individual kernel or of the lot. (For tolerances, see § 51.2557, Table I.)

(1) *Immature kernels* are excessively thin kernels and can have black, brown or gray surface with a dark interior color and the immaturity has adversely affected the flavor of the kernel.

(2) *Kernel spotting* refers to dark brown or dark gray spots aggregating more than one-eighth of the surface of the kernel.

(g) *Serious damage* means any specific defect described in paragraph (g) (1) through (5) of this section, or an equally objectionable variation of any one of these defects, any other defect, or any combination of defects, which seriously detracts from the appearance or the edible or marketing quality of the individual kernel or of the lot. (For tolerances see § 51.2557 Table I.)

(1) *Mold* which is readily visible on the kernel.

(2) *Minor insect or vertebrate injury* means the kernel shows conspicuous evidence of feeding.

(3) *Insect damage* is an insect, insect fragment, web or frass attached to the kernel. No live insects shall be permitted.

(4) *Rancidity* means the kernel is distinctly rancid to taste. Staleness of flavor shall not be classed as rancidity.

(5) *Decay* means one-sixteenth or more of the kernel is decomposed.

■ 17. Section 51.2562 is added to read as follows:

§ 51.2562 Metric Conversion Table.

Use the following table for metric conversion:

Inches	Millimeters
5/64	1.98
16/64	6.35
24/64	9.53
Ounces	Grams
1	28.35
2	56.7

Dated: August 19, 2003.

A.J. Yates,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 03–21547 Filed 8–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 1030

[Docket No. DA–01–03; AO–361–A35]

Milk in the Upper Midwest Marketing Area: Order Amending the Order

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document adopts as a final rule, without change an interim final rule concerning pooling provisions of the Upper Midwest Federal milk order. Specifically, this final rule continues to prohibit the ability to simultaneously pool the same milk on the Upper Midwest Federal milk order and a State-operated milk order that has market-wide pooling. Additionally, the final rule limits the amount of milk that can be diverted to nonpool plants from pool distributing plants regulated under the order. More than the required number of producers in the Upper Midwest marketing area have approved the issuance of the final order amendments.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 1, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gino Tosi, Marketing Specialist, USDA/AMS/Dairy Programs, Order Formulation and Enforcement Branch, Stop 0231–Room 2971, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250–0231, (202) 690–1366, e-mail: *gino.tosi@usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This administrative rule is governed by the provisions of Sections 556 and 557 of Title 5 of the United States Code and, therefore, is excluded from the requirements of Executive Order 12866.

This final rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule is not intended to have retroactive effect. This rule will not preempt any state or local laws, regulations, or policies, unless they present an irreconcilable conflict with the rule.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), provides that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under section 608c(15)(A) of the Act, any handler subject to an order may request modification or exemption from such order by filing with the Department of Agriculture (USDA) a petition stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with the law. A handler is afforded the opportunity for a hearing on the petition. After a hearing, the Department would rule on the petition. The Act provides that the District Court of the United States in any district in which the handler is an inhabitant, or has its principal place of business, has jurisdiction in equity to review the Department's ruling on the petition, provided a bill in equity is filed not later than 20 days after the date of the entry of the ruling.

Regulatory Flexibility Act and Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Agricultural Marketing Service has considered the economic impact of this action on small entities and has certified that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. For the purpose of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, a dairy farm is considered a ''small business'' if it has an annual gross revenue of less than $750,000, and a dairy products manufacturer is a ''small business'' if it has fewer than 500 employees.

For the purposes of determining which dairy farms are ''small businesses,'' the $750,000 per year criterion was used to establish a production guideline of 500,000 pounds per month. Although this guideline does not factor in additional monies that may be received by dairy producers, it should be an inclusive standard for most ''small'' dairy farmers. For purposes of determining a handler's size, if the plant is part of a larger company operating multiple plants that collectively exceed the 500-employee limit, the plant will be considered a large business even if the local plant has fewer than 500 employees.

In June 2001, there were 12,748 producers pooled on, and 57 handlers regulated by, the Upper Midwest order. Based on these criteria, the vast majority of the producers and handlers would be considered as small businesses. The adoption of the proposed pooling standards serves to revise established criteria that determine those producers, producer milk, and plants that have a reasonable association with, and are consistently serving the fluid needs of, the Upper Midwest milk marketing area and are not associated with other market-wide pools concerning the same milk. Criteria for pooling are established on the basis of performance levels that are considered adequate to meet the Class I fluid needs and, by doing so, determine those that are eligible to share in the revenue that arises from the

classified pricing of milk. Criteria for pooling are established without regard to the size of any dairy industry organization or entity. The criteria established are applied in an identical fashion to both large and small businesses and do not have any different economic impact on small entities as opposed to large entities. Therefore, the amendments will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

A review of reporting requirements was completed under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). It was determined that these amendments would have no impact on reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance requirements because they would remain identical to the current requirements. No new forms are proposed and no additional reporting requirements would be necessary.

This action does not require additional information collection that requires clearance by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) beyond currently approved information collection. The primary sources of data used to complete the forms are routinely used in most business transactions. Forms require only a minimal amount of information which can be supplied without data processing equipment or a trained statistical staff. Thus, the information collection and reporting burden is relatively small. Requiring the same reports for all handlers does not significantly disadvantage any handler that is smaller than the industry average.

Prior documents in this proceeding:

Notice of Hearing: Issued June 5, 2001; published June 11, 2001 (66 FR 31185).

Tentative Final Decision: Issued February 8, 2002; published February 14, 2002 (67 FR 7040).

Interim Final Rule: Issued April 16, 2002; published April 22, 2002 (67 FR 19507).

Final Decision: Issued June 18, 2003; published June 24, 2003 (68 FR 37674).

Findings and Determinations

The findings and determinations hereinafter set forth supplement those that were made when the Upper Midwest order was first issued and when it was amended. The previous findings and determinations are hereby ratified and confirmed, except where they may conflict with those set forth herein.

The following findings are hereby made with respect to the Upper Midwest order:

(a) *Findings upon the basis of the hearing record.* 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), a public hearing was held upon certain proposed amendments to the tentative marketing agreement and to the order regulating the handling of milk in the Upper Midwest marketing area.

Upon the basis of the evidence introduced at such hearing and the record thereof it is found that:

(1) The Upper Midwest order, as hereby amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act;

(2) The parity prices of milk, as determined pursuant to section 2 of the Act, are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk in the marketing area, and the minimum prices specified in the order, as hereby amended, are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest; and

(3) The Upper Midwest order, as hereby amended, regulates the handling of milk in the same manner as, and is applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial and commercial activity specified in, a marketing agreement upon which a hearing has been held.

(b) *Additional Findings.* It is necessary in the public interest to make these amendments to the Upper Midwest order effective September 1, 2003. Any delay beyond that date would tend to disrupt the orderly marketing of milk in the aforesaid marketing area.

The amendments to these orders are known to handlers. The final decision containing the proposed amendments to these orders was issued on June 18, 2003. These proposed amendments are identical to the amendments in the Interim Final Rule published in the **Federal Register** on April 22, 2002 (67 FR 19507) regulating the handing of milk in the Upper Midwest marketing area.

The changes that result from these amendments will not require extensive preparation or substantial alteration in the method of operation for handlers. In view of the foregoing, it is hereby found and determined that good cause exists for making these order amendments effective September 1, 2003. It would be contrary to the public interest to delay the effective date of these amendments for 30 days after their publication in the **Federal Register**. (Sec. 553(d), Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551–559.)

(c) Determinations. It is hereby determined that:

(1) The refusal or failure of handlers (excluding cooperative associations specified in Sec. 8c(9) of the Act) of more than 50 percent of the milk, which is marketed within the specified marketing area, to sign a proposed marketing agreement, tends to prevent the effectuation of the declared policy of the Act;

(2) The issuance of this order amending the Upper Midwest order is the only practical means pursuant to the declared policy of the Act of advancing the interests of producers as defined in the order(s) as hereby amended;

(3) The issuance of the order amending the Upper Midwest order is favored by at least two-thirds of the producers who were engaged in the production of milk for sale in the marketing area.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Parts 1030

Milk marketing orders.

Order Relative to Handling

■ *It is therefore ordered,* that on and after the effective date of this document, the handling of milk in the Upper Midwest marketing area shall be in conformity to and in compliance with the terms and conditions of the order, as amended, and as hereby further amended, as follows:

PART 1030—MILK IN THE UPPER MIDWEST MARKETING AREA

■ The interim final rule amending 7 CFR part 1030 which was published at (67 FR 19507) on April 16, 2002, is adopted as a final rule without change.

Dated: August 18, 2003.

A.J. Yates,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 03–21530 Filed 8–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–U

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food Safety and Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 430

[Docket No. 03–029N]

Listeria Monocytogenes Workshops for Small and Very Small Plants

AGENCY: Food Safety and Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of workshops.