

of meats, prepared meats, and meat products, be revised as set forth below.

PART 54—MEATS, PREPARED MEATS, AND MEAT PRODUCTS (GRADING, CERTIFICATION, AND STANDARDS)

1. The authority citation for Part 54 reads as follows:

Authority: Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, secs. 203, 205, as amended; 60 Stat. 1087, 1090, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1622 and 1624).

2. 7 CFR 54.6(c)(2) and 54.27(b) are revised to read as follows:

§ 54.6 How to obtain service.

(c) Request by applicant for service

(2) *Commitment.* If desired, the applicant may request to enter into an agreement with the Agricultural Marketing Service for the furnishing of service on a weekly commitment basis, whereby the applicant agrees to pay for 8 hours of service per day, 5 days per week, Monday through Friday, excluding Federal legal holidays occurring Monday through Friday on which no grading and certification services are performed, as provided in § 54.27(b), and the Agricultural Marketing Service agrees to make an official grader available to perform such service for the applicant. However, the Agricultural Marketing Service reserves the right to use any grader assigned to a plant under such a commitment to perform service for other applicants when, in the opinion of the Chief, the grader is not needed to perform service for the commitment applicant. An applicant who terminates a commitment, and within 1 year after cancellation is granted a new commitment at his request, shall pay for the moving costs actually incurred by the Agricultural Marketing Service to cover the transfer of the grader who will service the applicant's new commitment. If more than one applicant is involved in the reapplication for a cancelled meat grading and certification commitment requiring the transfer of the grader, the moving costs will be prorated among the applicants according to each applicant's committed portion of the grader's services. However, the moving costs will be charged only to those applicants who were parties to the previously cancelled commitment. An applicant may, for periods of 3 months or less, enter into an agreement by memorandum with the Agricultural Marketing Service for the furnishing of service on a weekly basis. In the latter case, transfer of graders would not be involved and charges will be made in accordance with § 54.27.

§ 54.27 Fees and other charges for service.

(b) *Fees for Service on Commitment Basis.* Minimum fees for service performed under a commitment agreement shall be on the basis of 8 hours per day, Monday through Friday, excluding Federal legal holidays occurring Monday through Friday on which no grading and certification services are performed, calculated at the hourly rates in accordance with paragraph (a) of this section. Hours worked on Saturdays, Sundays, Federal legal holidays, and in excess of 8 hours per day will be charged at the appropriate hourly rate in accordance with paragraph (a) of this section. The Agricultural Marketing Service reserves the right under such a commitment to use any grader assigned to the plant on a commitment basis to perform service for other applicants as provided in § 54.6(c), crediting the commitment applicant with the number of hours charged to the other applicant, provided the allowable credit hours, plus hours actually worked for the applicants, do not exceed 8 hours on any day, Monday through Friday, excluding all Federal legal holidays.

Done at Washington, D.C.: July 6, 1982.
Eddie F. Kimbrell,
Deputy Administrator, Commodity Services.
[FR Doc. 82-18705 Filed 7-9-82; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410-02-M

7 CFR Parts 1011, 1046, and 1098

[Docket Nos. AO-251-A23, AO-123-A48, and AO-184-A43]

Milk in the Tennessee Valley, Louisville-Lexington-Evansville and Nashville, Tennessee, Marketing Areas; Extension of Time for Filing Exceptions to Proposed Amendments to Tentative Marketing Agreements and to Orders

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Extension of time for filing exceptions to proposed rules.

SUMMARY: This action extends the time for filing exceptions to a recommended decision concerning proposed amendments to the Tennessee Valley, Louisville-Lexington-Evansville, and Nashville, Tennessee, milk orders. The additional time was requested by Counsel for Dairymen, Inc. (DI), a cooperative association that represents producers in all three marketing areas.

DATE: Exceptions now are due on or before August 2, 1982.

ADDRESS: Exceptions (four copies) should be filed with the Hearing Clerk, Room 1077, South Building, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard A. Glandt, Marketing Specialist, Dairy Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250, (202) 447-4829.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Prior documents in this proceeding:

Notice of Hearing: Issued September 4, 1981; published September 11, 1981 (46 FR 45354).

Correction: Published September 22, 1981 (46 FR 46813).

Notice of Rescheduled Hearing: Issued September 24, 1981; published September 29, 1981 (46 FR 47588).

Suspension of Rule: Issued November 24, 1981; published November 30, 1981 (46 FR 58064).

Emergency Partial Final Decision: Issued January 15, 1982; published January 21, 1982 (47 FR 2999).

Final Order: Issued January 26, 1982, published January 29, 1982 (47 FR 4228).

Recommended Decision: Issued June 14, 1982; published June 21, 1982 (47 FR 26656).

Notice is hereby given that the time for filing exceptions to the recommended decision on proposed amendments to the Tennessee Valley, Louisville-Lexington-Evansville and Nashville, Tennessee, milk orders is hereby extended to August 2, 1982.

This notice is issued pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), and the applicable rules of practice and procedure governing the formulation of marketing agreements and marketing orders (7 CFR Part 900).

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Parts 1011, 1046 and 1098.

Milk marketing orders, Milk, Dairy products.

Signed at Washington, D.C. on July 6, 1982.

William T. Manley,

Deputy Administrator, Marketing Program Operations.

[FR Doc. 82-18675 Filed 7-9-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-M

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service**9 CFR Part 114**

[Docket No. 82-033]

Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Amendment of Extension of the Expiration Date for a Serial or Subserial**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Current regulations do not permit the extension of the expiration date for any portion of a biological product which has left the premises of a licensed establishment. The restriction applies to any product which is shipped between two licensed establishments owned or controlled by the same person. Since the Department has greater assurance that a product moving between two licensed establishments owned by the same person would be properly stored, handled, and shipped, this proposal would exempt such movements from the restriction but only on a one-time basis for a particular lot of the product.

DATE: Comments must be received on or before September 10, 1982.

ADDRESS: Interested parties are invited to submit written data, views, or arguments regarding the proposed amendment to: Deputy Administrator, Veterinary Services, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 828-A, Federal Building, Hyattsville, MD 20782.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. R. J. Price, Senior Staff Veterinarian, Veterinary Biologics Staff, USDA, APHIS, VS, Room 827, Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, MD 20782, 301-436-8245.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposed amendment has been reviewed under USDA procedures established in Secretary's Memorandum No. 1512-1 to implement Executive Order 12291 and has been classified as a "non-major" rule.

Additionally, Dr. Harry C. Mussman, Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, has determined that these proposed changes would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A small entity is defined as an independently owned firm not dominant in the field of veterinary biologics. This action would result in a beneficial effect to licensed producers with more than one establishment owned or controlled

by the same person and would have no effect on other licensees.

This proposed amendment relating to extension of dating of biological products would allow such extension for serials, subserials, or portions thereof which had been shipped one time between licensed establishments owned or controlled by the same person. Current regulations specifically prohibit an extension of dating for product that has left licensed premises. Such prohibition is based on the fact that proper storage, handling, and shipment of biological products have a great bearing on their potency and stability. When biologics are shipped from one licensed establishment to another licensed establishment owned or controlled by the same person, there is greater assurance that such products would be properly stored, handled, and shipped. Proper storage conditions at both licensed locations which are subject to USDA inspection, and shipment under control of a single licensee warrant different treatment of such product from product which is found in normal distribution channels. The licensee using normal distribution channels has little control over the distributed product and cannot be assured that it is properly handled and protected from abuse by a distributor, wholesaler, or user at another location. Therefore, such product should not be considered for an extension of dating.

This proposed amendment would provide additional flexibility in distribution and control of inventories of the producers affected by it. Further, it has not been shown that existing regulations permitting the shipment between establishments owned or controlled by the same person of partially prepared products or serials of completed fractions of combination products in accordance with 9 CFR 114.3(d) has had any adverse effect on the quality of these products or components. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that a one-time shipment of finished product between two establishments owned or controlled by the same person would not adversely effect such product thereby preventing consideration of an extension of dating.

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 114

Animal biologics.

PART 114—PRODUCTION REQUIREMENTS FOR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS

Section 114.14(a)(2) would be revised to read:

§ 114.14 Extension of expiration date for a serial or subserial.

(a) * * *

(2) For any serial or any portion of any serial which has left licensed premises; *Provided*, That product which has been shipped once between two licensed establishments owned or controlled by the same person shall be exempt from this requirement.

* * * * *
(37 Stat. 832-833; 21 U.S.C. 151-158)

All written submissions made pursuant to this notice will be made available for public inspection at the address listed in this document during regular hours of business (8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday to Friday, except holidays) in a manner convenient to the public business (7 CFR 12.7(b)).

Done at Washington, D.C., this 6th day of July 1982.

Norvan L. Meyer,
Acting Deputy Administrator Veterinary Services.

[FR Doc. 82-18777 Filed 7-9-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 704**

[OPTS-80011B; TSH-FRL 2169-7]

Small Manufacturer Exemption Standards Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements; Correction**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: EPA issued a proposed rule containing general exemption standards for "small chemical manufacturers" under section 8(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act. The rule was published in the *Federal Register* of June 23, 1982 (47 FR 27206). This document deletes the words "or mixture" wherever they appear inappropriately in the rule proposal. This correction is necessary because the proposed small manufacturer exemption standards are intended to apply only to manufacturers of chemical substances. The standards, particularly the production volume criterion they contain, are not intended to apply to manufacturers of mixtures.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Douglas Bannerman, Acting Director, Industry Assistance Office (TS-799), Office of Toxic Substances, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E-511B, 401 M St., SW., Washington,

D.C. 20460, Toll free: (800-424-9065), In Washington, D.C. (554-1404), Outside the USA: (Operator-202-554-1404).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following corrections are made in FR Doc. 82-16794 appearing on page 27206 in the issue of June 23, 1982:

1. On page 27206, column 3, paragraph 5, line 7, the words "or mixture" are removed.

2. 40 CFR 704.65(a), (b)(4) and (8), and (c)(1) are corrected to read as follows:

§ 704.65 Persons who are small manufacturers.

(a) *Scope.* (1) Under the authority of section 8(a)(3)(B) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), 15 U.S.C. 2607(a)(3)(B), this rule sets forth standards identifying small manufacturers (including importers) of chemical substances. Except as stated in paragraph (a)(2) of this section, the manufacturers who qualify as "small" under the standards contained in paragraph (c) of this section are exempt from rules promulgated under the authority of section 8(a) after June 23, 1982.

(2) Notwithstanding this exemption, the Administrator may, for any rule promulgated under section 8(a), require reporting or recordkeeping from any small manufacturer of a chemical substance that is subject to a rule proposed or promulgated under TSCA sections 4, 5(b)(4), or 6, or is subject to an order in effect under TSCA section 5(e), or is the subject of relief that has been granted under a civil action brought under TSCA section 5 or 7.

(b) * * *

(4) "Manufacturer" means a person who imports, produces, or manufactures a chemical substance. A manufacturer may own or control one or more manufacturing sites. A manufacturer may be owned or controlled by a foreign or domestic parent company.

(8) "Production volume" means the quantity of a chemical substance which is produced by a manufacturer, as measured in kilograms or pounds.

(c) * * *

(1) *First standard.* A manufacturer is small if its total annual sales, when combined with those of its parent company (if any), are less than \$30 million. However, if the annual production volume of a particular chemical substance at any individual site owned or controlled by the manufacturer is greater than 45,400 kilograms (100,000 pounds), the

manufacturer shall not qualify as small for purposes of reporting on the production of that chemical substance at that site, unless the manufacturer qualifies as small under paragraph (c)(2) of this section.

* * * * *

Dated: July 7, 1982.

John A. Todhunter,
Assistant Administrator for Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 82-18844 Filed 7-9-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 761

[OPTS-62017C; TSH FRL 2170-01]

**Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs);
Notice of Availability of Guidelines for
the Analysis of PCBs**

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule-related notice.

SUMMARY: In the Federal Register of June 8, 1982 (47 FR 24976), the Environmental Protection Agency issued a proposed rule which excluded Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) produced in closed manufacturing processes and controlled waste manufacturing processes from the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) ban on the manufacture, processing, distribution in commerce and use of PCBs. In the proposed rule, EPA announced that it was in the process of developing guidelines for use in analyzing air emissions, water effluents, commercial products, and process waste streams from closed and controlled waste processes for PCBs. This notice announces the availability of the guidelines, which includes (1) a guidance document addressing sample collection and (2) detailed protocols for sample analysis as well as an EPA-sponsored analytical method validation study for review and comment.

DATES: Elsewhere in today's issue of the Federal Register, an informal hearing on the proposed rule is announced for July 26, 1982 in Washington, D.C. Comments on the guidance document, the proposed protocols and the analytical method validation study should be submitted by July 26, 1982. However, reply comments will be accepted for two weeks following the close of the hearing.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to: Document Control Officer (TS-793), Office of Pesticides and Toxic Substances, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E-409, 401 M St., SW.,

Washington, D.C. 20460.

Comments should bear the identifying notation OPTS 62017C. The administrative record, including comments supporting this action is available for public inspection in Rm. E-107 at the address noted above from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Douglas G. Bannerman, Acting Director, Industry Assistance Office (TS-799), Office of Toxic Substances, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E-509, 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, Toll free (800-424-9065), in Washington, D.C. (554-1404), Outside the USA (Operator-202-554-1404).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed rule published in the Federal Register of June 8, 1982 (47 FR 24976) excluded PCBs produced in closed and controlled waste manufacturing processes from the TSCA ban on the manufacture, processing, distribution in commerce, and use of PCBs. Closed manufacturing processes were defined as chemical processes in which PCBs are generated but from which no quantifiable PCBs are released to air, water, products, or wastes if capillary gas chromatography (CGC) coupled to electron impact mass spectrometry (EIMS) were used to analyze for PCBs. Similarly, controlled waste manufacturing processes were defined as chemical processes in which PCBs are generated but from which no quantifiable PCBs are released to air, water, or products if CGC/EIMS were used to analyze for PCBs, and any PCB containing wastes are disposed of by EPA-approved methods.

In the proposed rule, EPA described guidelines that it was in the process of developing for conducting chemical analyses of commercial products, air emissions, water effluents, and process waste streams for inadvertently produced PCBs by CGC/EIMS. EPA described the guidelines as addressing seven areas: (1) Sample collection and homogenization of the sample, (2) addition of surrogate compounds to the sample, (3) extraction and cleanup of the sample, (4) concentration or dilution of the sample, (5) analysis of the final extract, (6) reporting the results of the chemical analysis, and (7) developing a quality assurance program (QAP).

Since the publication of the proposed rule, EPA has prepared a guidance document addressing sample collection, developed protocols for sample analysis and has, in addition, sponsored an

analytical method validation study to test the efficacy of the EPA-specified analytical protocol for the analysis of non-Aroclor PCBs (CGC/EIMS). The method validation exercise was undertaken to check the validity of the proposed protocol for the analysis of PCBs in commercial products and process waste streams in particular. The samples analyzed to date in the validation study were provided by Dow Chemical Company and Vulcan Materials Company (through the cooperation of the Chemical Manufacturers Association) and by the Dry Chemical Manufacturers Association.

Data are presented in the preliminary analytical method validation study from the analyses of individual cleanup procedures as well as from the actual CGC/EIMS analyses of commercial products and process waste samples. Although these are preliminary studies conducted in a very short timeframe, the data generated from the studies indicate that the proposed method is applicable and useful for the analysis of PCBs in the matrices studied.

The guidance document provides detailed guidance on sample collection. The proposed protocols address separately, protocols for the analysis of chlorinated biphenyls generated as impurities or byproducts in commercial products, process wastes, air releases, and industrial wastewater. The document provides detailed guidance on extracting, purifying, separating, and detecting PCBs in the four media listed above. In addition, it provides detailed guidance on developing quality assurance plans to insure the integrity of the analytical data produced by the specified protocols.

Both the guidance document and the initial proposed protocols and analytical method validation study are available for review and comment in Rm. E-107 at the EPA address given above or by contacting the Industry Assistance Office (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 761

Hazardous materials, Labeling, Polychlorinated biphenyls, Recordkeeping and reporting requirements, Environmental protection.

Dated: July 7, 1982.

John A. Todhunter,

Assistant Administrator for Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 82-18845 Filed 7-9-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 761

[OPTS 62017B; 2169-8]

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs); Manufacture, Processing, Distribution, and Use in Closed and Controlled Waste Manufacturing Process; Notice of Informal Hearing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule related notice.

SUMMARY: As the result of requests, this notice announces that EPA will hold an informal hearing on its proposed rule to exclude the production of Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) in closed and controlled waste manufacturing processes from the provisions of section 6(e) of the Toxic Substances Control Act.

DATE: The informal hearing will be held on July 26, 1982, beginning at 9 a.m.

ADDRESS: The informal hearing will be held in: Rm. 3906, Waterside Mall, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Douglas G. Bannerman, Acting Director, Industry Assistance Office (OTS-799), Office of Toxic Substances, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E-511, 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, Toll free: (800-424-9065), In Washington, D.C.: (554-1404), Outside the USA: (Operator-202-554-1404).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the *Federal Register* of June 8, 1982 (47 FR 24976), notice was given that an informal hearing on EPA's proposed rule to exclude the production of PCBs in closed and controlled waste manufacturing processes from the provisions of section 6(e) of the Toxic Substances Control Act would be held, if requested, on August 6, 1982. The date of that informal hearing was corrected to July 23, 1982 in the *Federal Register* of June 14, 1982 (47 FR 25555). The date was tentative pending determination whether there would be an informal hearing. Since then, EPA has received requests to hold the informal hearing and the date has now been set to accommodate those requests. The hearing will take place on July 26, 1982.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 761

Hazardous materials, Labeling, Polychlorinated biphenyls, Recordkeeping and reporting requirements, Environmental protection.

Dated: July 7, 1982.

John A. Todhunter,

Assistant Administrator for Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 82-18843 Filed 7-9-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

Denial of Petition for Rulemaking; Strobe Lights on Motorcycles

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Denial of petition for rulemaking

SUMMARY: This notice records the denial of a petition for rulemaking by Dennis Palmer to allow the use of a small strobe light on motorcycles. The purpose of the light is to enhance motorcycle conspicuity. The agency concluded that, as designed, the light would impair the effectiveness of the headlamps and turn signals.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Marx Elliott, Crash Avoidance Division, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 (202-426-1714)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Dennis Palmer of Fairview, Pennsylvania, petitioned the agency for rulemaking to amend Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 108 to allow the use of a small strobe light for the purpose of enhancing motorcycle conspicuity. The lamp would emit 190 candelas, and be positioned 1 to 2 inches below the headlamp, and within 10 to 12 inches of the turn signal lamps. It would flash at a rate of 45 to 55 flashes per minute.

The agency concluded that the effectiveness of the headlamp and turn signals would be impaired by the location and intensity of the strobe lamp. Turn signal effectiveness would also be diminished by the strobe's flash rate which is slightly below the minimum required for the signals. Accordingly, the agency denied the petition. However, because the agency believes the concept of a variable intensity lamp has merit, it has encouraged Mr. Palmer to re-think his device in accordance with NHTSA's comments with the possibility of submitting another petition at a later date.