76).[2]

Fremont Bancorporation, Fremont, California, notification of intent to engage in *de novo* activities (acting as investment or financial adviser including providing portfolio and investment advice to any person) at 39150 Fremont Boulevard, Fremont, California (11/15/76).[2]

BankAmerica Corporation, San Francisco, California, notification of intent to relocate *de novo* activities (making loans, extending credit, servicing loans and other extensions of credit for itself and others and providing services incident to such loans and extensions of credit such as would be made or provided by a finance company including, but not limited to, providing funds and/or credit services in connection with the financing of stock and floor plan inventory of distributors and dealers of consumer products; making available to such dealers at their option and cost, fire, theft, and damage insurance on a monthly reporting basis covering only the outstanding indebtedness on such floor plan inventory) from Office "A", 3800 Union Road to The Cleveway Building Penthouse, Suite 3343, Harlem Road, Cheektowaga, New York, through its indirect subsidiaries, Ariens Credit Corporation (a Pennsylvania Corporation), BA FinanceAmerica Corporation (a New York Corporation), and Hupp Credit Corporation (a Delaware Corporation), subsidiaries of FinanceAmerica Corporation (12/8/76).[2]

BankAmerica Corporation, San Francisco, California, notification of intent to relocate *de novo* activities (making loans, extending credit, and providing services incident to such loans and extensions of credit such as would be made or provided by a finance company including, but not limited to, making consumer installment loans, purchasing installment sales finance contracts, and making loans to small businesses and extensions of credit secured by real or personal property; acting as agent or broker for the sale of credit related life, credit related accident and disability insurance, and credit related property insurance in connection with extensions of credit by FinanceAmerica Corporation) from 4800 Johnson Drive, Mission, Kansas to 3100 South 24th Street, Kansas City, Kansas, through its indirect subsidiary, FinanceAmerica Corporation (a Kansas Corporation), subsidiary of FinanceAmerica Corporation (12/8/76).[2]

BankAmerica Corporation, San Francisco, California, notification of intent to relocate *de novo* activities (making loans, extending credit, and providing services incident to such loans and extensions of credit such as would be made or provided by a finance company including, but not limited to, purchasing installment sales finance contracts on vehicles, mobile homes, pleasure equipment, and home improvements; acting as agent or broker for the sale of credit related life, credit related accident and disability insurance, and credit related property insurance in connection with extensions of credit by FinanceAmerica Credit Corporation) from 2103 Swift, Suite 101, North Kansas City, Missouri to 3100 South 24th Street, Kansas City, Kansas, through its indirect subsidiary, FinanceAmerica Credit Corporation (a Delaware Corporation), subsidiary of FinanceAmerica Corporation (12/8/76).[2]

BankAmerica Corporation, San Francisco, California, notification of intent to relocate *de novo* activities (making loans, extending credit, servicing loans and other extensions of credit for itself and others and providing services incident to such loans and extensions of credit such as would be made or provided by a finance company including, but not limited to, purchasing installment sales finance con-

tract, providing funds and/or credit services in connection with the financing of stock and floor plan inventory of distributors and dealers of consumer products; making available to such dealers at their option and cost, fire, theft, and damage insurance on a monthly reporting basis covering only the outstanding indebtedness on such floor plan inventory) from 5600 W. 95th Street, Overland Park, Kansas, to 3100 South 24th Street, Kansas City, Kansas, through its indirect subsidiaries, Finance-America Private Brands, Inc. (a Pennsylvania Corporation), Ariens Credit Corporation (a Pennsylvania Corporation), Hupp Credit Corporation (a Delaware Corporation), and Mercredit Corporation (a Pennsylvania Corporation), subsidiaries of FinanceAmerica Corporation (12/8/76).[3]

Security Pacific Corporation, Los Angeles, California, notification of intent to relocate de novo activities (the origination and acquisition of mortgage loans including development and construction loans on multi-family and commercial properties for its own account or for the sale to others and the servicing of such loans for others) from 4425 East Broadway to 6840 East Broadway, Tucson, Arizona, through its subsidiary, Security Pacific Mortgage Corporation (12/6/76).[3]

Wells Fargo & Company, San Francisco, California, notification of intent to engage in de novo activities (making or acquiring, for its own account or for the account of others, loans and other extensions of credit and servicing loans and other extensions of credit for any person) at 572 East Green Street, Pasadena, California, through a newly formed indirect subsidiary to be called Kern Mortgage Company, a subsidiary of Wells Fargo Realty Services, Inc. (12/10/76).[3]

Wells Fargo & Company, San Francisco, California, notification of intent to engage in de novo activities (making or acquiring, for its own account or for the account of others, loans and other extensions of credit; leasing personal or real property or acting as agent, broker, or adviser in leasing such property where the lease is to serve as the functional equivalent of an extension of credit to the lessee of the property and where at the inception of the initial lease the effect of the transaction (and, with respect to governmental entities only, reasonably anticipated future transactions) will yield a return that will compensate the lessor for not less than the lessor's full investment in the property plus the estimated total cost of financing the property over the term of the lease, from rentals; estimated tax benefits, investment tax credit, net economic gain from tax deferral from accelerated depreciation, and other tax benefits with a substantially similar effect and the estimated residual value of the property at the expiration of the initial term of the lease which in no case shall exceed 20 percent of the acquisition costs of the property to the lessor) at 425 California Street, San Francisco, California; 100 East 42nd Street, New York, New York; 208 South LaSalle, Room 1822, Chicago, Illinois; 1770 St. James Place, Suite 205, Houston, Texas; 2230 E. Imperial Highway, Suite 510, Los Angeles, California; through a newly-formed subsidiary to be called Wells Fargo Equipment Leasing Corporation (12/8/76).[3]

Wells Fargo & Company, San Francisco, California, notification of intent to engage in de novo activities (making or acquiring, for its own account or for the account of others, loans and other extensions of credit; leasing personal or real property or acting as agent, broker, or adviser in leasing such property where the lease is to serve as the functional equivalent of an extension of credit to the lessee of the property and where at the inception of the initial lease the effect of the transaction (and, with respect to governmental entities only, reasonably anticipated future transactions) will yield a return that will compensate the lessor for not less than the lessor's full investment in the property plus the estimated total cost of financing the property over the term of the lease, from rentals; estimated tax benefits, investment tax credit, net economic gain from tax deferral from accelerated depreciation, and other tax benefits with a substantially similar effect and the estimated residual value of the property at the expiration of the initial term of the lease which in no case shall exceed 20 percent of the acquisition cost of the property to the lessor) at 16600 Sprague Road, Cleveland, Ohio, through its subsidiary, Wells Fargo Leasing Corporation, Wells Fargo Transport Leasing Corporation and a newly-formed subsidiary to be called Wells Fargo Equipment Leasing Corporation (12/8/76).[3]

* * * * *

To Expand a Bank Holding Company Pursuant to Section 4(c)(12) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

Berkshire Hathaway Inc., New Bedford, Massachusetts, notification of intent to acquire directly and indirectly all of the outstanding stock of United National Insurance Company and American Insurance Service, Inc., both of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, engaged in the business of writing property and casualty insurance (12/17/76).[3]

REPORTS RECEIVED

None.

* * * * *

PETITIONS FOR RULEMAKING

Petition from Department of Justice for amendment of the Rules issued pursuant to the Bank Protection Act of 1968 (Docket No. R-0071).

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, January 4, 1977.

GRIFFITH L. GARWOOD,
*Deputy Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc.77-949 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## INDEPENDENT BANK CORP.

### Order Approving Acquisition of Bank

Independent Bank Corporation, Ionia, Michigan, a bank holding company within the meaning of the Bank Holding Company Act, has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to acquire all of the voting shares of the successor by consolidation to Western State Bank, Howard City, Michigan ("Bank"). The bank with which Bank is to be consolidated has no significance except as a means to facilitate the acquisition of the voting shares of Bank. Accordingly, the proposed acquisition of shares of the successor organization is treated herein as the proposed acquisition of the shares of Bank.

Notice of the application, affording opportunity for interested persons to submit comments and views, has been given in accordance with section 3(b) of the Act. The time for filing comments and views has expired, and the Board has considered the application together with all comments received, including those of the Commissioner of the Financial Institutions Bureau of the State of Michigan, in light of the factors set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Applicant, the 51st largest commercial banking organization in Michigan, controls three banks with aggregate deposits of about $74 million,[1] representing less than one percent of the total commercial bank deposits in Michigan. Acquisition of Bank would increase Applicant's share of commercial bank deposits in the State only slightly and would not have a significant effect upon the concentration of banking resources in Michigan.

Bank (deposits of $11.3 million) operates three offices, one in each of three separate banking markets, the Grand Rapids banking market,[2] the Freemont-Newaygo banking market,[3] and the Montcalm County banking market,[4] which are the relevant geographic markets for purposes of analyzing the competitive effects of the proposed acquisition. Bank is the sixteenth largest of seventeen banking organizations operating in the Grand Rapids banking market, the seventh largest of seven banking organizations operating in the Freemont-Newaygo banking market, and the sixth largest of nine banking organizations operating in the Montcalm County banking market, with 0.1, 0.4, and 7.6 percent, respectively, of the total deposits in commercial banks in each market.[5]

Applicant is presently represented in each of the three relevant banking markets. In the Grand Rapids banking market, Applicant's subsidiary bank was formed de novo in 1974, and controls deposits of $2.7 million, representing 0.2 percent of the total deposits in commercial banks in the market. In the Montcalm County banking market, Applicant's subsidiary bank controls deposits of $9.3 million,[6] representing 7.9 percent of the total deposits in commercial banks in the market. In the Freemont-Newaygo banking market, Applicant's subsidiary bank controls deposits of $8.8 million, representing 13.9 percent of the total commercial bank deposits in the market. It is the Board's view that consummation of this proposal would not have any significant adverse effect on existing competition in any relevant market in view of the relative size of

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, banking data are as of December 31, 1975.

[2] The Grand Rapids banking market is approximated by the Grand Rapids Ranally Metro Area ("RMA").

[3] The Freemont-Newaygo banking market is approximated by the southern two-thirds of Newaygo County.

[4] The Montcalm County banking market is approximated by Montcalm County and the two extreme northeastern townships of Kent County which are not included in the Grand Rapids RMA.

[5] Deposits as of June 30, 1975.

[6] Deposits as of June 30, 1975.

these organizations, their small market shares, and the number of remaining banking alternatives in each market. Accordingly, on the basis of the facts of record, the Board concludes that consummation of the proposal would have a slightly adverse effect on competition, but the Board does not regard it as significant and believes that it is outweighed by the convenience and needs factors discussed below.

The financial and managerial resources and future prospects of Applicant, its subsidiary banks, and Bank are satisfactory. Applicant will make available additional experienced financial personnel to assist Bank. Considerations relating to the banking factors are consistent with approval of the application. Application states that its affiliation with Bank would result in Bank's being able to draw upon Applicant's financial and managerial resources and, thus, should provide Bank with assistance in improving the quality of its services to the public, including the addition of data processing services, increased real estate mortgage lending, larger lines of credit, and the daily computation of interest on passbook savings accounts. Considerations relating to the convenience and needs of the community to be served lend some weight toward approval of the application and outweigh in the public interest the slightly adverse competitive effects that might result from consummation of the proposal. Based upon the foregoing and other considerations reflected in the record, it is the Board's judgment that the proposed acquisition is in the public interest and that the application should be approved.

On the basis of the record, the application is approved for the reasons summarized above. The transaction shall not be made (a) before the thirtieth calendar day following the effective date of this order or (b) later than three months after the effective date of this order, unless such period is extended for good cause by the Board, or by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago pursuant to delegated authority.

By order of the Board of Governors,[1] effective January 3, 1977.

GRIFFITH L. GARWOOD,
*Deputy Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc.77-926 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[1] Voting for this action: Vice Chairman Gardner and Governors Coldwell and Lilly. Voting against this action: Governor Wallich. Absent and not voting: Chairman Burns and Governors Jackson and Partee.

## LAKE VIEW BANCORP, INC.

### Order Denying Formation of Bank Holding Company

Lake View Bancorp, Inc., Northbrook, Illinois, has applied for the Board's approval under 3(a)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(1)) of formation of a bank holding company through acquisition of 100 percent of the voting shares (less directors' qualifying shares) of Lake View Trust and Savings Bank, Chicago, Illinois ("Bank").

Notice of the application, affording opportunity for interested persons to submit comments and views, has been given in accordance with 3(b) of the Act. The time for filing comments and views has expired, and the Board has considered the application and all comments received in light of the factors set forth in 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Applicant is a recently chartered, nonoperating corporation organized under the laws of Delaware for the purpose of becoming a bank holding company through acquisition of Bank ($329.7 million in deposits).[1] Upon acquisition of Bank, Applicant would control the 12th largest banking organization in the State of Illinois and would control approximately 0.5 percent of total deposits in commercial banks in the State.

Bank, located approximately 5 miles north of downtown Chicago, is the 11th largest of 196 commercial banks located in the Chicago banking market[2] and holds approximately 0.8 percent of the total commercial bank deposits in the market. The proposed transaction involves the transfer of ownership of Bank from an individual to a corporation owned by the same individual.[3] Applicant's principal, the present owner of Bank, is also the owner and director of two registered bank holding companies and an additional bank.[4] Each of these organizations operates in the Chicago banking market. Given the size of the banks involved and the structure of the market, it is the Board's view that the combination of these entities would have no significant adverse effects on competition.

Moreover, since the subject proposal is essentially a corporate reorganization and Applicant has no subsidiaries, it does not appear that consummation of the proposal would have any adverse effect upon existing or potential competition nor increase the concentration of banking resources, or have any other adverse effect upon any other banks in the relevant market. Thus, the Board concludes that the competitive considerations are consistent with approval of the application.

Under section 3(c) of the Act, the Board is required to consider the financial and managerial resources and future prospects of the proposed bank holding company involved and the bank to be acquired. With respect to the subject application, it appears that the financial and managerial resources and future prospects of Applicant are entirely dependent upon Bank. With respect to the managerial considerations of Applicant, they are regarded as generally satisfactory. In acting on one-bank holding company formations, the Board has been less restrictive than otherwise with respect to financial considerations in cases that involve a current or prospective owner-chief executive establishing a holding company to hold the individual's direct equity interest in the bank. The Board regards such a policy as being in the public interest in order to facilitate management succession on the community level at the nation's many smaller, independent banks. However, the Board has long held that, as a general matter, such a less restrictive policy with respect to financial considerations should not apply to those situations where the individuals are involved in more than a single one-bank holding company, such as those situations involving individuals that are engaged in establishing a series or chain of one-bank holding companies. In such situations, the Board believes that it is more appropriate to analyze such organizations under the standards that are normally applicable in analyzing acquisitions by multibank holding companies. The application of multibank holding company standards in such circumstances appears appropriate because of the interdependence of the banks in a chain of commonly-owned and one-bank holding companies and the distinct possibility that the financial and managerial resources of one or more of the banks in the chain may be used to support the operations of other members in the banking group.[5]

As part of this proposal, Applicant would assume the debt that its principal incurred in his acquisition of Bank's shares. Thus, Applicant proposes to incur a high level of acquisition debt, $27.6 million, which it expects to service over a 12-year period through Bank dividends that would appear to be in excess of half of Bank's projected annual net income, as well as through cash payments made

[1] All banking data are as of December 31, 1975.

[2] The Chicago banking market, the relevant geographic market for purposes of analyzing the competitive effects of the proposed transaction, is approximated by all of Cook and DuPage Counties and the southern portion of Lake County.

[3] Prior to the sale of Bank to William N. Lane, Applicant's principal, Bank was owned by N L Industries, Inc., New York, New York ("NL"), a diversified manufacturing company, which became a bank holding company by virute of the 1970 Amendments to the Act. On May 5, 1972, NL filed an irrevocable declaration to divest its interest in Bank by year-end 1980. Sale of Bank to Applicant's principal is intended to comply with that commitment.

[4] Northbrook Bancorp, Inc., which controls Northbrook Trust & Savings Bank, Northbrook, Illinois ($54.9 million in deposits) and Northwestco, Inc., which controls Northwest National Bank of Chicago ($312.4 million in deposits); and Pioneer Bank and Trust Co., Chicago, Illinois ($303.5 million in deposits).

[5] See Board Order dated January 15, 1974, denying the application of B H Co., Inc., Hardin, Montana (60 Fed. Res. Bull. 123 (1974)); Board Order dated October 17, 1975, approving the application of Commercial Bankshares, Inc., Grand Island, Nebraska (61 Fed. Res. Bull. 807 (1975)); and Board Order dated June 14, 1976, denying the application of Nebraska Banco, Inc., Ord, Nebraska (62 Fed. Res. Bull. 638 (1976)).

by Bank and retained by Applicant to the extent that they represent savings from filing consolidated tax returns. The projected earnings for Bank, in the Board's view, would not provide Applicant with the necessary financial flexibility to meet its annual debt servicing requirements as well as any unexpected problems that might arise at Bank. Moreover, if Bank's rate of growth approaches the growth rate of banks in its market area,[6] total capital funds of Bank as related to its total assets would become insufficient because of Applicant's inability to augment Bank's capital due to its substantial debt servicing requirements.

Furthermore, the Board notes with concern the highly leveraged condition of the two other one-bank holding companies owned by Applicant's principal as well as the high level of debt incurred by Applicant's principal in acquiring Pioneer Bank and Trust Co., Chicago, Illinois. It is also noted that the terms of the loan used to finance the purchase of Bank's shares are dependent upon a compensating balance provided by Bank, an action which the Board regards as an improper use of Bank funds. On the basis of the foregoing and other facts of record, the Board is of the view that it would not be in the public interest to approve the formation of a bank holding company with an initial debt structure that could result in the weakening of Bank's overall financial condition. Accordingly, the Board concludes that the considerations relating to the banking factors weigh against approval of the application.

As stated previously, the proposed formation of Applicant merely represents a restructuring of Bank's ownership. No significant changes in Bank's operations or in the services offered to Bank's customers are contemplated. Consequently, considerations relating to the convenience and needs of the community to be served are consistent with, but lend no weight toward approval of the application.

On the basis of all of the circumstances concerning this application, the Board concludes that the financial considerations involved in this proposal present adverse circumstances bearing upon the financial resources and future prospects of both Applicant and Bank. Such adverse factors are not outweighed by any procompetitive effects or by benefits that would result in serving the convenience and needs of the community. Accordingly, it is the Board's judgment that approval of the application would not be in the public interest and that the application should be denied.

On the basis of the record, the application is denied for the reasons summarized above.

By order of the Board of Governors,[7] effective January 3, 1977.

GRIFFITH L. GARWOOD,
*Deputy Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc.77-927 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[6] Applicant has projected Bank's annual growth in assets over the debt-retirement period at 4.5 per cent. The Board notes that over the last ten years the other banks in the market area of Bank have experienced an average compound rate of asset growth of 11.2 per cent.

[7] Voting for this action: Vice Chairman Gardner, and Governors Wallich, Coldwell, and Lilly. Absent and not voting: Chairman Burns, and Governors Jackson and Partee.

## MARION NATIONAL CORP.

### Order Approving Formation of Bank Holding Company

Marion National Corporation, Marion, Indiana, has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(1)) of formation of a bank holding company through acquisition of 28.29 percent (or more) of the voting shares of Marion National Bank of Marion, Marion, Indiana ("Bank").

Notice of the application, affording opportunity for interested persons to submit comments and views, has been given in accordance with section 3(b) of the Act. The time for filing comments and views has expired, and the Board has considered the application and all comments received in light of the factors set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Applicant, a closely held Indiana corporation, is engaged in the business of owning, holding and selling various securities for its own account. Upon consummation of the proposed transaction, Applicant would cease making investments that would otherwise be impermissible under the Act and would engage only in the business, pursuant to section 4(c)(5) of the Act, of holding and investing in shares which are of the kinds and amounts eligible for investment by national banking associations under the provisions of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (Paragraph Seventh, 12 U.S.C. 24).

Bank holds, deposits of $59.3 million[1] and is the largest of nine banks in the relevant market,[2] controlling approximately 31 percent of the total deposits in commercial banks in the market. Upon acquisition of Bank, Applicant would control approximately 0.33 percent of the total commercial bank deposits in the State of Indiana.

This proposal represents a distribution of shares of Bank currently held by the estate of John L. Bell, Sr. and is essentially a reorganization of Bank's present ownership into corporate form. Thus, consummation of the proposal would have no adverse effect on existing or potential competition and would not increase the concentration of banking resources in any relevant market. Accordingly, the Board concludes that competitive considerations are consistent with approval of the application.

The financial and managerial resources of Applicant and Bank are regarded as satisfactory. The future prospects of Applicant are dependent upon those of Bank, which are regarded as favorable. Accordingly, considerations relating to banking factors are consistent with approval.

Although consummation of the transaction would have no immediate effect on area banking needs, considerations relating to the convenience and needs of the community to be served are consistent with approval of the application. It is the Board's judgment that consummation of the proposed transaction would be consistent with the public interest and that the application should be approved.

On the basis of the record, the application is approved for the reasons summarized above. The transaction shall not be made (a) before the thirtieth calendar day following the effective date of this order or (b) later than three months after the effective date of this order, unless such period is extended for good cause by the Board, or by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago pursuant to delegated authority.

By order of the Board of Governors,[3] effective January 3, 1977.

GRIFFITH L. GARWOOD,
*Deputy Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc.77-928 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[1] All banking data are as of December 31, 1975.

[2] The relevant market is approximated by Grant County.

## MICHIGAN NATIONAL CORP.

### Acquisition of Bank

Michigan National Corporation, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to acquire 100 per cent of the voting shares (less directors' qualifying shares) of Michigan National Bank-Farmington, Farmington Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, a proposed new bank. The factors that are considered in acting on the application are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit views in writing to the Reserve Bank to be received not later than January 28, 1977.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, January 5, 1977.

GRIFFITH L. GARWOOD,
*Deputy Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc.77-929 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## PEOPLES BANKING CORP.

### Acquisition of Bank

Peoples Banking Corporation, Bay City, Michigan, has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to acquire all of the voting shares (less directors' qualifying shares) of the successor by consolidation to First National Bank of Lapeer, Lapeer, Michigan. The factors that are considered in acting on the application are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

[3] Voting for this action: Vice Chairman Gardner and Governors Wallich, Coldwell and Lilly. Absent and not voting: Chairman Burns and Governors Jackson and Partee.

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit views in writing to the Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, to be received not later than February 1, 1977.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, January 4, 1977.

GRIFFITH L. GARWOOD,
*Deputy Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc.77-930 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## TRUST COMPANY OF GEORGIA

### Order Approving Acquisition of Bank Holding Company and its Nonbank Subsidiary and Activities

Trust Company of Georgia ("Applicant"), Atlanta, Georgia, a bank holding company within the meaning of the Bank Holding Company Act, has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(5) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(5)) to acquire through merger Central Bankshares Corporation ("Corporation"), Jonesboro, Georgia, a one-bank holding company that owns all the voting shares of Central Bank and Trust Company ("Bank"), Jonesboro, Georgia. As part of the proposed transaction Applicant would acquire all the voting shares of Corporation's nonbank subsidiary, Central Bankshares Equity Corporation ("Equity"), Jonesboro, Georgia, and would acquire direct ownership and control of the leasing activities now engaged in directly by Corporation, for which acquisitions Applicant has applied for Board approval under section 4(c)(8) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)). Both the leasing activities of Corporation and the activities of Equity, which is engaged in making loans secured principally by second mortgages on single-family residences, have been determined by the Board by regulation to be activities permissible for bank holding companies under section 4(c)(8) of the Act.

Notice of the applications, affording opportunity for interested persons to submit comments and views, has been given in accordance with sections 3 and 4 of the Act (41 FR 46650, 46651). The time for filing comments and views has expired, and the Board has considered the applications and all comments received in light of the factors set forth in section 3(c) of the Act and the considerations specified in section 4(c)(8) of the Act.

Applicant, the third largest banking organization in Georgia, directly controls Trust Company Bank, Atlanta, Georgia, which has deposits of $796 million, and indirectly controls five other banks with aggregate deposits of approximately $400 million.[1] The aggregate deposits of Applicant's six subsidiary banks represent about ten percent of the total deposits in commercial banks in the State. Acquisition of Bank, through merger of Corporation into Applicant, would increase Applicant's share of the commercial bank deposits in the State by 0.14 percent and would not have a significant effect upon the concentration of banking resources in Georgia or alter Applicant's statewide ranking.

Bank is the 25th largest of 36 banking organizations in the Atlanta banking market[2] and holds deposits of $13.7 million, representing approximately 0.2 percent of the total deposits in commercial banks in the market. Trust Company Bank, Applicant's lead bank, and Security National Bank, Applicant's acquisition of which the Board recently approved, also operate in the Atlanta banking market. Together they comprise the third largest banking organization in the market with approximately 14 percent of the total deposits in commercial banks in the market. Trust Company Bank has 37 branches in DeKalb and Fulton Counties; Security National Bank has two branches, in Cobb County; and Bank has 4 branches in Clayton County and one limited banking office there. Although it appears that consummation of the proposed transaction would eliminate some existing competition between Bank and certain of Applicant's subsidiary banks, the Board notes that the competition that would be eliminated is not of a significant magnitude and that numerous independent banking organizations would remain in the Atlanta market following the merger. In addition, Georgia law prohibits Applicant from branching into or acquiring a de novo bank in Clayton County, and Bank, as the smallest of the six commercial banks in Clayton County, is the smallest vehicle that is available to Applicant as a means of entry into that county. Accordingly, Applicant's acquisition of Bank through this proposal is regarded as a foothold entry into Clayton County. In view of the foregoing, the Board concludes that the proposed merger would have only a slightly adverse effect on banking competition.

The financial and managerial resources of Corporation, Applicant, and their respective subsidiaries, and their future prospects are regarded as generally satisfactory, and considerations relating to banking factors are consistent with approval of the application. Applicant intends to offer services not now available to customers of Bank and to improve other services presently offered by Bank. Following consummation of the acquisition, Bank would make available to its customers reduced minimum deposits on time certificates of deposit and a more favorable method of compounding interest on passbook savings accounts. In addition, Applicant will assign a trust expert to improve the range and efficiency of Bank's trust services; will cause Bank to apply for new branches and for expansion of the services offered at an existing Bank office; and will increase the capabilities of Bank's existing 24-hour tellers. Considerations relating to convenience and needs of the community to be served accordingly lend some weight toward approval of the application to acquire Corporation's interest in Bank, sufficient to outweigh the slightly adverse effects on banking competition that might result from consummation of this proposal.

With respect to the nonbanking activities of Corporation and Applicant, consummation of this proposal would eliminate some direct competition in three nonbanking activities, but the Board concludes that the effect of eliminating Corporation's nonbanking competition in the Atlanta banking market would be negligible. Corporation and Applicant's lead bank both engage in leasing activities in the market, but Corporation has not actively engaged in leasing, and has only two relatively small leases on its books. Applicant's lead bank and its mortgage banking subsidiary originate permanent loans secured by mortgages on residential real property in the Atlanta banking market, and together accounted for 1.1 percent of such mortgages recorded in 1975. Bank has also engaged in this activity, but on an extremely limited scale, and originated no such mortgages in 1975. Finally, both Bank and Equity presently compete with Applicant's subsidiaries in the origination of loans secured by second mortgages on residential real property, but in 1975 Bank and Equity together originated only $500,000 in such loans, which is an insignificant part of the market's second mortgage originations. There is no evidence in the record indicating that acquisition by Applicant of these nonbanking activities would result in an undue concentration of resources, unfair competition, conflicts of interest, unsound banking practices, or other adverse effects on the public interest. To the contrary, Equity and Corporation's leasing business, through affiliation with Applicant, may be expected to be better able to obtain funds as necessary, and to draw on Applicant's expertise in nonbanking fields, resulting in the provision of more accessible and competitive leasing and mortgage lending service to the community, and the Board regards such considerations as being in the public interest.

Based on the foregoing and other considerations reflected in the record,[3] it is the Board's judgment that considerations affecting the competitive factors under section 3(c) of the Act and the balance of the public interest factors set forth in section 4(c)(8) of the Act both favor approval of Applicant's proposal.

Accordingly, the applications are approved for the reasons summarized above. The merger shall not be consummated before the thirtieth calendar day following the effective date of this Order or later than three months after the ef-

[1] All banking and market data are as of December 31, 1975. On December 7, 1976, the Board approved Applicant's acquisition of an additional bank, Security National Bank, Smyrna, Georgia, which holds deposits of $17.4 million.

[2] The Atlanta banking market is approximated by Fulton, DeKalb, Cobb, Gwinnett, Clayton, Douglas, Henry, and Rockdale Counties.

[3] Dissenting Statement of Governor Coldwell filed as part of the original document. Copies available upon request to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, or to the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

fective date of this Order, unless such period is extended for good cause by the Board, or by the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta pursuant to delegated authority. The approval of Applicant's nonbanking applications is subject to the conditions prescribed in § 225.4 of Regulation Y and to the authority of the Board to require reports by, and make examinations of, holding companies and their subsidiaries, and to require such modifications or termination of the activities of a bank holding company or any of its subsidiaries as the Board finds necessary to assure compliance with the provisions and purposes of the Act and the Board's regulations and orders issued thereunder, or to prevent evasion thereof.

By order of the Board of Governors,[4] effective January 3, 1977.

GRIFFITH L. GARWOOD,
*Deputy Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc.77-931 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Air Force

### AIR FORCE ROTC ADVISORY PANEL

#### Meeting

DECEMBER 29, 1976.

The Air Force ROTC Advisory Panel will hold a meeting on January 26-27, 1977, from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. at Maxwell Air Force Base, Building 800, Montgomery, Alabama.

The purpose of the meeting is to review the status of Air Force ROTC and to discuss related management improvement programs.

Meeting is open.

For further information, contact Executive Secretary, AFROTC Advisory Committee, 697-3055.

FRANKIE S. ESTEP,
*Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer, Directorate of Administration.*

[FR Doc.77-1052 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

### Office of the Secretary

### DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### Closed Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (d) of section 10 of Pub. L. 92-463, as amended by Pub. L. 94-409, notice is hereby given that a closed meeting of a Panel of the DIA Scientific Advisory Committee will be held as follows:

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1977

The entire meeting commencing at 0830 hours is devoted to the discussion of classified information as defined in section 552(b)(1), Title 5 of the U.S. Code and therefore will be closed to the public. Subject matter is to work on a study of specialized intelligence data requirements.

MAURICE W. ROCHE,
*Director, Correspondence and Directives OASD (Comptroller).*

JANUARY 5, 1977.

[FR Doc.77-944 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[4] Voting for this action: Vice Chairman Gardner, Governors Wallich and Lilly. Voting against this action: Governor Coldwell. Absent and not voting: Chairman Burns and Governors Jackson and Partee.

## GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

### REGULATORY REPORTS REVIEW

#### Receipt of Report Proposal

The following request for clearance of a report intended for use in collecting information from the public was received by the Regulatory Reports Review Staff, GAO, on January 4, 1976. See 44 U.S.C. 3512 (c) and (d). The purpose of publishing this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER is to inform the public of such receipt.

The notice includes the title of the request received; the name of the agency sponsoring the proposed collection of information; the agency form number, if applicable; and the frequency with which the information is proposed to be collected.

Written comments on the proposed SEC request are invited from all interested persons, organizations, public interest groups, and affected businesses. Because of the limited amount of time GAO has to review the proposed request, comments (in triplicate) must be received on or before January 31, 1977, and should be addressed to Mr. John M. Lovelady, Acting Assistant Director, Regulatory Reports Review, United States General Accounting Office, Room 5216, 425 I Street, NW, Washington, DC 20548.

Further information may be obtained from Patsy J. Stuart of the Regulatory Reports Review Staff, 202-376-5425.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SEC is requesting an extension no change clearance of its voluntary "Annual Asset Letter" which requests one element of information from all active registered investment companies. The letter requests the amount of the company's total assets as of June 30, except that if a company is an open-end investment company the amount shown should be the total net assets. If the company is a unit investment trust it is requested to state by "yes" or "no" whether it has investments in securities of a registered investment company. SEC estimates there are approximately 1200 potential respondents and reporting burden to be 5 minutes per annual response.

NORMAN F. HEYL,
*Regulatory Reports Review Officer.*

[FR Doc.77-888 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

[Federal Property Management Regulations; Temporary Reg. F-408]

### SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

#### Delegation of Authority

1. *Purpose.* This regulation delegates authority to the Secretary of Defense to represent the consumer interests of the executive agencies of the Federal Government in a telephone rate increase proceeding.

2. *Effective date.* This regulation is effective immediately.

3. *Delegation.*

a. Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 377, as amended, particularly sections 201(a)(4) and 205(d) (40 U.S.C. 481(a)(4) and 486(d)), authority is delegated to the Secretary of Defense to represent the consumer interests of the executive agencies of the Federal Government before the Tennessee Public Service Commission in a proceeding involving an application for increased intrastate revenues by the South Central Bell Telephone Company.

b. The Secretary of Defense may redelegate this authority to any officer, official, or employee of the Department of Defense.

c. This authority shall be exercised in accordance with the policies, procedures, and controls prescribed by the General Services Administration, and shall be exercised in cooperation with the responsible officers, officials, and employees thereof.

Dated: January 3, 1977.

JACK ECKERD,
*Administrator of General Services.*

[FR Doc.77-828 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[Federal Property Management Regulations; Temporary Reg. F-407]

### SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

#### Delegation of Authority

1. *Purpose.* This regulation delegates authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to represent the interests of the Department of the Treasury in proceedings before the New Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissioners involving telephone monitoring restrictions.

2. *Effective date.* This regulation is effective immediately.

3. *Delegation.*

a. Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, 63 Stat. 377, particularly sections 201(a)(4) and 205(d) (40 U.S.C. 481(a)(4) and 486(d)), authority is delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury to represent the interests of the Department of the Treasury before the New

Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissioners involving review of the standards for restrictions on telephone monitoring (Docket No. 752–110).

b. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate this authority to any officer, official, or employee of the Department of the Treasury.

c. This authority shall be exercised in accordance with the policies, procedures, and controls prescribed by the General Services Administration, and shall be exercised in cooperation with the responsible officers, officials, and employees thereof.

Dated: December 30, 1976.

WALLACE H. ROBINSON, JR.,
*Acting Administrator of General Services.*

[FR Doc.77–827 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

### Food and Drug Administration

### NATIONAL ADVISORY FOOD AND DRUG COMMITTEE

### Agenda Items

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of October 6, 1972 (Pub. L. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770–776 (5 U.S.C. App. I)), the Food and Drug Administration announced in a notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of December 21, 1976 (41 FR 55587), public advisory committee meetings and other required information in accordance with provisions set forth in section 10(a) (1) and (2) of the act.

Notice is hereby given that the meeting of the National Advisory Food and Drug Committee scheduled for January 24 and 25, 1977, has set up an agenda as follows: Report of Subcommittee on Antibiotics in Animal Feeds; planning of committee business on drained weight proposal, blending issue, and other matters; National Advisory Food and Drug Committee priority choices; and consideration of research grant proposals.

Dated: January 3, 1977.

JOSEPH P. HILE,
*Associate Commissioner for Compliance.*

[FR Doc.77–894 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

[Docket No. 76N–0471; NDA 16–899]

### PARKE, DAVIS & CO.

### Azaribine Tablets; Opportunity for Hearing On Proposal to Withdraw Approval of New Drug Application

This notice proposes to withdraw approval of the following new drug application (NDA) and offers opportunity for hearing on the question whether the drug has been shown to be safe for use in the treatment of psoriasis. Hearing requests are due February 10, 1977.

NDA 16–899; Triazure Tablets containing azaribine; formerly marketed by Parke, Davis & Co., Joseph Campau at the River, Detroit, MI 48232.

The NDA for Triazure was approved in February 1975 for use in the treatment of extensive, severe, recalcitrant psoriasis which has failed to respond to topical forms of therapy, with labeling that included a boxed warning concerning the reported incidence of thromboembolic events identified during the drug's investigational phase. The approval was conditioned upon the firm's conducting a postmarketing Phase IV study. The primary purpose of the Phase IV study was to acquire a definitive estimate of the drug-related incidence of thromboembolism in patients on Triazure and to determine, if possible, whether predisposing factors were important in judging patient risk. Marketing of the product was initiated in August 1975.

Progress reports on the Phase IV study were submitted on January 30, 1976, and April 26, 1976. No serious adverse reactions were reported up to January 1976 but by April there were four serious adverse reactions, two of which were thrombotic in nature. On August 6, 1976, Parke, Davis representatives presented a summary of the adverse reactions which had occurred up to that time. In the controlled Phase IV study, 65 patients had been reported, about half on control medication and half on Triazure therapy. There were two serious thrombotic events in the patients in the Phase IV trial, both in patients in the treated group. Most importantly, six reports of serious thrombotic episodes were reported in the estimated 500 to 1,000 patients taking the drug other than in the Phase IV study. In the studies conducted during the investigational phase almost half of the thromboembolic episodes were venous thrombophlebitis of the calf and were not striking in severity. Only three cases of peripheral arterial thrombosis and five cases of myocardial infarction were reported, and several of these patients had pre-existing arterial disease. In contrast, all but one of the eight cases reported postmarketing were arterial and severe and some occurred in highly unusual sites such as the arm or the toe. The unusual location of these thromboses, as well as the fact that both cases in the Phase IV study were in the treated group, strongly suggested that these episodes were drug related and their severity was alarming. Parke, Davis has withdrawn the drug from the market.

The Director of the Bureau of Drugs concludes that the occurrence of very serious thromboembolic events associated with the use of azaribine in the treatment of psoriasis outweighs the benefit that can be derived from its use.

Therefore, notice is given to the holder of the new drug application and to all other interested persons that the Director of the Bureau of Drugs proposes to issue an order under section 505(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(e)), withdrawing approval of the new drug application and all amendments and supplements thereto on the ground that new evidence of clinical experience, not contained in the application or not available until after the application was approved, evaluated together with the evidence available when the application was approved, shows that the drug is not shown to be safe for use under the conditions of use on the basis of which the application was approved.

If the applicant or any other person subject to this notice elects to avail himself of the opportunity for a hearing, the shall file on or before February 10, 1977, (1) a written notice of appearance and request for hearing, and (2) the data, information, and analyses on which he relies to justify a hearing, as specified in 21 CFR 314.200. Any other interested person may also submit comments on this notice. The procedure and requirements governing this notice of opportunity for hearing, a notice of appearance and request for hearing, a submission of data, information, and analyses to justify a hearing, other comments, and a grant or denial of hearing, are contained in 21 CFR 314.200.

The failure of the applicant or any other person subject to this notice to file timely written appearance and request for hearing as required by 21 CFR 314.200 constitutes an election by such person not to avail himself of the opportunity for a hearing, and approval of the application will be summarily withdrawn.

A request for a hearing may not rest upon mere allegations or denials, but must set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine and substantial issue of fact that requires a hearing. If it conclusively appears from the fact of the data, information, and factual analyses in the request for the hearing that there is no genuine and substantial issue of fact which precludes the withdrawal of approval of the application, or when a request for hearing is not made in the required format or with the required analyses, the Commissioner will enter summary judgment against the person(s) who requests the hearing, making findings and conclusions, denying a hearing.

All submissions pursuant to this notice shall be filed in quintuplicate with the Hearing Clerk, Food and Drug Administration, Rm. 4–65, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

All submissions pursuant to this notice, except for data and information prohibited from public disclosure pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 331(j) or 18 U.S.C. 1905, may be seen in the office of the Hearing Clerk during working hours, Monday through Friday.

This notice is issued under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 505, 52 Stat. 1052–1053, as amended (21 U.S.C. 355)), and under authority delegated to the Director of the Bureau of Drugs (21 CFR 5.31) (recodification published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of June 15, 1976 (41 FR 24262)).

Dated: December 29, 1976.

J. RICHARD CROUT,
*Director, Bureau of Drugs.*

[FR Doc.77–896 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

National Institutes of Health

## ALLERGY AND IMMUNOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES COUNCIL

### Meeting

Pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, notice is hereby given of the meeting of the Allergy and Immunology Subcommittee of the National Advisory Allergy and Infectious Diseases Council, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, January 26, 1977, in Building 31, Conference Room 7A24, Bethesda, Maryland. This meeting is being held in conjunction with the regular meeting of the Allergy Council on January 27–28, 1977. While the Subcommittee meeting is closed, persons interested may attend open portions of the Council meeting.

In accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552(b)(4), 552(b)(5) and 552(b)(6), Title 5, U.S. Code and section 10(d) of Public Law 92–463, the meeting will be closed to the public from 7:00 p.m. until adjournment, for the review, discussion, and evaluation of individual initial pending, supplemental, and renewal grant applications. The closed portion of the meeting involves solely the internal expression of views and judgments of Council members on individual grant applications containing detailed research protocols, designs, and other technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the applications.

Mr. Robert L. Schreiber, Chief, Office of Research Reporting and Public Response, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Building 31, Room 7A32, Bethesda, Maryland, telephone (301) 496–5717, will furnish rosters of Council members, a summary of the meeting, and other information pertaining to the meeting.

Dated: January 5, 1977.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 13.855, National Institutes of Health.)

SUZANNE L. FREMEAU,
*Committee Management Officer,*
*National Institutes of Health.*

[FR Doc.77–881 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## DIVISION OF RESEARCH GRANTS

### Workshop

Notice is hereby given of a Workshop on Fetal Endocrinology to be held following meetings by the Human Embryology and Development Study Section and the Endocrinology Study Section at the Vacation Village Hotel, Mission Bay, San Diego, California, February 17, 1977, from 1:00 p.m. to adjournment and February 18, 1977, from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Further information may be obtained from Dr. Samuel Moss, Executive Secretary, Human Embryology and Development Study Section, Westwood Building, Room 221, telephone 301/496–7597, and Mr. Morris M. Graff, Executive Secretary, Endocrinology Study Section, Westwood Building, Room 333, telephone 301/496–7346.

This workshop will be open to the public. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

Dated: December 20, 1976.

SUZANNE L. FREMEAU,
*Committee Management Officer,*
*National Institutes of Health.*

[FR Doc.77–884 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## DIVISION OF RESEARCH GRANTS

### Workshop

Notice is hereby given of a Workshop on Human Gait Research Sponsored by the Applied Physiology and Bioengineering Study Section, Children's Hospital Health Center, San Diego, California 92103, March 9, 1977, from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Further information may be obtained from Mrs. Ileen E. Stewart, Executive Secretary, Applied Physiology and Bioengineering Study Section, Westwood Building, Room 318, telephone 301/496–7581.

This workshop will be open to the public. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

Dated: December 20, 1976.

SUZANNE L. FREMEAU,
*Committee Management Officer,*
*National Institutes of Health.*

[FR Doc.77–885 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## NATIONAL ADVISORY RESEARCH RESOURCES COUNCIL

### Meeting

Pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, notice is hereby given of the meeting of the National Advisory Research Resources Council, Division of Research Resources, February 3–5, 1977, Conference Room No. 9, Building 31, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

The meeting will be open to the public from 9:00 to 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 3, for administrative matters. On Friday, February 4, Council members will divide into five subgroups and will meet entirely in open session from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Rooms 31/8A30, 31/Conf. Rm. 9, 31/5B03A, 31/5B03B, and 31/5A16 to discuss various sections of the report, "Assuring the Resources for Biomedical Research, An Evaluation of the Scientific Mission of the Division of Research Resources (DRR), NIH."

On Saturday, February 5, the Council will reconvene as a whole in open session in Building 31, Conference Room No. 6 to discuss the entire report and to make recommendations to the Director, DRR. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

In accordance with provisions set forth in sections 552(b)(4), 552(b)(5), and 552(b)(6), Title 5, U.S. Code and section 10(d) of Public Law 92–463, the meeting of the Council will be closed to the public on February 3 from 10:30 a.m. to adjournment on that day for the review, discussion and evaluation of individual initial pending, supplemental and renewal research grant applications. The closed portion of the meeting will involve solely the internal expression of views and judgments of committee members on individual grant applications containing detailed research protocols, designs, and other technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the applications.

Mr. James Augustine, Information Officer, Division of Research Resources, National Institutes of Health, Room 5B39, Building 31, Bethesda, Maryland 20014, (301) 496–5545, will provide information pertaining to the meeting. Dr. James F. O'Donnell, Deputy Director, Division of Research Resources, National Institutes of Health, Room 5B03, Building 31, Bethesda, Maryland 20014 (301) 496–6611, will furnish substantive information.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 13.306; 13.333; 13.337; 13.371; 13.375; National Institutes of Health.)

Dated: January 5, 1977.

SUZANNE L. FREMEAU,
*Committe Management Officer,*
*National Institutes of Health.*

[FR Doc.77–883 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

### Open Meetings

Pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, notice is hereby given of the meetings of committees advisory to the National Cancer Institute.

These meetings will be entirely open to the public to discuss issues relating to committee business as indicated in the notice. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available. Meetings will be held at the National Institutes of Health, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Maryland 20014, unless otherwise stated.

Mrs. Marjorie F. Early, Committee Management Officer, NCI, Building 31, Room 4B43, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland 20014 (301/496–5708) will furnish summaries of the meetings and rosters of committee members upon request.

Other information pertaining to the meeting can be obtained from the Executive Secretary indicated.

CHEMICAL SELECTION SUBGROUP OF CLEARINGHOUSE ON ENVIRONMENTAL CARCINOGENS

Dates: February 2, 1977; 8:30 a.m.—adjournment.
Place: Building 31C, Conference Room 10, National Institutes of Health.
Times: Open for the entire meeting.
Agenda: To consider criteria and procedures to be used in selecting chemicals for carcinogenicity studies and to review chemicals nominated for test.
Executive Secretary: Dr. James M. Sontag.
Address: Building 31, Room 3A16, National Institutes of Health.
Phone: 301/496–5106.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN SUBGROUP OF CLEARINGHOUSE ON ENVIRONMENTAL CARCINOGENS

Dates: February 3, 1977; 8:30 a.m.—adjournment.
Place: Building 31A, Conference Room 4, National Institutes of Health.
Times: Open for the entire meeting.
Agenda: To consider criteria and procedures to be used in designing carcinogenicity studies.
Executive Secretary: Dr. James M. Sontag.
Address: Building 31, Room 3A16, National Institutes of Health.
Phone: 301/496-5108.

PRESIDENT'S CANCER PANEL

Dates: February 8, 1977; 9:30 a.m.—adjournment.
Place: Building 31C, Conference Room 7, National Institutes of Health.
Times: Open for the entire meeting.
Agenda: To discuss the impact of cancer centers on host academic institutions. To hear reports from the Acting Director, National Cancer Institute and the Chairman, President's Cancer Panel.
Executive Secretary: Dr. Richard A. Tjaima.
Address: Building 31, Room 11A46, National Institutes of Health.
Phone: 301/496-5854.

EXECUTIVE SUBGROUP OF CLEARINGHOUSE ON ENVIRONMENTAL CARCINOGENS

Dates: February 28, 1977; 8:30 a.m.—adjournment.
Place: Building 31A, Conference Room 5, National Institutes of Health.
Times: Open for the entire meeting.
Agenda: To discuss the operation, function and objectives of the Subgroup.
Executive Secretary: Dr. James M. Sontag.
Address: Building 31, Room 3A16, National Institutes of Health.
Phone: 301/496-5108.

Dated: December 20, 1976.

SUZANNE L. FREMEAU,
*Committee Management Officer, National Institutes of Health.*

[FR Doc.77-882 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## Office of Education

## CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM

### Closing Date for Receipt of Applications for Fiscal Year 1977

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the authority contained in section 402 and section 406(f)(1) of the Education Amendments of 1974, Pub. L. 93-380 (20 U.S.C. 1851-53 and 1865(f)(1)) applications are being accepted from State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies, organizations, associations, institutions, and indivduals for grants and assistance contracts to support projects to demonstrate the most effective methods and techniques in career education and to develop exemplary career education models (including models in which handicapped children receive appropriate career education either by participation in regular or modified programs with nonhandicapped children or where necessary in specially designed programs for handicapped children whose handicaps are of such severity that they cannot benefit from regular or modified programs). Notice is also hereby given that pursuant to the authority contained in section 402 and section 406(f)(2) of Pub. L. 93-380 (20 U.S.C. 1851-53 and 1865(f)(2)) applications are being accepted from State educational agencies for grants and assistance contracts to support projects for developing State plans for the implementation of career education programs in the local educational agencies of the States.

Applications must be received by the U.S. Office of Education Application Control Center on or before March 10, 1977.

A. *Applications sent by mail.* An application sent by mail should be addressed as follows: U.S. Office of Education, Application Control Center, Grants and Procurement Management Division, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202, Attention: 13.554. An application sent by mail will be considered to be received on time by the Application Control Center if:

(1) The application was sent by registered or certified mail not later than March 7, 1977, as evidenced by the U.S. Postal Service postmark on the wrapper or envelope, or on the original receipt from the U.S. Postal Service; or

(2) The application is received on or before the closing date by either the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the U.S. Office of Education mail rooms in Washington, D.C. In establishing the date of receipt, the Commissioner will rely on the time-date stamp of such mail rooms or other documentary evidence of receipt maintained by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or the U.S. Office of Education.

B. *Hand delivered applications.* An application to be hand delivered must be taken to the U.S. Office of Education Application Control Center, Room 5673, Regional Office Building Three, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. Hand delivered applications will be accepted daily between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. Washington, D.C. time except Saturdays, Sundays, or Federal holidays. Applications will not be accepted after 4 p.m. on the closing date.

C. *Application routing.* All applicants must furnish an information copy of their application to the State educational agency of the State within which the applicant is located. This information copy must be submitted to the State Coordinator of Career Education, as designated by the Chief State School Officer, concurrently with the submission of the application to the U.S. Office of Education. The application submitted to the U.S. Office of Education must contain a statement that this has been accomplished. State educational agencies wishing to submit advice and comment on any application originating within their State may do so by forwarding such advice and comment to the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, Room 3100, Regional Office Building Three, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

D. *Application instructions and forms.* Applications must be prepared and submitted in accordance with instructions and forms which may be obtained from the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, Room 3100, Regional Office Building Three, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

E. *Program information.* (1) It is anticipated that grants and assistance contracts will be awarded in each of the categories specified in 45 CFR 160d.5, with the total amount of the awards in each category being approximately as follows: (a) incremental improvements in K-12 career education programs—$300,000, (b) demonstrations in such settings as the senior high school—$100,000, the community college—$100,000, adult and community education agencies—$100,000, and institutions of higher education—$100,000, (c) demonstrations for such special segments of the population as handicapped—$500,000, gifted and talented—$250,000, minority youth—$100,000, and low income youth—$100,000, and to reduce sex stereotyping in career choices—$100,000, (d) demonstrations of the training and retraining of persons for conducting career education programs—$1,100,000, and (e) communication of career education philosophy, methods, program activities, and evaluation results to career education practitioners and to the general public—$1,025,000. It is expected that a total of about 38 awards will be made in the above categories and that the average amount per award will be approximately $100,000. All of these will be new awards; no funds are reserved for continuation awards. Projects are normally one year in duration.

(2) It is anticipated that grants and assistance contracts will be awarded for the State plan projects specified in 45 CFR 160d.13, with the total amount of the awards for this category being approximately $2,500,000. It is expected that up to 56 awards will be made in this category and that the average amount per award will be approximately $45,000. All of these will be new awards; no funds are reserved for continuation awards. Projects are normally one year in duration.

(3) In addition to the grants and assistance contracts awarded pursuant to this notice, it is anticipated that approximately $3,760,000 worth of procurement contracts in career education will be awarded during Fiscal Year 1977. Requests for proposals for these procurement contracts will be published in the Commerce Business Daily at a later date.

F. *Applicable regulations.* The regulations applicable to the Career Education Program are:

(1) The Office of Education's General Provisions Regulations, which were published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 6, 1973, as amended (45 CFR Parts, 100, 100a, and appendices).

(2) The regulation for the Special Projects Act, which was published in the

FEDERAL REGISTER on July 15, 1976 (45 CFR Part 160, especially Part III in the Appendix thereof).

(3) The regulation for the Career Education Program, which was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on May 13, 1976 (45 CFR Part 160d).

(20 U.S.C. 1851–1853 and 1865.)

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 13.554; Career Education Program.)

Dated: December 10, 1976.

EDWARD AGUIRRE,
*Commissioner of Education.*

[FR Doc.77–823 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID

### Closing Date for Receipt of Applications

Under the authority of section 708(a) Of the Emergency School Aid Act (Title VII of Pub. L. 92–318, as amended; 20 U.S.C. 1601–1619), the Commissioner invites applications for assistance from local educational agencies and from other public and private nonprofit organizations, as appropriate, for—

(1) Special arts projects (see 45 CFR 185.91 to 185.91–3);

(2) Special mathematics projects (see 45 CFR 185.92 to 185.92–4);

(3) Special student concerns projects (see 45 CFR 185.93 to 185.93–4); and

(4) Other special projects to be conducted by (a) public agencies in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and (b) local educational agencies in support of voluntary plans described in section 706(a)(1)(D) of the statute and 45 CFR 185.11(b)(4) (providing for enrollment of nonresident children). (See 45 CFR 185.94 to 185.94–4.) Other special project applications will be invited by future notice of closing date.

Applications must be received by the United States Office of Education Application Control Center in Washington, D.C., on or before March 7, 1977.

A. *Applications sent by mail.* Applications sent by mail should be addressed as follows: United States Office of Education, Application Control Center, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20202; Attention: 13.532D (for special arts projects); Attention: 13.532E (for special mathematics projects); Attention: 13.532F (for special student concerns projects); or Attention: 13.532C (for other special projects).

An application sent by mail will be considered to have been received on time if: (1) The application was sent to the appropriate office by registered or certified mail not later than March 2, 1977, as evidenced by the U.S. Postal Service postmark on the wrapper or envelope, or on the original receipt from the U.S. Postal Service; or (2) The application is received on or before the closing date by the appropriate United States Office of Education mail room. In establishing the date of receipt, the Commissioner will rely on the time-date stamp of such mail room or other documentary evidence of receipt maintained by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the U.S. Office of Education.

B. *Hand delivered applications.* Hand delivered applications must be taken to the United States Office of Education Application Control Center, Room 5673, Regional Office Building Three, 7th and D Streets S.W., Washington, D.C. Hand delivered applications will be accepted daily between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Washington, D.C. time, except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays. Applications will not be accepted after 4 p.m. on the closing date.

C. *Program information.* (1) It is anticipated that $7,750,000 will be awarded to support projects submitted in response to this notice, as follows: (a) Special arts projects, $1,500,000; (b) Special mathematics projects, $750,000; (c) Special student concerns projects, $1,200,000; and (d) Other special projects, $4,300,000.

Additional special student concerns projects submitted in response to this notice may be funded as other special projects if the Commissioner determines that these projects will make substantial progress toward meeting the purposes of the statute.

The balance of the sums appropriated by Pub. L. 94–439 for section 708(a) of the statute will be awarded to support projects submitted in response to other notices of closing date.

(2) In last year's funding cycles: (a) Fifteen awards in an average amount of $94,475 were made for special arts projects; ten of these awards were made to applicants which received assistance for this purpose in fiscal year 1975;

(b) Two awards in an average amount of $475,000 were made for special mathematics projects; both awards were made to applicants which received assistance for this purpose in fiscal year 1975;

(c) Seven awards in an average amount of $201,931 were made for special student concerns projects; six of these awards were made to applicants which received assistance for this purpose in fiscal year 1975; and

(d) Of 41 additional awards made for special projects, five, in an average amount of $513,734, were made for projects in jurisdictions other than States and seven, in an average amount of $194.567, were made for projects in support of voluntary plans to enroll nonresident children. Seven of these twelve awards were made to applicants which received special projects assistance in fiscal year 1975.

(D) *Project periods.* Grant awards made pursuant to this notice will be for projects beginning no earlier than July 1, 1977 and ending no later than June 30, 1978, except that awards for special student concerns projects will be made for projects beginning no earlier than July 1, 1977 and ending no later than May 30,1979.

E. *Resubmitted applications.* As required by section 710(d)(2) of the Emergency School Aid Act (20 U.S.C. 1609 (d)(2)), applications from local educational agencies which are not approvable in whole or in part will be returned to applicants for modification and resubmission, within a reasonable period of time, at the applicants' option.

F. *Applicable regulations.* Grant awards made pursuant to this notice will be subject to the following regulations: (1) Regulations relating generally to programs under the Emergency School Aid Act (45 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 185) and, in particular, to special projects under that statute (Subpart J of that Part); and (2) The Office of Education General Provisions regulations (45 Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 100, 100a, and appendices), except to the extent that these regulations are inconsistent with 45 CFR Part 185.

G. *Program information and forms.* Information and application forms may be obtained from the Special Projects Branch, Equal Educational Opportunity Programs, Room 2017, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

Dated: December 27, 1976.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 13.532, Emergency School Aid—Special Projects.)

(20 U.S.C. 1601–1619.)

JOHN W. EVANS,
*Acting Commissioner of Education.*

[FR Doc.77–824 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

### Office of Education

## NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

### Public Hearing

Notice is hereby given pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463) that the next meeting of the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education will be held from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, January 27 and from 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m. on Saturday, January 29 in the Hindsman Conference Room of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas. On Friday, January 28, 1977, the Council will hold public hearings from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., in the fifth floor conference room.

The National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education is established pursuant to section 732(a) of the Bilingual Education Act (20 U.S.C. 880b–11) to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education concerning matters arising in the administration of the Bilingual Education Act.

The meetings shall be open to the public. The proposed agenda includes:

JANUARY 27, 1977

Approval of minutes; Reports from Standing Committees and Program Delegate; Issue Papers; Presentation of work statement on future Issue Papers; New Business; and Consideration of proposed legislative changes due in May, 1977.

JANUARY 28, 1977

Consonant with the Council's charge to provide advice on matters relating to the ad-

ministration of the aforementioned Act, testimony will be heard on the following topics: (1) Maintenance vs. Transitional Bilingual Education; (2) Service vs. Demonstration vs. Start-Up Costs; (3) Serving Diverse Language Groups; and (4) Research Needs.

The following procedures shall be observed during the public hearings:

(1) Witnesses shall be heard on a first come basis; (2) Witnesses shall limit their testimony to twenty minutes. Ten to fifteen minutes of formal presentation followed by five to ten minutes of questioning from Council members; (3) Two or more persons from the same organization shall designate one person to speak for the group; (4) Witnesses shall present a written synopsis of their oral presentation. Witnesses who do not provide such a synopsis will be heard after all who have written synopsis are heard; (5) Witnesses who have testified at previous hearings will be heard after all others; (6) Witnesses may address the Council in either English or in their native language. The Written synopsis of the oral presentation must be submitted in English. Witnesses who have chosen to give testimony in their native language may submit their written synopsis in that language in addition to their synopsis in English; and (7) All testimony shall be tape recorded.

JANUARY 29, 1977

Meeting of the following subcommittees: Budget: review of FY 1977 Budget; Legislation: Proposed legislative changes; Nov. 1 Report to Congress; review of 1977 Annual Report schedule; Public Hearings: previous day's hearings; and Non-Spanish Minority Languages: outline and content of issue paper.

In the event that the tentative agenda is completed prior to the projected date or time, the Council will adjourn the meeting.

Records shall be kept of all meetings and shall be available for public inspection in Room 421, Reporter's Building, 300 7th Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20202.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on January 6, 1977.

JOHN C. MOLINA,
*Director,*
*Office of Bilingual Education.*

[FR Doc.77-959 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

### NEW MEXICO

### Proposed Withdrawal and Reservation of Lands for Military Purposes

The United States Army, Corps of Engineers, on behalf of the Department of the Army, filed application NM-29537 on December 31, 1976, for the withdrawal of lands described below from settlement, sale, location, or entry under the public land laws, including the mining and the mineral leasing laws. The applicant desires the lands for military purposes in connection with the McGregor Range (Fort Bliss) air support and other compatible uses.

Until February 10, 1977, all persons who wish to submit comments, suggestions, or objections, in connection with the proposed withdrawal may present their views in writing to the undersigned officer of the Bureau of Land Management.

Pursuant to section 204(h) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), an opportunity for a public hearing is hereby afforded. All interested persons who desire to be heard on the proposed withdrawal must submit a written request for a hearing to the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, at the address shown below, within the 30-day period allowed. Upon determination by the State Director that a public hearing will be held, the time and place will be announced.

The lands involved are presently segregated from the operation of the public land laws by virtue of withdrawals effected by Public Land Orders No. 1470 of August 21, 1957, and No. 1547 of November 7, 1957, which withdrawals will expire on August 20, and November 6, 1977, respectively. Under section 204(b) of the Act the segregation will remain in effect for a period of 2 years from date of publication of this notice unless the Congress approves the withdrawal prior to that date, in which case the segregation would be continued in accordance with the legislation.

The authoried officer of the Bureau of Land Management will undertake such investigations as are necessary to determine the existing potential demand for the lands and their resources. He will also undertake negotiations with the applicant agency with the view of adjusting the application to reduce the area to the minimum essential to meet the applicant's needs, to provide for the maximum concurrent utilization of the lands for purposes other than the applicant's, and to reach agreement on the concurrent management of the lands and their resources.

He will also prepare a report for consideration of the Secretary of the Interior who will submit a legislative proposal to the Congress of the United States for its consideration to determine whether the lands will be withdrawn as requested by the applicant agency.

The lands involved in the application are described below. The total acreage of the area has been furnished by the Corps of Engineers and is delineated on a map designated M1-1-0005, approved 11 June 1956, a copy of which is on file in Case No. NM-29537, New Mexico State Office, Bureau of Land Management.

All correspondence in connection with this withdrawal should be directed to the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Chief, Division of Technical Services, P.O. Box 1449, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501.

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

T. 26 S., R. 6 E.,
- Sec. 1, N½SE¼ lying south and east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Sec. 25, S½N½ and E½SE¼;
- Sec. 26, S½NE¼ and S½SE¼;
- Sec. 35, N½NE¼;
- Sec. 36, lots 5, 6, 7, 8 and N½N½.

T. 24 S., R. 7 E.,
- Secs. 12, 13, 14 and 23, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Secs. 24 and 25;
- Secs. 26, 27 and 34, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Secs. 35 and 36.

T. 25 S., R. 7 E.,
- Secs. 1 and 2;
- Sec. 3, E½ and that part of the W½ lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Secs. 4 and 9, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Secs. 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14;
- Sec. 16, that part lying east and south of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Sec. 20, NE¼NE¼;
- Sec. 21, NW¼NW¼;
- Sec. 23;
- Sec. 24, N½, SW¼, E½SE¼ and SW¼SE¼;
- Secs. 25, 26 and 27;
- Sec. 28, S½S½;
- Sec. 30, that part lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Sec. 31, lots 5, 6 and 7;
- Sec. 32, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
- Sec. 34, lots 1, 2, NE¼ and N½SE¼;
- Sec. 35, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
- Sec. 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½.

T. 26 S., R. 7 E.,
- Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
- Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
- Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼ and SE¼;
- Sec. 6, lots 3, 6 and SE¼NW¼;
- Sec. 10;
- Sec. 11, E½ and NW¼;
- Secs. 12 and 13;
- Sec. 14, E½ and SW¼;
- Sec. 15, NE¼, N½NW¼, SE¼NW¼ and SW¼SW¼;
- Secs. 16 and 17;
- Sec. 18, lots 3, 4, E½ and E½SW¼;
- Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
- Secs. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28;
- Sec. 29, N½;
- Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, NE¼ and E½NW¼;
- Sec. 31, lots 2, 3, 4 and 5;
- Sec. 32, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½;
- Sec. 33, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½;
- Sec. 34, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½;
- Sec. 35, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½;
- Sec. 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½.

T. 22 S., R. 8 E.,
- Secs. 13, 23 and 24, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Sec. 25, lots 1 to 16, inclusive;
- Sec. 26, lots 1, 2, 6 and that part of S½ lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Secs. 34 and 35, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Sec. 36.

T. 23 S., R. 8 E.,
- Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
- Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
- Secs. 3, 9 and 10, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
- Secs. 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15;
- Secs. 16, 20 and 21, those parts lying east and south of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;

Secs. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28;
Secs. 29, 31 and 32, those parts lying east and south of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 33, 34, 35 and 36.

T. 24 S., R. 8 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, SE¼NE¼, S½NW¼ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Secs. 6 and 7, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 8 to 14, inclusive;
Sec. 15, N½, N½S½, SE¼SW¼ and S½SE¼;
Secs. 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

T. 25 S., R. 8 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼; E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32, 33, 34, 35 and 36.

T. 26 S., R. 8 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20 to 26, inclusive;
Sec. 27, E½, E½W½, W½NW¼ and NW¼SW¼;
Sec. 28, N½N½, NE¼SW¼ and NW¼SE¼;
Sec. 29, N½, N½S½, S½SW¼ and SW¼SE¼;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, N½NE¼ and NE¼NW¼;
Sec. 33, lot 4 and NW¼NW¼;
Sec. 34, N½NE¼ and NE¼NW¼;
Sec. 35, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½;
Sec. 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½.

T. 19 S., R. 9 E.,
Sec. 2, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Secs. 3 and 10, all those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Sec. 11, W½;
Sec. 12, E½;
Secs. 13 and 14;
Secs. 15 and 22, all those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 23, 24, 25 and 26;
Secs. 27 and 34, all those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 35 and 36.

T. 20 S., R. 9 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Secs. 3 and 10, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 11, 12, 13 and 14;
Secs. 15 and 21, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 22 to 27, inclusive;
Secs. 28 and 33, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 34, 35 and 36.

T. 21 S., R. 9 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Secs. 4 and 9, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 10 to 15, inclusive;
Sec. 16, E½;
Sec. 21, that part lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 22, 23, 24 and 25;
Sec. 26, NE¼, W½, N½SE¼ and SE¼SE¼;
Sec. 27;
Secs. 28, 32 and 33, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Sec. 34, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 35, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½.

T. 22 S., R. 9 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Secs. 5 and 8, those parts lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Secs. 9 to 14, inclusive;
Sec. 15, E½, E½NW¼, NW¼NW¼ and SW¼;
Secs. 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, that part lying east of the Southern Pacific Railway right-of-way;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20 and 21;
Sec. 22, E½;
Secs. 23, 24, 25 and 26;
Sec. 27, E½;
Secs. 28 and 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 and 33;
Sec. 34, E½;
Secs. 35 and 36.

T. 23 S., R. 9 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, S½NE¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 8;
Sec. 9, W½NE¼ and W½;
Sec. 10, E½, NW¼NW¼, SE¼NW¼ and SW¼;
Secs. 11 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20, 21 and 22;
Sec. 23, N½, SW¼, E½SE¼ and SW¼SE¼;
Secs. 24 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

T. 24 S., R. 9 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8, 9, 10 and 11;
Sec. 12, E½, E½W½, W½NW¼ and NW¼SW¼;
Secs. 13 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

T. 25 S., R. 9 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8, 9 and 10;
Sec. 11, W½NE¼, SE¼NE¼, W½ and SE¼;
Sec. 12, SW¼SW¼;
Secs. 13 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20 to 26, inclusive;
Sec. 27, W½NE¼, SE¼NE¼, W½ and SE¼;
Secs. 28 and 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

T. 26 S., R. 9 E.,
Sec. 1, NE¼, W½ and W½SE¼;
Secs. 2, 3 and 4;
Sec. 5, E½;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½W½;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 to 16, inclusive;
Sec. 17, N½ and SW¼;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 20, W½;
Sec. 21, E½ and SW¼;
Secs. 22 and 23;
Sec. 24, N½, N½S½, SE¼SW¼ and S½SE¼;
Secs. 25 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, N½NE¼ and NE¼NW¼;
Sec. 32, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½;
Sec. 33, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½;
Sec. 34, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½;
Sec. 35, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½;
Sec. 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and N½N½.

T. 19 S., R. 10 E.,
Sec. 7, W½ and S½SE¼;
Sec. 8, SW¼SW¼;
Sec. 9, SW¼;
Sec. 10, E½;
Sec. 11;
Sec. 12, W½ (unsurveyed);
Sec. 13, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and W½;
Sec. 14, NE¼ and S½;
Secs. 15 and 16;
Sec. 17, W½W½;
Secs. 18 to 22, inclusive;
Sec. 23, E½ and SW¼;
Sec. 24, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and W½;
Sec. 25, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and W½;
Secs. 26 to 34, inclusive;
Sec. 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and W½.

T. 20 S., R. 10 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, S½NE¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 8 and 9;
Secs. 11 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 22 to 27, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

T. 21 S., R. 10 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 21, inclusive and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and E½;
Secs. 8 to 14, inclusive;
Sec. 15, SE¼;
Secs. 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and E½;
Sec. 19, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and E½;
Secs. 20, 21 and 22;
Sec. 23, N½, SW¼ and N½SE¼;
Secs. 24 and 25;
Sec. 26, W½NE¼, W½ and SE¼;
Secs. 27, 28 and 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and E½;
Sec. 31, lots 1 to 14, NE¼ and N½SE¼;
Sec. 32, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 33, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 34, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 35, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½.

T. 22 S., R. 10 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 5 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 5 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½N½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and S½N½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼ NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 8;
Sec. 9, lots 1 to 16, inclusive;
Secs. 10 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 5 to 12, inclusive, NE¼ and E½NW¼;
Sec. 20, lots 1 to 15, inclusive;
Sec. 21, lots 1 to 8, inclusive and E½;
Secs. 22 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 5 to 20, inclusive;
Sec. 31, lots 5 to 20, inclusive;
Secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

7. 23 S., R. 10 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼ NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½NE¼, SW¼NE¼, E½W½ and SE¼;
Sec. 20, N½NE¼, SW¼NE¼, W½ and SE¼;
Secs. 21 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 and 33;
Sec. 34, E½, E½W½, NW¼NW¼ and W½SW¼;
Secs. 35 and 36.

T. 24 S., R. 10 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 5 to 20, inclusive;
Sec. 4, lots 5 to 20, inclusive;
Sec. 5, lots 3 to 8, inclusive, S½NW¼ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, S½NE¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 and 9;
Sec. 10, E½, N½NW¼ and SW¼;
Sec. 11, lots 1 to 16, inclusive;
Sec. 12, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and NW¼;
Sec. 13, lots 1 to 16, inclusive;
Secs. 14, 15, 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20, 21, 22 and 23;
Sec. 24, lots 1 to 16, inclusive;
Sec. 25, lots 1 to 16, inclusive;
Secs. 26, 27, 28 and 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 32, E½, W½NW¼, SE¼NW¼ and SW¼;
Secs. 33, 34, 35 and 36.

T. 25 S., R. 10 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 8, SW¼;
Sec. 9, S½;
Sec. 10, S½S½;
Sec. 11, N½;
Secs. 12 and 13;
Sec. 14, E½SW¼, NW¼SW¼ and SE¼;
Secs. 15, 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20, 21 and 22;
Sec. 23, E½E½, NW¼NE¼ and W½SE¼;
Sec. 24, N½ and SW¼;
Sec. 26, E½ and S½SW¼;
Secs. 27, 28 and 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 and 33;
Sec. 35.

T. 26 S., R. 10 E.,
Secs. 2, 3, 4 and 5;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 and 9;
Sec. 10, NW¼;
Sec. 16, N½ and SW¼;
Sec. 17;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 20;
Sec. 21, NW¼;
Sec. 29, N½ and SW¼;
Sec. 30, lot 1, NE¼ and NE¼NW¼;
Sec. 32, lots 3, 4 and N½NW¼.

T. 20 S., R. 11 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼ NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20 to 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

T. 21 S., R. 11 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 14, inclusive, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 20;
Secs. 25 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, NE¼, E½ NW¼, NE¼SW¼ and N½SE¼;
Sec. 32, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 33, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 34, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, NW¼NE¼, N½NW¼, S½N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 35, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½;
Sec. 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, N½ and N½S½.

T. 22 S., R. 11 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼ NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 to 12, inclusive;
Secs. 15, 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

T. 23 S., R. 11 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼ NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, W½E½, E½W½ and SE¼SE¼;
Secs. 32 to 36.

T. 24 S., R. 11 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 8 to 23, inclusive;
Sec. 7, lots 5 to 20, inclusive;
Sec. 8, lots 1 to 16, inclusive;
Secs. 9, 10 and 11;
Sec. 12, NW¼;
Sec. 14, NW¼;
Secs. 15, 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, lots 5 to 20, inclusive;
Sec. 19, lots 5 to 20, inclusive;
Sec. 20, lots 1 to 8, inclusive and W½;
Sec. 21, lots 1 to 16, inclusive;
Sec. 22, lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13 and 14;
Sec. 28, N½ and SW¼;
Sec. 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 32.

T. 25 S., R. 11 E.,
Sec. 5, lots 3, 4, S½NW¼ and SW¼;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 7, N½ and SW¼;
Sec. 18, NW¼.

T. 20 S., R. 12 E.,
Sec. 2, S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and S½N½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2 and S½NE¼;
Sec. 7, NW¼NW¼;
Sec. 8, NW¼;
Sec. 9, SE¼NE¼;
Sec. 10, N½SW¼ and SE¼SE¼;
Sec. 11, E½NW¼ and NE¼SW¼;
Sec. 15, E½NE¼ and SE¼SE¼;
Sec. 16;
Sec. 22, W½SW¼;
Sec. 24, lot 3 and NW¼SE¼;
Sec. 26, SE¼NE¼, S½NW¼, N½SW¼ and NW¼SE¼;
Sec. 27, SW¼NE¼, S½NW¼ and N½S½;
Sec. 28, NW¼NE¼, N½NW¼, S½N½ and N½S½;
Secs. 30 and 32;
Sec. 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, W½E½ and W½.

T. 21 S., R. 12 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3 and 4;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12 and SW¼;

Sec. 5, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 11, inclusive and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 20 and 21;
Sec. 22, N½;
Secs. 23 to 27, inclusive;
Sec. 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 32, 34, 35 and 36.

T. 22 S., R. 12 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, S½NE¼ and SE¼;
Secs. 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12;
Secs. 14, 15, 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, E½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 20, 21 and 22;
Secs. 24 to 29, inclusive;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 32 to 36, inclusive.

T. 23 S., R. 12 E.,
Secs. 1 to 5, inclusive;
Sec. 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 8 to 12, inclusive;
Sec. 14, N½;
Sec. 15, N½, N½S½ and S½SW¼;
Sec. 17;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Secs. 20 and 21;
Sec. 22, W½NE¼, SE¼NE¼ and W½;
Sec. 28, NW¼;
Sec. 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and E½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, NE¼ and NE¼SE¼;
Sec. 32, NW¼.

T. 24 S., R. 12 E.,
Sec. 6, lots 10, 11, 12 and 13.

T. 20 S., R. 13 E.,
Sec. 7, lots 3 and 4;
Sec. 16, S½;
Sec. 17, S½;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 21, NE¼;
Sec. 22, E½, NW¼ and E½SW¼;
Sec. 25, E½NW¼ and SW¼;
Sec. 26, SW¼NE¼ and E½SE¼;
Secs. 27 and 28;
Sec. 29, S½;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32, 33 and 34;
Sec. 35, SE¼NW¼, W½W½ and NE¼SW¼;
Sec. 36.

T. 21 S., R. 13 E.,
Sec. 1, lots 8, 9, 10, 12 and S½;
Sec. 2, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 3, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1 to 12, inclusive and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 14, inclusive, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 8 to 17, inclusive;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20, 21, 22 and 23;
Sec. 24, N½ and SW¼;
Sec. 25, NW¼;
Secs. 26, 27, 28 and 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32, 33 and 34;
Sec. 35, N½ and SW¼.

T. 22 S., R. 13 E.,
Sec. 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 4, lots 3, 4, S½NW¼ and S½;
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, S½N½ and S½;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 9, E½ and SW¼;
Sec. 10, W½;
Sec. 16, NW¼ and N½SW¼;
Sec. 20;
Sec. 21, NW¼;
Sec. 29, N½ and SW¼;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 32, NW¼.

T. 23 S., R. 13 E.,
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼ and E½SW¼.

T. 21 S., R. 14 E.,
Sec. 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 8 and SW¼;
Sec. 6, lots 1 to 14, inclusive, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, NE¼ and E½W½;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2 and E½NW¼.

The lands described above aggregate 608,384.87 acres, more or less in Otero County.

The following described lands lie within Lincoln National Forest:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

LINCOLN NATIONAL FOREST

T. 19 S., R. 10 E.,
Sec. 1, SW¼ and W½W½SE¼ (unsurveyed);
Sec. 12, W½W½E½ (unsurveyed).

T. 19 S., R. 11 E.,
Sec. 6, lots 6, 7, E½SW¼ and SE¼;
Sec. 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 8;
Sec. 9, S½;
Sec. 14, SW¼;
Secs. 15, 16 and 17;
Sec. 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 20, 21, 22 and 23;
Sec. 24, S½;
Sec. 25, E½, NW¼, W½SW¼ and SE¼SW¼;
Secs. 26, 27, 28 and 29;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Secs. 32 and 33;
Sec. 34, N½;
Sec. 35, E½, NW¼, W½SW¼ and SE¼SW¼;
Sec. 36.

T. 19 S., R. 12 E.,
Sec. 29, S½;
Sec. 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, E½ and E½W½;
Sec. 32.

The areas described above aggregate approximately 18,004.06 acres in Otero County.

MICHAEL T. SOLAN,
*Chief, Division of Technical Services.*

[FR Doc.77-1023 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## Office of the Secretary

[Order No. 2997]

## ESCROW ACCOUNT

### Establishment of Deposit, Investment and Payment Policies

Section 1.—*Purpose.* The purpose of this order is (a) to establish policy for the deposit, investment, and payment of monies in the escrow account as authorized and required by section 2 of the Act of January 2, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and (b) to delegate to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs (Commissioner) the responsibility of setting up the account, preparing guidelines for administering the account, and making investments and disbursements of the monies in the account.

Section 2.—*Delegation of Authority.* The Commissioner is hereby delegated the responsibility of (a) setting up the escrow account, (b) preparing guidelines for administering the account and crediting the investment income to the account, (c) publishing the guidelines in the FEDERAL REGISTER, and (d) making investments and disbursements of the account.

The heads of all Interior Offices and Bureaus administering lands in Alaska subject to section 2 of the Act are directed to deposit appropriate proceeds to the escrow account and devise and maintain a record, as described in section 5(b) of this order and guidelines to be established pursuant to this order. Other Federal Agencies administering lands subject to section 2 of the Act and the State of Alaska are requested to comply with this order and the guidelines to be established pursuant to this order.

Section 3.—*Scope.* This order deals with all proceeds collected from contracts, leases, permits, rights-of-way, or easements pertaining to lands or resources in lands withdrawn for Native selection. This order does not affect the responsibility of any Office, Bureau, or Agency under appropriate law for determining and collecting amounts due from such contracts, leases, permits, rights-of-way, or easements.

Section 4.—*Definitions.* (a) *Escrow account* means an account entitled "Deposits of Proceeds of Lands Withdrawn for Native Selection, Bureau of Indian Affairs," which has been established in the Treasury of the United States pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act for deposit, withdrawal, and disbursement of proceeds.

(b) *Affected lands* means those lands that on January 1, 1976, were withdrawn by or pursuant to sections 11, 14, 16, 17 (d)(2)(E), or 19 of the Alaska Native Claim Settlement Act (ANCSA) for Native selection and, from the time of withdrawal, lands subsequently withdrawn for Native selection by, under, or pursuant to the ANCSA and amendments thereto, and for so long as these lands remain withdrawn for Native selection and conveyance.

(c) *Withdrawn* means that lands have been set aside either by section 11(a)(1) or (2) or 16(a) or (d) of the ANCSA, as amended, or a positive action by the Secretary of the Interior in the form of a Public Land Order for selection by Native entities under the ANCSA.

(d) *Proceeds* means all monies received on or after January 1, 1976, from contracts, leases, permits, rights-of-way, or easements pertaining to affected lands, or the resources thereof, except (1) fil-

ing and similar administrative fees, (2) trespass and similar damages, and (3) all income received by the Federal Government which is a reimbursement of Federal expenses.

Proceeds from contracts, leases, permits, rights-of-way, or easements involving the subsurface resources of lands within Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 and units of the National Wildlife Refuge System are not subject to the provisions of section 2 of the Act, except those proceeds which may derive from the specific Kenai National Moose Range lands identified for conveyance in section 12 of the Act.

(e) *Payment* means (1) disbursement of proceeds and appropriate interest and investment return of monies in the escrow account to the grantee of the surface and/or subsurface estate, (2) disbursement of proceeds of monies in the escrow account into the appropriate Federal account as provided in section 2(a) of the Act, or (3) deposit into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the interest and investment return accruing to proceeds that are to be returned to the appropriate Federal account.

(f) *Conveyance* means the issuance of a document which conveys legal title.

(g) *Grantee* means the individual, association, corporation, or other Native entity that receives a conveyance from the United States under the ANCSA, as amended.

Section 5. *Policy.* The policies set forth herein will be applied to assure that the escrow account is equitably and fairly administered.

(a) The Secretary, by issuance of this order, serves notice that there has been established an escrow account entitled "Deposits of Proceeds of Lands Withdrawn for Native Selection, Bureau of Indian Affairs" in the Treasury of the United States for the deposit of proceeds derived from contracts, leases, permits, rights-of-way, or easements pertaining to affected lands or resources in affected lands withdrawn for Native selection pursuant to the ANCSA. All Departments or Agencies of the Federal Government and the State of Alaska receiving such proceeds are requested to deposit proceeds to the account and advise the Commissioner of the deposit.

(b) All Departments or Agencies of the Federal Government and the State of Alaska receiving such proceeds are also requested to devise and maintain a record which includes (1) the identity of the specific contract, lease, etc., involved; (2) the statutory authority under which the proceeds were collected; (3) the account to which the proceeds would have otherwise been deposited; (4) the specific description of the lands involved in the contract, lease, etc.; (5) whether the proceeds were derived from the surface or subsurface estate; and (6) other information determined necessary, as described in the guidelines to be established pursuant to this order.

(c) The Commissioner shall devise and maintain a record and accounting system for the escrow account that will permit identification of the source of funds, interest or return applicable to such funds, and payment of such funds. He shall identify and/or furnish the necessary forms, guidelines, and procedures required for implementation to the agencies collecting or expected to collect proceeds.

(d) The Commissioner may cause the funds in the escrow account to be invested as provided by the Act and will coordinate with the Department of the Treasury to obtain any interest on funds in the account as provided by the Act. Interest or investment return shall be applied to all funds in the account in proportion to the amount, rate of return, and period of return.

(e) Upon issuance of a conveyance document to a Native entity, the Director, Bureau of Land Management, will furnish the Commissioner, and the head of any other agency known by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to be administering the affected lands, a copy of the conveyance document in order that the appropriate agency may (1) determine the percentage of the proceeds, interest, and investment return to be paid to the grantee, and (2) submit it to the Commissioner in order that the Commissioner may authorize payment to the grantee.

(f) Where the contract, lease, permit, right-of-way, or easement does not fall entirely within the conveyed land or interest, the grantee shall receive a payment based on the proportionate amount that results from multiplying the total proceeds and appropriate interest and investment return attributable to the conract, lease, etc., by a fraction in which the numerator is the acreage of the contract, lease, etc., falling within the conveyance and the denominator is the total acreage within the contract, lease, etc.

However, in the case of timber sale contracts involving more than one specific cutting area, each such cutting area will be considered a separate "contract" for purposes of computing the payment. Thus, if the entire cutting area falls within the area conveyed, the entire proceeds from that cutting area shall be paid. If only a portion of the cutting area falls within the area conveyed, the pro rata amount as provided above shall apply.

(g) In an area where (1) there have been no selections and the selection period has terminated, (2) selections have been rejected and the decision is final, or (3) the final action has been taken on all pending selections by Native entities, the Director, BLM, shall inform the Commissioner and the head of any other agency known by BLM to be administering the affected lands of the description of lands not selected or conveyed.

(h) Agencies administering affected lands should provide the Commissioner with a list of those accounts where the final action has been taken so that the Commissioner may (1) return any remaining proceeds in the escrow account attributable to such lands to the appropriate Federal account to which they would have otherwise been deposited; (2) deposit the interest and investment return attributable to the remaining proceeds to miscellaneous receipts, Treasury; and (3) notify the "original" collection agency of such return.

Section 6.—*Limitations.* The actions of the Commissioner under this delegation shall be audited by the Assistant Secretary—Administration and Management at such times as the Assistant Secretary shall determine, but not less frequently than once each year.

Section 7.—*Effective date.* This order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until it is amended, revoked, or superseded. However, in the absence of the foregoing, the provisions of this order shall terminate two years from the date of signiature. Notice of proposal and period of comment is found to be unnecessary due to the limited applicability of this order and its categorization as interpretation of section 2 of the Act of January 2, 1976.

(89 Stat. 1146.)

Dated: January 3, 1977.

THOMAS S. KLEPPE,
*Secretary of the Interior.*

[FR Doc.77-1022 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

### Memorandum of Agreement and Delegation of Authority

The purpose of this agreement is to delegate authority to the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with the implementation of section 606(a) of the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America (Pub. L. 94-241, 90 Stat. 263, 48 U.S.C. 1681 note).

It is hereby agreed between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury that, pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 11021 of May 7, 1962, as amended by Executive Order 11944 of October 25, 1976, there is hereby delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be exercised in such manner as he may deem appropriate, the authority necessary to perform all functions on behalf of the government of the Northern Mariana Islands with respect to the administration, collection and assessment, and enforcement of the taxes (including interest and penalties) imposed by the Northern Mariana Islands Social Security Act.

It is agreed that the authority delegated herein may be redelegated to any officer or employee of the Department of the Treasury. It is further agreed that this Memorandum of Agreement and

Delegation shall be effective on January 1, 1977.

Dated: December 31, 1976.

WILLIAM E. SIMON,
*Secretary of the Treasury.*

Dated: December 23, 1976.

THOMAS S. HEPPE,
*Secretary of the Interior.*

[FR Doc.77-921 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## OIL SHALE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY PANEL

### Meeting

Notice is hereby given in accordance with Pub. L. 92-463 that a meeting of the Oil Shale Environmental Advisory Panel will begin at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, January at the Howard Johnson's Motor Lodge in Grand Junction, Colorado. The meeting will begin at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, January 25, in the Powderhorn Room and conclude at noon on Wednesday, January 26.

The Panel was established to assist the Department of the Interior in the performance of its functions in connection with the supervision of oil shale leases issued under the prototype oil shale leasing program, The purpose of this meeting is to hear a briefing on proposed revision of the Detailed Development Plan for lease tract C-b, review a proposed pipeline right-of-way for lease tract C-a, review the eighth quarterly summary data reports for lease tracts C-a, C-b, and for the U-a and U-b tracts combined, to receive reports from Interior officials and to consider any other matters which have come before the Panel.

The meeting is open to the public. It is expected that space will permit at least 100 persons to attend the meeting in addition to the panel members. Interested persons may make brief presentations to the panel or file written statements. Request should be made to Mr. William L. Rogers, Chairman, at the Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, Room 688, Building 67, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225.

Further information concerning this meeting may be obtained from Mr. Henry O. Ash, Office of the Oil Shale Environmental Advisory Panel, Room 690, Building 67, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225, Telephone No. (303) 234-3275. Minutes of the meeting will be available for public inspection 30 days after the meeting at the panel office.

DENNIS N. SACHS,
*Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior.*

JANUARY 6, 1977.

[FR Doc.77-912 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## National Park Service

## NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

### Notification of Pending Nominations

Nominations for the following properties being considered for listing in the National Register were received by the National Park Service before December 30, 1976. Pursuant to § 60.13(a) of 36 CFR Part 60, published in final form on January 9, 1976, written comments concerning the significance of these properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation may be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240. Written comments should be submitted by January 24, 1977.

JERRY L. ROGERS,
*Acting Chief, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation.*

### DELAWARE

*Delaware County*

Glen Mills, *Glen Mills School*, Glen Mills Rd.

### MARYLAND

*Baltimore County*

*My Lady's Manor (Lady Baltimore's Manor)*, area of 10th election district, northern (also in Harford County).

### NEW JERSEY

*Bergen County*

Lyndhurst, *River Road School*, 400 Riverside Ave.

*Burlington County*

Roebling, *Roebling Historic District*, between Riverside and Hornberger Aves., and 2nd and 8th Sts.

*Cumberland County*

Millville, *Millville's First Bank Building* 2nd and E. Main Sts.

*Hunterdon County*

Clinton vicinity, *Perryville Tavern*, W of Clinton (in Union Township) at jct. of I 78 and SR 42.

*Morris County*

Boonton, *Rockaway Valley Methodist Church*, N of Boonton (in Boonton Township) on Valley Rd. off Washington Ave.
Madison, *Gibbons Mansion*, 36 Madison Ave.

*Sussex County*

Branchville vicinity, *Log Cabin and Farm*, N of Branchville (in Frankford Township) on Madison Ave.

### NEW YORK

*Monroe County*

Rochester, *East Avenue Historic District*, irregular boundary including East Ave. and adjacent streets.

*New York County*

New York, *The New York Cancer Hospital*, 2 West 106th St.

### NORTH DAKOTA

*Cass County*

Amenia, *Burlington Northern, Inc., Depot*, Woodard Ave.

*McHenry County*

Granville, *Granville State Bank*, Main and 2nd Sts.

### PENNSYLVANIA

*Centre County*

Centre Hall, *Gregg, Andrew, Homestead*, 2 mi. E of Centre Hall between PA 192 and PA 45.
Spring Mills, *Fisher, Maj. Jared B., House*, Penn Hall, S side of PA 45.

*Chester County*

Unionville, *Unionville Village Historic District*, in irregular pattern along Doe Run, Embreeville, and Wollaston Rds.

*Cumberland County*

William Grove vicinity, *Williams, John, House*, 0.5 mi. S of William Grove.

*Lancaster County*

Bainbridge, *Locust Grove*, 0.5 mi. S of Bainbridge.

*Lehigh County*

Emmaus, *Kemmerer House (Irongate)*, 3 Iroquois St.

*Montgomery County*

Lansdale, *Jenkins Homesteam*, 137 Jenkins Ave.

*Northampton County*

Easton vicinity, *Coffeetown Grist Mill*, Coffeetown and Kressman Rds. Williams Township.

*Schuylkill County*

Pottsville, *Yuengling Brewing Company*, 5th W. Mahantongo Sts.

### SOUTH CAROLINA

*Berkeley County*

Cross vicinity, *Lawson's Pond Plantation*, 5 mi. N of Cross off SC 6.
Cross vicinity, *Loch Dhu*, 5 mi. N of Cross off SC 6.

*Charleston County*

Charleston, *Central Baptist Church*, 26 Radcliffe St.
Charleston vicinity, *Magnolia Cemetery*.

*Dillon County*

Little Rock vicinity, *St. Paul's Methodist Church*, NW of jct. of SC 9 and secondary route (Harllee's Bridge).

*Greenville County*

Greenville, *Greenville Baptist Church, First Baptist Church*, 101 West McBee Ave.

*Horry County*

Conway vicinity, *Hebron Church*, 10 mi. S of Conway on US 701.

*York County*

McConnells vicinity, *Bethesda Presbyterian Church*, 3.5 mi. NE of McConnells on SC 332.
Rock Hill, *Ebenezer Academy*, 2132 Ebenezer Rd.

### TEXAS

*Coryell County*

Gatesville, *Coryell County Courthouse*, Public Sq.

[FR Doc.77-562 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Federal Bureau of Investigation

## NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER ADVISORY POLICY BOARD

### Renewal

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), notice is hereby given of the renewal of the NCIC Advisory Policy Board and its Security and Confidentiality (S&C) Committee.

The Assistant Attorney General for Administration, United States Department of Justice, has determined that renewal of this Board is necessary and in

the public interest. Copies of documents relating to the work of the Board and its S&C Committee can be obtained at FBI Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the Board is to recommend to the FBI general policy with respect to the philosophy, concept and operational principles of the NCIC system.

Membership on this Board consists of twenty-six (26) representatives of criminal justice agencies throughout the United States. Twenty (20) members are elected; five each from the four (4) NCIC geographic regions. Qualified electors are representatives of NCIC control terminal agencies. The FBI does not participate in the electoral process. Six additional members representing the judicial, prosecutorial, and correctional segments of the criminal justice community are appointed by the Director of the FBI.

The purpose of the Board's S&C Committee is to review matters pertaining to the overall security of the NCIC system with particular emphasis upon security, confidentiality and privacy issues as they relate to the NCIC Computerized Criminal History File. This review is done on a continuing basis and the S&C Committee's recommendations provide guidance to the Board in this important area of major public concern.

The S&C Committee is composed of eleven members, ten of whom are selected by the Chairman of the Board from the criminal justice community. One member is from the FBI. The tenure of the S&C Committee parallels that of the Board which it serves and expires accordingly.

The Chairman of the Board is elected by the Board's members and will serve until January 4, 1979. The Chairman of the Board's S&C Committee must be a member of the Board, is appointed by the Board Chairman, and his term also expires on January 4, 1979.

CLARENCE M. KELLEY,
*Director.*

[FR Doc.77-922 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

### Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

### ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE ADMINISTRATOR ON STANDARDS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

#### Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the site of the January 14–16, 1977, meeting of the Advisory Committee to the Administrator on Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice has been changed from the Scottsdale Hilton, 6333 N. Scottsdale Road, Scottsdale, Arizona to the Holiday Inn, 915 E. Apache Boulevard, Tempe, Arizona. The meeting was previously announced on December 23, 1976. The Advisory Committee on Standards is a subdivision of the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

The change was made in order to bring the costs of the meeting within the limitations set forth in the regulations on travel.

The meeting will be open to the public. For further information, contact:

Richard Van Duizend, National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20531, (202) 376-3952.

J. A. BROZOST,
*Attorney Advisor,*
*Office of General Counsel.*

[FR Doc.77-836 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

### NATIONAL MINORITY ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

#### Fact Finding and Needs Assessment Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the National Minority Advisory Council on Criminal Justice (NMACCJ) will meet Wednesday and Thursday, January 26 and 27, 1977, in Atlanta, Georgia. The fact finding and needs assessment meeting is scheduled to convene at 7:30 p.m. on January 26, at the Atlanta Internationale Hotel, located at Capitol Avenue and Stadium in Atlanta, Georgia, telephone: (404) 688-1900. This meeting is scheduled to run from 7:30 p.m. until 10:30 p.m. on Wednesday evening, and 10 a.m. until 6 p.m. on Thursday, January 27.

This meeting represents the first effort on the part of the NMACCJ to gather factual information and data concerning the problems of minorities and the criminal justice system at the local, county, state and Federal level in the areas of community crime prevention, criminal justice educational and training programs, police, courts, and corrections. The NMACCJ will not concentrate on specific allegations of discrimination but rather on the impact of the criminal justice system on minorities. This will be an open meeting and persons wishing to attend must furnish their own transportation and accomodations. Anyone wishing to make written or oral statement should contact:

Lewis W. Taylor, Special Assistant to the Administrator for Minorities and Women, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531, (202) 376-3936.

JAY A. BROZOST,
*Attorney-Advisor,*
*Office of General Counsel.*

[FR Doc.77-838 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Occupational Safety and Health Administration

### ALASKA STATE STANDARDS

#### Notice of Approval

1. *Background.* Part 1953 of Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations prescribes procedures under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 667) (hereinafter called the Act) by which the Regional Administrator for Occupational Safety and Health (hereinafter called the Regional Administrator) under a delegation of authority from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health (hereinafter called the Assistant Secretary) (29 CFR 1953.4) will review and approve standards promulgated pursuant to a State plan which has been approved in accordance with section 18(c) of the Act and 29 CFR Part 1902. On August 10, 1973, notice was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 21628) of the approval of the Alaska plan and the adoption of Subpart R to Part 1952 containing the decision.

The Alaska plan provides for the adoption of Federal standards as State standards (by reference or after comments and/or public hearing). Section 1953.20 provides that "where any alteration in the Federal program could have an adverse impact on the 'at least as effective as' status of the State program, a program change supplement to a State plan shall be required."

In response to Federal standard changes the State has submitted, by letters dated May 21, 1976 (Change 1), July 8, 1976 (Change 2), and September 21, 1976 (Change 3), from Edmund N. Orbeck, Commissioner, Alaska Department of Labor to James W. Lake, Regional Administrator, and incorporated as part of the plan, State standards comparable to OSHA standards 29 CFR Part 1910 as republished on June 27, 1974 (39 FR 23502); December 3, 1974 (39 FR 41841); June 27, 1975 (40 FR 27368); March 26, 1975 (40 FR 13436); and March 26, 1975 (40 FR 13440).

Change 1 includes State initiated changes correcting typographical errors; numbering changes; the State response to Federal changes to 29 CFR 1910.217 Mechanical Powered Punch Presses (39 FR 41841) dated December 3, 1974; and references to the Alaska General Safety Code. State subchapters and effective dates relating to these changes are as follows: Subchapter 1, effective June 30, 1973, as amended November 22, 1975; Subchapter 2, effective September 26, 1974; Subchapter 3, effective June 30, 1973; Subchapter 4, effective June 30, 1973; and Subchapter 5, effective September 26, 1974. These standards are adopted in accordance with AS 18.60.20, as the minimum standards to be followed throughout the State of Alaska.

Change 2 includes State initiated changes to the Alaska General Safety Code, Subchapter 1, effective March 27, 1976, comparable to 29 CFR Part 1910, consisting of numbering changes and typographical corrections.

Change 3 includes changes to the Alaska General Safety Code: Subchapter 1 effective September 30, 1976, including Vehicle Mounted Elevating and Rotating Work Platforms (40 FR 13439) March 26, 1975; Helicopters (40 FR 13440) March 26, 1975; and Industrial Slings (40 FR 27368) June 27, 1975, as well as State initiated changes correcting typographical errors and clarifying numbers and references.

These standards, which are contained in the Alaska General Safety Code, were promulgated after public hearings held on June 30, 1975, in Anchorage (Change 1); July 16, 1976, in Ketchikan; July 20–

21, 1976, in Anchorage; and July 23, 1976, in Fairbanks (Change 3). Change 2 was adopted after public comment pursuant to the Alaska Administrative Procedures Act AS 44.62.

2. *Decision.* Having reviewed the State submission in comparison with the Federal standards, it has been determined that the State standards are identical to the Federal standards, except for numbering, State titles, and grammatical editing, and accordingly are hereby approved.

3. *Location of supplement for inspection and copying.* A copy of the standards supplement, along with the approved plan, may be inspected and copied during normal business hours at the following locations: Office of the Regional Administrator, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Room 6003 Federal Office Building, 909 First Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98174; State of Alaska, Department of Labor, Office of the Commissioner, Juneau, Alaska 99801; and the Technical Data Center, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, New Department of Labor Building, Room N-3620, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

4. *Public participation.* Section 1953.2 (c) of this chapter provides that where State standards are identical to or "at least as effective as" comparable Federal standards and have been promulgated in accordance with State law, approval may be effective upon publication without an opportunity for further public participation. As the standards under consideration are identical to the Federal standards and have been promulgated in accordance with State law, they are approved without further opportunity for public comment.

This decision is effective January 11, 1977.

(Sec. 18, Pub. L. 91-596, 84 Stat. 1608 (29 U.S.C. 667)).

Signed at Seattle, Washington this third day of December 1976.

JAMES W. LAKE,
*Regional Administrator, Office of Safety and Health Administration.*

[FR Doc.77-957 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## INDIANA

### Approval of Plan Supplement

1. *Background.* Part 1953 of Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, provides procedures under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 667) (hereinafter referred to as the Act), for review of changes and progress in the development and implementation of State plans which have been approved in accordance with section 18(c) of the Act and Part 1902 of this chapter. On March 6, 1974, a notice was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (39 FR 8611) of the approval of the Indiana plan and the adoption of Subpart Z of Part 1952 containing the decision of approval. On July 14, 1975, the State of Indiana submitted a supplement to the plan involving a State initiated change (see Subpart E of 29 CFR Part 1953).

2. *Description of supplement.* The supplement concerns the establishment of a position entitled, "IOSHA Supervisor" whose responsibilities include directing the implementation of the State's occupational safety and health program; the coordination of all State agencies which are assigned specific program responsibilities; final review of all violations and the abatement of such violations. The IOSHA Supervisor is administratively responsible to the Commissioner of Labor.

3. *Location of the plan and its supplement for inspection and copying.* A copy of the supplement, along with the approved plan, may be inspected and copied during normal business hours at the following locations: Directorate of Federal Compliance and State Programs, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Room N3608, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; Office of the Regional Administrator, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Room 3259, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604; and the State of Indiana Division of Labor, Room 1013, State Office Building, Indianapolis, Indiana 46202.

4. *Public participation.* Under section 1953.2(c) of this chapter, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health (hereinafter referred to as the Assistant Secretary) may prescribe alternative procedures to expedite the review process or for any other good cause which may be consistent with applicable law. The Assistant Secretary finds that the Indiana supplement described above is consistent with commitments made in the approved plan which had previously been available for public comment, and the recommendations made on pages 8-5 and 10-7 of Indiana's second semi-annual report (for the period covering November 1, 1974 to March 31, 1975). Accordingly, it is found that further public comment and notice is unnecessary.

5. *Decision.* After careful consideration, the Indiana plan supplement outlined above is approved under Part 1953 of his chapter. This decision incorporates the requirements of the Act and implementing regulations applicable to State plans generally.

(Sec. 18, Pub. L. 91-596, 84 Stat. 1608 (29 U.S.C. 667).)

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 23rd day of December 1976.

MORTON CORN,
*Assistant Secretary of Labor.*

[FR Doc.77-959 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## WASHINGTON STATE STANDARDS

### Approval

1. *Background.* Part 1953 of Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations prescribes procedures under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (hereinafter called the Act) by which the Regional Administrators for Occupational Safety and Health (hereinafter called Regional Administrator) under a delegation of authority from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health (hereinafter called the Assistant Secretary) (29 CFR 1953.4) will review and approve standards promulgated pursuant to a State plan which has been approved in accordance with section 18(c) of the Act and 29 CFR Part 1902. On January 26, 1973, notice was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER 38 FR 2421 of the approval of the Washington plan and the adoption of Subpart F to Part 1952 containing the decision.

The Washington plan provides for the adoption of State standards which are at least as effective as comparable Federal standards promulgated under section 6 of the Act. Section 1953.20 provides that "where any alteration in the Federal program could have an adverse impact on the at least as effective as status of the State program, a program change supplement to a State plan shall be required."

In response to Federal standards changes, the State has submitted by letter dated October 6, 1976 from John Hillier, Assistant Director, to James W. Lake, Regional Administrator, and incorporated as part of the plan, State standards comparable to 29 CFR Part 1910.183 Helicopters as published in the FEDERAL REGISTER 40 FR 13440 dated March 26, 1975.

These State standards, which are contained in the Washington General Safety and Health Code WAC 296-24, were promulgated after public hearings held on September 15, 1976 at Yakima, Washington.

2. *Decision.* Having reviewed the State submission in comparison with the Federal standards, it has been determined that the State standards are at least as effective as the comparable Federal standards and accordingly are hereby approved. The State standards are more specific concerning work permitted under hovering craft. The detailed standards comparison is available at the locations specified below.

3. *Location of supplement for inspection and copying.* A copy of the standards supplement, along with the approved plan, may be inspected and copied during normal business hours at the following locations: Office of the Regional Administrator, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Room 6048, Federal Office Building, 909 First Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98174; Department of Labor and Industries, 308 East Fourth Avenue, Olympia, Washington 98504; and the Technical Data Center, Room N3620, 200 Constitution Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

4. *Public participation.* Section 1953.2 (c) provides that where State standards are identical to or "at least as effective" as comparable Federal standards, and have been promulgated in accordance with State law, approval may be effective upon publication without an opportunity for further public participation. As the standards under consideration are "at least as effective" as the Federal standards, and have been promulgated

in accordance with State law (including an opportunity for public comment and/or a public hearing), they are approved without an opportunity for further public comment.

This decision is effective January 11, 1977.

(Sec. 18, Pub. L. 91-596, 84 Stat. 1608 (29 U.S.C. 667).)

Signed at Seattle, Washington this 16th day of November 1976.

JAMES W. LAKE,
*Regional Administrator, Occupational Safety and Health Administration.*

[FR Doc.77-960 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## Office of the Secretary

[TA-W-1238]

### ALDEN SHOE CO.

**Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1238: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on November 8, 1976 in response to a worker petition dated October 29, 1976 which was filed by three workers at the Alden Shoe Company, Middleboro, Massachusetts. The investigation revealed that men's orthopedic shoes and men's dress shoes are produced.

The notice of investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 23, 1976 (41 FR 51627). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of the Alden Shoe Company, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision of the firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales, production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that the first three criteria have not been met.

SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

The average annual employment of production workers at Alden Shoe remained unchanged in 1974 compared with 1973, increased 0.9 percent in 1975 compared with 1974 and increased 4.3 percent in the period January through November 1976 compared with the like period in 1975.

Average weekly hours worked increased 4.9 percent in 1974 compared with 1973, decreased 3.5 percent in 1975 compared with 1974 and increased 4.2 percent in the period January through November 1976 compared with the like period in 1975.

SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Sales in terms of quantity decreased 1.2 percent in 1974 compared with 1973, increased 1.8 percent in 1975 compared with 1974 and increased 3.4 percent in the period January through November 1976 compared with the like period in 1975.

Production in terms of quantity decreased 1.6 percent in 1974 compared with 1973, increased 3.8 percent in 1975 compared with 1974 and increased 10.9 percent in the period January through November 1976 compared with the like period in 1975.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Industry sources have indicated that there are no known imports of men's orthopedic shoes. Due to the specialized need and care of the individual user, a closer working relationship is needed between the customer and the manufacturer. This eliminates the probability of significant imports of orthopedic shoes.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

Orthopedic shoes are of sophisticated design and construction and are normally dispensed by medical prescription where correction and therapy modification are deemed necessary. These shoes are typically high priced and as such, sales would be most affected by current domestic economic conditions as individuals may choose to forestall purchases of orthopedic shoes.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, it is concluded that separations of workers have not occurred and that sales and production of men's orthopedic shoes at Alden Shoe Company have not declined as required for certification under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-994 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1151]

### ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA

**Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1151: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 7, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on that date which was filed by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of workers and former workers producing primary aluminum at the Point Comfort, Texas Operations of the Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa).

The notice of investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 29, 1976 (41 FR 47616). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of the Aluminum Company of America, the U.S. Department of the Interior, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts, and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that all of the above criteria have been met.

SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

The average number of production workers at Point Comfort rose 10 percent from 1973 to 1974 and declined 29 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first three quarters of 1976, plant employment was 22 percent below that in the same period of 1975.

SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Production of primary aluminum at Point Comfort decreased in volume by two percent from 1973 to 1974 and by

62 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first three quarters of 1976, plant production was 61 percent below that in the like period of 1975.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of primary aluminum increased from 614 thousand short tons in 1973 to 628 thousand short tons in 1974 and then declined to 550 thousand short tons in 1975. Imports rose from 215 thousand short tons in the first half of 1975 to 342 thousand short tons in the first half of 1976.

The ratio of imports to domestic aluminum production increased from 12.8 percent in 1974 to 14.2 percent in 1975 and rose from 10.6 percent in the first half of 1975 to 22.0 percent in the first half of 1976.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

The Department's investigation revealed that most of the primary aluminum produced at Point Comfort is shipped to corporate fabrication mills and corporate warehouses. Corporate imports of primary aluminum by Alcoa increased 11 percent in volume from the first three quarters of 1975 to the first three quarters of 1976.

Faced with a drop in demand for aluminum products and an increase in corporate inventories, Alcoa decided early in 1975 to curtail corporate production of primary aluminum. As a result of this decision, smelting and refining operations at Point Comfort were cut back, and workers were laid off during 1975 and 1976.

Aluminum production requires a large amount of electrical energy. Point Comfort is dependent on natural gas to run its electrical generators. The rising cost of natural gas has made Point Comfort a high energy cost plant in comparison with other Alcoa plants. The relatively high energy cost at Point Comfort was one of the primary reasons for the long curtailment of production at the plant. The relatively low energy cost at Alcoa's aluminum plants in Norway and South America was a factor behind the increase in corporate imports of aluminum in 1976.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increases of imports like or directly competitive with the primary aluminum produced at Point Comfort contributed importantly to the total or partial separation of the workers at such plant. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers engaged in employment related to the production of primary aluminum at the Point Comfort, Texas Operations of the Aluminum Company of America who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after September 1, 1976, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chaper 2 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-961 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1145]

## AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL SHOE CORP.

### Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1145: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 5, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on that date which was filed on behalf of workers formerly engaged in cutting and stitching footwear uppers at the Portsmouth, New Hampshire facility of American International Shoe Corporation.

The notice of investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 29, 1976 (41 FR 47616). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of American International Shoe Corporation, its former customers, the Office of Management and Budget, the American Footwear Industries Association, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts, and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligiblity to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision of the firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such workers' firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that criteria three and four have not been met.

SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

The average number of production workers fluctuated widely from September 1975, when the plant first began production, through August 1976. All workers were separated from employment by the end of August 1976 when the plant closed.

SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED

Sales increased from September 1975, when the plant first began production, to January 1976, then declined through August 1976, when all production ceased. American International Shoe produced on a contractual basis, and separate production records were not maintained.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of leather footwear shoe uppers are not separately identifiable in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated. Leather shoe uppers are included in a basket category consisting of leather shapes for use in footwear. Official statistics are recorded only in value terms, which do not reflect the change in value of leather in recent years. The proportion of leather shoe uppers to the value of the entire category is not known.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

Customers of American International Shoe Corporation indicated, in response to a survey, that they do not import shoe uppers. Imports of shoes which incorporate uppers of the same origin are not like or directly competitive with shoe uppers produced by American International.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation I conclude that increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with leather and vinyl shoe uppers produced at the Portsmouth, New Hampshire plant of American International Shoe Corporation, did not contribute importantly to the total or partial separation of the workers of that plant.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 29th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-1001 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1144]

## AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL SHOE CORP.

### Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1144: investigation regarding certifi-

in accordance with State law (including an opportunity for public comment and/or a public hearing), they are approved without an opportunity for further public comment.

This decision is effective January 11, 1977.

(Sec. 18, Pub. L. 91-596, 84 Stat. 1608 (29 U.S.C. 667).)

Signed at Seattle, Washington this 16th day of November 1976.

JAMES W. LAKE,
*Regional Administrator, Occupational Safety and Health Administration.*

[FR Doc.77-960 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## Office of the Secretary

[TA-W-1238]

### ALDEN SHOE CO.

**Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1238: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on November 8, 1976 in response to a worker petition dated October 29, 1976 which was filed by three workers at the Alden Shoe Company, Middleboro, Massachusetts. The investigation revealed that men's orthopedic shoes and men's dress shoes are produced.

The notice of investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 23, 1976 (41 FR 51627). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of the Alden Shoe Company, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision of the firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales, production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that the first three criteria have not been met.

#### SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

The average annual employment of production workers at Alden Shoe remained unchanged in 1974 compared with 1973, increased 0.9 percent in 1975 compared with 1974 and increased 4.3 percent in the period January through November 1976 compared with the like period in 1975.

Average weekly hours worked increased 4.9 percent in 1974 compared with 1973, decreased 3.5 percent in 1975 compared with 1974 and increased 4.2 percent in the period January through November 1976 compared with the like period in 1975.

#### SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Sales in terms of quantity decreased 1.2 percent in 1974 compared with 1973, increased 1.8 percent in 1975 compared with 1974 and increased 3.4 percent in the period January through November 1976 compared with the like period in 1975.

Production in terms of quantity decreased 1.6 percent in 1974 compared with 1973, increased 3.8 percent in 1975 compared with 1974 and increased 10.9 percent in the period January through November 1976 compared with the like period in 1975.

#### INCREASED IMPORTS

Industry sources have indicated that there are no known imports of men's orthopedic shoes. Due to the specialized need and care of the individual user, a closer working relationship is needed between the customer and the manufacturer. This eliminates the probability of significant imports of orthopedic shoes.

#### CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

Orthopedic shoes are of sophisticated design and construction and are normally dispensed by medical prescription where correction and therapy modification are deemed necessary. These shoes are typically high priced and as such, sales would be most affected by current domestic economic conditions as individuals may choose to forestall purchases of orthopedic shoes.

#### CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, it is concluded that separations of workers have not occurred and that sales and production of men's orthopedic shoes at Alden Shoe Company have not declined as required for certification under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-994 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1151]

### ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA

**Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1151: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 7, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on that date which was filed by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of workers and former workers producing primary aluminum at the Point Comfort, Texas Operations of the Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa).

The notice of investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 29, 1976 (41 FR 47616). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of the Aluminum Company of America, the U.S. Department of the Interior, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts, and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that all of the above criteria have been met.

#### SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

The average number of production workers at Point Comfort rose 10 percent from 1973 to 1974 and declined 29 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first three quarters of 1976, plant employment was 22 percent below that in the same period of 1975.

#### SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Production of primary aluminum at Point Comfort decreased in volume by two percent from 1973 to 1974 and by

62 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first three quarters of 1976, plant production was 61 percent below that in the like period of 1975.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of primary aluminum increased from 614 thousand short tons in 1973 to 628 thousand short tons in 1974 and then declined to 550 thousand short tons in 1975. Imports rose from 215 thousand short tons in the first half of 1975 to 342 thousand short tons in the first half of 1976.

The ratio of imports to domestic aluminum production increased from 12.8 percent in 1974 to 14.2 percent in 1975 and rose from 10.6 percent in the first half of 1975 to 22.0 percent in the first half of 1976.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

The Department's investigation revealed that most of the primary aluminum produced at Point Comfort is shipped to corporate fabrication mills and corporate warehouses. Corporate imports of primary aluminum by Alcoa increased 11 percent in volume from the first three quarters of 1975 to the first three quarters of 1976.

Faced with a drop in demand for aluminum products and an increase in corporate inventories, Alcoa decided early in 1975 to curtail corporate production of primary aluminum. As a result of this decision, smelting and refining operations at Point Comfort were cut back, and workers were laid off during 1975 and 1976.

Aluminum production requires a large amount of electrical energy. Point Comfort is dependent on natural gas to run its electrical generators. The rising cost of natural gas has made Point Comfort a high energy cost plant in comparison with other Alcoa plants. The relatively high energy cost at Point Comfort was one of the primary reasons for the long curtailment of production at the plant. The relatively low energy cost at Alcoa's aluminum plants in Norway and South America was a factor behind the increase in corporate imports of aluminum in 1976.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increases of imports like or directly competitive with the primary aluminum produced at Point Comfort contributed importantly to the total or partial separation of the workers at such plant. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers engaged in employment related to the production of primary aluminum at the Point Comfort, Texas Operations of the Aluminum Company of America who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after September 1, 1976, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chaper 2 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-961 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1145]

## AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL SHOE CORP.

### Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1145: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 5, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on that date which was filed on behalf of workers formerly engaged in cutting and stitching footwear uppers at the Portsmouth, New Hampshire facility of American International Shoe Corporation.

The notice of investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 29, 1976 (41 FR 47616). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of American International Shoe Corporation, its former customers, the Office of Management and Budget, the American Footwear Industries Association, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts, and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligiblity to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision of the firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such workers' firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that criteria three and four have not been met.

SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

The average number of production workers fluctuated widely from September 1975, when the plant first began production, through August 1976. All workers were separated from employment by the end of August 1976 when the plant closed.

SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED

Sales increased from September 1975, when the plant first began production, to January 1976, then declined through August 1976, when all production ceased. American International Shoe produced on a contractual basis, and separate production records were not maintained.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of leather footwear shoe uppers are not separately identifiable in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated. Leather shoe uppers are included in a basket category consisting of leather shapes for use in footwear. Official statistics are recorded only in value terms, which do not reflect the change in value of leather in recent years. The proportion of leather shoe uppers to the value of the entire category is not known.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

Customers of American International Shoe Corporation indicated, in response to a survey, that they do not import shoe uppers. Imports of shoes which incorporate uppers of the same origin are not like or directly competitive with shoe uppers produced by American International.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation I conclude that increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with leather and vinyl shoe uppers produced at the Portsmouth, New Hampshire plant of American International Shoe Corporation, did not contribute importantly to the total or partial separation of the workers of that plant.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 29th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-1001 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1144]

## AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL SHOE CORP.

### Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1144: investigation regarding certifi-

cation of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 5, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on that date which was filed on behalf of workers formerly engaged in cutting and stitching footwear uppers at the Newport, New Hampshire facility of American International Shoe Corporation.

The Notice of Investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 29, 1976 (41 FR 47616). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of American International Shoe Corporation, its former customers, the Office of Management and Budget, the American Footwear Industries Association, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that criteria three and four have not been met.

SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

The average number of production workers increased from November, 1975, when the plant first began production, through June 1976. All workers were separated from employment by the end of August 1976 when the plant closed.

SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Sales increased from November 1975, when the plant first began production, through March 1976. American International Shoe produced on a contractual basis, and separate production records were not maintained. Production ceased in August 1976.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of leather footwear shoe uppers are not separately identifiable in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated. Leather shoe uppers are included in a basket category consisting of leather shapes for use in footwear. Official statistics are recorded only in value terms, which do not reflect the change in value of leather in recent years. The proportion of leather shoe uppers to the value of the entire category is not known.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

Customers of American International Shoe Corporation indicated, in response to a survey, that they do not import shoe uppers. Imports of shoes which incorporate uppers of the same origin are not like or directly competitive with shoe uppers produced by American International.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation I conclude that increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with uppers for leather footwear produced at the Newport, New Hampshire plant of American International Shoe Corporation, did not contribute importantly to the total or partial separation of the workers of that plant.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 29th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-1002 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-1,457]

## ARMCO STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Kansas City Works, Kansas City, Missouri of Armco Steel Corp., Middletown, Ohio (TA-W-1,457). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with billets, bars, rebars, rod angles, flats, channels, fasteners, wire rope, & wire products produced by Armco Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a signficant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatend to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-988 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-1,498]

## BETHLEHEM STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Vernon, California, Los Angeles plant of Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bethlehem, Pa. (TA-W-1,498). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with wire, galvanized wire, industrial fasteners, and reinforcement bars and other products of iron and steel produced by Bethlehem Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the de-

termination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-972 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,496]

## BETHLEHEM STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania (TA-W-1,496). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron, steel and brass products produced by Bethlehem Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address show below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade*
*Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-973 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,508]

## CASCADE STEEL ROLLING MILLS, INC.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 22, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated December 3, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Cascade Steel Rolling Mills, Inc., McMinnville, Oregon (TA-W-1,508). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with carbon steel rebars produced by Cascade Steel Rolling Mills, Inc. or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 22nd day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-966 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1, 507]

## EMPIRE COKE CO.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Empire Coke Company, Holt, Alabama, a Div. of McWane Cast Iron Pipe Co., Birmingham, Alabama (TA-W-1, 507). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with coke produced by Empire Coke Company or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility require-

ments of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-967 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,483]

## HAWAIIAN WESTERN STEEL LTD.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 20, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated December 3, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Hawaiian Western Steel Ltd., Ewa Beach, Hawaii (TA-W-1,483). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with reinforcing steel, reinforcing bars produced by Hawaiian Western Steel Ltd. or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 20th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-986 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1085]

## INCOPA INDUSTRIES, INC.

### Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1085: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on September 20, 1976, in response to a worker petition received on that date which was filed by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of American on behalf of workers and former workers of Incopa Industries, Inc., Bristol, Tennessee, a subsidiary of Koracorp Industries, Inc. San Francisco, California.

The Notice of Investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 5, 1976 (41 FR 43972). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of Koracorp Industries, Inc., the parent firm of Incopa Industries, Inc., the customers of Incopa Industries, the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. Department of Commerce, industry analysts, and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that although the first three criteria have been met, the fourth criterion has not been met.

#### SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

Average employment of production workers fell 42 percent in 1975 compared to 1974 and declined 24 percent in the first half of 1976 compared to the like period of 1975.

#### SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Sales fell 45 percent in 1975 compared to 1974 and decreased 25 percent in the first half of 1976 compared to the like period of 1975.

#### INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of man-made coated or protected fabric increased in 1972 and 1973, declined in 1974 and rose 9 percent in 1975 compared to 1974. Imports increased 100 percent in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the like period of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 8.5 percent in 1974 to 11.5 percent in 1975.

#### CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

Customers surveyed indicated that they did not switch their purchases of coated fabrics from Incopa Industries, Inc. to foreign producers. One customer, that accounted for almost 40 percent of Incopa Industries' sales in 1975, reduced purchases by more than 50 percent in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the like period of 1975. This customer reduced purchases from Incopa Industries because it experienced a large drop in sales to the U.S. Government which purchases no imported coated fabrics.

#### CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increases of imports like or directly competitive with coated fabrics produced by Incopa Industries, Inc., Bristol, Tennessee, did not contribute importantly to the total or partial separation of the workers of that plant.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 29th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.76-1003 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1243]

## INTERNATIONAL SHOE CO.

### Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1243: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on November 8, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on that date which was filed by the Boot and Shoe Workers Union on behalf of workers and former workers producing men's shoes and Hy-Test boots at the Flora, Illinois plant of the International Shoe Company, St. Louis, Missouri.

The notice of investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 23, 1976 (41 FR 51631). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of the International Shoe Company, its customers, the Department of Commerce, the International Trade Commission, industry analysts, and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened with becoming totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that all of the above criteria have been met.

#### SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

Employment of production workers declined 13 percent from 1973 to 1974, declined 8 percent from 1974 to 1975, and declined 6 percent in the first three quarters of 1976 compared to the same period of 1975. All production workers were laid-off in November 1976 when the plant was permanently closed. A skeleton crew of maintenance workers and supervisors were retained after November to complete closs-up operations. All employment terminations are expected to occur by the first week in January, 1977.

#### SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Production of men's dress shoes and Hy-Test Safety Boots at the Flora plant declined 34 percent in quantity from 1973 to 1974, declined 10 percent from 1974 to 1975, and declined 23 percent in the first three quarters of 1976 compared to the same period of 1975. All production ceased in November 1976 when the plant was permanently closed.

#### INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of men's dress and casual footwear increased absolutely in each year from 1971 to 1973, declined from 1973 to 1974, and then increased from 1974 to 1975 and in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the same period of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 46.1 percent in the first nine months of 1975 to 52.1 percent in the same period of 1976.

Imports of work footwear increased absolutely in each year from 1971 to 1974, declined from 1974 to 1975, and then increased in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the same period of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 9.3 percent in the first nine months of 1975 to 19.6 percent in the first nine months of 1976.

#### CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

The investigation has revealed that retail customers reduced purchases from International Shoe in 1975 and 1976. Several of the customers surveyed shifted to purchases of imported men's shoes.

The import influence resulting in the deterioration of International Shoe's market for men's dress shoes led to the closure of the Flora, Illinois plant in November, 1976.

#### CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increases of imports like or directly competitive with men's shoes produced at the Flora, Illinois plant of the International Shoe Company contributed importantly to the total or partial separation of the workers of that plant. In accordance with the provision of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers engaged in employment related to the production of men's shoes and Hy-Test Safety Boots at the Flora, Illinois plant of the Internaltional Shoe Company who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 29, 1975 and before February 1, 1977 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2 of the Trade Act of 1974. All workers separated from employment on or after February 1, 1977 are not eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-992 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1242]

## INTERNATIONAL SHOE CO.

### Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1242: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on November 8, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on November 8, 1976 which was filed by the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union on behalf of workers and former workers producing men's shoes at the West Plains, Missouri plant of the International Shoe Company, St. Louis, Missouri.

Notice of the Investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 23, 1976 (41 FR 51630). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of International Shoe Company, its customers, the International Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, industry analysts and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed important" but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that all of the above criteria have been met.

#### SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

Employment of production workers increased 3 percent from 1973 to 1974, and then declined 6 percent from 1974 to 1975. Employment declined in the second and third quarters of 1976 compared to the same quarters of the previous year.

SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Production at the West Plains, Missouri plant increased 3 percent in quantity from 1973 to 1974, and then declined 20 percent from 1974 to 1975. Production declined in the second and third quarters of 1976 compared to the same quarters of 1975.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of men's dress and casual footwear increased absolutely in each year from 1971 to 1973, declined from 1973 to 1974, and then increased absolutely from 1974 to 1975 and in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the first nine months of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 46.1 percent in the first nine months of 1975 to 52.1 percent in the same period of 1976.

Imports of work footwear increased each year from 1971 to 1974 and decreased in 1975. Imports increased both absolutely and relatively from the first three quarters of 1975 to the similar period in 1976.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

Customers reduced purchases of men's shoes from International Shoe in 1975 and 1976. Approximately 45 percent of the customers surveyed have shifted to purchases of imported men's footwear.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increases of imports like or directly competitive with men's shoes produced by the West Plains, Missouri plant of the International Shoe Company, St. Louis, Missouri, contributed importantly to the total or partial separations of the workers of that plant. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers engaged in employment related to the production of men's shoes at the West Plains, Missouri plant of the International Shoe Company, St. Louis, Missouri who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 18, 1975 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 29th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-993 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1333]

## ITT GRINNELL CORP.

### Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1333: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on November 30, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on November 30, 1976 which was filed by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of workers producing steel pipes, fittings, valves, and brass foundry products at the Warren, Ohio plant of ITT Grinnell Corporation.

The notice of investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on December 21, 1976 (41 FR 55606). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained from the United Steelworkers of America and ITT Grinnell Corporation.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision of the firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated.

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely,

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

Without regard to whether any other criteria have been met, criterion (1) has not been met. The evidence developed in the Department's investigation reveals that no involuntary separations occurred during 1975 or 1976 to the present.

The average weekly hours worked during 1975 and to date have been 40 hours or more.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that employees at the Warren, Ohio plant of ITT Grinnell Corporation have not become totally or partially separated as required in Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-991 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1409]

## KENTUCKY ELECTRIC STEEL CO.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 14, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated December 3, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Kentucky Electric Steel Company, Ashland, Kentucky (TA-W-1409). Accordingly, the Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with angles, flats and channels of high carbon and alloy steel produced by Kentucky Electric Steel Company or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFA 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 14th day of December 1976.

DOMINIC SORRENTINO,
*Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-989 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1509]

## MARATHON MANUFACTURING CO.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 22, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated December 3, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974

("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Marathon Stainless Rolling Division, Marathon Manufacturing Company, Tempe, Arizona (TA-W-1509). Accordingly, the Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with carbon steel bars produced by Marathon Manufacturing Company or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 22nd day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-965 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-1504]

## MESTA MACHINE CO.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 22, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated December 3, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of West Homestead, Pa. plant of Mesta Machine Company, Pittsburgh, Pa. (TA-W-1504). Accordingly, the Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221 (a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with rolling mill machinery & equipment produced by Mesta Machine Company or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 22nd day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-970 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-1077]

## MILWAUKEE GLOVE CO.

### Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1077: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on September 15, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on that date which was filed by the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union on behalf of workers and former workers producing leather dress gloves, leather work gloves, and leather outerwear at Milwaukee Glove Company, Marinette, Wisconsin.

The Notice of Investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 1, 1976 (41 FR 43495). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from information and publications provided by officials and customers of Milwaukee Glove Company, the Work Glove Manufacturers Association, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts, and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

Without regard to whether any of the other criteria have been met, criterion (1) has not been met.

The Department's investigation revealed that employment of production workers at Milwaukee Glove Company after declining two percent in the fourth quarter of 1975 compared to the fourth quarter of 1974, increased eight percent, ten percent, and 16 percent in the first three quarters of 1976 compared to the same respective quarters in 1975. Employment in the third quarter of 1976 reached peak quarterly levels for the period under investigation—from January 1973 to September 1976. Officials of Milwaukee Glove Company and local union officials attributed minor fluctuations in employment levels to the use of voluntary part-time employment by workers drawing social security benefits.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that significant total or partial separations of workers at Milwaukee Glove Company, Marinette, Wisconsin, have not occurred as required for certification under Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-1004 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1224]

## NEW YORK IMPERIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

### Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1224: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on November 3, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on that date which was filed on behalf of workers and former workers producing brassieres and girdles at the Brooklyn, New York plant of New York Imperial Foundation, Inc.

The Notice of Investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 19, 1976 (41 FR 51143). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials and publications of New York Imperial Foundation, Inc., its customers, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially seprated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The Department's investigation has revealed that all of the above criteria have been met.

SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

Average weekly employment of production workers at New York Imperial declined 5 percent in 1974 from 1973, 11 percent in 1975 from 1974 and 19 percent in the first 11 months of 1976 from the same period in 1975.

SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Production of girdles at New York Imperial declined 6 percent in 1974 from 1973, 8 percent in 1975 from 1974 and 23 percent in the first 11 months of 1976 from the same period in 1975.

Production of brassieres (number of brassieres cut) at New York Imperial decreased 11 percent in 1974 from 1973, increased 11 percent in 1975 from 1974 and decreased 17 percent in the first 11 months of 1976 from the same period in 1975.

Since January 1974, approximately 80 percent of brassieres cut and sold by Imperial have been shipped to a Puerto Rican firm for stitching. The remaining 20 percent are stitched at Imperial's Brooklyn plant.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of brassieres into the U.S. increased absolutely and relative to domestic production in each year from 1972 through 1975 from the previous year. Imports increased 12 percent in 1975 from 1974. Imports increased 28 percent in the first 9 months of 1976 from the first 9 months of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 35.4 percent in 1974 to 42.3 percent in 1975.

Imports of girdles into the U.S. increased in 1972 from 1971, decreased in 1973 from 1972, and increased in 1974 and 1975 from the previous year. Imports increased 18 percent in 1975 from 1974 and 88 percent in the first 9 months of 1976 from the same period of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 2.6 percent in 1974 to 3.1 percent in 1975.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

Customers accounting for 95 percent of Imperial's sales have decreased purchases of brassieres and girdles from New York Imperial and increased purchases of imports.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increases of imports like or directly competitive with brassieres and girdles produced at the Brooklyn, New York plant of New York Imperial Foundation, Inc., contributed importantly to the total or partial separations of the workers of that plant. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers at the Brooklyn, New York plant of New York Imperial Foundation, Inc., who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 19, 1975, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-995 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,503]

## NORTHWESTERN STEEL & WIRE CO.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Northwestern Steel & Wire Company, Sterling, Illinois (TA-W-1,503). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with wire fabrications, structural steel, bars, rods, billets and ingots produced by Northwestern Steel & Wire Company or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-971 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,510]

## PACIFIC STATES STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 22, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated December 3, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Pacific States Steel Corporation, Union City, California (TA-W-1,510). Accordingly, the Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with structural shapes carbon steel produced by Pacific States Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U. S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 22nd day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-964 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,495]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Culvert Division, Canton, Ohio of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1,495). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221 (a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-974 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,494]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976, the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Berger Division, Canton, Ohio of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1494). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221 (a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-975 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,493]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Canton South, Canton, Ohio plant of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1,493). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistant, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221 (a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-976 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,492]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Canton Alloy Division, Canton, Ohio of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1,492). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221 (a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigtaion is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-977 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1491]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United States Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Youngstown, Ohio plant of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1491). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-978 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,490]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Warren, Ohio plant of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1,490). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-979 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,489]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Niles, Ohio plant of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1,489). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-980 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,488]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Massillon, Ohio plant of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1,488). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address show below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition fleld in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-981 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,487]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Gadsden, Alabama plant of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1,487). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221 (a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U. S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-982 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,486]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1,486). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221 (a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address show below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-983 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-485]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of South Chicago, Illinois plant of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1485). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221 (a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address show below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-984 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1484]

## REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 15, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 15, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("The Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Buffalo, New York plan of Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-1484). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with iron and steel products produced by Republic Steel Corporation or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of the investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case in available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 15th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of*
*Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-985 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1164]

## ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL

### Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1164: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 13, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on October 13, 1976 which was filed by three workers on behalf of workers and former workers producing the Rockwell Quadrasonic ladies seamless hosiery machine at the Rockwell International plant in Reading, Pennsylvania.

The Notice of Investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 29, 1976 (41 FR 47629). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of Rockwell International and its customers, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That such increased imports like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increasd quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

Without regard to whether any of the other criteria have been met, the investigation revealed that criterion four has not been met.

Rockwell International began producing an experimental circular knitting machine in early 1975. This prototype machine called Quadrasonic was designed to produce ladies seamless hosiery. The Quadrasonic prototypes were never sold commercially by Rockwell.

The Quadrasonic program never progressed beyond the experimental stage. Field tests of Quadrasonic machines uncovered many technical problems. In assessing the cost of further developmental work on Quadrasonic, management decided to discontinue the experimental work. All employees were on this project were terminated in October 1976.

Quadrasonic machines were never available for sale on the commercial market and therefore increases of imports of circular knitting machines for sale to end users could not have contributed importantly to the termination of developmental work on this prototype machine.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increased imports of circular knitting machinery for hosiery have not contributed importantly to total or partial separations of the workers engaged in employment related to developmental work on Quadrasonic at the Reading, Pennsylvania plant of Rockwell International as required for certification under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management,*
*Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-998 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-1214]

## ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL

### Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1214: Investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 31, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on October 31, 1976 which was filed by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of workers and former workers producing circular knitting machines also known as large diameter knitting machines at the Rockwell International plant in Reading, Pennsylvania.

The Notice of Investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 19, 1976 (41 FR 51144). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of Rockwell International, its customers, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

If any one of the criteria is not met, a negative determination must be made.

Rockwell International at Reading discontinued the production of flat kitting machinery in October 1974 and discontinued the production of large diameter knitting machinery in January 1975. Since then, the only employees having any involvement with either flat or large diameter knitting machinery were those involved in the reconditioning of repossessed machinery previously sold by the Knitting Machinery Division to be resold by Rockwell.

The Department of Labor has already determined that the performance of services is not included within the term "articles" as used in Section 222(3) of the Act. See Notice of Negative Determination in Pan American World Airways, Incorporated (TA-W-153; 40 FR 54639).

The petitioning group of workers are employed in the performance of servicing repossessed either flat or large diameter knitting machines. These workers were not involved in the production of an article within the meaning of Section 222(3) of the Act.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the issues, I have determined that services of reconditioning either flat or large diameter knitting machines by the petitioning group of workers employed at the Reading, Pennsylvania plant of Rockwell International are not "articles" within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974. Therefore this petition is denied.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-996 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-1,370]

## SARCO CO.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 1, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated November 1, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Sarco Company, Allentown, Pa., division of White Consolidated Industries, Inc., Allentown, Pa. (TA-W-1370). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with the secretarial services provided by Sarco Company or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 1st day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-990 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-1147]

## SEBASTIANA C. INC.

### Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1147: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 7, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on October 7, 1976 which was filed on behalf of workers and former workers engaged in shrimp and fish catching activities for Sebastiana C., Inc., Gloucester, Massachusetts.

The notice of investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 29, 1976 (41 FR 47629). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of Sebastiana C. Incorporated, its customers, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, and Department Files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in that workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The Department's investigation revealed that criterion (4) has not been met.

SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

Employment based on crew share and the average number of trips made declined 18.1 percent in 1975 compared to 1974 and then increased 13.7 percent in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the first nine months of 1975.

SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Sales at Sebastiana declined 15.9 percent in 1975 compared to 1974 and then increased 7.1 percent in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the first nine months of 1975.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of shrimp decreased absolutely and relatively from 1974 to 1975. Imports of shrimp increased from 101.1 thousand pounds in the first six months of 1975 to 124.4 thousand pounds in the first six months of 1976. The ratio of imports to production rose from 205.0 percent in the first six months of 1975 to 212.6 percent in the first six months of 1976.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

The Department's investigation indicated that approximately 70 percent of the total catch of Sebastiana C. is fresh fish. Customers of Sebastiana C. do not purchase imported fish. The other 30 percent of the catch was shrimp. Regulations issued by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission have prohibited any catching of shrimp in the waters off Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts since April 15, 1976.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increases of imports like or directly competitive with fresh fish and shrimp handled by Sebastiana C. did not contribute importantly to the total or partial separations of the workers.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 29th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-1000 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,506]

## SHENANGO, INC.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 22, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated December 3, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Sharpsville, Pennsylvania plant of Shenango, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa. (TA-W-1,506). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with ingot molds and stools produced by Shenango, Incorporated or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address show below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 22nd day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-968 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1,505]

## SHENANGO, INC.

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 22, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated December 3, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of the Neville Island, Pa. plant, of Shenango, Incorporated, Pittsburgh, Pa. (TA-W-1,505). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with coke and iron produced by Shenango, Incorporated or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 22nd day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-969 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[TA-W-1156, 1157, 1158, 1271]

## SWEETREE MILLS, INC.

### Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1156, 1157, 1158, and 1271: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 12, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on October 12, 1976 which was filed on behalf of workers formerly producing ladies' knit sweaters and knit sportswear at the Cherryville sewing plant (TA-W-1157), the Cherryville dye house (TA-W-1156,) and Kings Mountain sewing plant (TA-W-1158) of Sweetree Mills, Incorporated, Cherryville, N.C. A fourth petition, received on November 24, 1976 was filed on behalf of workers formerly producing ladies' knit sweaters and knit sportswear at the Cherryville knitting plant (TA-W-1271) of Sweetree Mills, Incorporated.

The Notices of Investigation were published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 29, 1976 (41 FR 47630 and 47631) and December 7, 1976 (41 FR 53553). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of Sweetree Mills, Inc., its customers, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. International Trade Commission, industry analysts and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or

an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production.

The investigation reveals that all of the above criteria have been met.

SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

The average number of production workers at the Cherryville knitting plant declined 4 percent from 1973 to 1974 and declined 32 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first nine months of 1976, employment declined 28 percent compared to the first nine months of 1975.

The average number of production workers at the Cherryville dye house declined 15 percent from 1973 to 1974 and declined 33 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first nine months of 1976, employment declined 37 percent compared to the first nine months of 1975.

The average number of production workers at the Cherryville sewing plant increased 17 percent from 1973 to 1974 and then declined 13 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first nine months of 1976, employment declined 11 percent compared to the first nine months of 1975.

The average number of production workers at the King's Mountain sewing plant increased 11 percent from 1973 to 1974 and then declined 1 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first nine months of 1976, employment declined 26 percent compared to the first nine months of 1975. King's Mountain employment data for June through September 1976, reflect those workers who were transferred with sportswear production from King's Mountain to the Cherryville sewing plant.

The average number of salaried workers at Sweetree Mills, Inc. increased 18 percent from 1973 to 1974 and then declined 15 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first nine months of 1976, salaried employment declined 27 percent compared to the first nine months of 1975.

All employment of Sweetree Mills, Inc. was terminated in September 1976.

SALES, PRODUCTION, OR BOTH HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Sales of ladies' knit sweaters declined 7 percent from 1973 to 1974 and declined 35 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first six months of 1976, sweater sales increased 30 percent compared to the first six months of 1975.

Sales of ladies' knit sportswear increased 20 percent from 1973 to 1974 and then declined 18 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first six months of 1976, sportswear sales declined 35 percent compared to the first six months of 1975.

Production of ladies' knit sweaters declined 3 percent from 1973 to 1974 and declined 38 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first six months of 1976, sweater production declined 5 percent compared to the first six months of 1975.

Production of ladies' knit sportswear increased 3 percent from 1973 to 1974 and then declined 20 percent from 1974 to 1975. In the first six months of 1976, sportswear production increased 29 percent compared to the first six months of 1975.

The King's Mountain plant was closed in June 1976. At that time, sewing of remaining sportswear inventory and workers engaged in the production of sportswear were transferred from King's Mountain to the Cherryville sewing plant. The sportswear operation was segregated from sweater production until Sweetree went out of business. In September 1976 production at the three remaining Sweetree plants ceased.

INCREASED IMPORTS

Imports of women's misses', and children's knit sweaters declined absolutely and relatively in each year from 1971 through 1973. Imports increased absolutely from 1973 to 1974, from 1974 to 1975, and from the first nine months of 1975 to the first nine months of 1976. The ratio of imports to domestic production declined from 104.9 percent in 1974 to 94.6 percent in 1975.

Imports of women's, misses', and children's knit slacks and shorts increased absolutely in each year from 1971 through 1973 and then declined absolutely from 1973 to 1974. Imports increased both absolutely and relatively from 1974 to 1975. Imports declined absolutely in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the first nine months of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 41.6 percent in 1974 to 44.8 percent in 1975.

Imports of women's, misses' and children's knit coats (including blazers) increased absolutely from 1971 to 1972 and increased absolutely and relatively from 1972 to 1973 and from 1973 to 1974. Imports increased relatively from 1974 to 1975 and increased absolutely in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the first nine months of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 21.7 percent in 1974 to 21.8 percent in 1975.

Imports of women's, misses', and children's knit blouses and shirts increased absolutely from 1971 to 1972, from 1972 to 1973, and then increased absolutely and relatively from 1973 to 1974. Imports increased absolutely and relatively from 1974 to 1975 and increased absolutely in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the first nine months of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 69.6 percent in 1974 to 81.6 percent in 1975.

Imports of women's, misses', and children's knit slacks and shorts increased and relatively from 1971 to 1972 and then declined absolutely and relatively from 1972 to 1973 and from 1973 to 1974. Imports increased absolutely and relatively from 1974 to 1975 and then declined absolutely in the first nine months of 1976 compared to the first nine months of 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic production increased from 5.1 percent in 1974 to 7.6 percent in 1975.

Import data for ladies' knit vests was not available. Vests are included in the basket category "women's, misses', and children's—all other clothing".

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

The Department's investigation revealed that customers reduced purchases of ladies' knit sweaters and knit sportswear from Sweetree Mills in 1975 and 1976 and substituted purchases of imported sweaters and sportswear.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increases of imports like or directly competitive with ladies' knit sweaters and knit sportswear produced at the Cherryville sewing plant, dye house, knitting plant and King's Mountain sewing plant of Sweetree Mills, Incorporated contributed importantly to the total or partial separation of the workers of those plants. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers engaged in employment related to the production of ladies' knit sweaters and knit sportswear at the Cherryville sewing plant, dye house, knitting plant, and King's Mountain sewing plant of Sweetree Mills, Incorporated, Cherryville, N.C. who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after September 30, 1975 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc. 77-999 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-11T]

## TRW, INC.

### Completion of Termination Investigation Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223(d) of the Trade Act of 1974, the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-11T: investigation regarding termination of certification of eligibility of apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 223(d) of the Act.

On June 19, 1975, workers producing carbon composition resistors at the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Division of TRW, Incorporated, Cleveland, Ohio were certified as eligible to apply for trade adjustment assistance. The Notice of Determination was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on June 26, 1975 (40 FR 27084).

The investigation regarding termination of certification was initiated on May 27, 1976 to determine whether the groups of workers specified above con-

tinue to meet the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Act. The Notice of Investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on June 29, 1976 (41 FR 26771). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

During the course of the investigation, information was obtained from officials of TRW, Incorporated, its customers, industry analysts, and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdivision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

Whenever it becomes evident that any of the above criteria are no longer met, the certification as issued must be revised to include a termination date. The termination date would apply only with respect to total or partial separations occurring after this date as specified in the revised certification.

The investigation reveals that all four criteria continue to be met.

### SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

Subsequent to the June 19, 1975 finding, employment of production workers decreased 51 percent from 1974 to 1975. Employment decreased 5 percent in the first quarter of 1976 compared to the like period of 1975. Employment increased 16 percent in the second quarter of 1976 compared to the same quarter of the previous year, but declined 16 percent from the previous quarter. Employment increased 9 percent in the third quarter of 1976 compared to the same quarter of the previous year and remained unchanged from the previous quarter. Employment figures include the Downington, Pennsylvania facility of TRW, which employs workers engaged in the preparation of paints for the resistors produced at the Philadelphia Division and represents approximately 1½ percent of total employment.

Employment of salaried workers declined 41 percent from 1974 to 1975, and 14 percent in the first ten months of 1976 from the same period in 1975.

### SALES OR PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Subsequent to the June 19, 1975 finding, sales of carbon composition resistors by the Philadelphia Division of TRW, Inc. decreased 44 percent in quantity from 1974 to 1975. Sales increased 25 percent in the first quarter of 1976 compared to the like period of 1975, then decreased in quantity in the second and third quarters of 1976, 7 percent and 32 percent, respectively, compared to the like periods of 1975.

Production of carbon composition resistors decreased 58 percent in quantity from 1974 to 1975. Sales increased 25 per- in the first, second, and third quarters of 1976, 34 percent, 22 percent and 18 percent in quantity, respectively, compared to the same quarters of 1975. Production decreased 37 percent in the second quarter of 1976 compared to the first quarter of 1976 and decreased 7 percent in the third quarter of 1976 compared to the second quarter of 1976.

### INCREASED IMPORTS

Subsequent to the June 19, 1975 finding, imports of carbon composition resistors decreased both absolutely and relatively from 1974 to 1975. Imports increased absolutely and relatively in the first six months of 1976 compared to the same period of the previous year. The ratio of imports to domestic production and consumption increased from 34.0 percent and 26.2 percent, respectively, in the first six months of 1975, to 57.3 percent and 37.0 percent, respectively, in the first six months of 1976.

### CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

The evidence developed during the Department's investigation revealed that customers decreased their purchases of carbon composition resistors from TRW's Philadelphia Division from 1974 to 1975 and in the first 10 months of 1976 compared to the same period of 1975, and increased their purchases of imported resistors. These customers cited the lower price of imported resistors as the reason for the shift in purchasing patterns.

### CONCLUSION

While employment at the Philadelphia Division of TRW, Inc. increased in the second and third quarters of 1976 compared to the same quarters in 1975, employment declines are anticipated as evidenced by the decrease in numbers of production workers in the second and third quarters of 1976 from the previous quarters. Further evidence that TRW has not recovered from the impact of imports is also seen by the decline in employment of production workers in the first, second and third quarters of 1976, 46 percent, 55 percent, and 55 percent, respectively, when compared to the like periods of 1974.

While production at the Philadelphia Division of TRW increased in the first, second, and third quarters of 1976 compared to the same quarters in 1975, production declines are expected as evidenced by the decrease in production in the first, second, and third quarters of 1976 from the previous quarters. Additionally, production of carbon composition resistors declined in the first, second, and third quarters of 1976, 40 percent, 65 percent, and 61 percent, respectively, when compared to the same quarters of 1974.

Sales decreased in the second and third quarters of 1976 compared to the same quarters of the previous year and decreased in quantity in the first, second, and third quarters of 1976, 54 percent, 58 percent, and 62 percent, respectively, compared to the same quarters of 1974.

U.S. imports of fixed resistors increased absolutely and relatively in the first six months of 1976 compared to the like period of 1975. Customers surveyed continued to decrease their purchases of carbon composition resistors from TRW's Philadelphia Division and increase their purchases of imported resistors in the first ten months of 1976 compared to the same period in 1975.

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that total or partial separations of workers producing carbon composition resistors at the Philadelphia Division of TRW, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio and related workers at the Downington, Pennsylvania facility continue to be attributable to the conditions specified in section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Therefore, the certification issued on June 19, 1975 for TA-W-11, the Philadelphia Division of TRW, Incorporated, Cleveland, Ohio and related workers at the Downington, Pennsylvania facility is not revised to include a termination date of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-1005 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-1171]

## WASHINGTON STOVE WORKS

### Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 the Department of Labor herein presents the results of TA-W-1171: investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance as prescribed in section 222 of the Act.

The investigation was initiated on October 14, 1976 in response to a worker petition received on October 14, 1976 which was filed by the International Molders and Allied Workers Union on behalf of workers and former workers producing cast iron stoves at the Everett, Washington plant of Washington Stove Works.

The Notice of Investigation was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 5, 1976 (41 FR 48819). No public hearing was requested and none was held.

The information upon which the determination was made was obtained principally from officials of Washington Stove Works, its customers, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. Inter-

national Trade Commission, industry analysts and Department files.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision of the firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely;

(3) That articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the firm or subdecision are being imported in increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production; and

(4) That such increased imports have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the decrease in sales or production. The term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

The investigation has revealed that all of the above criteria have been met.

SIGNIFICANT TOTAL OR PARTIAL SEPARATIONS

Employment of production workers declined 36.3 percent in the first three quarters of 1976 compared to the first three quarters of 1975. Separations first occurred at the plant on March 15, 1976.

SALES, PRODUCTION, OR BOTH, HAVE DECREASED ABSOLUTELY

Company sales of cast iron stoves, in value, increased 125.6 percent in 1975 compared to 1974. Company sales of cast iron stoves, in value, declined 27.6 percent in the first three quarters of 1976 compared to the first three quarters of 1975.

Plant production, in quantity, of cast iron stoves increased 68.5 percent in 1975 compared to 1974. Plant production of cast iron stoves declined 67.1 percent in the first three quarters of 1976 compared to the first three quarters of 1975. Plant production, in quantity, declined 27.1 percent in the first quarter of 1976 compared to the first quarter of 1975.

INCREASED IMPORTS

U.S. imports of cast iron stoves were negligible from 1972 through 1973. U.S. imports increased to 75 thousand units in 1974. U.S. imports were 233 thousand units in 1975, an increase of 210.7 percent compared to 1974.

The ratio of imports of cast iron stoves to domestic production was 46.3 percent in 1974 and increased to 95.9 percent in 1975. The radio of imports to domestic production was 86.8 percent in the first three quarters of 1975 and increased to 117.8 percent in the first three quarters of 1976.

The ratio of imports to domestic consumption was 31.6 percent in 1974 and increased to 48.8 percent in 1975. The ratio of imports to domestic consumption was 46.5 percent in the first three quarters of 1975 and increased to 54.1 percent in the first three quarters of 1976.

CONTRIBUTED IMPORTANTLY

Major customers of Washington Stove Works indicated that they have increased their purchases of imported cast iron stoves while decreasing their purchases from Washington Stove Works. Customers have increased purchases of imported cast iron stoves because of lower prices.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increased imports of cast iron stoves have contributed importantly to the total or partial separation of the workers at the Everett, Washington plant of Washington Stove Works. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All employees at the Everett, Washington plant of Washington Stove Works who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after March 15, 1976 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 30th day of December 1976.

JAMES F. TAYLOR,
*Director, Office of Management, Administration and Planning.*

[FR Doc.77-997 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[TA-W-1464]

## YOUNGSTOWN SHEET AND TUBE CO

### Investigation Regarding Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

On December 20, 1976 the Department of Labor received a petition dated December 3, 1976 which was filed under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") by the United Steelworkers of America on behalf of the workers and former workers of Campbell, Struthers Works, Youngstown, Ohio of Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio (TA-W-1464). Accordingly, the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, has instituted an investigation as provided in section 221(a) of the Act and 29 CFR 90.12.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether absolute or relative increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with basic steel produced by Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company or an appropriate subdivision thereof have contributed importantly to an absolute decline in sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision and to the actual or threatened total or partial separation of a significant number or proportion of the workers of such firm or subdivision. The investigation will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved. A group meeting the eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Act will be certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act in accordance with the provisions of Subpart B of 29 CFR Part 90.

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.13, the petitioner or any other person showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigation may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of this investigation to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 21, 1977.

The petition filed in this case is available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 20th day of December 1976.

MARVIN M. FOOKS,
*Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc.77-987 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

## NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

### FUTURE COUNCIL MEETINGS

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to Pub. L. 92-463, that future dates of meetings of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children will be held as follows:

January 28-29, 1977, February 25-26, March 11 (Editing Committee only), April 1-2, May 20-21, June 10-11, July 15-16, August 19-20, September 9-10, October 14-15, November 18-19, December 9-10.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children is established under section 148 of the Elementary and Secondary Act (20 U.S.C. 2411) to advise the President and Congress on the effectiveness of compensatory education to improve the educational attainment of disadvantaged children.

Because of limited space, all persons wishing to attend should call for reservations in advance area code 202/382-6945.

Records shall be kept of all Committee proceedings and shall be available for public inspection at the Office of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, located at 425 13th St., NW, Suite 1012, Washington, D.C. 20004.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on January 4, 1977.

PAUL F. KELLER,
*Acting Executive Director.*

[FR Doc.77-897 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## COUNCIL MEETING

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, that the next meeting of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children will be held at 425 13th St., NW, Suite 1012, Washington, D.C. on January 28, 1977 from 9:00 am–5:00 pm and on January 29, 1977 from 9:00 am–12 noon. The Committees on Legislation, Mandated Studies and Adolescence will meet to go over individual drafts of legislation and the full Council will meet to review Committee reports and further develop sections of the 1977 Annual Report.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children is established under section 148 of the Elementary and Secondary Act (20 U.S.C. 2411) to advise the President and Congress on the effectiveness of compensatory education to improve the educational attainment of disadvantaged children.

Because of limited space, all persons wishing to attend should call for reservations by January 24, 1977 area code 202/382–6945.

Records shall be kept of all Committee proceedings and shall be available for public inspection at the Office of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, located at 425 13th St., NW, Suite 1012, Washington, D.C. 20004.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on January 4, 1977.

PAUL F. KELLER,
*Acting Executive Director.*

[FR Doc.77–898 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

# NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (77–2)]

## NASA RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COUNCIL

### Meeting

The NASA Research and Technology Advisory Council will meet on February 2–4, 1977, in Room 625 of Federal Office Building 10B at NASA Headquarters, 600 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20546. The meeting will be open to the public on a first-come, first-served basis up to the seating capacity of the room, which is about 40 persons.

The NASA Research and Technology Advisory Council was established to advise NASA's senior management in the area of aeronautics and space research and technology. The Council studies issues, pinpoints critical problems, determines gaps in needed technology, points out desirable goals and objectives, summarizes the state of the art, assesses ongoing work, and makes recommendations to help NASA plan and carry out a program of greatest benefit to the nation. The Chairman is Dr. Ronald Smelt. There are 17 members on the Council itself and additional members on five committees and four panels which report to the Council.

The following list sets forth the approved agenda and schedule for the meeting. For further information, please contact the Executive Secretary, Mr. C. Robert Nysmith (Code R–3), NASA Headquarters, Washington, DC 20546, Area Code 202 755–8550.

FEBRUARY 2, 1977

| *Time* | *Topic* |
|---|---|
| 8:30 a.m. | Opening remarks. (Purpose: To summarize the topics to be discussed at the meeting and note any changes in the NASA organization and personnel.) |
| 9 a.m. | NASA 5-year plan—1978–82. (Purpose: To present the NASA 5-year plan for the council's review and comment.) |
| 1:15 p.m. | OAST fiscal year 1978 budget. (Purpose: To inform the council of the proposed fiscal year 1978 aeronautics and space technology program and budget.) |
| 2:15 p.m. | Fiscal year 1979 planning. (Purpose: To discuss and plan future RTAC activities to insure that the advice provided by RTAC is timely and of maximum usefulness to NASA during formulation of the potential fiscal year 1979 technology programs and budget.) |
| 3 p.m. | Future planning. (Purpose: To solicit RTAC recommendations on future areas which should be emphasized.) |
| 3:45 p.m. | NASA aeronautics facility energy requirements and utilization. (Purpose: To present and discuss the requirements and utilization of energy by the research centers' aeronautical facilities and solicit the council's advice and recommendations regarding proposed NASA activities to reduce facility energy consumption.) |
| 4:45 p.m. | Status of issues and recommendations. (Purpose: To discuss NASA's actions in response to RTAC issues and recommendations.) |
| 5:45 p.m. | Adjournment. |

FEBRUARY 3, 1977

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:30 a.m. | Center of Excellence Discussion (Purpose: To discuss the RTAC recommendations and suggestions concerning NASA technology "centers of excellence.") |
| | Committee and panel reports. (Purpose: To permit the chairman of each committee and panel to identify issues and recommendations from the last meeting of his committee/panel, for council discussion.) |
| 10 a.m. | Committee on aerodynamics and configurations. |
| 11 a.m. | Panel on space vehicles. |
| 1 p.m. | Panel on aeronautical safety and operating systems. |
| 2 p.m. | Committee on guidance, control, and information systems. |
| 3:15 p.m. | Committee on aeronautical propulsion. |
| 4:15 p.m. | Panel on research. |
| 5:15 p.m. | Adjournment. |

FEBRUARY 4, 1977

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:30 a.m. | Panel on general aviation technology. |
| 9:30 a.m. | Committee on materials and structures. |
| 10:45 a.m. | Committee on space propulsion and power. |
| 12:45 p.m. | Council deliberations. (Purpose: To allow time for the council to categorize and document recommendations and observations to be reported to NASA.) |
| 2:30 p.m. | Informal council report to NASA. (Purpose: The council will report recommendations to senior NASA officials, and other highlights of the meeting will be discussed.) |
| 3:30 p.m. | Adjournment. |

JOHN M. COULTER,
*Acting Assistant Administrator for DOD and Interagency Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.*

JANUARY 4, 1977.

[FR Doc. 77–889 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

[Notice 77–3]

## SPACE PROGRAM ADVISORY COUNCIL

### Meeting

The NASA Space Program Advisory Council will meet on February 1 and 2, 1977, in Room 7002, Federal Office Building 6, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20546. The meeting, to be held from 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on both days, is open to the public. The seating capacity of the room is about 40 persons, including Council members and other participants. Visitors will be requested to sign a visitor's register.

The NASA Space Program Advisory Council was established as an interdisciplinary group to advise NASA senior management with respect to the plans for, the work in progress on, and the accomplishments of NASA's space programs. The Council is concerned with the disciplines appropriate to Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, Space Applications, and Space Systems, as they bear on space programs. The Chairman of the Council is Dr. Frederick Seitz. There are currently seventeen members on the Council and additional members on four standing committees which report to the Council. The following list sets forth the approved agenda and schedule for the meeting. For further information contact the Executive Secretary, Mr. Nathaniel B. Cohen, Area Code 202 755–8433, NASA Headquarters, Washington, DC 20546.

FEBRUARY 1, 1977

| | |
|---|---|
| 9 a.m. | Opening remarks. This time is provided for the chairman's introductory remarks and for executive secretary to cover administrative matters. |

| Time | Topic |
|---|---|
| | Fiscal year 1978 President's budget. NASA will review the fiscal year 1978 budget submitted for Congressional approval and will discuss its implications. |
| 10 a.m. | Fiscal year 1978 5-year planning. NASA will review the approach to developing, and review the contents of, a 5-year planning report developed in conjunction with the fiscal year 1978 budget submission. The views of the council regarding the upcoming preparation of a fiscal year 1979 5-year planning report will be sought. |
| 2:30 p.m. | SPAC committee reports. This time is provided for reports of the 4 standing committees on matters they have considered since the last SPAC meeting. |
| 4:30 p.m. | Adjourn. |

FEBRUARY 2, 1977

| | |
|---|---|
| 9 a.m. | STS reimbursement policy. A reimbursement policy governing the establishment of fees to be charged to users of the Space Transportation System has been proposed for formal issuance. This policy will be reviewed for the council. |
| 10 a.m. | Viking results. The most recent scientific results of the Viking missions and considerations of possible options for post-Viking exploration of Mars will be presented to the council. |
| 11 a.m. | Program update. Highlights of space program events and activities since the last meeting of the council will be summarized. |
| 1:30 p.m. | Working session. This period is set aside for general discussion by SPAC of matters brought before the council by NASA. |
| 4:30 p.m. | Adjourn. |

JOHN M. COULTER,
*Acting Assistant Administrator, DOD and Interagency Affairs.*

JANUARY 5, 1977.

[FR Doc.77-890 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### HANDICAPPED IN SCIENCE PROGRAM

#### Invitation to Submit Preliminary Proposals

The National Science Foundation (NSF) invites *preliminary proposals* from colleges, universities, schools for the handicapped, and non-profit organizations, for projects to develop and test mechanisms to attract physically handicapped individuals to scientific careers. Through experimentation with promising solutions, the Foundation seeks to identify and demonstrate effective models for the physically handicapped.

Preliminary proposals outlining the proposed project should be submitted to the Handicapped in Science Program by February 25, 1977. The Foundation staff will in two stages review the preliminary proposals and will either discourage submission of a formal proposal or encourage submission and provide information for the submission of a formal proposal by April 15, 1977.

The preliminary proposal should not exceed five pages, sketching in broad strokes the essential features of the experiment. It is important, however, that the design, procedures and the evaluation plan be identified, and the costs be estimated.

Proposers should note that funds will not be provided for student participant support; special services cost will be considered where clearly justified.

Five copies of the completed proposal are requested. They should be sent to:

Handicapped in Science Program, Division of Science Manpower Improvement, Directorate for Science Education, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550.

Dated: January 5, 1977.

M. REBECCA WINKLER,
*Acting Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc.77-887 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-206]

### SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO. AND SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.

#### Consideration of Variance Involving Provisional Operating License No. DPR-13

The Southern California Edison Company of Rosemead, California and San Diego Gas and Electric Company of San Diego, California (licensees) are authorized by Provisional Operating License No. DPR-13 to operate a nuclear power reactor identified as San Onofre Unit No. 1 (the facility), located in San Diego County, California, at steady state power levels up to 1347 MWt.

By letter dated November 3, 1976, Southern California Edison Company (SCEC) indicated that based on its efforts to date and the remaining work to be done to achieve compliance with the Commission's Interim Acceptance Criteria (IAC; 36 FR 12247, June 29, 1971), operation of San Onofre, Unit No. 1 was scheduled to be resumed on February 11, 1977. The work which involves the installation of the on-site emergency power system, has continued during the present facility outage with the reactor shut down since September 30, 1976, prior to the expiration of the October 1, 1976 IAC conformance date granted in the Commission's August 5, 1974 variance.

In its letter dated December 16, 1976 (which updates its previous letter dated November 19, 1976) SCEC proposed to have the new on-site emergency power system available for operation upon startup of the facility as scheduled for February 11, 1977, with transfer pumps for supplying diesel oil to the two new diesel generators that do not meet the required ASME Section III pump qualifications. The facility would be operated in this manner until replacement of the transfer pumps with physically and functionally similar pumps that will be certified to meet the ASME, Section III requirements. SCEC's request for approval of this proposed course of action may involve a request for variance from the IAC for the purpose of obtaining an extension of time for replacement of the fuel oil transfer pumps with pumps certified to meet Section III requirements.

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation is considering a variance which would extend the October 1, 1976, deadline for achieving compliance for the facility until April 30, 1977. The variance may be granted upon a finding that there is good cause and that there is reasonable assurance that the granting of the extension will not adversely affect the health and safety of the public. The Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation will consider and issue a determination, together with supporting reasons, with respect to the variance. In that connection, the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation invites the submission of views and comments by any interested persons. Such views and comments should be submitted in writing, address to the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, not later than January 25, 1977.

A copy of SCEC's letters of November 3, 19, December 16, 1976, and related correspondence and documents including the Commission's Order of August 5, 1974, have been placed in the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C., and the Mission Viejo Branch Library, 24851 Chrisanta Drive, Mission Viejo, California.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 7th day of January, 1977.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

A. SCHWENCER,
*Chief, Operating Reactors Branch No. 1, Division of Operating Reactors.*

[FR Doc.77-1107 Filed 1-10-77;10:20 am]

## OHIO RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

### GREEN RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE COORDINATED JOINT PLAN

#### Availability of Report for Review

Pursuant to section 204(3) of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 (Pub. L. 89-90), the Ohio River Basin Commission has completed a report summarizing the current Comprehensive Coordinated Joint Plan (CCJP) for the Green River Basin portion of the Ohio River Basin. The Report currently is being reviewed by the Governors, the head of each Federal agency, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the Commission has been appointed.

Views, comments and recommendations on the CCJP are requested by

April 4, 1977. Copies are available on request to the Ohio River Basin Commission, 36 E. Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

FRED E. MORR,
*Chairman.*

[FR Doc.77-923 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 511]

### APPLICATIONS FOR BRIDGE PERMITS

#### Brownsville, Texas

Notice is hereby given that the Department of State has received three separate applications for permits authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of international bridges in the Brownsville, Texas area. Applications have been filed by the City of Brownsville and by Cameron County, Texas, for permits authorizing a highway bridge connecting Brownsville with the City of Matamoros. Both the City and County seek authority to build similar bridges in substantially the same location. A third application has been filed by the Brownsville Navigation District for a permit authorizing a rail-highway bridge in the area of the Port of Brownsville.

The Department's jurisdiction with respect to these applications is based upon Executive Order 11423, dated August 16, 1968, and the International Bridge Act of 1972 (Pub. L. 92-343, 86 Stat. 731, approved September 26, 1972).

As required by E.O. 11423, the Department of State is circulating these applications to concerned agencies for comment. In addition, the Office of Environmental Affairs of the Department of State is initiating an assessment of the environmental effects of the three proposals to determine if environmental impact statements will be required.

Interested persons may submit their views regarding these applications in writing to Mr. Phillip R. Trimble, Assistant Legal Adviser for Economic and Business Affairs, Room 6420, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

The applications and related documents made part of the record to be considered by the Department of State in connection with these applications are available for inspection and copying in the Office of the Assistant Legal Adviser for Economic and Business Affairs during normal business hours.

Any questions relating to this notice may be addressed to Mr. Trimble at the above address, telephone 202-632-0242; or to Mr. John Crook, of his office, telephone 202-632-1571.

For the Secretary of State,

Dated: December 30, 1976.

PHILLIP R. TRIMBLE,
*Assistant Legal Adviser for Economic and Business Affairs.*

[FR Doc.77-924 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

### Agency for International Development

### HOUSING GUARANTY PROGRAM FOR REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

#### Information for Investors

The Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) has advised the Banco Hipotecario Nacional (the Borrower) an instrumentality of the Government of Panama that upon execution by an eligible U.S. investor acceptable to A.I.D. of an agreement to loan the Borrower an amount not to exceed $3,400,000 and subject to the satisfaction of certain further terms and conditions by the Borrower, A.I.D. will guaranty repayment to the investor of the principal and interest on such loan. The guaranty will be backed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America and will be issued pursuant to authority contained in section 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (the Act). Proceeds of the loan will be used to finance housing for lower income families.

Eligible investors interested in extending a guaranteed loan to the Borrowers should communicate promptly with:

Franklin Almillategui, General Manager, Banco Hipotecario Nacional, Apartado 222, Panama 1, Republic of Panama.

Investors eligible to receive a guaranty are those specified in section 238(c) of the Act. They are: (1) U.S. citizens; (2) domestic corporations, partnerships or associations substantially beneficially owned by U.C. citizens; (3) foreign corporations whose share capital is at least 95 percent owned by U.S. citizens; and (4) foreign partnerships or associations wholly owned by U.S. citizens.

To be eligible for a guaranty, the loan must be repayable in full no later than the thirtieth anniversary of the first disbursement of the principal amount thereof and the interest rate may be no higher than the maximum rate to be established by A.I.D.

The Borrower projects a schedule of disbursements covering approximately a two year period from the date of the loan agreement and prospective Investors should consider this in proposing a guaranteed loan to the Borrower. In addition, the Investor must provide for the servicing of his loan, i.e., recordation and disposition of loan payments received from the Borrower.

Information as to eligibility of investors and other aspects of the A.I.D. housing guaranty program can be obtained from:

Director, Office of Housing, Agency for International Development, Room 300 E, SA-2, Washington, D.C. 20523.

This notice is not an offer by A.I.D. or by the Borrower. The Borrower and not A.I.D. will select a lender and negotiate the terms of the proposed loan.

Dated: December 13, 1976.

DONALD A. GARDNER,
*Deputy Director, Office of Housing Agency for International Development.*

[FR Doc.77-837 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Internal Revenue Service

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Pension and Welfare Benefit Programs

### EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLANS

#### Pendency of Exemption Relating to Transactions Involving the Ragnar Benson Profit Sharing Plan and Trust (Application No. D-I75)

*Correction*

In FR Doc. 77-99 appearing in the issue of Tuesday, January 4, 1977 on page 956, in the 3rd column, the 2nd full paragraph numbered "11.", the last sentence should read, "With this capital contribution, which will total approximately $140,000 over the seven year period, all of the new loans will be repaid on a straight-line principal plus interest basis."

### Office of the Secretary

### SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

#### Memorandum of Agreement and Delegation of Authority

CROSS REFERENCE: For a document issued jointly by the Department of the Treasury, Office of the Secretary, and the Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, on the subject of a delegation of authority to the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with establishment of a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States, see FR Doc. 77-921 appearing in the Notices section of this issue under the Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary.

## INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Notice No. 301]

### ASSIGNMENT OF HEARINGS

JANUARY 6, 1977.

Cases assigned for hearing, postponement, cancellation or oral argument appear below and will be published only once. This list contains prospective assignments only and does not include cases previously assigned hearing dates. The hearings will be on the issues as presently reflected in the Official Docket of the Commission. An attempt will be made to publish notices of cancellation of hearings as promptly as possible, but interested parties should take appropri-

ate steps to insure that they are notified of cancellation or postponements of hearings in which they are interested.

MC 61502 Sub 9, Wm. McCullough Transportation Co., Inc., now being assigned March 9, 1977 (3 days), at New York, N.Y. in a hearing room to be later designated.

MC 59457 Sub 31, Sorensen Transportation Company, Inc., now being assigned March 7, 1977 (2 days), at New York, N.Y. in a hearing room to be later designated.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77—1019 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

## FOURTH SECTION APPLICATIONS FOR RELIEF

JANUARY 6, 1977.

An application, as summarized below, has been filed requesting relief from the requirements of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit common carriers named or described in the application to maintain higher rates and charges at intermediate points than those sought to be established at more distant points.

Protests to the granting of an application must be prepared in accordance with Rule 40 of the General Rules of Practice (49 CFR 1100.40) and filed on or before January 26, 1977.

FSA No. 43296—*Joint Rail-Water Container Rates—Baltic Shipping Company.* Filed by Baltic Shipping Company, (No. 104), for itself and interested rail carriers. Rates on general commodities, between ports in Europe, and rail stations on the U.S. Atlantic Coast Seaboard.

Grounds for relief—Water competition.

Tariffs—Baltic Shipping Company tariffs Eastbound No. 1, I.C.C. No. 1, F.M.C. No. 18, and Westbound No. 2, I.C.C. No. 2, F.M.C. No. 19. Rates are published to become effective on February 6, 1977.

FSA No. 43297—*Iron or Steel Articles to Beaumont, Texas.* Filed by Southwestern Freight Bureau, Agent, (No. B–646), for interested rail carriers. Rates on iron or steel articles, in carloads, as described in the application, from Alton and Federal, Illinois, to Beaumont, Texas.

Grounds for relief—Rate relationship and market competition.

Tariff—Supplement 245 to Southwestern Freight Bureau, Agent, tariff 301–F, I.C.C. No. 5098. Rates are published to become effective on February 8, 1977.

By the Commission.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77–1008 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

[Notice No. 101]

## MOTOR CARRIER TRANSFER PROCEEDINGS

JANUARY 11, 1977.

Application filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b) in connection with transfer application under section 212a(b) in connection with transfer application under section 212a(b) and Transfer Rules, 49 CFR Part 1132:

No. MC–FC–76904. By application filed December 28, 1976, WALLACE TRANSPORT, INC., P.O. Box 214, Somers Point, N.J., 08244, seeks temporary authority to lease a portion of the operating rights of JOHNSRUD TRANSPORT, INC., Highway 9 West, P.O. Box 447, Cresco, IA, 52136, under section 210a(b). The transfer to WALLACE TRANSPORT, INC., of a portion of the operating rights of JOHNSRUD TRANSPORT, INC., is presently pending.

By the Commission.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77–1020 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

[Notice No. 2]

## MOTOR CARRIER TEMPORARY AUTHORITY APPLICATIONS

JANUARY 5, 1977.

The following are notices of filing of applications for temporary authority under section 210a(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act provided for under the provisions of 49 CFR 1131.3. These rules provide that an original and six (6) copies of protests to an application may be filed with the field official named in the FEDERAL REGISTER publication no later than the 15th calendar day after the date the notice of the filing of the application is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. One copy of the protest must be served on the applicant, or its authorized representative, if any, and the protestant must certify that such service has been made. The protest must identify the operating authority upon which it is predicated, specifying the "MC" docket and "Sub" number and quoting the particular portion of authority upon which it relies. Also, the protestant shall specify the service it can and will provide and the amount and type of equipment it will make available for use in connection with the service contemplated by the TA application. The weight accorded a protest shall be governed by the completeness and pertinence of the protestant's information.

Except as otherwise specifically noted, each applicant states that there will be no significant effect on the quality of the human environment resulting from approval of its application.

A copy of the application is on file, and can be examined at the Office of the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., and also in the ICC Field Office to which protests are to be transmitted.

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC 57697 (Sub-No. 5TA), filed December 20, 1976. Applicant: LESTER SMITH TRUCKING, INC., P.O. Box 16424, 2645 E. 51st Ave., Denver, Colo. 80216. Applicant's representative: Michael J. Norton, P.O. Box 2135, 404 Boston Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah 84110. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (a) *Gypsum and gypsum products*, from points in Albuquerque, N. Mex., and its commercial zone, to points in Colorado and Arizona; (b) *Paper products and gypsum paper*, from points in Colorado, to Albuquerque, N. Mex., and its commercial zone; and (c) *Lumber, lumber products, and wood products*, from points in Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana, to points in New Mexico, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shippers: There are approximately 5 statements of support attached to the application, which may be examined at the Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington, D.C., or copies thereof which may be examined at the field office named below. Send protests to: Roger L. Buchanan, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 721 19th St., 492 U.S. Customs House, Denver, Colo. 80202.

No. MC 107818 (Sub-No. 84TA), filed December 21, 1976. Applicant: GREENSTEIN TRUCKING COMPANY, 280 N.W. 12th Ave., P.O. Box 608, Pompano Beach, Fla. 33061. Applicant's representative: Martin Sack, Jr., 1754 Gulf Life Tower, Jacksonville, Fla. 32207. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Prepared dough*, in vehicles equipped with mechanical refrigeration, from New Albany, Ind., to points in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Refrigerated Foods Co., Division of the Pillsbury Co., 602 2nd Ave., South, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402. Send protests to: Joseph B. Teichert, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, Monterey Bldg., Suite 101, 8410 N.W. 53rd Terrace, Miami, Fla. 33166.

No. MC 112288 (Sub-No. 13TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: YARBROUGH TRANSFER COMPANY, 1500 Doune St., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27107. Applicant's representative: John L. Brown, 2236 Brookfield Dr., S.W., Roanoke, Va. 24018. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Air conditioning, air filtration, refrigeration and humidifying equipment*, the transportation of which because of size or weight requires the use of special equipment, from Salisbury, N.C., to points in Georgia, Iowa, Michigan, South Carolina and Wisconsin, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Gamewell Mechanical, Inc., P.O. Box 1949, Salisbury, N.C. 28144. Send protests to: Terrell Price, District Supervisor, 800 Briar Creek Road, Room CC516, Mart Office Bldg., Charlotte, N.C. 28205.

No. MC 112539 (Sub-No. 17TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: PERCHAK TRUCKING, INC., P.O. Box 811, Route 309, Hazle Village, Hazleton, Pa.

18201. Applicant's representative: Joseph F. Hoary, 121 S. Main St., Taylor, Pa. 18517. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Malt beverages*, in containers, from South Volney Township, N.Y., to Hazleton, Pa., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Quality Beverage Dist., 695 Poplar St., Hazleton, Pa. 18201. Send protests to: Paul J. Kenworthy, District Supervisor, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, 314 U.S. Post Office Bldg., Scranton, Pa. 18503.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. 236TA), filed December 21, 1976. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer St., Boston, Mass. 02210. Applicant's representative: Lawrence T. Sheils (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Food and food products*, in vehicles equipped with mechanical refrigeration (except commodities in bulk, in tank vehicles), from the plantsite and storage facilities of Granite State Packing Co., at or near Manchester, N.J., to points in Colorado, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin, restricted to traffic originating at the above-named origin and destined to the above-named destinations, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Granite State Packing Co., 163 Hancock St., Manchester, N.H. 03105. Send protests to: Max Gorenstein, District Supervisor, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, 150 Causeway St., Boston, Mass. 02114.

No. MC 113908 (Sub-No. 392TA), filed December 21, 1976. Applicant: ERICKSON TRANSPORT CORP., 2105 East Dale St., P.O. Box 3180 G.S.S. Springfield Mo. 65804. Applicant's representative: B. B. Whitehead (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Liquid concrete admixtures*, in bulk, from points in Tarrant County, Tex., to points in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin and Wyoming, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Master Builders, Lee at Mayfield, Cleveland, Ohio 44118. Send protests to: John V. Barry, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 600 Federal Bldg., 911 Walnut St., Kansas City, Mo. 64106.

No. MC 114457 (Sub-No. 279TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: DART TRANSIT COMPANY, 2102 University Ave., St. Paul, Minn. 55114. Applicant's representative: James H. Wills (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Foodstuffs* (except commodities in bulk), from the plantsite and warehouse facilities of Jeno's, Inc., Duluth, Minn., to points in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska and South Dakota, restricted to the transportation of traffic originating at and destined to the above named points, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Jeno's, Inc., 525 Lake Ave., South, Duluth, Minn. 55802. Send protests to: Marion L. Cheney, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 414 Federal Bldg., & U.S. Courthouse, 110 S. 4th St., Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.

No. MC 114533 (Sub-No. 353TA), filed December 17, 1976. Applicant: BANKERS DISPATCH CORPORATION, 1106 W. 35th St., Chicago, Ill. 60609. Applicant's representative: Paul R. Bergant (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Exposed and processed film and prints, complimentary replacement film*, and incidental dealer handling supplies (except motion picture films and materials and supplies used in connection with commercial and television motion pictures), between Salt Lake, Davis and Weber Counties, Utah, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Idaho, Colorado, Oregon and Wyoming, for 180 days. Supporting shippers: Filmcraft, Inc., Steve Brooks, Manager, 1475 S. Main St., Transamerica Film Service, 1430 S. Main St., Vern Hilman, Plant Manager, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115. Sun Photo Service, D. Thomas Silvers, Exec. V.P., 1146 S. State St., Salt Lake City, Utah 84110. Send protests to: Patricia A. Roscoe, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Everett McKinley Dirksen Bldg., 219 S. Dearborn St., Room 1386, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

No. MC 117765 (Sub-No. 219TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: HAHN TRUCK LINE, INC., 5315 N.W. 5th St., P.O. Box 75218, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73107. Applicant's representative: R. E. Hagan (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Malt beverages*, in containers; (1) from Laredo, Tex., to points in Oklahoma; and (2) from Wichita, Kans., to points in Oklahoma, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Hirst Imports, Inc., 1140 N.W. 4th St., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73106. Send protests to: Joe Green, District Supervisor, Room 240 Old Post Office Bldg., 215 N.W. Third St., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.

No. MC 117940 (Sub-No. 203TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: NATIONWIDE CARRIERS, INC., P.O. Box 104, Maple Plain, Minn. 55359. Applicant's representative: Bruce A. Bullock, 530 Univac Bldg., 7100 W. Center Road, Omaha, Nebr. 68106. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Such merchandise* as is dealt in by discount and variety stores (except foodstuffs and commodities in bulk), from points in Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont and West Virginia, to the facilities of S. S. Kresge Company, in Illinois, Indiana and Ohio, restricted to traffic originating at the named origin states and destined to the named facilities, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: S. S. Kresge Company, 3100 W. Big Veaver, Troy, Mich. 48084. Send protests to: Marion L. Cheney, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 414 Federal Bldg., & U.S. Courthouse, 110 S. 4th St., Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.

No. MC 117940 (Sub-No. 204TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: NATIONWIDE CARRIERS, INC., P.O. Box 104, Maple Plain, Minn. 55359. Applicant's representative: Bruce A. Bullock, 530 Univac Bldg., 7100 W. Center Road, Omaha, Nebr. 68106. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Such merchandise* as is dealt in by discount and variety stores (except foodstuffs and commodities in bulk), from points in Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont and West Virginia, to the facilities of S. S. Kresge Company, in the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, restricted to traffic originating in the named origin states and destined to the named facilities, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: S. S. Kresge Company, 3100 W. Big Veaver, Troy, Mich. 48084. Send protests to: Marion L. Cheney, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 414 Federal Bldg., & U.S. Courthouse, 110 S. 4th St., Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.

No. MC 118806 (Sub-No. 51TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: ARNOLD BROS. TRANSPORT, LTED., 851 Lagimodiere Blvd., Suite 200, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R2J 3K4. Applicant's representative: Daniel C. Sullivan, 327 S. LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill. 60604. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Egg flats, egg cartons and peat moss pots*, from the ports of entry on the International Boundary Line between the United States and Canada located at or near Pembina, N. Dak., and Noyes, Minn., to points in California, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wisconsin, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Fibre Form Industries, Inc., Box 1958, Tisdale, Saskatchewan, Canada. Send protests to: Ronald R. Mau, District Supervisor, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Com-

mission, P.O. Box 2340, Fargo, N. Dak. 58102.

No. MC 119934 (Sub–No. 210TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: ECOFF TRUCKING, INC., 625 E. Broadway, Fortville, Ind. 46040. Applicant's representative: Robert W. Loser, II, 1009 Chamber of Commerce Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind. 46204. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Liquid sugar*, in bulk, from Reserve, La., to Atlanta and Forest Park, Ga.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Louisville, Ky.; and Malden, Mo.; and (2) *Dry sugar*, in bulk, from Reserve, La., to Atlanta and Forest Park, Ga.; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Malden, Mo., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Godchaux Henderson Sugar, Inc., P.O. Drawer AM, Reserve, La. 70084. Send protests to: Fran Sterling, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Bldg., & U.S. Courthouse, 46 E. Ohio St., Room 429, Indianapolis, Ind. 46204.

No. MC 129301 (Sub-No. 5TA), filed December 21, 1976. Applicant: ENGLISH AND SONS CORPORATION, 412 Kings Highway, Thorofare, N.J. 08086. Applicant's representative: James H. Sweeney, P.O. Box 684, Woodbury, N.J. 08096. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Foodstuffs, cold pack or frozen, canned, preserved or prepared and pet food*, between Camden, N.J., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Delaware, Maryland and New York within 125 miles of Camden, N.J., restricted to a transportation service to be performed under a continuing contract with Campbell Soup Company, Camden, N.J.; (2) *Foodstuffs*, from Vincetown, N.J., to points in Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia and West Virginia, restricted to a transportation service to be performed under a continuing contract with Francis C. Stokes Company, Vincetown, N.J.; and (3) *General commodities* (except commodities in bulk, dangerous explosives and household goods as defined by the Commission), between Cinnaminson, N.J., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia and the District of Columbia, restricted to a transportation service to be performed under a continuing contract with Anthony Sales, Cinnaminson, N.J., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shippers: (1) Campbell Soup Company, Camden, N.J. 08101. (2) Francis C. Stokes Company, P.O. Box 278, Vincentown, N.J. 08088. and (3) Anthony Sales, 1300 Taylors Lane, Cinnaminson, N.J. 08077. Send protests to: Dieter H. Harper, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 428 E. State St., Room 204, Trenton, N.J. 08608.

No. MC 133193 (Sub-No. 2TA), filed December 20, 1976. Applicant: JAMES ANDREWS, doing business as JAMES ANDREWS TRUCKING CO., 69 Catlin Ave., Roosevelt, N.Y. 11575. Applicant's representative: Roy A. Jacobs, 550 Mamaroneck Ave., Harrison, N.Y. 10528. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Wearing apparel*, between Inwood, N.Y., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in the New York, N.Y., Commercial Zone, as defined by the Commission, under a continuing contract with Gay Togs, Inc., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Gay Togs, Inc., 475 Doughty Blvd., Inwood, N.Y. 11696. Send protests to: Maria B. Kejss, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10007.

No. MC 133741 (Sub-No. 19TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: OSBORNE TRUCKING CO., INC., 1008 Sierra Drive, Riverton, Wyo. 82501. Applicant's representative: David R. Parker, 1600 Broadway, 2310 Colorado State Bank Bldg., Denver, Colo. 80202. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Wood chips*, in bulk, from the facilities utilized by Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, in the Dubois, Wyo., commercial zone, to the facilities utilized by Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, in the Riverton, Wyo., commercial zone, restricted to shipments having a subsequent movement by rail, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, 1300 S.W. 5th Ave., Portland, Oreg. 97201. Send protests to: Paul A. Naughton, Transportation Specialist, Interstate Commerce Commission, 1006 Federal Bldg., and Post Office, 100 E. B St., Casper, Wyo. 82601.

No. MC 134467 (Sub-No. 15TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: POLAR EXPRESS, INC., P.O. Box 845, Springdale, Ark. 72764. Applicant's representative: Charles M. Williams, 350 Capitol Life Center, 1600 Sherman St., Denver, Colo. 80203. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Prepared flour mixes and frosting mixes*, from the plantsite and storage facilities of Chelsea Milling Co., at or near Chelsea, Mich., to points in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas and Missouri, restricted to traffic originating at the plantsite or storage facilities of Chelsea Milling Co., at or near Chelsea, Mich., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Chelsea Milling Co., North St., Chelsea, Mich. 48118. Send protests to: William H. Land, Jr., District Supervisor, 3108 Federal Office Bldg., 700 W. Capitol, Little Rock, Ark. 72201.

No. MC 134970 (Sub-No. 10 TA), filed December 21, 1976. Applicant: UNZICKER TRUCKING, INC., P.O. Box 35, Route #24 East, El Paso, Ill. 61738. Applicant's representative: Charles W. Gustafson, (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, meat by-products and articles distributed by meat packinghouses* as described in Sections A and C of Appendix I to the report in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates*, 61 M.C.C. 209 and 766 (except hides and commodities in bulk), from the plantsite and storage facilities utilized by Wilson & Company, Inc., at or near Monmouth, Ill., to Albany, Ga., Atlanta, Ga., and its Commercial Zone, Lovejoy, Ga., Thomasville, Ga., New Orleans, La., and its Commercial Zone, Shreveport, La., and its Commercal Zone, Suffolk, Va., Jacksonville, Fla., and its Commercial Zone, Madison, Fla., and Plant City, Fla., and Tampa, Fla., and its Commercial Zone, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Wilson Foods Corporation, A. N. Brent, Manager, Transportation, P.O. Box 26724, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73126. Send protests to: Patricia A. Roscoe, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Everett McKinley Dirksen Bldg., 219 S. Dearborn St., Room 1386, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

No. MC 135437 (Sub-No. 9TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: TRI-NORTHEASTERN TRANSPORT, INC., South Main St., Lyndonville, N.Y. 14098. Applicant's representative: S. Michael Richards, P.O. Box 225, 44 North Ave., Webster, N.Y. 14580. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen mushrooms*, from Kennett Square, Pa., to Rochester, N.Y., Owensboro, Ky., and Evansville, Ind., for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Ragu Foods, Inc., 1680 Lyell Ave., Rochester, N.Y. 14606. Send protests to: George M. Parker, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 910 Federal Bldg., 111 West Huron St., Buffalo, N.Y. 14202.

No. MC 138231 (Sub-No. 2TA), filed December 17, 1976. Applicant: WILBUR CARTER, 401 St. Augustine Road, Valdosta, Ga. 31601. Applicant's representative: Virgil H. Smith, Suite 12, 1587 Phoenix Blvd., Atlanta, Ga. 30349. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular

routes, transporting (1) *Furniture and components of furniture* (except commodities in bulk); and (2) *raw materials and component parts* used in the manufacture of furniture (except commodities in bulk), from Candler, N.C., to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia; and from points in the destination states named in (1) above, to Candler, N.C., under a continuing contract with Harris Pine Mills, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Harris Pine Mills, Drawer 1168, Pendleton, Oreg. 97801. Send protests to: G. H. Fauss, Jr., District Supervisor, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, Box 35008, 400 W. Bay St., Jacksonville, Fla. 32202.

No. MC 138383 (Sub–No. 2TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: JON C. SAWYER, doing business as, SAWYER TRANSPORT CO., 3535 Wolf Road, Saginaw, Mich. 48601. Applicant's representative: Karl L. Gotting, 1200 Bank of Lansing, Lansing, Mich. 48933. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Industrial sand*, in bulk, from the facilities of Nugent Sand Company, at Muskegon, Mich., and its commercial zone, to Defiance, Ohio, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Central Foundry Division, GMC, 77 W. Center St., P.O. Box 1629, Saginaw, Mich. 48605. Send protests to: C. R. Flemming, District Supervisor, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, 225 Federal Bldg., Lansing, Mich. 48933.

No. MC 138626 (Sub–No. 1TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: LESLIE OAKLEY, JR. AND BARRY D. OAKLEY, doing business as, OAKLEY BROTHERS TRUCKING, Fairfield, Mont. 59436. Applicant's representative: Mr. Dzivi, 529 Northwestern Bank Bldg., Great Falls, Mont. 59401. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Plastic, aluminum and steel pipe and wheel line sprinklers*, from points in Oregon, Washington and Idaho, to points in Montana and to the International Boundary line between the United States and Canada as the same is contiguous with the boundaries of Montana. Applicant intends to tack its existing authority with MC 138626, for 180 days. Supporting shippers: Mike Saranto, Purchasing Manager, Pringle Manufacturing Company, Box 235, Walla Walla, Wash. 99362. William Bixby, Manager, Johns-Mansville, Inc., McNary, Oreg. Send protests to: Paul J. Lebane, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 2602 First Ave., North Billings, Mont. 59101.

No. MC 139663 (Sub-No. 1 TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: HASKINS & SON, INC., 815 Max Ave., Lansing, Mich. 48915. Applicant's representative: Karl L. Gotting, 1200 Bank of Lansing, Lansing, Mich. 48933. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Industrial sand*, in bulk, from the facilities of the Nugent Sand Company, at Muskegon, Mich., and its commercial zone to Defiance, Ohio, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Central Foundry Division, GMC, 77 W. Center St., P.O. Box 1629, Saginaw, Mich. 48605. Send protests to: C. R. Flemming, District Supervisor, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, 225 Federal Bldg., Lansing, Mich. 48933.

No. MC 140665 (Sub-No. 4 TA), filed December 21, 1976. Applicant: PRIME, INC., Route 1, Box 115–B, Urbana, Mo. 65767. Applicant's representative: Clayton Geer, P.O. Box 786, Ravenna, Ohio 44266. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Electric lamps; lighting fixtures, Christmas tree lamp outfits; electric cord sets; dry cell batteries; and portable battery chargers*, from Bellevue, Cleveland, Warren, Youngstown, Ravenna, Circleville and Bucyrus, Ohio, to points in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Wyoming, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: General Electric Company, Nela Park, Cleveland, Ohio 44112. Send protests to: John V. Barry, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 600 Federal Bldg., 911 Walnut St., Kansas City, Mo. 64106.

No. MC 141205 (Sub-No. 5TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: HUSKY OIL TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, 600 S. Cherry St., Denver, Colo. 80222. Applicant's representative: Karl F. Anuta (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Crude oil*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from oil wells located in Nye County, Nev., to refineries located at or near Salt Lake City, North Salt Lake and Woods Cross, Utah, under a continuing contract with Husky Oil Company, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Husky Oil Company, 600 S. Cherry St., Denver, Colo. 80222. Send protests to: Herbert C. Ruoff, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 721 19th St., 492 U.S. Customs House, Denver, Colo. 80202.

No. MC 142290 (Sub-No. 1TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: JERNIGAN TRUCKING COMPANY, INC., Route 1, Box 141, Seffner, Fla. 33584. Applicant's representative: M. Craig Massey, 202 E. Walnut St., P.O. Drawer J, Lakeland, Fla. 33802. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Clinker*, between Tampa, Fla., and Port Manatee, Fla., under a continuing contract with National Portland Cement Company of Florida, Inc., for 180 days. Supporting shipper: National Portland Cement Company of Florida, Inc., Route 1, Port Manatee, Palmetto, Fla. 33561. Send protests to: Joseph B. Teichert, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, Monterey Bldg., 8410 N.W. 53rd Terrace, Miami, Fla. 33166.

No. MC 142722 (Sub-No. 1TA), filed December 20, 1976. Applicant: CRAIG LEE SCHUELLER & MARTIN STEWART PHILLIPS, doing business as SCHIPPS TRANSFER & STORAGE CO., 7815 Slater No. 2, Huntington Beach, Calif. 92647. Applicant's representative: Craig Lee Schueller (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Used household goods, and personal effects*, restricted to the performance of pickup and delivery service in connection with packing, crating and containerization and decontainerization of such traffic between the warehouse facilities of Schipp's Transfer & Storage, in Orange County, Calif., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties, Calif., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Purchasing & Contracting Office, U.S. Marine Corps, P.O. Box 1609, Oceanside, Calif. 92054. Send protests to: Mary A. Francy, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, Room 1321, Federal Bldg., 300 N. Los Angeles St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90012.

No. MC 142610 (Sub-No. 1TA), filed December 20, 1976. Applicant: ACTION MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., P.O. Box 29102, 8303 Old Gentilly Road, New Orleans, La. 70189. Applicant's representative: William P. Jackson, 3426 North Washington Blvd., Arlington, Va. 22210. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Canned goods and preserved foodstuffs*, in glass containers, from the plant facilities of B. F. Trappey, Inc., at Lafayette, La., and New Iberia, La., to points in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, and New York, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: B. F. Trappey, Inc., P.O. Box 400, New Iberia, La. 70560. Send protests to: Ray C. Armstrong, Jr., District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 9038 U.S. Postal Service Bldg., 701 Loyola Ave., New Orleans, La. 70113.

No. MC 142750 TA, filed December 20, 1976. Applicant: ROBERT NEWSOME, JR., Box 34, Naugatuck, W. Va. 25686. Applicant's representative: John M. Friedman, 2930 Putnam Ave., Hurricane, W. Va. 25526. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Heating oil, diesel fuel and gasoline*, in bulk, in tank trailers, from Leach, Ky., to Chattaroy, Matewan, and Williamson, W. Va., and from Ironton, Ohio, to Matewan and Williamson, W. Va., under a continuing contract with B & C Oil Company, Inc., and J. H. Trippett

Distributing, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shippers: Harold B. Davis, Office Manager-Company Representative, B & C Oil Company, Inc., Box 177, Matewan, W. Va 25678. J. H. Trippett, Owner, J. H. Trippett Distributing, 1413 W. 5th Ave., Williamson, W. Va. 25661. Send protests to: H. R. White, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 3108 Federal Office Bldg., 500 Quarrier St., Charleston, W. Va. 25301.

No. MC 142751 TA, filed December 21, 1976. Applicant: TWIN LAKES SERVICE, INC., 651–80th Ave., N.E., Minneapolis, Minn. 55432. Applicant's representative: Robert P. Sack, P.O. Box 6010, West St. Paul, Minn. 55118. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Malt beverages* (except commodities in bulk), from Milwaukee, Wis., to St. Cloud, Minn., under a continuing contract with Shabel Beverage, Inc., for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Schabel Beverage, Inc., St. Cloud, Minn. 56301. Send protests to: Marion L. Cheney, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Comerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 414 Federal Bldg., & U.S. Courthouse, 110 S. 4th St., Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.

PASSENGER APPLICATION

No. MC 142692 (Sub-No. 1TA), filed December 20, 1976. Applicant: OHIO VALLEY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, 2177 National Road, P.O. Box 2086, Wheeling, W. Va. 26003. Applicant's representative: Paul C. Camilletti, Peoples Federal Bldg., Wheeling, W. Va. 26003. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage;* (1) from Rayland, Ohio, through Tiltonsville, Martins Ferry, and Bridgeport, Ohio, to Wheeling, W. Va., and return; (2) from Blaine, Ohio, through Wolfehurst, Brookside, and Bridgeport, Ohio, to Wheeling, W. Va., and return; (3) Shadyside, Ohio, through Bellaire and Bridgeport, Ohio, to Wheeling, W. Va., and return; and (4) Incidental charter service for above area and to West Liberty, W. Va., and West Alexander, Pa., and environs; *Passengers and their baggage;* between Wheeling, W. Va., and Shadyside, Blaine, and Rayland, Ohio, as follows: from Wheeling, W. Va., over U.S. Highway 40 to Bridgeport, Ohio, thence over Ohio Route 7 to Shadyside, Ohio; from Wheeling, W. Va., over U.S. Highway 40 to Bridgeport, Brookside, and Blaine, Ohio; from Wheeling, W. Va., over U.S. Highway 40 to Bridgeport, Ohio, thence over Ohio Route 7 to Martins Ferry, Ohio via Zane Highway Hanover Street, return to Ohio Route 7 to Tiltonsville, Yorkville, and Rayland, Ohio, via Main Street, return over these routes to Wheeling, W. Va., service is authorized to and from all intermediate points on the above specified routes, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shippers: Bel-O-Mar Regional Council and Interstate Planning Commission, P.O. Box 2086, Wheeling, W. Va. 26003. Eastern Ohio Regional Transit Authority, Citizens Savings Bank, Martins Ferry, Ohio 43935. Send protests to: J. A. Niggemyer, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 416 Old Post Office Bldg., Wheeling, W. Va. 26003.

By the Commission.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-1018 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[Notice No. 3]

## MOTOR CARRIER TEMPORARY AUTHORITY APPLICATIONS

JANUARY 6, 1977.

The following are notices of filing of applications for temporary authority under section 210a(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act provided for under the provisions of 49 CFR 1131.3. These rules provide that an original and six (6) copies of protests to an application may be filed with the field official named in the FEDERAL REGISTER publication no later than the 15th calendar day after the date the notice of the filing of the application is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. One copy of the protest must be served on the applicant, or its authorized representative, if any, and the protestant must certify that such service has been made. The protest must identify the operating authority upon which it is predicated, specifying the "MC" docket and "Sub" number and quoting the particular portion of authority upon which it relies. Also, the protestant shall specify the service it can and will provide and the amount and type of equipment it will make available for use in connection with the service contemplated by the TA application. The weight accorded a protest shall be governed by the completeness and pertinence of the protestant's information.

Except as otherwise specifically noted, each applicant states that there will be no significant effect on the quality of the human environment resulting from approval of its application.

A copy of the application is on file, and can be examined at the Office of the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., and also in the ICC Field Office to which protests are to be transmitted.

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC 1485 (Sub-No. 12TA), filed December 27, 1976. Applicant: SCHROOL TRANSPORTATION, INC., 360 Governor St., East Hartford, Conn. 06108. Applicant's representative: Hugh M. Joseloff, 80 State St., Hartford, Conn. 06103. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, cooked, cured or preserved*, n.o.i., from the plantsites of the shipper at Manchester and Bedford, N.H., to points in Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: M. M. Mades Co., Inc., 67 South St., Somerville, Mass. 02143. Send protests to: J. D. Perry, Jr., Interstate Commerce Commission, 324 U.S. Post Office Bldg., 135 High St., Hartford, Conn. 06101.

No. MC 33322 (Sub-No. 19TA), filed December 28, 1976. Applicant: JOHN N. APGAR, SR. (IRVING L. APGAR, JOHN N. APGAR, JR. AND THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF CENTRAL JERSEY, EXECUTORS AND TRUSTEES), STERLING E. APGAR (MORRIS RUTER, TRUSTEE) AND DORTHY E. ANDERSON, doing business as APGAR BROS., 232 W. Union Ave., Bound Brook, N.J. 08805. Applicant's representative: Herbert Alan Dubin, 1819 H St., NW., Suite 1030, Washington, D.C. 20006. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Antifreeze*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from the facilities of Union Carbide Corporation, located at to near Freehold, N.J., to Baltimore, Md.; Tarytown, N.Y.; Wilmington, Del.; and Exton, Pa., under a continuing contract with Union Carbide Corporation, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Union Carbide Corporation, Corporate Distribution Department, 270 Park Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017. Send protests to: Julia M. Papp, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, 9 Clinton St., Newark, N.J. 07102.

No. MC 49387 (Sub-No. 47TA), filed December 28, 1976. Applicant: ORSCHELN BROS. TRUCK LINES, Highway 24 East, P.O. Box 658, Moberly, Mo. 65270. Applicant's representative: Herman W. Huber, 101 E. High St., Jefferson City, Mo. 65101. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Drugs, medicines, toilet preparations, surgical dressings, swabs and absorbent cotton and advertising matter and store display racks or stands* when moving at the same time and in the same vehicle with the above described commodities, from Jefferson City, Mo., to Lafayette, Inc., for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Chesebrough-Pond's, Inc., John St., Clinton, Conn. 06413. Send protests to: Vernon V. Coble, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 600 Federal Bldg., 911 Walnut St., Kansas City, Mo.

No. MC 108393 (Sub-No. 113TA), filed December 28, 1976. Applicant: SIGNAL DELIVERY SERVICE, INC., 201 E. Ogden Ave., Hinsdale, Ill. 60521. Applicant's representative: Thomas B. Hill (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over iregular routes, transporting: *Electrical and gas appliances, parts of electrical and gas appliances, and equipment, materials and supplies* used in the manufacture, distribution and repair of electrical and gas appliances, between St. Paul, Minn., on the one hand,

and Tupelo, Miss., on the other, under a continuing contract with Whirlpool Corporation, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Whirlpool Corporation, Carl Anderson, Director of Corporate Traffic, Administrative Center, Benton Harbor, Mich. 49022. Send protests to: Patricia A. Roscoe, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Everett McKinley Dirksen Bldg., 219 S. Dearborn St., Room 1386, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

No. MC 108393 (Sub-No. 114TA), filed December 28, 1976. Applicant: SIGNAL DELIVERY SERVICE, INC., 201 E. Ogden Ave., Hinsdale, Ill. 60521. Applicant's representative: J. A. Kundtz, 1100 National City Bank Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio 44114. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Parts of electrical and gas appliances, and equipment, materials and supplies* used in the manufacture, distribution and repair of electrical and gas appliances, between Ft. Wayne, Ind., and Danville, Ky., under a continuing contract with Whirlpool Corporation, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Whirlpool Corporation, Carl R. Anderson, Director of Corporate Traffic, Administrative Center, Benton Harbor, Mich. 49022. Send protests to: Patricia A. Roscoe, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Everett McKinley Dirksen Bldg., 219 S. Dearborn St., Room 1386, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

No. MC 112617 (Sub-No. 356TA), filed December 28, 1976. Applicant: LIQUID TRANSPORTERS, INC., P.O. Box 21395, Louisville, Ky. 40221. Applicant's representative: Charles R. Dunford (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Acids*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Evansville, Ind., to points in Ohio, Michigan, and West Virginia, restricted to shipments having a prior movement by rail, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Oscar T. Smith, President, S & R Services, Inc., P.O. Box 1182, Henderson, Ky. 42420. Send protests to: Elbert Brown, Jr., District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 426 Post Office Bldg., Louisville, Ky. 40202.

No. MC 114457 (Sub-No. 280TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: DART TRANSIT COMPANY, 2102 University Ave., St. Paul, Minn. 55114. Applicant's representative: James H. Wills (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meat, meat products, and articles distributed by meat packinghouses* as described in Sections A and C of Appendix I to the report in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates*, 61 M.C.C. 209 and 766 (except commodities in bulk), from Eau Claire, Wis., to points in Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Landy of Wisconsin, Inc., 2411 3rd St., Eau Claire, Wis. 54701. Send protests to: Marion L. Cheney, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 414 Federal Bldg. & U.S. Courthouse, 110 S. 4th St., Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.

No. MC 115242 (Sub-No. 13TA), filed December 27, 1976. Applicant: DONALD MOORE, 601 North Prairie, Prairie du Chien, Wis. 53821. Applicant's representative: Michael S. Varda, 121 S. Pinckney St., Madison, Wis. 53703. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Malt beverages*, from Peoria, Ill., to Dubuque, Iowa, and on return, *empty malt beverage containers and pallets*, from Dubuque, Iowa, to Peoria, Ill., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Dubuque Hilliday Sales, Inc., 1270 E. 12th St., Dubuque, Iowa 52001. Send protests to: Richard K. Shullaw, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 130 W. Wilson St., Room 202, Madison, Wis. 53703.

No. MC 116014 (Sub-No. 79TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: OLIVER TRUCKING COMPANY, INC., Box 53, Lexington Road, Winchester, Ky. 40391. Applicant's representative: Louis J. Amato, P.O. Box E, Bowling Green, Ky. 42101. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Treated poles*, from Bibb, Fulton and Richmond Counties, Ga., to points in Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Southern Wood Piedmont Co., P.O. Box 5047, Spartanburg, S.C. Send protests to: H. C. Morrison, Sr., District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Room 216 Bakhaus Bldg., 1500 W. Main St., Lexington, Ky. 40505.

No. MC 117565 (Sub-No. 95TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: MOTOR SERVICE COMPANY, INC., Lake Park Road, P.O. Box 448, Coshocton, Ohio 43812. Applicant's representative: John R. Hafner (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Mobile homes*, in single and double wide units, in initial movement, from Middlebury, Ind., to points in Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Coachmen Homes Corporation, P.O. Box 705, Middlebury, Ind. 46540. Send protests to: Frank L. Calvary, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 220 Federal Bldg., & U.S. Courthouse, 85 Marconi Blvd., Columbus, Ohio 43215.

No. MC 118989 (Sub-No. 150TA), filed December 27, 1976. Applicant: CONTAINER TRANSIT, INC., 5223 S. 9th St., Milwaukee, Wis. 53221. Applicant's representative: Albert A. Andrin, 180 N. LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill. 60601. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Metal containers and container closures*, from Chicago, Ill., to Jeannette, Pa., and Jonesboro, Ark., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: The Continental Group, Inc., 150 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606. Send protests to: John E. Ryden, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operation, U.S. Federal Bldg., & Courthouse, 517 E. Wisconsin Ave., Room 619, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

No. MC 123543 (Sub-No. 1TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: FANELLI'S EXPRESS, INC., Campion Road, New Hartford, N.Y. 13413. Applicant's representative: Murray J. S. Kirshtein, 118 Bleeker St., Utica, N.Y. 130501. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Corrugated and plastic shipping containers, materials, supplies, and machinery used in the manufacture thereof*, from New Hartford, N.Y., to Hamden, Hartford, and West Hartford, Conn.; Everett, Lawrence, and Springfield, Mass.; Waltham, Maine; Londonderry, N.H.; Carlstadt, Flemington, Hackensack, and Secaucus, N.J.; East Stroudsburg, Erie, Franklin, Lancaster, Leetsdale, Middletown, Reading, Stroudsburg, West Reading, and Wynnewood, Pa.; Bennington, Charlotte, Hinesburg, St. Albans, and Winooski, Vt.; and from Boston, Canton, Hyde Park, Palmer, Springfield, and Wakefield, Mass.; Bangor, Dixfield, Oakland, Old Town, Passadumkeag, and Portland, Maine, Stirling, N.J.; Gettysburg and Erie, Pa., to New Hartford, N.Y., under a continuing contract with Mohawk Containers, Inc., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Richard C. Kennedy, Assistant, to President, Mohawk Containers, Inc., P.O. Box 218, New Hartford, N.Y. 13413. Send protest to: Morris H. Gross, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, U.S. Courthouse & Federal Bldg., 100 S. Clinton St., Room 1259, Syracuse, N.Y. 13202.

No. MC 126276 (Sub-No. 165TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: FAST MOTOR SERVICE, INC., 9100 Plainfield Road, Brookfield, Ill. 60513. Applicant's representative: James C. Hardman, 33 N. La Salle St. Chicago, Ill. 60602. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Metal containers and metal container closures*, from Sharonville, Ohio, to Siloam Springs and Springdale, Ark.; Champaign, Chicago, Milford, and Rossville, Ill.; Berne, Bloomington, Buffington, La Porte, Mt. Summit, Port Isabel, Orestes, Swayzee, Valparaiso, and Wilkinson, Ind.; Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Owensboro, Ky.; Cross-

ville, Greenville, Jackson, Memphis, Nashville, and Newport, Tenn.; and Madison and Milwaukee, Wis., under a continuing contract with The Continental Group, Inc., for 180 days. Supporting shipper: The Continental Group, Inc., Richard Dwyer, Regional Traffic & Distribution Manager, 150 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606. Send protests to: Patricia A. Roscoe, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Everett McKinley Dirksen Bldg., 219 S. Dearborn St., Room 1386, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

No. MC 129712 (Sub-No. 8TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: GEORGE BENNETT MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., P.O. Box 954, McDonough, Ga. 30253. Applicant's representative: Frank D. Hall, Suite 713, 3384 Peachtree Road, NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30326. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Tractors* (except truck tractors); *and attachments, parts and accessories* for tractors when moving at the same time and in the same equipment with tractors; and all having a prior movement by rail, from the rail ramps located at or near Memphis, Tenn., Greenville, Miss., and Birmingham, Ala., to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Lousiana, under a continuing contract with Fort Tractor Operations, Ford Motor Company, Troy, Mich., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Ford Tractor Operations, Ford Motor Company, 2500 E. Maple Road, Troy, Mich. 48084. Send protests to: E. A. Bryant, Transportation Specialist, Interstate Commerce Commission, 1252 W. Peachtree St., NW., Room 546, Atlanta, Ga., 30309.

No. MC 129712 (Sub-No. 9TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: GEORGE BENNETT MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., P.O. Box 954, McDonough, Ga. 30253. Applicant's representative: Frank D. Hall, Suite 713, 3384 Peachtree Road, N.E., Atlanta, Ga. 30326. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Tractors* (except truck tractors); *and attachments, parts and accessories* for tractors when moving at the same time and in the same equipment with tractors; and all having a prior movement by rail, from the rail ramps located at or near Tampa and Jacksonville, Fla., to points in Florida, under a continuing contract with Ford Tractor Operations, Ford Motor Company, Troy, Mich., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Ford Tractor Operations, Ford Motor Company, 2500 E. Maple Road, Tryo, Mich. 48084. Send protests to: E. A. Bryant, Interstate Commerce Commission, 1252 W. Peachtree St., N.W., Room 546, Atlanta, Ga. 30309.

No. MC 133684 (Sub-No. 23TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: GORDON FAST FREIGHT, INC., 2205 Pacific Highway East, Tacoma, Wash. 98422. Applicant's representative: Michael D. Duppenthaler, 607 Third Ave., Seattle, Wash. 98104. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Malt beverages*, from Fairfield, Cailf., to Kent, Wash., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: City Beverage Distributors, Inc., 848 S. Third, Kent, Wash. 98031. Send protests to: L. D. Boone, Transportation Specialist, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, 858 Federal Bldg., 915 Second Ave., Seattle, Wash. 98174.

No. MC 134134 (Sub-No. 20TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: MAINLINER MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., 2002 Madison St., Omaha, Nebr. 68107. Applicant's representative: Arlyn L. Westergren, Suite 530 Univac Bldg., 7100 W. Center Road, Omaha, Nebr. 68106. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, meat by-products and articles* distributed by meat packinghouses, from the plantsite and storage facilities utilized by Armour & Co., at or near Omaha, Nebr., to points in Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and West Virginia, for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: D. A. Chute, Manager, Transportation & Distribution, Armour Food Company, 111 W. Clarendon Ave., Greyhound Tower, Phoenix, Ariz. 85077. Send protests to: Carroll Russell, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Suite 620, 110 N. 14th St., Omaha, Nebr. 68102.

No. MC 134405 (Sub-No. 31TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: BACON TRANSPORT CO., P.O. Box 1134, Ardmore, Okla. 73401. Applicant's representative: O. G. BACON III (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fuel oil*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Arkansas City, Kans., to Muskogee, Okla., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Riffe Petroleum Company, 1700 Philtower Bldg., Tulsa, Okla. 74103. Send protests to: Joe Green, District Supervisor, Room 240 Old Post Office Bldg., 215 N.W. Third St., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.

No. MC 134477 (Sub-No. 130TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: SCHANNO TRANSPORTATION, INC., 5 West Mendota Road, West St. Paul, Minn. 55118. Applicant's representative: Robert P. Sack, P.O. Box 6010, West St. Paul, Minn. 55118. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meat, meat products, meat by-products and articles distributed by meat packinghouses*, as described in Sections A and C of Appendix I to the report in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates*, 61 M.C.C. 209 and 766 (except hides and commodities in bulk), from Huron, S. Dak., to points in Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Wisconsin and Washington, D.C., restricted to traffic originating at the plantsite and storage facilities of Huron Dressed Beef, Inc., at or near Huron, S. Dak., and destined to points in the above-named states, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Huron Dressed Beef, Inc., Huron, S. Dak. Send protests to: Marion L. Cheney, Transportation Assistant, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 414 Federal Bldg., and U.S. Courthouse, 110 S. 4th St., Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.

No. MC 134599 (Sub-No. 151TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: INTERSTATE CONTRACT CARRIER CORPORATION, P.O. Box 748, Salt Lake City, Utah 84110. Applicant's representative: Richard A. Peterson, P.O. Box 81849, Lincoln, Nebr. 68501. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Games, toys, and plastic articles*, and (2) *materials, parts and supplies* used in the manufacture of items in part (1) above (except commodities in bulk and those requiring special handling or special equipment); (1) between Edison, N.J., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in California, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and Washington; (2) from Edison, N.J., to points in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nebraska, Ohio, South Carolina and Wisconsin, under a continuing contract with Mattel, Inc., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Mattel, Inc., 5150 Rosecrans Ave., Hawthorne, Calif. 90250. Send protests to: Lyle D. Helfer, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, 5301 Federal Bldg., 125 S. State St., Salt Lake City, Utah 84138.

No. MC 134859 (Sub-No. 8TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: FRANK RUSSELL & SON, 401 S. Ida St., West Frankfort, Ill. 62896. Applicant's representative: Donald Russell (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Magnetite*, in bulk and in bags, from Meramec Mine, at or near Pea Ridge, Mo., to Elizabethtown, Ky., under a continuing contract with Colt Industries, Crucible Inc., Magnetics Div., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Gene P. Jaggers, V.P./Controller, Colt Industries, Crucible Inc., Magnetics Div., P.O. Box 100, Elizabethtown, Ky. 42701. Send protests to: Harold C. Jolliff, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, P.O. Box 2418, Springfield, Ill. 62705.

No. MC 142239 (Sub-No. 4TA) (Correction), filed December 13, 1976, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of December 27, 1976, and republished as corrected this issue. Applicant: WASHINGTON TRANSPORTATION CO., 3305 Highway 192, Council Bluffs, Iowa 51501. Applicant's representative: Edward A. O'Donnell, 1004 29th St., Sioux City, Iowa 51104. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, meat by-products and articles distributed by meat packinghouses* as described in Sections A and C of Appendix I to the report in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates*, 61 M.C.C. 209 and 766 (except hides and commodities in bulk), from the commercial zones of Omaha, Nebr., Madison, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa, to points in Illinois and Indiana, within the Chicago, Ill., commercial zone and points in the commercial zones of Detroit, Mich., Boston, Mass.; Cleveland, Ohio; Baltimore, Md.; and South Windsor, Conn.; and Toledo, Ohio; and points in New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania. Restriction: Restricted to a transportation service to be performed under a continuing contract with Cudahy Foods Co., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: T. L. Byerly, Purchasing Manager, Cudahy Co., 5051 S. 33rd St., Omaha, Nebr. 68107. Send protests to: Carroll Russell, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Suite 620, 110 N. 14th St., Omaha, Nebr. 68102. The purpose of this republication is to correct the territorial description in this proceeding.

No. MC 142346 (Sub-No. 2TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: LARMER TRANSFER CO., 90129 Prarie Road, P.O. Box 706, Eugene, Oreg. 97041. Applicant's representative: Russell M. Allen, 1200 Jackson Tower, Portland, Oreg. 97205. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel plate, angle iron, bars, pipe and channel*, from the plantsite of Farwest Steel Plant, at Eugene, Oreg., to Ontario, Oreg., for interline with shipper or certified carriers for ultimate destination in Boise, Idaho, under a continuing contract with Farwest Steel Corporation, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Farwest Steel Corporation, P.O. Box 889, Eugene, Oreg. 97401. Send protests to: A. E. Odoms, District Supervisor, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, 114 Pioneer Courthouse, Portland, Oreg. 97204.

No. MC 142440 (Sub-No. 1TA), filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: SPURLING AVIATION, INC., 8403 Perimeter Road South, Seattle, Wash. 98188. Applicant's representative: Clyde H. MacIver, 1900 Peoples National Bank Bldg., 1415 Fifth Ave., Seattle, Wash. 98171. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Supplies and materials* used in the manufacture of fiberglass pleasure boats; and (2) *Industrial machinery parts*, between points in King, Snohomish and Skagit Counties, Wash., on the one hand, and, on the other, Marysville (Snohomish County), Arlington (Snohomish County), and Sedro Woolley (Skagit County), Washington (restricted to traffic having an immediately prior or subsequent movement by air in interstate or foreign commerce and to individual shipments not exceeding 500 lbs.), for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shippers: Glas-Ply, Inc., 14524 40th Ave., N.E., Marysville, Wash. 98270. Bayliner Marine Corp., P.O. Box 24467, Route 5, Arlington, Wash. Bendix/Skagit Corporation, P.O. Box 151, Sedro-Woolley, Wash. 98284. Send protests to: L. D. Boone, Transportation Specialist, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, 858 Federal Bldg., Seattle, Wash. 98174.

No. MC 142681TA (Correction), filed November 29, 1976, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of December 10, 1976, and republished as corrected this issue. Applicant: JOHN L. BRADY, doing business as J & M ENTERPRIZE, 48 N. 1st West, Hyde Park, Utah 84318. Applicant's representative: Irene Warr, 430 Judge Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah 84111. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Flour and Bran*, in bags, from the plant site of Gilt Edge Flour Mill, at or near Richmond, Utah, to points in California, under a continuing contract with Gilt Edge Flour Mills, Inc., for 180 days. Applicant has also filed an underlying ETA seeking up to 90 days of operating authority. Supporting shipper: Guilt Edge Florur Mills, Inc., P.O. Box 161, Richmond, Utah 84333. Send protests to: Lyle D. Helfer, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations 5301 Federal Bldg., 125 S. State St., Salt Lake City, Utah 84138. The purpose of this republication is to correct the applicant's name.

No. MC 142762TA, filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: VERPLANK'S COAL & DOCK CO., Ferrysburg, Mich. 49409. Applicant's representative: Karl L. Gotting, 1200 Bank of Lansing, Lansing, Mich. 48933. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Industrial sand*, in bulk, from the facilities of the Nugent sand Company, at Muskegon, Mich., and its commercial zone to Defiance, Ohio, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Central Foundry Division, GMC, 77 W. Center St., P.O. Box 1629, Saginaw, Mich. 48605. Send protests to: C. R. Flemming, District Supervisor, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, 225 Federal Bldg., Lansing, Mich. 48933.

No. MC 142763TA, filed December 23, 1976. Applicant: G.W. CANNON COMPANY, P.O. Box 506, Muskegon, Mich. 49443. Applicant's representative: Karl L. Gotting, 1200 Bank of Lansing, Lansing, Mich. 48933. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Industrial sand*, in bulk, from the facilities of the Nugent Sand Company, at Muskegon, Mich., and its commercial zone, to Defiance, Ohio, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Central Foundry Division, GMC, 77 W. Center St., P.O. Box 1629, Saginaw, Mich. 48605. Send protests to: C. R. Flemming, District Supervisor, Bureau of Operations, Interstate Commerce Commission, 225 Federal Bldg., Lansing, Mich. 48933.

PASSENGER APPLICATIONS

No. MC 110060 (Sub-No. 2TA), filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: TRANSPORTES CHIHUAHUENSES, S.A. De C.V., 16 de Septiembre 250 OTE, Juarez Chihuahua, Mexico. Applicant's representative: M. Ward Bailey, 2412 Continental Life Bldg., Fort Worth, Tex. 76102. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in charter operations, between Presidio, Tex., and the International Boundary Line between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, from Presidio, Tex., over U.S. Highway 67 to the International Boundary Line between the United States and Mexico and return over the same routes, serving no intermediate points, for 180 days. Supporting shipper: Pan American Travel Service, Del Camino Motor Hotel, P.O. Box 9401, El Paso, Tex. Send protests to: Haskell E. Ballard, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Operations, Box H-4395 Herring Plaza, Amarillo, Tex. 79101.

No. MC 142760TA, filed December 22, 1976. Applicant: DATA PROCESSING MAINTENANCE, INC., doing business as LUXURY COACHES, 4220 LaBranch, Box 8326, Houston, Tex. 77004. Applicant's representative: Thomas F. Sedberry, 1102 Perry-Brooks Bldg., Austin, Tex. 78701. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their bagage*, in round-trip special or charter operations, and in round-trip special operations, between points in Harris County, Tex., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in New Mexico and Colorado, at or near snow skiing areas, for 180 days. Supporting shippers: There are approximately 8 statements of support attached to the application, which may be examined at the Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington, D.C., or copies thereof which may be examined at the field office named below. Send protests to: John F. Mensing, District Supervisor, Interstate Commerce Commission, 8610 Federal Bldg., 515 Rusk, Houston, Tex. 77002.

By the Commission.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-1017 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[Ex Parte No. 137; Service Date Jan. 6, 1977]

## CONTRACTS FOR PROTECTIVE SERVICES

At a Session of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Division 2, held at its office in Washington, D.C., on the 28th day of December, 1976.

Upon consideration of the record in this proceeding including the petition for rulemaking and modification and clarification of rules filed June 14, 1976 by certain Eastern Railroads and the replies thereto filed by the Pacific Fruit Express Company on June 26, 1976 and Bureau of Enforcement on July 6, 1976; and the motion to open rulemaking proceedings filed on August 20, 1976 by twenty-four railroads (Railroads); and

It appearing, That petitioners have submitted proposed modifications to the contracts for protective service regulations at 49 CFR 1032 and have requested that their petition be handled with the remand of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *Southern Ry.* v. *United States* 412 F. Supp. 1122 (1976);

*It further appearing*, That the Railroads in their motion request that the Commission clarify our order in 318 I.C.C. 111 (1962), determine its future applicability to the Railroads, determine whether our ruling at 340 I.C.C. 754 (1972) should be incorporated in this proceeding, decide whether it should be adopted as to all carriers and car lines. and resolve the applicable rules for the Southern remand;

*And it further appearing*, That the petition and motion are premature since negotiations between the carriers and car lines are currently progressing and an informal conference pertaining to a settlement between the parties is scheduled for February 9, 1977;

Wherefore and good cause appearing therefore:

*It is ordered*, That the petition and motion to the extent they seek institution of a rulemaking proceeding be, and they are hereby, denied at this time.

By the Commission, Division 2, Commissioners Hardin, O'Neal and Christian.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-1016 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[AB 1 (Sub-No. 49); Service Date Jan. 6, 1977]

## CHICAGO AND NORTH WESTERN TRANSPORTATION CO.

### Abandonment Between Elkhorn Junction and Irvington, in Douglas County, Nebraska

DECEMBER 21, 1976.

The Interstate Commerce Commission hereby gives notice that its Section of Energy and Environment has concluded that the proposed abandonment by the Chicago and North Western Transportation Company between Elkhorn Junction and Irvington, a distance of 5.3 miles, all in Douglas County, Nebr., if approved by the Commission, does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq., and that preparation of a detailed environmental impact statement will not be required under section 4332(2)(C) of the NEPA.

It was concluded, among other things, that the environmental impacts of the proposed action are considered insignificant because traffic on the line has been non-existent for 2 years and the only shipper on the line has relocated its operations. Also, no land use plans of an economic or industrial importance exist which would necessitate the continued operation of the line. The right-of-way has been determined to be suitable for other transportation purposes and recreation use following abandonment.

This conclusion is contained in a staff-prepared environmental threshold assessment survey, which is available on request to the Interstate Commerce Commission, Office of Proceedings, Washington, D.C. 20423; telephone 202-275-7011.

Interested persons may comment on this matter by filing their statements in writing with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., 20423, on or before February 3, 1977.

It should be emphasized that the environmental threshold assessment survey represents an evaluation of the environmental issues in the proceeding and does not purport to resolve the issue of whether the present or future public convenience and necessity permit discontinuance of the line proposed for abandonment. Consequently, comments on the environmental study should be limited to discussion of the presence or absence of environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-1010 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[AB 7 (Sub-No. 29); Service Date Jan. 6, 1977]

## CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE, ST PAUL AND PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

### Abandonment in the City of Berlin, Green Lake County, Wisconsin

DECEMBER 23, 1976.

The Interstate Commerce Commission hereby gives notice that its Section of Energy and Environment has concluded that the proposed abandonment by the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company of its line of railroad beginning at Engineer's station 2214 + 14 (milepost 181.08) and extending northwesterly to the end of the track at Engineer's station 2233 + 73 (milepost 181.45) a total distance of 1,959 feet of main track and 4,115 feet of other track, all in the City of Berlin, Green Lake County, Wis., if approved by the Commission, does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq., and that preparation of a detailed environmental impact statement will not be required under section 4332(2)(C) of the NEPA.

It was concluded, among other things, that abandonment of the subject line will not adversely change existing environmental and economic conditions in the affected area because (1) traffic on the line is at a very low level and no increases are expected, (2) the dismantling of the line and rerouting of traffic should create only minimal environmental impacts, (3) removal of the line is consistent with City improvement plans and private industrial expansion plans for the area, and (4) there will be no historic impacts involved.

This conclusion is contained in a staff-prepared environmental threshold assessment survey, which is available on request to the Interstate Commerce Commission, Office of Proceedings, Washington, D.C. 20423, telephone 202-275-7011.

Interested persons may comment on this matter by filing their statements in writing with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., 20423, on or before February 7, 1977.

It should be emphasized that the environmental threshold assessment survey represents an evaluation of the environmental issues in the proceeding and does not purport to resolve the issue of whether the present or future public convenience and necessity permit discontinuance of the line proposed for abandonment. Consequently, comments on the environmental study should be limited to discussion of the presence or absence of environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-1013 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[AB 19 (Sub-No. 11); Service Date Jan. 6, 1977]

## FAIRMONT, MORGANTOWN AND PITTSBURGH RAILROAD CO. AND BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD CO.

### Abandonment Portion Smithfield and Masontown Branch Between Strum and Leckrone, in Fayette County, Pennsylvania

DECEMBER 23, 1976.

The Interstate Commerce Commission hereby gives notice that its Section of Energy and Environment has concluded that the proposed abandonment by the Fairmont and Morgantown and Pittsburgh Railroad Company and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company between Strum and Leckrone all in Fayette County, Pa., a total distance of 6.58 miles, if approved by the Commission, does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the

meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq., and that preparation of a detailed environmental impact statement will not be required under section 4332(2)(C) of the NEPA.

It was concluded, among other things, that the environmental impacts of the proposed action are considered insignificant because the amount of traffic diverted to motor carrier is not expected to create any substantial alterations in existing air quality and fuel consumption. No land use or development plans exist; while the major commodity shipped on this line is coal, abandonment will not preclude the extraction of this resource from the surrounding area. Finally, it has been determined that the right-of-way is not suitable for other public purposes.

This conclusion is contained in a staff-prepared environmental threshold assessment survey, which is available on request to the Interstate Commerce Commission, Office of Proceedings, Washington, D.C. 20423, telephone 202-275-7011.

Interested persons may comment on this matter by filing their statements in writing with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C. 20423, on or before February 7, 1977.

It should be emphasized that the environmental threshold assessment survey represents an evaluation of the environmental issues in the proceeding and does not purport to resolve the issue of whether the present or future public convenience and necessity permit discontinuance of the line proposed for abandonment. Consequently, comments on the environmental study should be limited to discussion of the presence or absence of environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-1015 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[AB 12 (Sub-No. 20); Service Date Jan. 6, 1977.]

## SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION CO.

DECEMBER 23, 1976.

In the matter of Southern Pacific Transportation Company—Abandonment of its line of railroad—in Victoria, Goliad, Bee, San Patricid, Jim Wells, Brooks and Hidalgo Counties, Texas; Finance Docket No. 28024. Southern Pacific Transportation Company—Trackage rights—over Missouri Pacific Railroad Company between Harlingen and Placedo, in Cameron and Victoria Counties, Texas; Finance Docket No. 28078. Southern Pacific Transportation Company—Construction and operations between lines of Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and the Texas Mexican Railway Company at Robstown, Nueces County, Texas.

The Interstate Commerce Commission hereby gives notice that its Section of Energy and Environment has concluded that the action proposed by the Southern Pacific Transportation Company—abandonment of certain portions of its line (between Victoria and Beeville, in Victoria, Goliad, and Bee Counties, Tex.; between Skidmore and Alice, in Bee, San Patricio, and Jim Wells Counties, Tex.; and between Falfurrias and Edinburg, in Brooks and Hidalgo Counties, Tex.—a distance of approximately 149.9 miles; acquisition of trackage rights over the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company line between Harlingen and Placedo, in Cameron and Victoria Counties, Tex.; and construction of and operation over a connecting track between the lines of Texas Mexican Railway Company and Missouri Pacific at Robstown, in Mueces County, Tex.—if approved by the Commission, does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq., and that preparation of a detailed environmental impact statement will not be required under section 4332(2)(C) of the NEPA.

It was concluded, among other things, that diversion of rail traffic to motor carriers would not result in a significant increase in energy consumption, air pollution, or highway traffic. In none of the communities which would lose direct rail access under the proposal are there definitive developmental plans reliant on continued rail service. Consequently, the proposed action will not have a serious adverse effect on rural and community development. It was found that the right-of-way is suitable for alternative public use.

This conclusion is contained in a staff-prepared environmental threshold assessment survey, which is available on request to the Interstate Commerce Commission, Office of Proceedings, Washington, D.C. 20423; telephone 202-275-7011.

Interested persons may comment on this matter by filing their statements in writing with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C. 20423, or before February 7, 1977.

It should be emphasized that the environmental threshold assessment survey represents an evaluation of the environmental issues in the proceeding and does not purport to resolve the issue of whether the present or future public convenience and necessity permit discontinuance of the line proposed for abandonment. Consequently, comments on the environmental study should be limited to discussion of the presence or absence of environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-1009 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

---

[AB 12 (Sub-No. 31); Service Date Jan. 6, 1977]

## SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION CO.

### Abandonment Between Westwood Siding and Beverly Hills In Los Angeles County, California

DECEMBER 21, 1976.

The Interstate Commerce Commission hereby gives notice that its Section of Energy and Environment has concluded that the proposed abandonment by the Southern Pacific Transportation Company of 1.22 miles of its rail line between Westwood Siding and Beverly Hills, in Los Angeles County, Calif., if approved by the Commission, does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq., and that preparation of a detailed environmental impact statement will not be required under section 4332(2)(C) of the NEPA.

It was concluded, among other things, that the environmental impacts of the proposed action are considered insignificant because of the lack of traffic on the subject line and the absence of any historical, safety, or ecological impacts associated with the proposed action.

Local and regional transportation and development plans do not include continued operation of the subject line as a prerequisite to their implementation. These plans do include, however, the utilization of the subject right-of-way for alternative public uses and public agencies have expressed their interest in acquiring this property should the line be abandoned.

This conclusion is contained in a staff-prepared environmental threshold assessment survey, which is available on request to the Interstate Commerce Commission, Office of Proceedings, Washington, D.C. 20423; telephone 202-275-7011.

Interested persons may comment on this matter by filing their statements in writing with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., 20423, on or before February 3, 1977.

It should be emphasized that the environmental threshold assessment survey represents an evaluation of the environmental issues in the proceeding and does not purport to resolve the issue of whether the present or future public convenience and necessity permit discontinuance of the line proposed for abandonment. Consequently, comments on the environmental study should be limited to discussion of the presence or absence of environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77-1014 Filed 1-10-77;8:45 am]

[AB 12 (Sub-No. 46); Service Date, Jan. 6, 1977.]

## SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION CO.

### Abandonment Between Hamilton and Ordbend in Glenn County, California

DECEMBER 23, 1976.

The Interstate Commerce Commission hereby gives notice that its Section of Energy and Environment has concluded that the proposed abandonment by the Southern Pacific Transportation Company of its branch line between Hamilton and Ordbend, a distance of 7.3 miles, in Glenn County, Calif., if approved by the Commission, does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq., and that preparation of a detailed environmental impact statement will not be required under section 4332(2)(C) of the NEPA.

It was concluded, among other things, that there will be no significant impacts on community development, historical sites, energy consumption, or local ecology resulting from the abandonment, and that the roads and highways in the area are capable of handling the small increase in truck traffic which will be diverted from the subject line.

This conclusion is contained in a staff-prepared environmental threshold assessment survey, which is available on request to the Interstate Commerce Commission, Office of Proceedings, Washington, D.C. 20423; telephone 202–275–7011.

Interested persons may comment on this matter by filing their statements in writing with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C. 20423, on or before February 7, 1977.

It should be emphasized that the environmental threshold assessment survey represents an evaluation of the environmental issues in the proceeding and does not purport to resolve the issue of whether the present or future public convenience and necessity permit discontinuance of the line proposed for abandonment. Consequently, comments on the environmental study should be limited to discussion of the presence or absence of environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77–1012 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]

[AB 12 (Sub-No. 26); Service Date Jan. 6, 1977.]

## SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION CO.

### Abandonment Between Villa Park and Trust in Orange County, California

DECEMBER 27, 1976.

The Interstate Commerce Commission hereby gives notice that: 1. The Commission's Section of Energy and Environment has prepared an environmental threshold assessment survey in the above-entitled proceeding in which it was concluded that the proceeding does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq. 2. A notice setting forth this conclusion was served November 22, 1976, and no substantive comments in opposition, of an environmental nature, have been received by the Commission in response to said notice. 3. This proceeding is now ready for further disposition within the Office of Hearings or the Office of Proceedings as appropriate.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.77–1011 Filed 1–10–77;8:45 am]