Subpart C also issued under 5 U.S.C. 5304, 5305, and 5553; sections 302 and 404 of FEPCA, Pub. L. 101–509, 104 Stat. 1462 and 1466; and section 3(7) of Pub. L. 102–378, 106 Stat. 1356;

Subpart D also issued under 5 U.S.C. 5535(g) and 7701(b)(2);

Subpart E also issued under 5 U.S.C. 5336:

Subpart F also issued under 5 U.S.C. 5304, 5305(g)(1), and 5553; and E.O. 12883, 58 FR 63281, 3 CFR, 1993 Comp., p. 682;

Subpart G also issued under 5 U.S.C. 5304, 5305, and 5553; section 302 of the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990 (FEPCA), Pub. L. 101–509, 104 Stat. 1462; and E.O. 12786, 56 FR 67453, 3 CFR, 1991 Comp., p. 376.

Subpart F—Locality-Based Comparability Payments

2. In § 531.603, paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

§ 531.603 Locality pay areas.

- * * * * *
- (b) The following are locality pay areas for the purpose of this subpart:
- (1) Atlanta, GA—consisting of the Atlanta, GA MSA;
- (2) Boston–Worcester–Lawrence, MA–NH–ME–CT—consisting of the Boston–Worcester–Lawrence, MA–NH–ME–CT CMSA;
- (3) Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI—consisting of the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA;
- (4) Cincinnati–Hamilton, OH–KY–IN—consisting of the Cincinnati–Hamilton, OH–KY–IN CMSA;
- (5) Cleveland–Akron, OH—consisting of the Cleveland–Akron, OH CMSA;
- (6) Columbus, OH—consisting of the Columbus, OH MSA;
- (7) Dallas–Fort Worth, TX—consisting of the Dallas–Fort Worth, TX CMSA;
- (8) Dayton–Springfield, OH—consisting of the Dayton–Springfield, OH MSA;
- (9) Denver–Boulder–Greeley, CO—consisting of the Denver–Boulder–Greeley, CO MSA;
- (10) Detroit–Ann Arbor–Flint, MI—consisting of the Detroit–Ann Arbor–Flint, MI CMSA;
- (11) Hartford, CT—consisting of the Hartford, CT MSA plus that portion of New London County, CT, not located within the Hartford, CT MSA;
- (12) Houston–Galveston–Brazoria, TX—consisting of the Houston– Galveston–Brazoria, TX CMSA;
- (13) Huntsville, AL—consisting of the Huntsville, AL MSA;
- (14) Indianapolis, IN—consisting of the Indianapolis, IN MSA;
- (15) Kansas City, MO–KS—consisting of the Kansas City, MO–KS MSA;

- (16) Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA—consisting of the Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA; plus Santa Barbara County, CA, and that portion of Edwards Air Force Base, CA, not located within the Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA;
- (17) Miami–Fort Lauderdale, FL—consisting of the Miami–Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA;
- (18) Milwaukee–Racine, WI—consisting of the Milwaukee–Racine, WI CMSA:
- (19) Minneapolis–St. Paul, MN–WI—consisting of the Minneapolis–St. Paul, MN–WI MSA;
- (20) New York–Northern New Jersey–Long Island, NY–NJ–CT–PA—consisting of the New York–Northern New Jersey–Long Island, NY–NJ–CT–PA CMSA;
- (21) Orlando, FL—consisting of the Orlando, FL MSA;
- (22) Philadelphia–Wilmington– Atlantic City, PA–NJ–DE–MD consisting of the Philadelphia– Wilmington–Atlantic City, PA–NJ–DE– MD CMSA;
- (23) Pittsburgh, PA—consisting of the Pittsburgh, PA MSA;
- (24) Portland–Salem, OR–WA—consisting of the Portland–Salem, OR–WA CMSA;
- (25) Richmond–Petersburg, VA—consisting of the Richmond–Petersburg, VA MSA;
- (26) Sacramento-Yolo, CA—consisting of the Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA;
- (27) St. Louis, MO–IL—consisting of the St. Louis, MO–IL MSA;
- (28) San Diego, CA—consisting of the San Diego, CA MSA;
- (29) San Francisco–Oakland–San Jose, CA—consisting of the San Francisco– Oakland–San Jose, CA CMSA;
- (30) Seattle–Tacoma–Bremerton, WA—consisting of the Seattle–Tacoma–Bremerton, WA CMSA;
- (31) Washington–Baltimore, DC–MD–VA–WV—consisting of the Washington–Baltimore, DC–MD–VA–WV CMSA, plus St. Mary's County, MD; and
- (32) Rest of U.S.—consisting of those portions of the continental United States not located within another locality pay area.

[FR Doc. 96–27629 Filed 10–24–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6325–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Parts 1005, 1007, 1011, 1046 [Docket No. AO-388-A9, et al.; DA-96-08]

Milk in the Carolina and Certain Other Marketing Areas; Notice of Extension of Time for Filing Comments

7 CFR Part	Marketing area	AO Nos.
1005 1007 1011 1046	Carolina	AO-388-A9 AO-366-A38 AO-251-A40 AO-123-A67

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Extension of time for filing comments to the tentative partial decision.

SUMMARY: This notice extends the time for filing comments to the tentative partial decision which would incorporate a transportation credit balancing fund into four Federal milk marketing orders in the southern United States. The amendments are based on the record of a public hearing held May 15–16, 1996, in Charlotte, North Carolina. Carolina Virginia Milk Producers Association requested additional time to observe and evaluate the amendments. The time has been extended forty-five (45) days to November 30, 1996.

DATES: Comments are now due on or before November 30, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments (six copies) should be filed with the Hearing Clerk, Room 1083, South Building, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nicholas Memoli, Marketing Specialist, USDA/AMS/Dairy Division, Order Formulation Branch, Room 2971, South Building, P.O. Box 96456, Washington, DC 20090–6456, (202) 690–1932.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Prior documents in this proceeding: *Notice of Hearing:* Issued May 1, 1996; published May 3, 1996 (61 FR 19861).

Tentative Partial Decision: Issued July 12, 1996; published July 18, 1996 (61 FR 37628).

Interim Amendment of Rules: Issued August 2, 1996; published August 9, 1996 (61 FR 41488).

Notice of Extension of Time for Filing Comments to Tentative Partial Decision: Issued August 16, 1996; published August 23, 1996 (61 FR 43474).

A notice was published in the Federal Register on August 23, 1996 (61 FR 43474), extending the time to file comments to the tentative partial final decision regulating the handling of milk in the Carolina, Southeast, Tennessee Valley and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville marketing areas from August 17 to October 16, 1996. Notice is hereby given that the time for filing comments to the tentative partial decision regulating the handling of milk in the aforesaid marketing areas is hereby further extended from October 16 to November 30, 1996.

The initial comment period was extended, from August 16 to October 17, 1996, at the request of Carolina Virginia Milk Producers Association, to allow interested persons to comment more accurately on the amendments. The cooperative has asked that the comment period be extended an additional fortyfive (45) days to November 30, 1996, to allow more observation time to evaluate the amendments. The cooperative stated that the amendments went into effect on August 10, 1996, and it has only observed the amendments for one Federal order pool.

It should be noted that any finalization of the tentative partial decision, with or without modification, may only be based on the factual record received in evidence at the oral hearing on May 15-16, 1996. To the extent that any comments will be based on subsequent factual occurrences, the Secretary would have to reopen the oral hearing if he believed consideration of such subsequent facts to be warranted. Nonetheless, the Secretary welcomes full participation by all interested persons in the rulemaking process. Thus, the comment period is further extended from October 16 to November 30, 1996.

This notice is issued pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), 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 1005, 1007, 1011, and 1046

Milk marketing orders.

Dated: October 18, 1996.

Lon Hatamiya,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96-27458 Filed 10-24-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

10 CFR Part 708

Contractor Employee Protection Program

AGENCY: Department of Energy. **ACTION:** Notice of inquiry.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy's contractor employee protection program provides recourse to DOE contractor employees who believe that they have been retaliated against for such activities as disclosing information regarding mismanagement of environmental, safety, health, and other matters, for participating in Congressional proceedings, or for refusing to engage in illegal or dangerous activities. Under this program, the Department has been investigating and adjudicating cases for the past four and one half years. As part of Secretary Hazel R. O'Leary's policy of 'zero tolerance for reprisal' against employees who raise workplace concerns, the DOE invites members of the public, particularly those persons with experience under this process (e.g., claimants, contractors, attorneys), to recommend any regulatory changes that might help to streamline the process and make it more responsive to the needs of both claimants and contractors. DATES: Comments are due on December 24, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments (5 copies) may be submitted to: William A. Lewis, Jr., Director, Office of Employee Concerns, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, Att: Contractor Employee Protection NOI.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeffrey C. Crater, Office of the Under Secretary, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585, 202-586-6479. **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant** to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (Act) [42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.] and the Department of Energy Organization Act, the Department of Energy (Department) carries out numerous programs, including research, development, production, and environmental cleanup. These programs are carried out by contractors under the supervision of the Department at various Departmentowned and/or operated facilities around the United States.

As part of a comprehensive set of health and safety policies, the Department has promulgated a regulation on contractor employee protection, which is codified at 10 CFR part 708. This regulation, promulgated

in 1992, 57 FR 7541 (March 3, 1992), provides a remedy for a contractor employee who has been discriminated against as a result of having disclosed information about waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement of health, safety, or environmental related matters, or about violations of law or regulation, for participating in Congressional proceedings, or for having in good faith refused to engage in illegal or dangerous activities. Since its inception, the Department has received comments and suggestions on how to improve the contractor employee protection program. In November 1995, the Office of Contractor Employee Protection was transferred to the Office of Inspector General. In response to congressional directive, the Office of Contractor Employee Protection was disestablished through a reorganization effective October 1, 1996. The Office of Inspector General will continue to investigate allegations of retaliation against contractor employees covered by Part

Accordingly, the Department plans to amend part 708 to enhance its effectiveness and to address the reorganization of the contractor employee protection program. Although the Department has consulted with various stakeholders about this subject, the Department hereby invites public input from any interested person who thinks that part 708 should be revised and has suggestions for particular amendments. It will be followed eventually by a notice of proposed rulemaking that will give interested members of the public an opportunity to comment on the Department's formal proposal to amend part 708.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on October 11, 1996.

William A. Lewis, Jr.,

Director, Office of Employee Concerns. [FR Doc. 96-27418 Filed 10-24-96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Chapter I

[Summary Notice No. PR-96-7]

Petition for Rulemaking; Summary of Petitions Received; Dispositions of **Petitions Issued**

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of petitions for

rulemaking received and of dispositions

of prior petitions.