the Hayes wells was unreliable and did not establish an adequate factual foundation upon which exception relief could be granted. In a Statement of Objections to the Proposed Decision and Order, Equipment submitted additional information however, which it indicated was accurate and would provide an adequate basis for granting exception relief. In considering this data, the DOE found that Equipment's operating costs had increased to a point where the firm no longer had an economic incentive to continue the production of crude oil from the Hayes wells. The DOE also determined that if Equipment abandoned its operations at the Hayes wells, a substantial quantity of domestic crude oil would not be recovered. On the basis of criteria applied in previous Decisions, the DOE determined that Equipment should be granted prospective exception relief. In its Application, Equipment also requested retroactive exception relief. In rejecting that request the DOE found that although the firm would have been granted prospective exception relief had it filed and Application for Exception on an earlier date, it failed to show that it would experience a severe and irreparable injury at the present time in the absence of retroactive relief. Accordingly, the DOE denied Equipment's request for retroactive exception relief.

Finnegans of Virginia, Inc., Washington, D.C.; DRC-0001, motor gasoline

Finnegans of Virginia, Inc. filed a Statement of Objections to a Proposed Decision and Order issued to it by FEA Region III (now DOE Region III) on September 27, 1977. In the Proposed Decision, the Regional Office determined that the firm's request for an increase in motor gasoline allocation at one of its retail sites should be denied. In its Statement of Objections and in testimony which it presented at an evidentiary hearing, the firm alleged that the Regional Office erred in finding that the firm did not demonstrate that the market area is experiencing a significant increase in demand for an allocated product which is presently not being met by local supply. Finnegans argued that the increased allocation was necessary in order to assure sufficient supplies for the expanded capacity of the retail outlet. In rejection the firm's contentions, the DOE noted that similar arguments had been raised and rejected in previous determinations. *See Western Stores Division of the Continental Oil Co.*, 2 DOE Par. 81,007 (1978) and cases cited therin. Since the firm failed to raise any new arguments which would cause the DOE to depart from the principles established in those cases, the firm's exception request was denied.

Gulf Oil Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma; DXE-1859, crude oil

Gulf Oil Corporation filed an Application for Exception from the provisions of 10 CFR, Part 212, Subpart D. The exception request, if granted, would result in an extension of exception relief previously granted to Gulf and would permit it to continue to sell certain quantities of the crude oil produced from the Kiefer Unit of the Glenn Field, located in Creek County, Oklahoma, at upper tier prices. In considerting the exception request, the DOE found that the operating costs per barrel at the Kiefer Unit continued to exceed the applicable lower tier ceiling price and that continued exception relief was therefore necessary to provide Gulf with an adequate economic incentive to maintain production operations. In accordance with the methodology established in previous Decisions, the DOE permitted Gulf to sell 42.91 percent of the crude oil produced for the working interests from the Kiefer Unit at upper tier prices for a six-month period.

Maguire Oil Company, Dallas, Texas; DXE-1791, crude oil

The Maguire Oil Company filed an Application for Exception from the provisions of 10 CFR Part 212, Subpart D. The request, if granted, would result in an extension of exception relief previously granted to Maguire and would permit the firm to sell all of the crude oil which it produces from the Chandler Lease at market prices in excess of the levels permitted under the DOE regulations. See *Maguire Oil Co.*, 2 DOE Par. 81,037 (1978). In considering the exception request, the DOE found that the Chandler Lease continued to incur increased operating costs and that, in the absence of an extension of exception relief, the working interests would lack an incentive to produce crude oil from the property. In view of this situation and on the basis of the operating data presented for the well for the previous six months, the DOE concluded that the working interest owners should be permitted to sell 100 percent of the crude oil produced from the well at market prices in order to recover the increased operating costs of the well.

Texaco, Inc., New Orleans, Louisiana; DXE-1871, crude oil

Texaco, Inc. filed an Application for exception from the provisions of 10 CFR, Part 212, Subpart D. The request, if granted, would result in an extension of exception relief previously granted to Texaco and would permit the firm to continue to sell a portion of the crude oil produced from the BF Reno RA Sand Unit (the BF Unit) at upper tier ceiling prices. *See Texaco, Inc.*, 2 DOE Par. 81,129 (1978). In considering the exception application, the DOE found that the BF Unit continued to incur increased operating costs and that, in the absence of an extension of exception relief, the working interests would lack an incentive to produce crude oil from the property. In view of this situation and on the basis of the operating data presented for the well for the previous six months, the DOE concluded that the working interest owners should be permitted to sell 28.41 percent of the crude oil produced from the well at upper tier ceiling prices in order to recover the increased operating costs of the well.

Union Oil Company of California, Los Angeles, California; DXE-0413, crude oil

On September 29, 1978 the Union Oil Company of California (Union) filed a Statement of Objections to a Proposed Decision and Order which was issued to it on August 25, 1978. In the Proposed Decision, the DOE tentatively determined that the firm should be granted an extension of exception relief previously approved which would permit the working interest owners of the State and Coast Guard leases to sell a protion of the crude oil produced for their benefit at upper tier ceiling prices. Because Union is the refiner as well as the producer of the crude oil produced from the State and Coast Guard leases, the DOE determined in the Proposed Decision that the level of relief afforded Union should be based on the entitlements benefits that would accrue to the firm as a result of exception relief. In its Statement of Objections Union contested this methodology and claimed that the method of calculating relief should be the same for refiner-producers and non-refiner-producers. After considering the firm's contentions, the DOE agreed with Union's assertion and recalculated relief using the methodology established in previous Decisions. Accordingly, the DOE permitted Union to sell 55.95 percent and 83.08 percent of the crude oil produced from the State and Coast Guard leases respectively at upper tier ceiling prices for a six month period.

DISMISSALS

The following submissions were dismissed following a statement by the applicant indicating that the relief requested was no longer needed:

DiCarlo Service Station, Schenectady, New York; DEE-1940

Puerto Rico Olefins Company, Washington, D.C.; DEE-1303

The following submissions were dismissed on the grounds that recent regulatory changes have eliminated the need for the exception relief requested:

Belridge Oil Company, Los Angeles, California; DXE-2025

Sanford P. Fagadau, Dallas, Texas; DXE-2026, DXE-2034

Copies of the full text of these Decisions and Orders are available in the public Docket Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room B-120, 2000 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20461, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., e.s.t., except Federal holidays. They are also available in *Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines*, a commercially published loose leaf reporter system.

MELVIN GOLDSTEIN,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

FEBRUARY 16, 1979.

[FR Doc. 79-5669 Filed 2-23-79; 8:45 am]

[6450-01-M]

ISSUANCE OF DECISIONS AND ORDERS

Week of December 4 through December 8, 1978

Notice is hereby given that during the week of December 4 through December 8, 1978, the Decisions and Orders summarized below were issued with respect to Appeals and Applications for Exception or other relief filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy. The following summary also contains a list of submissions which were dismissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals and the basis for the dismissal.

APPEAL

Getty Oil Co., New York, N.Y.; DEA-0172, natural gas liquids

The Getty Oil Company filed an Appeal from a Decision and Order which the Assistant Administrator for Fuels Regulation of the Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA) issued to the firm on February 24, 1978. In that Order, the ERA granted Getty's request to use a separate allocation fraction in determining the volumes of propane, butane and natural gasoline which it is required to distribute to its customers in California. However, the ERA denied Getty's request to use separate allocation fractions in determining the quantities of those products which it supplies to customers in its Eastern and Central regions. In considering the Getty Appeal, the DOE determined that the firm had failed to demonstrate that it lacked sufficient facilities to enable it to equitably distribute its allocable supply of natural gas liquids between its Eastern and Central regions. The DOE also found that Getty had failed to demonstrate that it would be unduly burdensome for the firm to establish interregional exchange agreements that could reliably supplement other means of distributing available natural gas liquid supplies between the two regions. The DOE therefore concluded that Getty had not shown that the February 24 Order was arbitrary, capricious or erroneous in fact or law. Accordingly, the Getty Appeal was denied.

REQUESTS FOR EXCEPTION

Green Pipe and Supply Co., Tulsa, Okla.; DEE-1829, crude oil

Green Pipe and Supply Co., filed an Application for Exception from the provisions of 10 CFR, Part 212, Subpart D, which, if granted, would permit the firm the sell the crude oil produced from the Nora Bruner Lease, located in Seminole County, Oklahoma, at upper tier ceiling prices. In considering the exception request, the DOE found that Green Pipe's operating costs had increased to the point where the firm no longer had an economic incentive to continue the production of crude oil from the lease. On the basis of the criteria applied in previous Decisions, the DOE determined that Green Pipe should be permitted to sell at upper tier ceiling prices 49.67 percent of the crude oil produced from the lease for the benefit of the working interest owners during the period November 14, 1978 through August 30, 1979.

Gulf Oil Corp., Tulsa, Okla.; DEE-0837, DEE-0838, DEE-0839, DEE-0840, DEE-0841 natural gas liquids

Gulf Oil Corporation filed a Statement of Objections to a May 15, 1978 Proposed Decision and Order which tentatively determined that the firm should be granted an exception from the provisions of 10 CFR 212.165 to permit it to increase the prices it charges for natural gas liquids and natural gas liquid products at five natural gas processing plants. In considering the Gulf Objection, the DOE found that the proposed exception relief was based upon incorrect data that the firm had submitted. Accordingly, the DOE modified the level of exception relief to reflect the corrected data.

Jack Halbert, Tyler, Tex.; FEE-4844, FEE-4845, crude oil

Jack Halbert filed an Application for Exception from the provisions of 10 CFR, Part 212, Subpart D, which, if granted, would permit Halbert to treat two leases as stripper well properties. Subsequent to the submission of Halbert's request, DOE Region VI determined that the leases had qualified for stripper well status on September 1, 1976. The portion of the firm's Application which related to the period subsequent to that date was therefore dismissed. In considering Halbert's request for exception relief for the period prior to September 1, 1976, the DOE determined that no showing that retroactive relief was appropriate had been made. Accordingly, Halbert's request for retroactive exception relief was denied.

O. B. Mobley, Shreveport, Louisiana, DEE-1021, crude oil

Mr. O. B. Mobley, Jr., filed an Application for Exception which, if granted, would permit him to determine the base production control level (BPCL) for the Lewisville Smackover Lime Unit (Lewisville Unit) under the provisions of 10 CFR 212.75 rather than 10 CFR 212.72. In his exception request, Mobley contended that the working interest owners of the Lewisville Unit are suffering a serious hardship and gross inequity as a result of the requirement that they determine the BPCL under Section 212.72. In considering the request, the DOE found that Mobley had not been harmed by any undue administrative delay which may have occurred in the issuance of Interpretation 1978-6, which determined that Mobley is required to calculate the BPCL for the Lewisville Unit under Section 212.72. The DOE also found that Mobley had not shown that actions of the Arkansas Oil and Gas Commission had resulted in a distortion of the objectives of the DOE Regulations. Finally, the DOE determined that the financial data submitted by Mobley indicated that the working interest owners of the Lewisville Unit were earning substantial profits on the operation of that property. Accordingly, the Mobley Application for Exception was denied.

Pennzoil Producing Company, Houston, Texas, DXE-1877 crude oil

Pennzoil Producing Company filed an Application for Exception from the provisions of 10 CFR, Part 212, Subpart D, which, if granted, would result in an extension of the exception relief previously granted to Pennzoil and would permit the firm to sell a portion of the crude oil produced from the Perry Sand Waterflood Unit, North Segment, located in Yazoo County, Mississipi, at upper tier ceiling prices. In considering the Pennzoil request, the DOE found that the firm had continued to incur increased operating expenses at the Perry Unit, and that, in the absence of continued exception relief, the working interest owners would lack an economic incentive to continue the production of crude oil from the property. On the basis of the operating data which Pennzoil submitted for the most recent fiscal period, the DOE granted exception relief which permitted Pennzoil to sell at upper tier ceiling prices 91.04 percent of the crude oil produced from the Perry Unit for the benefit of the working interest owners for a period of six months.

REMEDIAL ORDERS

Central Oil Company, Raynham, Massachusetts, DRO-0048, motor gasoline; No. 2 heating oil

Central Oil Company filed a Statement of Objections to a Proposed Remedial Order which DOE Region I issued to the firm on April 24, 1978. In the Proposed Remedial Order, the Regional Office found that during 1973 and 1974 Central had charged prices for motor gasoline and No. 2 heating oil that were in excess of the prices permitted under 10 CFR 212.92 and 212.93. The Regional Office therefore proposed that Central be required to refund $53,561.76, plus interest, to its customers. In its Statement of Objections, Central contended that the Proposed Remedial Order should be rescinded in view of the new audit policy of the Office of enforcement. In considering the Objection, the DOE held that the new audit policy did not apply to Central since the firm had been audited prior to the commencement of the new policy. Central also contended that it had made voluntary reductions in the prices of motor gasoline and No. 2 heating oil subsequent to the period in which the overcharges occurred and that these reductions should offset the amount of the required refund. However, the DOE found that there was no evidence that Central had reduced its prices below the prevailing market prices and that reductions had in fact been made for the purpose of making restitution for prior overcharges. Accordingly, the Central Objection was denied and the DOE issued the Proposed Remedial Order as a final Remedial Order.

Don E. Pratt Oil Operations, Hays, Kansas, DRO-0039, crude oil

Don E. Pratt Oil Company filed a Statement of Objections to a Proposed Remedial Order which DOE Region VII issued to the firm on April 7, 1978. In the Proposed Remedial Order, the Regional Office found that Pratt had overcharged its customers in sales of crude oil from 24 properties. In its Objection, Pratt contended that the Proposed Remedial Order failed to adequately inform the firm of the basis for the calculation of the alleged overcharges. In considering the Objection, the DOE found that Pratt had been served with copies of workpapers setting forth the DOE's methodology for computing overcharges. The DOE therefore concluded that Pratt had been given ample opportunity to challenge the Regional Office's findings. However, the DOE found that the Proposed Remedial Order did not contain any provisions setting forth the method or the timing for refunds. The DOE therefore remanded the Proposed Remedial Order to the Regional Office to design a payback schedule that would minimize the disruption of Pratt's ongoing business operations.

PETITION FOR SPECIAL REDRESS

Propane Industrial, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri, DSG-0019, propane

Propane Industrial, Inc. (PII) filed a Petition for Special Redress which, if granted, would result in the issuance of an Order quashing a subpoena that DOE Region VII issued to the firm on December 22, 1977. In considering the Petition, the DOE noted that Section 205.8(h)(4) of the DOE Regulations provides that a preliminary review of a Petition will be made in order to determine whether a reasonable probability exists that

the petitioner will be able to satisfy the criteria for relief. *See* 41 Fed. Reg. 55322 (December 20, 1976). The DOE reviewed the contentions which PII advanced in its Petition and concluded that PII had failed to demonstrate that an immediate review was warranted to correct substantial errors in law, to prevent substantial injury to legal rights, or to cure a gross abuse of administrative discretion. The PII Petition was therefore dismissed.

REQUEST FOR STAY

Petroleum Management, Inc., Wichita, Kansas, DRS-0125, crude oil

Petroleum Management, Inc. (PMI) filed an Application for Stay of a Remedial Order which was issued to the firm by FEA Region VII on April 27, 1977. On October 19, 1978, the DOE denied PMI's Appeal of the Remedial Order with respect to ten of the 12 properties at issue and remanded the Remedial Order for further findings with respect to the two remaining properties. *Petroleum Management, Inc.*, 2 DOE Par. —— (October 19, 1978). If the present request were granted, the refund provisions of the Remedial Order would be stayed pending judicial review. In considering the Application, the DOE found that the approval of stay relief would have an adverse affect upon PMI's customers who are entitled to receive refunds of the overcharges involved. The DOE also concluded that stay relief would frustrate the compelling public interest in securing timely compliance with DOE regulations. Accordingly, the Application for Stay was denied.

DISMISSALS

The following submissions were dismissed following a statement by the applicant indicating that the relief requested was no longer needed:

American Petrofina, Inc, Washington, D.C., DEE-0867
Armstrong Gas, Inc., Fort Myers, Florida, DRC-0008
Wallace B. Jayred, Houston, Texas, DEE-1985

The following submission was dismissed for failure to correct deficiencies in the firms's filing as required by the DOE Procedural Regulations:

KE-LA-DA Enterprises, Inc., Archie, Missouri, DEE-1790

Copies of the full text of these Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Docket Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room B-120, 2000 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20461, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., e.s.t., except Federal holidays. They are also available in *Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines*, a commercially published loose leaf reporter system.

MELVIN GOLDSTEIN,
Director,
Office of Hearings and Appeals.

FEBRUARY 16, 1979.

[FR Doc. 79-5670 Filed 2-23-79; 8:45 am]

[6450-01-M]

ISSUANCE OF DECISIONS AND ORDERS

Week of December 26 through December 29, 1978

Notice is hereby given that during the week of December 26 through December 29, 1978, the Decisions and Orders summarized below were issued with respect to Appeals and Applications for Exception or other relief filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy. The following summary also contains a list of submissions that were dismissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals and the basis for the dismissal.

APPEALS

Leigh Hauter, Falls Church, Virginia, DFA-0258, Freedom of Information

Leigh Hauter appealed from a denial of a request for information that he had submitted under the Freedom of Information Act (the FOIA). In his request Hauter had sought the release of all documents held by the DOE that contained any reference to him. The Information Access Officer identified two drafts of an intra-agency memorandum and a transcript of information received and recorded by the Energy Operations Center, as being responsive to Hauter's request. However, the documents were withheld from Hauter on the grounds that they were exempt under the provisions of Section 552(b)(5) of the FOIA. In considering Hauter's Appeal, the DOE determined that the documents were pre-decisional, intra-agency communications the disclosure of which could impair the quality of agency decisions. The DOE therefore held that this material was properly withheld under Section 552(b)(5) of the FOIA and the Hauter Appeal was denied.

Riddle Oil Company, et al., Dallas, Texas, DFA-0256, Freedom of Information

Riddle Oil Company, *et al.* (Riddle) appealed from an order isued by the DOE Information Access Officer on October 25, 1978 denying in part a request for information that Riddle had filed under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552 (the FOI Act). In response to the request, the Information Access Officer withheld all or part of twenty-eight documents on the grounds that they were exempt from mandatory disclosure under the provisions of Sections 552(b)(4), 552(b)(5), 552(b)(7)(A) or 552(b)(7)(B) of the FOI Act. In considering the Appeal, the DOE noted that Riddle and the other appellants, were the working interest owners of the J. P. Little, Bracero Transportation Company and Holdsworth A Leases, and in that capacity should have access to audit workpapers relating to those leases. In addition, the DOE determined that some of the information contained in the documents withheld in the October 25 Order was already in the public domain and was therefore no longer confidential. Accordingly, the DOE directed that this material be released. However, the DOE determined that two documents and portions of seven others were properly withheld under Sections 552(b)(4) or 552(b)(5). In addition, the DOE rejected Riddle's contention that the October 25 Order was erroneous because it was signed by the Director of the Division of Freedom of Information and Privacy Act Activities rather than by the Information Access Officer. Finally, the DOE rejected Riddle's contentions that the October 25 Order failed to describe adequately the documents withheld or to state adequately the grounds for invoking the statutory exemptions. The Riddle Appeal was therefore granted in part and denied in part.

REQUEST FOR EXCEPTION

Sentry Refining, Inc., Corpus Christi, Texas, DEE-1459, crude oil

Sentry Refining, Inc. filed an Application for Exception in which it requested additional entitlement benefits with respect to the low gravity California crude oil that it processes in its Corpus Christi, Texas refinery. The DOE noted that the issues raised by Sentry had been considered at length in a Decision and Order issued to the Commonwealth Oil Refining Company, Inc. (Corco) and that in that decision the DOE had approved exception relief of an analogous type. *Commonwealth Oil Refining Co., Inc.*, 2 DOE Par. 81,069 (1978). After reviewing the Sentry submission, the DOE determined that the conclusions reached in the *Corco Decision* with regard to the need to provide an additional market for certain low gravity California crude oil through the exceptions process also applied in this case. Accordingly, an excpetion was granted to Sentry, and the firm was authorized to receive $4.57 in additional entitlement benefits for each barrel of low gravity, high sulfur Santa Maria Valley crude oil that it processes in its refinery. The DOE also observed, however, that the market for California crude oil has improved substantially in recent months as a result of a number of factors, including the approval of exception relief, and consequently future exceptions of this type would be approved on an extremely limited basis.

REQUEST FOR STAY

Tosco Corporation, Los Angeles, California, DES-1910, motor gasoline

Tosco Corporation filed an Application for Stay of certain provisions of Section 212.83 (the refiner price rule) pending a determination on the merits of an Application for Exception that it had filed. In that exception application Tosco requested an extension of exception relief previously granted to the firm. *See Tosco Corp.*, 1 DOE Par. 80,193 (1978). In particular, Tosco requested that it be permitted to treat the prices established in certain variable price contracts as its May 15, 1973 prices for purposes of computing its maximum allowable selling prices for motor gasoline to two of its classes of purchaser. In considering the stay request, the DOE determined that it would be desirable to maintain the *status quo ante* pending a decision on the Application for Exception. The DOE found that denial of the stay request could result in an irreparable injury to the firm, while approval of the request would not result in comparable injury to other affected persons. Based on this finding, and taking into consideration the determination in the previous excpetion proceeding, the DOE concluded that the Tosco Application for Stay should be approved.

REQUEST FOR TEMPORARY STAY

Schulze Processing, Inc., Washington, D.C., DST-0012, crude oil

Schulze Processing, Inc. filed an Application for Temporary Stay in which it requested that its obligation to purchase entitlements in the amount specified in the Entitlements Notice for October 1978 be suspended pending a final determination on an Appeal that it had filed of that Notice. In considering the Schulze request, the DOE found that the financial material provided by the firm generally supported the claim the Schulze would incur an irreparable injury if it were required to satisfy immediately the entitlement purchase obligation specified in the October Entitlements Notice. The DOE also found that the contentions raised by Schulze regarding the propriety of the method by which its October entitlement purchase obligation was determined were substantial and warranted further analysis. Finally, the DOE observed that it could adjust in future months the entitlement obligation of Schulze and effectively compensate other firms unable to sell entitlements, and consequently no significant harm would be incurred by third parties as a result of approval of a temporary stay. The Schulze Application for Temporary Stay was therefore granted.

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER

Edgington Oil Company, Los Angeles, California, DEX-0134, crude oil

On December 6, 1978, the DOE issued a Proposed Decision and Order to Edgington Oil Company, granting in part the firm's request for an exception from the provisions of the Entitlements Program (10 CFR 211.67). Subsequent to that date, the Office of Hearings and Appeals discovered a computational error in the data on which the level of exception relief granted to the firm was based. The DOE therefore recalculated the level of exception relief and modified the December 6, 1978 Proposed Decision and Order to reflect the correct data.

DISMISSAL

The following submission was dismissed following a statement by the applicant indicating that the relief requested was no longer needed:

Craft Petroleum Company, Jackson, Mississippi, DEE-1560

Copies of the full text of these Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Docket Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room B-120, 2000 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20461, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., e.s.t., except Federal holidays. They are also available in *Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines*, a commercially published loose leaf reporter system.

MELVIN GOLDSTEIN,
Director,
Office of Hearings and Appeals.

FEBRUARY 16, 1979.

[FR Doc. 79-5673 Filed 2-23-79; 8:45 am]

[4110-87-M]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service

Center for Disease Control

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH FIELD RESEARCH PROJECT

Initiation

AGENCY: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). Center for Disease Control, PHS, HEW.

ACTION: Notice of Research Project Initiation.

SUMMARY: NIOSH announces that it is ready to begin data collection on a field research project entitled "Reproductive History Study of Workers Exposed to Carbon Disulfide". Carbon disulfide is a colorless, volatile liquid with excellent solvent properties. The substance is used in the production of viscose rayon and cellophane. This project is part of the NIOSH industrywide research effort conducted under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

This notice does not constitute a request for proposal.

DATES: Field work is scheduled to begin on or about April 9, 1979.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sherry G. Selevan, Division of Surveillance, Hazard Evaluations and Field Studies; NIOSH, Robert A. Taft Laboratories, 4676 Columbia Parkway, Cincinnati, Ohio 45226 Telephone: (513) 684-2761.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 20, 1978, NIOSH published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (43 FR 42306) a list of field research projects scheduled for initiation in calendar year 1978. That notice stated that more specific information would be provided to the public 6 weeks before starting field work on any of the proposed projects. On December 20, 1978 NIOSH published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (43 FR 59442) a notice announcing that data collection for a research project entitled "Cross-sectional Medical Study of Workers Exposed to Carbon Disulfide" would begin on or about February 15, 1979. Field investigation and data collection on the following study will begin on or about April 9, 1979 and will be conducted simultaneously with the medical study announced on December 20.

Title: Reproductive History Study of Workers Exposed to Carbon Disulfide.

Project Officer: Sherry G. Selevan, Division of Surveillance, Hazard Evaluations and Field Studies, NIOSH.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to determine what, if any, adverse pregnancy outcomes occur in the families of workers exposed to carbon disulfide.

Background: Reports from the Soviet Union, Romania and Italy, suggest that carbon disulfide has reproductive effects on both men and women. Early reports, in 1931 and 1928, reported abnormal sexual function, loss of sex drive and impotence in male workers.

Clinical observations of male workers with carbon disulfide intoxication in Italy (1956) mentioned that 17 of 100 observed cases spontaneously reported sexual dysfunction, the severity of which correlated with patients' overall symptoms.

In 1969 Romanian researchers reported the results of an analysis of semen of 31 exposed men with chronic carbon disulfide poisoning and that of an equal number of unexposed men. Twenty-five percent of the expose workers had some sperm abnormality. Data from questionnaires given to the exposed workers also indicates changes in sexual function for 78 percent.

This study was planned to examine male exposure to carbon disulfide and pregnancy outcome in the wives of these male workers.

Study Description: The proposed study group will consit of approximately 300 workers from a viscose rayon plant. A comparison group of 300 workers will be chosen using a stratified random selection with the stratification on age and sex. The wives of these 600 workers will be interviewed using a questionnaire covering demographic data, occupational history and reproductive history. Individual participation in this study is on a voluntary basis. These data will be combined with work history data obtained from the husbands to get a complete view of the effects of occupational exposures from both the husband and the wife.

The NIOSH field research project described above will be conducted under the authority of Section 20 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 669) and in accordance with the provision of Part 85a of Title 42, Code of Federal Regulations. The protocol for this type of project has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget and determined to be in compliance with the Federal Reports Act.

Dated: February 7, 1979.

ANTHONY ROBBINS,
Director, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 79-5739 Filed 2-23-79; 8:45 am]