

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register
Vol. 61, No. 90
Wednesday, May 8, 1996

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

5 CFR Part 532
RIN 3206-AH28

Prevailing Rate Systems; Changes in Survey Responsibilities for Certain Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.
ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is issuing a final rule to change survey responsibilities for several appropriated fund Federal Wage System (FWS) wage areas in recognition of shifting employment patterns among agencies and the need for lead agencies to balance their wage

survey workloads throughout the 2-year survey cycle. The changes are designed to improve administration of the Federal Wage System and affect the following local wage areas: Eastern South Dakota; Ft. Wayne-Marion, Indiana; Madison, Wisconsin; Buffalo, New York; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Augusta, Maine; Southeastern Michigan; and Southwestern Oregon.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 7, 1996.
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angela Graham Humes, (202) 606-2848.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 9, 1996, OPM published a proposed rule (61 FR 4940) to change the survey responsibilities (lead agency designation and/or wage survey timing) for eight appropriated fund FWS wage areas (Eastern South Dakota; Ft. Wayne-Marion, Indiana; Madison, Wisconsin; Buffalo, New York; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Augusta, Maine; Southeastern Michigan; and Southwestern Oregon). The proposed rule provided for a 30-day period for public comment. OPM received no comments during the comment period. Therefore, the proposed rule is being adopted as a final rule.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

I certify that these regulations will not have a significant economic impact on

a substantial number of small entities because they will affect only Federal agencies and employees.

List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 532

Administrative practice and procedure, Freedom of information, Government employees, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wages.

Office of Personnel Management.
Lorraine A. Green,
Deputy Director.

Accordingly, OPM is amending 5 CFR part 532 as follows:

PART 532—PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS

1. The authority citation for part 532 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 5343, 5346; § 532.707 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 552.

2. Appendix A to subpart B of part 532 is amended by revising the entries for Fort Wayne-Marion, Indiana; Augusta, Maine; Southwestern Michigan; Buffalo, New York; Southwestern Oregon; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Eastern South Dakota; and Madison, Wisconsin, and by adding a footnote to read as follows:

APPENDIX A TO SUBPART B OF PART 532—NATIONWIDE SCHEDULE OF APPROPRIATED FUND REGULAR WAGE SURVEYS

State	Wage area	Lead agency	Beginning month of survey	Fiscal year of full scale odd or even
Indiana	Fort Wayne-Marion	DoD	October	Odd.
Maine	Augusta ¹	VA	May	Even.
Michigan	Southwestern Michigan ¹	VA	October	Odd.
New York	Buffalo ¹	DoD	September	Odd.
Oregon	Southwestern Oregon	VA	June	Even.
Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh	VA	July	Odd.
South Dakota	Eastern South Dakota ¹	DoD	October	Even.
Wisconsin	Madison	DoD	July	Even.

APPENDIX A TO SUBPART B OF PART 532—NATIONWIDE SCHEDULE OF APPROPRIATED FUND REGULAR WAGE SURVEYS—Continued

State	Wage area	Lead agency	Beginning month of survey	Fiscal year of full scale odd or even
*	*	*	*	*

¹ The revised fiscal year entries are scheduled to begin for Augusta, Maine, in fiscal year 1996; for Buffalo, New York, and Southwestern Michigan in fiscal year 1997; and for Eastern South Dakota in fiscal year 1998.

[FR Doc. 96-11379 Filed 5-7-96; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 6325-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 51

[Docket Number FV-93-301]

Florida Grapefruit, Florida Oranges and Tangelos, and, Florida Tangerines; Grade Standards

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule revises the United States Standards for Grades of Florida Grapefruit, United States Standards for Grades of Florida Oranges and Tangelos, and, United States Standards for Grades of Florida Tangerines. The Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS), in cooperation with industry, and other interested parties develops and improves standards of quality, condition, quantity, grade and packaging in order to facilitate commerce by providing buyers, sellers, and quality assurance personnel uniform language and criteria for describing various levels of quality and condition as valued in the marketplace.

The revisions will: Redefine terms to reflect more clearly current cultural and marketing practices; add and revise the grades so as to make them uniform and consistent with each other and other recently revised U.S. grade standards; express defect tolerances in terms of percentages instead of specific numbers of defective fruit; revise the size sections to provide greater flexibility in marketing and packaging new varieties of fruit; and, delete references to a visual aid which is no longer available.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This regulation is effective August 1, 1996. The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of August 1, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Frank O'Sullivan, Fresh Products Branch, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.O. Box 96456, Room 2056 South Building, Washington, DC 20090-6456, (202) 720-2185.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is issuing this rule in conformance with Executive Order 12866.

Pursuant to the requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et. seq.), AMS has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The revision of U.S. Standards for Grades of Florida Grapefruit, U.S. Standards for Grades of Florida Oranges and Tangelos, and U.S. Standards for Grades of Florida Tangerines will not impose substantial direct economic cost, recordkeeping, or personnel workload changes on small entities, and will not alter the market share or competitive position of these entities relative to large businesses.

The final rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. This action is not intended to have retroactive effect. This final rule will not preempt any State or local laws, regulations, or policies, unless they present an irreconcilable conflict with this rule. There are no administrative procedures which must be exhausted prior to any judicial challenge to the provisions of the rule.

Agencies periodically review existing regulations. An objective of the review is to ensure that the grade standards are serving their intended purpose, the language is clear, and the standards are consistent with AMS policy and authority.

The proposed rule, United States Standards for Grades of Florida Grapefruit, Florida Orange and Tangelos, and Florida Tangerines, was published in the Federal Register on February 22, 1995, (60 FR 9990-10004).

The Florida Citrus Packers (FCP), which represents the majority of citrus growers and packers in Florida,

requested that the standards be revised in order to bring them into conformity with current cultural, harvesting and marketing practices developed since the standards were last revised in December 1980.

The 60-day comment period ended April 24, 1995, and a total of fourteen comments were received from growers, shippers, receivers, and researchers.

Nine comments from growers, and shippers were in favor of the proposal in its entirety. These commentators agreed that due to changes in current cultural, harvesting, and marketing practices of Florida citrus, it was necessary to change the standards as proposed.

A copy of the proposed rule was provided to the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) for help in identifying studies, data collection or other information concerning the possible effect of the proposed revision on pesticide use. ARS was unable to identify any relevant information.

One comment from a broker did not address the provisions of the proposal, and indicated that the standards do not pertain to them.

One comment stated that they were "not in favor of the proposed changes and that there needs to be an effort to bring about standardization of grades of citrus." AMS disagrees. In light of the vast differences between the various citrus growing regions in the United States and the necessary differences in their respective citrus products, it would not be helpful to commerce in these commodities to create one U.S. standard that could not accurately identify quality and condition characteristics.

Two comments were in favor of the proposal except for its provisions regarding size, bruising, oil spots and skin breakdown. One comment from a grower/shipper/marketer stated that in the proposal §§ 51.762, 51.1153, and 51.1822 paragraph (a) concerning "approved and recognized methods" could be misconstrued to refer to pack patterns in the current size sections and therefore should reference the Florida Department of Citrus Code, a State regulation. AMS disagrees. Although