

association or other entity that exercises fiduciary powers pursuant to such plan.

4. By revising the introductory text of paragraph (a) to § 240.14b-1 to read as follows:

§ 240.14b-1 Obligation of registered brokers and dealers in connection with the prompt forwarding of certain communications to beneficial owners.

(a) Respond, by first class mail or other equally prompt means, directly to the registrant no later than seven business days after the date it receives an inquiry made in accordance with § 240.14a-13(a) by indicating, by means of a search card or otherwise: * * *

5. Paragraph (a)(1) and the introductory text to paragraph (b) of § 240.14b-2, published December 9, 1986 (51 FR 44267) to be effective July 1, 1987, are revised; paragraph (c)(1)(i)(b) is correctly designated as (c)(1)(i)(B); paragraph (e)(1), the introductory text to paragraph (h) and Note 2 to paragraph (i) are revised, and new paragraph (j) is added as follows:

§ 240.14b-2 Obligation of banks, associations and other entities that exercise fiduciary powers in connection with the prompt forwarding of certain communications to beneficial owners.

(a)(1) Shall respond, by first class mail or other equally prompt means, directly to the registrant no later than one business day after the date it receives an inquiry made in accordance with § 240.14a-13(a) by indicating the name and address of each of its respondent banks that holds the registrant's securities on behalf of beneficial owners, if any, and

(b) Within five business days after the record date, shall: * * *

(e) Shall: (1) respond, by first class mail or other equally prompt means, directly to the registrant no later than one business day after the date it receives an inquiry made in accordance with § 240.14a-13(b)(1) by indicating the name and address of each of its respondent banks that holds the registrant's securities on behalf of beneficial owners, if any;

(h) For customer accounts opened on or before December 28, 1986, unless it has made a good faith effort to obtain affirmative consent to disclosure of beneficial owner information pursuant to paragraph (e)(2) of this section, shall provide such information as to

beneficial owners who do not object to disclosure of such information. A good faith effort to obtain affirmative consent to disclosure of beneficial owner information shall include, but shall not be limited to, making an inquiry: * * *

Note 2 to paragraph (i).—If more than one person shares voting power or if the instrument creating that voting power provides that such power shall be exercised by different persons depending on the nature of the corporate action involved, all persons entitled to exercise such power shall be deemed beneficial owners: *Provided, however*, that only one such beneficial owner need be designated among the beneficial owners to receive proxies or requests for voting instructions, other proxy soliciting material and/or annual reports to security holders, if the person so designated assumes the obligation to disseminate, in a timely manner, such materials to the other beneficial owners.

(j) A bank, association or other entity that exercises fiduciary powers shall not—

(1) Include in its response pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section:

(2) Forward proxy cards or requests for voting instructions, proxy soliciting material or annual reports to security holders pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section to; or

(3) Comply with any alternative to paragraph (c) of this section approved by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section with regard to: beneficial owners who are employee benefit plan participants or beneficiaries with respect to securities held in nominee name pursuant to such plan.

6. By redesignating current paragraphs (b) through (i) as paragraphs (c) through (j) and adding new paragraph (b) to § 240.14c-1 to read as follows:

§ 240.14c-1 Definitions.

(b) *Employee benefit plan.* For purposes of § 240.14c-7, the term "employee benefit plan" means any purchase, savings, option, bonus, appreciation, profit sharing, thrift, incentive, pension or similar plan solely for employees, directors, trustees or officers.

7. Paragraphs (a)(1)(i)(A), Note 1 to paragraph (a), paragraph (b)(3) and paragraph (c) of § 240.14c-7, published December 9, 1986 (51 FR 44267) to be effective July 1, 1987, are revised, and new paragraphs (a)(1)(i)(C) and (d) are added as follows:

§ 240.14c-7 Providing copies of material for certain beneficial owners.

- (a) * * *
- (1) * * *
- (i) * * *

(A) whether other persons are the beneficial owners of such securities and, if so, the number of copies of the information statement necessary to supply such material to such beneficial owners;

(C) whether it holds the registrant's securities on behalf of any respondent bank and, if so, the name and address of each such respondent bank; and * * *

Note 1 to paragraph (a).—If the registrant's list of security holders indicates that some of its securities are registered in the name of a clearing agency registered pursuant to section 17A of the Act (e.g., "Cede & Co.," nominee for the Depository Trust Company), the registrants shall make appropriate inquiry of the clearing agency and thereafter of the participants in such clearing agency who may hold on behalf of a beneficial owner or respondent bank, and shall comply with the above paragraph with respect to any such participant (see § 240.14c-1 (h)).

(b) * * *

(3) Make such request to the following persons that hold the registrant's securities on behalf of beneficial owners: all brokers, dealers, banks, associations and other entities that exercise fiduciary powers;

(c) A registrant, as its option, may mail its annual report to security holders to the beneficial owners whose identifying information is provided by record holders and respondent banks, pursuant to § 240.14b-1(c) and § 240.14b-2(e) (2) and (3), provided that such registrant notifies the record holders and respondent banks at the time it makes the inquiry required by paragraph (a) of this section that the registrant will mail the annual report to security holders to the beneficial owners so identified.

(d) The inquiry required by paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this section shall not cover beneficial owners who are employee benefit plan participants or beneficiaries with respect to securities of the registrant held in nominee name by a bank, association or other entity that exercises fiduciary powers pursuant to such plan.

By the Commission.

Jonathan G. Katz,
Secretary.

June 18, 1987.

[FR Doc. 87-14328 Filed 6-23-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

18 CFR Parts 154, 375 and 382

[Docket No. RM87-3-001; Order No. 472-A]

Annual Charges Under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986

Issued: June 17, 1987.

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, DOE.

ACTION: Order clarifying final rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission clarifies its intent in its final rule regarding "Annual Charges Under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, 52 FR 21263 (June 5, 1987), that the only natural gas storage volumes to be considered in assessing annual charges against any reporting pipeline will be those storage volumes not already included in the reporting pipeline's sales and transportation volumes.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 17, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Roland M. Frye, Jr., Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of the General Counsel, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426 (202) 357-8315.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Before Commissioners: Martha O. Hesse, Chairman; Anthony G. Sousa, Charles G. Stalon, Charles A. Trabandt and C.M. Naeve.

I. Introduction

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is clarifying its intent in the final rule issued in this docket on May 29, 1987,¹ that the only natural gas storage volumes to be considered in assessing annual charges against any reporting pipeline will be those storage volumes not already included in the reporting pipeline's sales and transportation volumes.

II. Background

In the final rule, the Commission stated that it would base its annual charges assessments against interstate natural gas pipelines on the volumes of gas sold and transported by those pipelines. The Commission defined such volumes as the sum of the volumes reported by all natural gas pipelines on Annual Report Form No. 2, page 521, lines 42 (Total Sales), 46 (Total, Gas Transported or Compressed for Others), 50 (Natural Gas Delivered to

Underground Storage), and 51 (Natural Gas Delivered to LNG Storage); Annual Report Form No. 2-A, page 18, line 11 plus applicable transportation volumes in lines 13-15; and Annual Report Form No. 14, line 13 of Schedule I (Natural Gas) and line 13 of Schedule II (LNG).²

III. Discussion

It has come to the Commission's attention that some of the gas reported as storage volumes in natural gas pipeline companies' annual report forms for calendar year 1986 was also reported as sales and transportation volumes on the same forms, and that therefore, under the final rule's methodology for computing annual charges, any volumes of gas stored and either transported or sold by the same pipeline would be subject to double counting. The Commission did not intend this result, and therefore clarifies that it intends to assess annual charges based on only (1) sales, transportation and compression volumes, and (2) storage volumes of gas not also reported by the storing pipeline in its sales, transportation and compression volumes.

However, the Commission's Form Nos. 2 and 2-A do not provide for the separation of the volumes included in these two categories.³ Therefore, the Commission will give natural gas pipelines the opportunity to provide such separated data. By close of business on June 30, 1987, any interstate natural gas pipeline may provide the Commission with a sworn statement which separates its reported storage volumes into categories (1) and (2) as described in the immediately preceding paragraph.⁴ In its annual charge computations, the Commission will include only those storage volumes included in category (2). A company that chooses not to file the data requested in this order will be assessed annual charges based on its entire storage volumes, i.e., the volumes included in both categories (1) and (2). In future years, the Commission will require such data in its Form Nos. 2 and 2-A. To this end, the Commission is amending its instructions to these forms to require that every pipeline provide such data as

² 52 FR at 21276.

³ Because no importers currently store natural gas under contract, the Commission does not now need to provide for the separation of storage volume data reported in Form No. 14.

⁴ To facilitate such natural gas pipelines' timely filing of this data, the Commission is serving a copy of this order on each pipeline which is listed in Appendix B of the final rule and which reported storage volumes in its 1986 annual report. This service is by United States Mail, first class, on the date of issuance of this order.

part of a footnote on page 520 of Form No. 2 or page 21 of Form No. 2-A.⁵

IV. Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

The Paperwork Reduction Act⁶ and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations⁷ require that OMB approve certain information collection requirements imposed by agency rule. On June 17, 1987, OMB approved for 70 days supplemental reporting requirements and revisions to FERC Form Nos. 2 and 2-A under OMB Control Number 1902-0028 and 1902-0030, respectively.

V. Effective Date

In the final rule, the Commission intended that only contract storage volumes be included in the Commission's computation of natural gas pipelines' annual charges. However, because this order contains a new reporting requirement and revisions to Form Nos. 2 and 2-A, this order becomes effective on June 17, 1987, the date on which OMB issued a 70-day approval of that requirement and those revisions.

By the Commission.

Kenneth F. Plumb,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 87-14327 Filed 6-23-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms

27 CFR Part 9

[TD ATF-254; Re: Notice No. 439 and 592]

Revision of the El Dorado Viticultural Area Boundary, California

AGENCY: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF); Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule, Treasury decision.

SUMMARY: ATF is revising the boundary of the El Dorado viticultural area to include a vineyard which was unintentionally omitted from the original petition which ATF adopted in T.D.

⁵ The instructions which Order No. 472 added to these pages (52 FR 21274, n. 151 and 21297-21300 (Appendices C and D)) are supplemented with the following language:

Also indicate by footnote the volumes of gas which are stored by the reporting pipeline and not also reported as sales, transportation and compression volumes by the reporting pipeline, and the volumes of gas which are stored by the reporting pipeline and also reported as sales, transportation or compression volumes by the reporting pipeline.

⁶ 44 U.S.C. 3501-3520 (1982).

⁷ 5 C.F.R. Part 1320 (1987).

¹ "Annual Charges Under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986," Final Rule, Order No. 472, 52 FR 21263 (June 5, 1987).

ATF-152 (48 FR 46518). This revision is based on a petition submitted by Mr. A.G. Boissevain, President, El Dorado Wine Growers Association, Camino, California. The establishment of viticultural areas and the subsequent use of viticultural area names as appellations of origin in wine labeling and advertising will help consumers better identify wines they purchase. The use of viticultural area appellations of origin will also help wineries distinguish their products from wines made in other areas.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rule is effective July 24, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James A. Hunt, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Ariel Rios Federal Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20226 (202-566-7626).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The El Dorado Wine Grape Growers Association in Camino, California, petitioned ATF for the establishment of an American viticultural area to be named "El Dorado." The El Dorado viticultural area is located within El Dorado County, east of Sacramento, California. In response to this petition, ATF published a notice of proposed rulemaking, Notice No. 439 (47 FR 55954), in the *Federal Register* on December 14, 1982, proposing the establishment of El Dorado as a viticultural area.

On October 13, 1983, ATF published T.D. ATF-152 (48 FR 46518) establishing the El Dorado viticultural area. Mr. A.G. Boissevain, President, El Dorado Wine Grape Growers Association, submitted a petition to include a vineyard just outside of the western boundary of the El Dorado viticultural area. The vineyard was unintentionally omitted when the boundaries were established along Range and Township lines rather than along a more complicated contour line of 1200 foot elevation. Mr. Boissevain stated that the petitioned for area has the same name identification, topography, soil types, amount of rainfall, elevation and temperatures as found in the El Dorado viticultural area and would be distinguished from the surrounding area.

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

In response to Mr. Boissevain's second petition, ATF published a notice of proposed rulemaking, Notice No. 592 (51 FR 19853), proposing a revision of the El Dorado viticultural area boundary. No comments were received.

Conclusion

After considering the evidence presented by the petitioner, ATF determined that it would be proper to extend the El Dorado viticultural area. Accordingly, this document prescribes a revised boundary for the El Dorado viticultural area.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act relating to a final regulatory flexibility analysis (5 U.S.C. 604) are not applicable to this final rule because it will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The final rule will not impose, or otherwise cause, a significant increase in reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance burdens on a substantial number of small entities. The final rule is not expected to have a significant secondary or incidental effect on a substantial number of small entities.

Accordingly, it is hereby certified under the provisions of Section 3 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Compliance With Executive Order 12291

In compliance with Executive Order 12291, 46 FR 13193 (1981), ATF has determined that this final rule is not a "major rule" since it will not result in:

- (a) An annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more;
- (b) A major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or
- (c) Significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96-511, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR Part 1320, do not apply to this final rule because no requirement to collect information is imposed.

List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 9

Administrative practice and procedure, Consumer protection, Viticultural areas, and Wine.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this document is James A. Hunt, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

Authority and Issuance

Title 27, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 9, American Viticultural Areas is amended as follows:

PART 9—[AMENDED]

Paragraph 1. The authority citation for Part 9 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 27 U.S.C. 205.

Par. 2. Section 9.61 is amended by revising paragraph (c)(12), redesignating existing paragraphs (c)(13) through (c)(15) as (c)(17) through (c)(19) respectively, and adding new paragraphs (c)(13) through (c)(16) to read as follows:

§ 9.61 El Dorado.

- (c) * * *
- (12) Thence north along the range line to its intersection with U.S. Route 50;
- (13) Thence west along U.S. Route 50 to its intersection with Cameron Park Drive;
- (14) Thence north along Cameron Park Drive to its intersection with Green Valley Road;
- (15) Thence east along Green Valley Road to its intersection with range line R.10 E/ R.9 E;
- (16) Thence north along the range line to its intersection with the township line T.10 N./ T.11 N;
- * * *

Signed: May 29, 1987.

Stephen E. Higgins,
Director.

Approved: June 4, 1987.

John P. Simpson,

Deputy Assistant Secretary (Regulatory,
Trade and Tariff Enforcement).

[FR Doc. 87-14297 Filed 6-23-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-31-M

27 CFR Part 9

[T.D. ATF-255; Re: Notice No. 399 and No. 434]

Revision of the Monticello Viticultural Area Boundary, Virginia

AGENCY: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), Treasury.

ACTION: Treasury decision, Final rule.

SUMMARY: ATF is revising the boundary of the Monticello viticultural area to include vineyards which were omitted from the original petition which ATF adopted in T.D. ATF-164 (49 FR 2757). This rule is based on a petition submitted by Edward W. Schwab, Autumn Hill Vineyards, located in Stanardsville, Virginia. The

establishment of viticultural areas and the subsequent use of viticultural area names as appellations of origin in wine labeling and advertising will help consumers better identify wines they purchase. The use of viticultural area appellations of origin will also help wineries distinguish their products from wines made in other areas.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rule is effective July 24, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James A. Hunt, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Ariel Rios Federal Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20226 (202-566-7626).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Six wine grape growers in the Charlottesville area of Virginia first petitioned ATF to establish a viticultural area to be known as "Monticello." In response to the petition, ATF published a notice of proposed rulemaking, Notice No. 399 (46 FR 59274), on December 4, 1981, to establish a viticultural area in the Charlottesville, Virginia, area to be known as "Monticello." During the comment period The Jefferson Wine Grape Growers Society petitioned for an enlargement of the Monticello viticultural area boundary. ATF published an amended notice of proposed rulemaking, Notice No. 434 (47 FR 52200), on November 19, 1982. All the comments received favored the enlarged boundary for the Monticello viticultural area.

On January 23, 1984, ATF published T.D. ATF-164 (49 FR 2757) establishing the Monticello viticultural area. On November 9, 1984, a petition was received from Mr. Edward W. Schwab, Managing Partner, Autumn Hill Vineyards, to include Greene County in the Monticello viticultural area. Mr. Schwab said he became aware of the Monticello viticultural area after it was established and he was not aware of the rulemaking process that had taken place.

Greene County is a small county which borders the northern boundary of the Monticello viticultural area. Mr. Schwab submitted a statement and evidence from the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service Agriculture Extension Agent that the petitioned for area has essentially the same topography, soil types, amount of rainfall, elevation and temperatures as found in the bordering Monticello viticultural area. Mr. Schwab amended his petition to exclude a mountainous area in the western part of Greene County so that the revised area would be even more similar to the existing Monticello viticultural area.

The Monticello viticultural area is approximately 1250 square miles and therefore, extends many miles from its namesake and home of Thomas Jefferson in Charlottesville, Virginia. The evidence submitted during the earlier rulemaking process established that the Monticello name extends throughout Central Virginia, to include Albemarle, Orange, Nelson and Greene Counties, because of Thomas Jefferson's dominant influence in the region. Historical publications have numerous references to Jefferson's leasing farm land throughout Central Virginia to expand his Monticello acreage. Other references list Monticello as the primary source of crop experimentation data and planting material (including grapevines) used to start new farms in Central Virginia.

One current example which shows that the name identification extended several miles to the north of Monticello to Orange and Greene Counties is a mansion similar in appearance to Monticello which Jefferson designed for his friend, James Barbour. The mansion burned in 1884, but all the brick structure and columns remain making the structure easily identified with Monticello. This mansion, the Barboursville Ruins, is now a historical landmark and tourist attraction. The eastern boundary of the revised viticultural area is near the Barboursville Ruins.

Comments

No additional information was received during the comment period. A copy of the petition to revise the boundary and supporting evidence is available for inspection during normal business hours at the following location: ATF Reading Room, Rm. 4407, Office of Public Affairs and Disclosure, 12th and Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act relating to a final regulatory flexibility analysis (5 U.S.C. 604) are not applicable to this final rule because it will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The final rule will not impose, or otherwise cause, a significant increase in reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance burdens on a substantial number of small entities. The final rule is not expected to have a significant secondary or incidental effect on a substantial number of small entities.

Accordingly, it is hereby certified under the provisions of section 3 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C.

605(b)), that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Compliance With Executive Order 12291

In compliance with Executive Order 12291 (46 FR 13193 (1981)), ATF has determined that this final rule is not a "major rule" since it will not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; it will not result in a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State or local government agencies, or geographic regions; and it will not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of the United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96-511, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR Part 1320, do not apply to this final rule because no requirement to collect information is imposed.

List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 9

Administrative practice and procedure, Consumer protection, Viticultural areas, Wine.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this document is James A. Hunt, FAA, Wine and Beer Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

Authority and Issuance

Title 27, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 9, American Viticultural Areas is amended as follows:

PART 9—[AMENDED]

Paragraph 1. The authority citation for Part 9 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 27 U.S.C. 205.

Par. 2. Section 9.48(c) is revised to read as follows:

§ 9.48 Monticello.

(c) *Boundaries.* (1) From Norwood, Virginia, following the Tye River west and northwest until it intersects with the eastern boundary of the George Washington National Forest;

(2) Following this boundary northeast to Virginia Rt. 664;

(3) Then west following Rt. 664 to its intersection with the Nelson County line;

(4) Then northeast along the Nelson County line to its intersection with the Albemarle County line at Jarman Gap;

(5) From this point continuing northeast along the eastern boundary of the Shenandoah National Park to its intersection with the northern Albemarle County line;

(6) Continuing northeast along the Greene County line to its intersection with Virginia Rt. 33;

(7) Follow Virginia Rt. 33 east to the intersection of Virginia Rt. 230 at Stanardsville;

(8) Follow Virginia Rt. 230 north to the Greene County line (the Conway River);

(9) Following the Greene County line (Conway River which becomes the Rapidan River) southeast to its intersection with the Orange County line;

(10) Following the Orange County line (Rapidan River) east and northeast to its confluence with the Mountain Run River;

(11) Then following the Mountain Run River southwest to its intersection with Virginia Rt. 20;

(12) Continuing southwest along Rt. 20 to the corporate limits of the town of Orange;

(13) Following southwest the corporate limit line to its intersection with U.S. Rt. 15;

(14) Continuing southwest on Rt. 15 to its intersection with Virginia Rt. 231 in the town of Gordonsville;

(15) Then southwest along Rt. 231 to its intersection with the Albemarle County line.

(16) Continuing southwest along the county line to its intersection with the James River;

(17) Then following the James River to its confluence with the Tye River at Norwood, Virginia, the beginning point.

Signed: May 22, 1987.

W.T. Drake,
Acting Director

Approved: June 1, 1987.

John P. Simpson,
Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Regulatory, Trade and Tariff Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 87-14296 Filed 6-23-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-31-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 4

[CGD 87-040]

OMB Control Numbers

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), requires generally that all regulations which contain recordkeeping or reporting requirements must be approved by the Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Once approved, these regulations are assigned an OMB Control Number. OMB Control Numbers for regulations within certain parts of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations are displayed in a table appearing at 33 CFR 4.02. This document updates the table to display OMB Control Numbers assigned to certain regulations within Title 33.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 24, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LT Sandra Sylvester, (202) 267-1534.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This final rule was not preceded by a notice of proposed rulemaking and is being made effective in less than 30 days. This rule merely displays existing OMB Control Numbers pertaining to specific Coast Guard regulations for the public's information. Therefore, the Coast Guard has determined that notice and comment procedures are unnecessary under the Administrative Procedure Act [5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)]. Since this rule has no substantive effect, good cause exists to make this rule effective in less than thirty days under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

Drafting Information

This rule was drafted by LT Sandra R. Sylvester, Office of Chief Counsel, Regulations and Administrative Law Division.

Regulatory Evaluation

This regulation is considered to be non-major under Executive Order 12291, and non-significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979). The economic impact of this final rule has been found to be so minimal that further evaluation is unnecessary. This rule merely displays existing OMB Control Numbers and imposes no new substantive requirements. Since the impact of this rule is expected to be minimal, the Coast Guard certifies that it will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 4

Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

PART 4—[AMENDED]

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 4 of Chapter I, Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 4 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3507; 49 CFR 1.45(a).

2. The table in § 4.02(b) is amended by adding new entries in numerical order and revising the entry for Part 165 to read as follows:

§ 4.02 Display.

* * *	
(b) Display	
* * *	
Part 127.....	2115-0552
* * *	
Section 140.15.....	2115-0553
* * *	
Part 160.....	2115-0540
Part 161.....	2115-0540
* * *	
Part 164.....	2115-0540
Part 165.....	2115-0540
* * *	

Dated: June 11, 1987.

J.E. Vorbach,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chairman,
Marine Safety Council.

[FR Doc. 87-14107 Filed 6-23-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[PP 4E3112/R892; FRL-3221-5]

Pesticide Tolerance for 4-Amino-6-(1,1-Dimethylethyl)-3-(Methylthio)-1,2,4-Triazin-5(4H)-One

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule establishes a tolerance for the combined residues of the herbicide (4-amino-6-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-3-(methylthio)-1,2,4-triazin-5(4H)-one) (referred to in the preamble as metribuzin), and its triazinone metabolites in or on the raw agricultural commodity carrots. This regulation to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of the herbicide in or on carrots was requested in a petition by the Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4).

EFFECTIVE DATE: Effective on June 24, 1987.

ADDRESS: Written objections, identified by the document control number, [PP 4E3112/R892], may be submitted to: Hearing Clerk (A-110), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.