are insured by a Federal agency or a service corporation thereof and the seller."

6. Amend § 545.7–6 by removing the phrase "mobile home(s)" wherever it appears and replacing it with the phrase "manufactured home(s)."

§ 545.9–1 [Amended]

7. Amend paragraph (c)(1)(i) of § 545.9–1 by removing the phrase "mobile homes" and replacing it with the phrase "manufactured homes.".

SUBCHAPTER F—SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES

PART 584—REGULATED ACTIVITIES

§ 584.2–1 [Amended]

8. Revise paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of § 584.2–1 by removing the phrase "mobile home" and replacing it with the phrase "manufactured home".

(Home Owners' Loan Act Section 5(c), 12 U.S.C. 1464(c), as amended by Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act § 401, 94 Stat. 153)

By the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

J. J. Finn,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 81–34429 Filed 11–30–81; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6720–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 148

[Docket No. 81N–0272]

Quick Frozen Blueberries; Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Possible Establishment of a Standard

Correction

In FR Doc. 81–30470, appearing at page 51926 in the issue of Friday, October 23, 1981, the designation "CAC/RS 103–1978" should have appeared above the heading "Recommended International Standard for Quick Frozen Blueberries" in the second column of page 51927.

BILLING CODE 1505–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

21 CFR Part 193

[FAP 5H5097/P73B; PH–FRL–1994–3]

Diquat; Proposed Food Additive Regulation

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This notice reproposes that 21 CFR 193.160 be amended by extending the current regulation to permit additional uses of diquat in reservoirs, marshes, bayous, drainage ditches, canals, rivers, and streams that are quiescent or slow-moving with a tolerance limitation of 0.01 part per million for diquat in potable water. The proposal was submitted by the Department of the Army. This amendment to the regulations would establish the maximum permissible level for residues of diquat in potable water.

DATE: Written comments must be received on or before February 1, 1982.

ADDRESS: Written comments to: Richard F. Mountfort, Product Manager (PM) 23, Registration Division (TS–767C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW, Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard F. Mountfort (703–557–1830).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA issued a notice that published in the **Federal Register** of March 5, 1981 (46 FR 15281) that the Department of the Army and Chevron Chemical Co. had petitioned the EPA to establish a regulation permitting residues of diquat in potable water.

The notice proposed that Subpart A of 21 CFR Part 193 be amended by revising § 193.160 to read as follows:

§ 193.160 Diquat.

(a) A tolerance of 0.01 ppm is established for residues of the herbicide diquat (6,7-dihydrodipyrido (1,2-a:2',1'-c) pyrazidiinium) derived from application of the dibromide salt in potable water resulting from the application of the pesticide for control of aquatic weeds in ponds, lakes, reservoirs, marshes, bayous, drainage ditches, canals, streams, and rivers which are slow-moving or quiescent in programs of the Corps of Engineers or other federal or State public agencies. These agencies or contractors under their direct control will make certain that the treated water will not be used for animal consumption, swimming, spraying, domestic purposes, or for irrigation for 14 days post-treatment or until approved analysis shows that the water does not contain more than 0.01 ppm of diquat (calculated as the cation) and that no treatment will be made where commercial processing of fish is practiced.

(b) A tolerance of 0.01 ppm is established for residues of the herbicide diquat (6,7-dihydrodipyrido (1,2-a:2',1'-c) pyrazidiinium) (calculated as the cation) derived from application of the dibromide salt in potable water resulting from the application of the pesticide in ponds, lakes, and drainage ditches where there is little or no outflow of water and which are totally under the control of the user. The applicator will make certain that treated water will not be used for animal consumption, swimming, spraying, irrigation, or domestic purposes for 14 days posttreatment. These applications of diquat are not to be used in aquatic sites in Florida.

A correction document was published in the **Federal Register** of April 22, 1981 (46 FR 22907).

No requests for referral to an advisory committee were received in response to this notice of proposed rulemaking.

Comments on the proposed rule were received from twenty different parties. Four of the commenters expressed support of the proposed rule without reservation. The remaining sixteen commenters expressed support for establishing the rule, but stated reservations about the text at several places in the proposal. The major issues revolved around the following three points:

(1) Ten commenters requested clarification of the restriction under § 193.160(a) concerning commercial processing of fish. The restriction is included because the Agency has residue data showing higher levels of diquat in fish viscera than in the edible portions for which the tolerance is intended. The Agency is concerned that the viscera residues will concentrate during processing to fish protein concentrate or fish meal. However, the Agency is not attempting to limit diquat use in situations where private or commercial fishing occurs. The Agency has, therefore, clarified the restriction to read: "* * * no treatment will be made where commercial processing of fish, resulting in the production of fish protein concentrate is fish meal, is practiced."

(2) Eleven commenters opposed or requested clarification of the restriction under § 193.160(b) prohibiting private applicator use of diquat in ponds, lakes, and drainage ditches in Florida. Two commenters cited diquat's propensity to bind readily to soil particles. They reasoned that this property would mitigate against diquat residues transferring from treated sites to other bodies of water. Private use of diquat in aquatic situations is acceptable where the user can follow label directions prescribed to assure that residues in drinking water, irrigated crops, fish and shellfish are within established limits. The Agency considers all bodies of water in Florida to be interconnected because of the high water table. The Agency does not, therefore, consider any body of water to be totally under control of the user. One commenter suggested that "totally" be omitted from the restriction because it implies the absolute. The Agency does not believe that omitting the word "totally" would

change the sense of the restriction, which is that the applicators have control of the treated water. We do believe the term is useful in reinforcing our intent to restrict private applicator use of diquat in lakes, ponds, and drainage ditches and thus, have retained it with this reproposal. The restriction will not prohibit the use of diquat in any aquatic site in Florida. It will limit diquat use in Florida to persons described under paragraph § 193.160(a). The Agency will reconsider the restriction if adequate data from field trials or documented evidence from actual use are presented to show that diquat residues will not transfer through the shallow water aquifers typical of Florida (particularly sandy soils). The Agency is modifying the restriction so that it clearly applies to private applicator use as follows: "§ 193.160(b) * * * "For the purposes of this paragraph only [§ 193.160(b)], these applications of diquat are not to be used in aquatic sites in Florida."

(3) Five commenters requested addition of the category licensed or certified applicators to the user groups cited under § 193.160 (a) (licensees of Federal or State public agencies). These commenters were concerned that the proposed languge was too restrictive with regard to who could apply diquat to the listed aquatic sites under such programs. The Agency's position is that appropriate Federal or State agencies administering public water management programs should determine which categories or groups of applicators are qualified and can adhere to the restrictions on diquat aquatic use described in § 193.169(a).

Water management district personnel, municipal officials, applicators certified for aquatic pesticides use and other trained, experienced applicators may be eligible as licensees. The agency concludes that addition of the category licensed applicators would be consistent with the regulation described in § 193.160(a). The pertinent language, therefore, is revised to read as follows: "§ 193.160(a) xxx. These agencies or contractors or licensees under their direct control xxx". The proposed tolerance represents 12.73 percent of the maximal permitted intake (MPI) for diquat residues. These values are based on a no-observable-effect level (NOEL) of 10 ppm (0.5 mg/kg of body weight; 2-year rat feeding study), a safety factor of 100, and an MPI of 0.3000 mg/day for a 60 kg person. Since the production of cataracts in experimental animals is the most sensitive indicator of diquat toxicity, the NOEL quoted above is the noncataractogenic level.

The evaluation of the scientific data supporting this proposed regulation is presented in the **Federal Register** of March 5, 1981 (46 FR 15281).

As discussed in the Agency's proposal of March 5, 1981, the Agency will, at a later date, establish regulations under the Safe Drinking Water Act to limit concentrations of pesticides in drinking water. Until these regulations are established, the Agency will continue to rely on food additive tolerances established under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to describe limits on residues in drinking water resulting from direct applications of pesticides in aquatic situations. The establishment of a diquat tolerance for potable water is not intended to substitute for, nor will it preclude the subsequent development, if necessary, of a national drinking water standard (Maximum Containment Level (MCL)) for this chemical, nor would it necessarily determine what the MCL would be.

It is concluded that the pesticide may be safely used in the prescribed manner when such use is in accordance with the prescribed label and labeling registered pursuant to FIFRA, as amended (86 Stat. 973, 89 Stat. 751; U.S.C. 135(a) *et seq.*). Therefore, it is proposed that 21 CFR 193.160 be amended as set forth below.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed regulation. The comments must bear a notation indicating both the subject and the petition and document control number "[FAP 5H5097/P73B]". All written comments filed in response to this notice of proposed rulemaking will be available for public inspection in the office of Richard Mountfort from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

As required by Executive Order 12291, EPA has determined that this proposed rule is not a "Major" rule and therefore does not require a Regulatory Impact Analysis. In addition, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this proposal from the OMB review requirements of Executive Order 12291, pursuant to section 8(b) of that Order.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-534, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new food and feed additive levels, or conditions for safe use of additives, or raising such food and feed additive levels do not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the **Federal Register** of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24945).

(Sec. 409(c)(1), 72 Stat. 1786; (21 U.S.C. 346(c)(1))).

Dated: November 16, 1981.

Edwin L. Johnson,

Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

PART 193—TOLERANCES FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD ADMINISTERED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Therefore, it is proposed that 21 CFR 193.160 be revised to read as follows:

§ 193.160 Diquat.

(a) A tolerance of 0.01 ppm is established for residues of the herbicide diquat (6,7-dihydrodipyrido (1,2-a:2',1'-c) pyrazidiinium) derived from application of the dibromide salt in potable water resulting from the application of the pesticide for control of aquatic weeds in ponds, lakes, reservoirs, marshes, bayous, drainage ditches, canals, streams, and rivers which are slow-moving or quiescent in programs of the Corps of Engineers or other Federal or State public agencies. These agencies or contractors or licensees under their direct control will make certain that the treated water will not be used for animal consumption, swimming, spraying, domestic purposes, or for irrigation for 14 days posttreatment or until approved analysis shows that the water does not contain more than 0.01 ppm of diquat (calculated as the cation) and that no treatment will be made where commercial processing of fish, resulting in the production of fish protein concentrate or fish meal, is practiced.

(b) A tolerance of 0.01 ppm is established for residues of the herbicide diquat (6,7-dihydrodipyrido (1,2-a:2',1'-c) pyrazidiinium) (calculated as the cation) derived from application of the dibromide salt in potable water resulting from the application of the pesticide in ponds, lakes, and drainage ditches where there is little or no outflow of water and which are totally under control of the user. The applicator will make certain that treated water will not be used for animal consumption, swimming, spraying, irrigation, or domestic purposes for 14 days posttreatment. For the purposes of this paragraph only [§ 193.160(b)] these applications of diquat are not to be used in aquatic sites in Florida.

[FR Doc. 81-34410 Filed 11-30-81; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-32-M

40 CFR Part 141

[WH-FRL-1938-2]

Maximum Contaminant Levels for Fluoride

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or the Agency).

ACTION: Response to petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: On June 4, 1981, the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(e) filed a petition requesting that EPA exercise its rulemaking authority by repeal of 40 CFR 141.11(c), that portion of the National Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulations establishing Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) for fluoride. The Administrator hereby acknowledges receipt of the petition and agrees to consider the actions proposed by the petitioners as part of the process of developing Revised National Primary Drinking Water Regulations under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph A. Cotruvo, Director, Criteria and Standards Division, Office of Drinking Water (WH-550), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, 202/472-5016.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Petition

The petition filed by the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control seeks repeal of the National Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulations for Fluoride, 40 CFR 141.11(c). The petitioner contends that: (1) The costs of reducing fluoride levels in water supplies with naturally high fluoride content is prohibitive and in excess of the supposed benefits and (2) fluoride in public water supplies does not present a health hazard.

The petitioner commissioned a study of fluoride reduction alternatives for forty-three South Carolina community water supplies. On the basis of results from that study, petitioner has concluded that the costs of fluoride reduction would make compliance with the current regulations economically burdensome. A copy of the report of the commissioned study was filed with the EPA Regional Office in Atlanta, Georgia. The petitioner noted that the costs of fluoride reduction, as determined by the study, are much higher than the cost estimates relied upon by EPA at the time of promulgation of the fluoride regulations in 1975.

The petitioner also submits that fluorosis, the visible effect of elevated fluoride levels, is not an adverse health effect that should be regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Rather, the petitioner maintains that fluorosis is essentially an aesthetic effect, and therefore should not be controlled by a national drinking water regulation. Petitioner asserts that fluoride should be controlled only by a secondary drinking water regulation, pending further study of the medical and economic aspects of fluoride removal from drinking water. Secondary drinking water regulations are intended to specify maximum contaminant levels that are requisite to protect the public welfare, and are not Federally enforceable.

II. Agency Action in Response to Petition

A. Background

During the development of the National Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulations, EPA consulted the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, specifically the National Institute of Dental Research, the Division of Dental Health and the Deputy Surgeon General on the effects of fluoride in drinking water. EPA sought to ascertain whether fluoride should be included as a health-related contaminant, and if so, at what levels.

Acting upon the advice of the Surgeon General, EPA categorized dental fluorosis in its more severe forms as an adverse health effect. In addition to staining of dental enamel, severe fluorosis is characterized by pitting and flaking of dental enamel.

At the time of its development the 1975 National Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulation for fluoride was designed to be protective against the more severe levels of fluorosis and not against the merely cosmetic staining that also occurs. As the amount of fluoride in drinking water is increased, the incidence of all levels of fluorosis increases, including the more severe form. It is believed that the extent of the various degrees of dental fluorosis is a function of the amount of fluoride exposure during the years when tooth enamel generation is occurring, roughly up to ages 8 to 10.

B. Revised National Primary Drinking Water Regulations

The Agency has been actively attempting to resolve these questions and will continue to address the issues during the development of Revised Primary Drinking Water Regulations.

1. *Epidemiology Studies.* To reevaluate the issue regarding fluoride health effects, EPA has funded two epidemiology studies. A third epidemiology study, funded by the National Institute of Dental Research, has a similar goal—to determine if fluoride naturally occurring in drinking water causes adverse effects, and if so, at what levels.

After some delay, the study in Texas is now nearing completion, and the final report is scheduled for delivery in February 1982. The objectives of the project are the identification of the significant dental effects which occur in a specific age strata of a human population and the relationship of these to consumption of water containing natural fluorides and other sources of fluoride. Another aspect of the Texas project involves a survey of public opinion, in which participants will provide their perception of the problems related to dental fluorosis.

As an expansion of the Texas epidemiologic study, another project is intended to assess the benefits of normal dentition as compared to costs associated with fluorosed teeth. This study will examine caries incidence versus fluoride levels and fluorosis occurrence, and the costs of corrective dental care for caries and fluorosis.

The study in South Carolina conducted by the State of South Carolina and support by EPA funds, and submitted in support of the petition, is as yet unreported in the scientific literature and therefore has not yet undergone peer review. However, the study did show that moderate and severe fluorosis, the type associated with physiological damage to teeth, had been detected apparently as frequently as reported in the earlier literature.

The National Institute of Dental Research (NIDR) study, carried out in Illinois, is also nearing completion. In this investigation, dental caries experience and the prevalence and severity of dental fluorosis is being assessed among children who have consumed continually since birth, drinking water containing natural fluoride at two, three or four times the concentrations currently recommended as optimal by the U.S. Public Health Service for reducing dental caries for the specific geographic area. In addition to the conventional criteria used in diagnosing fluorosis, which involve an index based on the condition of the most affected teeth, NIDR will also utilize criteria which involve the most visible teeth, in an effort to assess the sociological impact and the aesthetic aspects of fluorosis.

All of the reports from these studies will be subject to formal peer review by a cross section of interested institutions. EPA will seek advice on the physiological effects of fluoride in water from experts in the field including the

Surgeon General, the American Dental Association and State authorities. The evaluations resulting from the review process will contribute significantly to the reapparisal of fluoride's status in revised drinking water regulations by providing an understanding of the frequency, extent and effect of dental fluorosis, and the effect of fluoride in water on dental caries.

2. *Treatment Options and Costs.* In the area of fluoride treatment and associated costs, EPA has underway a number of projects having a direct bearing on the issue raised by the petitioner. These projects include:

(a) Field studies of treatment processes including activated alumina and reverse osmosis, for the removal of inorganic contaminants from water.

(b) An evaluation of operating costs and effectiveness of low and highpressure reverse osmosis for the removal of specific contaminants, including fluoride, from drinking water.

(c) A project involving the use of a mobile pilot plant to evaluate and compare ion exchange, reverse osmosis and activited alumina for the removal of fluoride and other ground-water contaminants.

(d) Evaluation of performance and cost of full-scale treatment facilities for the removal of fluoride by activated alumina.

(e) Comparative evaluation of full-scale and individual fluoride removal systems, involving cost and efficacy evaluations in both existing and new installations.

(f) In addition to the data generated by EPA studies, data from existing fluoride removal plants are being compiled so that up-to-date actual cost figures will be available.

C. Decision of the Administrator

EPA hereby acknowledges receipt of the petition from the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. EPA will review the information supplied by the petitioner, along with all information related to the health effects of elevated fluoride levels and treatment costs during its ongoing regulatory development process. The objective of this process is to develop Revised Primary Drinking Water Regulations. The development of Revised Primary Drinking Water Regulations is already underway.

The present target date for comprehensive proposed Revised Primary Drinking Water Regulations is the fall of 1983. However, in response to the petition, EPA will accelerate the development process for the fluoride portion of those regulations and will make a decision regarding revised fluoride regulations as soon as the current epidemiology studies are completed, reported, and reviewed, and revised treatment and economic impact assessments are completed. The current schedule would allow a decision in approximately August of 1982.

Dated: November 17, 1981.

Anne M. Gorsuch,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 81-34233 Filed 11-30-81; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-38-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

43 CFR Subtitle A

Prohibition of Flood Insurance for Undeveloped Coastal Barriers

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent to issue proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of the Interior intends to issue a proposed rule on or about August 13, 1982, which will delineate those coastal barriers along the Atlantic Coast and Gulf of Mexico which are determined to be undeveloped and unprotected as defined in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) of 1981. He will also issue a proposed definitional framework which amplifies the language of the Act and provides the basis for consistent and accurate delineation of boundaries. Data summaries on each designated unit will accompany the maps. The Secretary will take this action pursuant to Title III, Part 4 of OBRA, which requires that he designate those coastal barriers which are undeveloped so that no new Federal flood insurance shall be provided on or before October 1, 1983 for any new construction or substantial improvements of structures located on those undeveloped coastal barriers. The draft definitional framework will be made available for review and comment on December 8, 1981. The draft maps and data summaries will be made available on January 15, 1982 for a 60-day comment period. Comments on the draft definitional framework, maps and data summaries should be received prior to the close of the comment period on March 15, 1982. Proposed designations for submission to the Congress will be based on the actual-on-the-ground conditions in existence as of this date, March 15, 1982.

DATES:

Draft definitions to be released for public review and comment on or about: December 8, 1981.

Draft maps and data summaries to be released for public review and comment on or about: January 15, 1982.

Comments on the definitions, maps and data summaries to be received on or before: March 15, 1982.

On-the-ground conditions for proposed designations established as of this date: March 15, 1982.

Proposed designations and Report to Congress: August 13, 1982.

Final designations: October 15, 1982.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Ric Davidge, Chairman, Coastal Barriers Task Force, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, (202-343-5347).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 13, 1981, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act was enacted. Title III, Part 4 of this legislation concerned Flood, Crime, and Riot Insurance. Within that Part, section 341, subsections (a)-(c) and (e), amended specific portions of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. Section 341, subsection (d)(1) of that Act, also amended the National Flood Insurance Act by adding a new section. That new section, section 1321(a)-(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act, is entitled "Undeveloped Coastal Barriers". Section 341, subsection (d)(2) of OBRA while not an amendment to the National Flood Insurance Act, also establishes responsibilities within the Department of the Interior with regard to undeveloped coastal barriers.

This document is to provide a notice of the procedure and methodology with which the Department of the Interior intends to develop and implement its responsibilities under new section 1321 of the National Flood Insurance Act to designate undeveloped coastal barriers and its responsibilities with regard to section 341(d)(2) of OBRA to conduct a study of undeveloped coastal barriers. This notice identifies the key responsibilities established by this legislation and advises the public where additional information may be obtained and where comments should be sent. It is also designed to identify a process through which the Department of the Interior will consider the requirements of the Executive Order on Federal Regulation, E.O. 12291; the Regulatory Flexibility Act; the Paperwork Act of 1980; the National Environmental Policy Act, as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality and by this

Department; and, Departmental regulations.

New section 1321 of the National Flood Insurance Act—entitled *Undeveloped Coastal Barriers*—establishes limits on the availability of flood insurance with regard to certain undeveloped coastal barriers. Subsection (a) provides that "(no) new flood insurance coverage shall be provided under this title on or before October 1, 1983, for any new construction or substantial improvements of structures located on undeveloped coastal barriers which shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior." All flood insurance issued prior to that date will remain in effect regardless of location. The exclusion on flood insurance coverage will only be applicable to new construction or substantial improvements after October 1, 1983, on undeveloped coastal barriers, as designated by the Secretary of the Interior. Subsection (b), and its legislative history, provide definitions of the term "coastal barrier" and the word "undeveloped". This subsection also provides that certain already protected coastal barriers shall be excepted from these definitions and shall not be designated. These provisions will be implemented in the following manner.

First, the Department has determined that implementation of this new section will require the development of a definitional framework in order to designate undeveloped coastal barriers with precision. This effort has been initiated within the Department. The Department intends to further refine the statutory definition of terms "coastal barrier", "undeveloped", and similar terms within the latitude afforded by this legislation and its legislative history prior to final designation of undeveloped coastal barriers.

Second, the Department intends to integrate into the process of developing this definitional framework, and designations of undeveloped coastal barriers the requirements of E.O. 12291, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, and the National Enironmental Policy Act to the degree they are applicable.

Third, the Department has also determined that public participation in the development of draft definitional framework, maps and data summaries will be beneficial. Accordingly, the Department has issued this Notice and will provide the public with a minimum of a 60 day comment period on draft maps and data summaries and will take additional steps to assure public participation during that comment period. In addition, the draft definitional framework will be made available to members of Congress, State and local officials and the public on or about December 8, 1981.

Fourth, it is contemplated that draft maps (indicating application of the draft definitional framework to coastal barriers) and data summaries will be available for public review and comment on or about January 15, 1982. The boundaries of undeveloped coastal barriers will be based upon the best data available to the Department at the time of printing. It is expected, however, that updating of that data both by the Department and the public will be necessary. The Department intends to develop proposed designations for submission to Congress based on actual on-the-ground conditions in existence at the close of the comment period. This is presently scheduled to be March 15, 1982. This approach means that changes in the geomorphic status or development status of potential undeveloped coastal barriers will be taken into consideration as of that date. To facilitate this process, comments submitted within one week after the close of the comment period will be accepted to ensure that the Department has the most accurate information possible as of that point in time. This approach is necessary to ensure that proposed designations can be provided the Congress in a timely manner.

Fifth, the Department intends to issue a final definitional framework and final designations in the fall of 1982. These final designations will follow transmission of the proposed delineations and the study to Congress as required by section 341(d)(2) of OBRA. These designations will be based on the definitional concepts adopted, after public comment, to implement the law.

The second component of the Department of the Interior's responsibilities with regard to undeveloped coastal barriers as provided by the terms of the OBRA is the study required by section 341(d)(2) of that Act. That provision requires that:

> (2) The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a study for the purpose of designating the undeveloped coastal barriers which will be affected by the amendment made by paragraph (1). Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress a report of the findings and conclusions of such study together with a proposed designation of the undeveloped coastal barriers and any recommendation regarding the definition of the term "coastal barrier" as enacted by such amendment.

This study shall be conducted as a part of the process of developing definitions and designations as discussed above. It will also be closely integrated with the NEPA process. A significant portion of this study will be based upon new information received as a result of comments on the draft maps and definitions issued earlier and from other sources. As required by law, this study (including recommendations regarding the definition of the term "coastal barrier" and "undeveloped" if any) and the Department's proposed definitions and designations—as they may be revised following the close of the public review and comment period—will be provided to the Congress prior to August 13, 1982. Further public review and comment will also be provided at that time. Transmission of the study and proposed designations to the Congress will, in essence, provide the public with a second comment period prior to final designation.

G. Ray Arnett,

Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

[FR Doc. 81-34355 Filed 11-30-81; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-10-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 81

[Docket No. 81-657]

Vessel Traffic Service System (VTS) Communications in the Houston VTS Area; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a proposed rule on the Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) System communication in the Houston VTS area that appeared at page 50573 in the **Federal Register** of Wednesday, October 14, 1981 (46 FR 50573). The action is necessary to correct typographical errors in the west longitudes in the Appendix.

ADDRESS: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda R. Figueroa, Private Radio Bureau, (202) 632-7175.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Errata, PR Docket No. 81-657

Released: November 18, 1981.

In the matter of amendment of Parts 81 and 83 of the rules to make the frequency 156.55 MHz available exclusively for Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) communications in the Houston VTS radio protected area.