The document was published with several errors. This document corrects those errors.

DATES: Written comments by October 16, 1996; written comments on the agency's economic impact determination by October 16, 1996. The agency is requesting comments within a 30-day period, instead of the normal 90 days, so that the marketing status of OTC avobenzone-containing sunscreen drug products can be determined in an expeditious manner. FDA is proposing that any final rule based on this proposal become effective 12 months after its date of publication in the Federal Register.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 12420 Parklawn Dr., rm. 1–23, Rockville, MD 20857. Desk copies of these written comments to Debra L. Bowen, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (HFD–560), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William E. Gilbertson, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (HFD–105), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, 301–827–2304.

In FR Doc. 96–23547, appearing on page 48645 in the Federal Register of Monday, September 16, 1996, the following corrections are made:

1. On page 48646, in the third column, lines 3 through 7 are removed.

2. On page 48651, in Table 2, the ingredient ''Octylsalicyulate'' is corrected to read ''Octyl salicylate''.

PART 352—SUNSCREEN DRUG PRODUCTS FOR OVER-THE-COUNTER HUMAN USE

3. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 352 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 201, 501, 502, 503, 505, 510, 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321, 351, 352, 353, 355, 360, 371).

§ 352.20 [Corrected]

4. On page 48654, in the third column, in § 352.20, paragraph (a)(3)(i) is revised; paragraphs (a)(3)(iii) through (a)(3)(xx) are redesignated as (a)(3)(iv) through (a)(3)(xxi), respectively; new paragraph (a)(3)(iii) is added; in newly redesignated paragraph (a)(3)(vii), ''Ethyl .4-[bis(hydroxypropyl]'' is corrected to read ''Ethyl 4-[bis(hydroxypropyl]''; in newly redesignated paragraph (a)(3)(x), the word ''Lawsons'' is corrected to read ''Lawsone''. The revision and addition reads as follows:

§ 352.20 Permitted combinations of active ingredients.

(a) * * *

(3) * * *

(i) Aminobenzoic acid 5 to 15 percent.

* * * * *

(iii) Cinoxate 1 to 3 percent.

* * * * *

Dated: October 8, 1996.

William K. Hubbard,

Associate Commissioner for Policy Coordination.

[FR Doc. 96–26211 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–F

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

24 CFR Parts 42, 92, 215, 219, 221, 236, 290, 511, 570, 574, 576, 582, 583, 585, 882, 885, 886, 889, 890, 906, 941, 950, 968, 970, and 983

[Docket No. FR–4122–P–01]

RIN 2501–AC31

Office of the Secretary

Displacement, Relocation Assistance, and Real Property Acquisition for HUD and HUD-Assisted Programs; Streamlining Rule

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HUD.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice seeks public comment on a rulemaking HUD is considering. In an effort to comply with the President's regulatory reform initiatives, HUD is considering streamlining its regulations for displacement, relocation assistance, and real property acquisition by consolidating into one part similar provisions throughout title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), and by eliminating provisions that repeat statutory language or are otherwise unnecessary. Because of the scope of this effort and the potential difficulties in preparing one set of regulations that would be adapted for all HUD programs, HUD is seeking comments from users of the program regulations to determine whether a consolidated set of relocation regulations would be preferable and feasible.

DATES: Comments must be submitted by December 10, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this advance notice of proposed rulemaking to the Rules Docket Clerk, Office of General Counsel, Room 10276, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20410–0500. Communications should refer to the above docket number and title. Facsimile (FAX) comments are not acceptable. A copy of each communication submitted will be available for public inspection and copying between 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. weekdays at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Janice Petty, Relocation Specialist, Relocation and Real Estate Division, Room 7168, telephone number (202) 708–1367 (this is not a toll-free number). For legal questions, contact: David Polatsek, Attorney-Advisor, Community Development Division, Room 8158, telephone number (202) 708–2027 (this is not a toll-free number). For hearing- and speech-impaired persons, the telephone numbers may be accessed via TTY by calling the Federal Information Relay Service at (800) 877–8339. The address for both of these persons is: Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20410.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 4, 1995, President Clinton issued a memorandum to all Federal departments and agencies regarding regulatory reinvention. In response to this memorandum, HUD conducted a page-by-page review of its regulations to determine which can be eliminated, consolidated, or otherwise improved.

HUD is considering whether the regulations for displacement, relocation, and real property acquisition can be improved and streamlined by consolidating similar requirements throughout individual program regulations in title 24 of the CFR. The major part of these regulations would then refer to part 42 for relocation-related requirements, which would continue to reference the Department of Transportation's government-wide rule at 49 CFR part 24, as well as include HUD-specific requirements. Through a final rule published on October 3, 1996 (61 FR 51756), HUD moved into part 42 relocation requirements implementing section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(d)(4)) (Section 104(d)), which requires a residential antidisplacement and relocation assistance plan (RARAP) by State and local governments receiving funds under the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG), and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) programs.

Several provisions in HUD's regulations throughout title 24 of the

CFR repeat statutory language from the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Pub. L. 91–646, 84 Stat. 1894, 42 U.S.C. 4601) (URA). Other provisions repeat language from the Department of Transportation's regulations implementing the URA. Because the requirements apply to more than one program, HUD had repeated the requirements in different program regulations. This repetition is unnecessary, and updating these scattered provisions is cumbersome and often creates confusion.

HUD would like to remove language restating requirements already imposed by statute and replace that language with citations to the specific statutory provision. In addition, HUD would propose regulatory language as necessary that would further develop the statutory requirements, but that would be useful as a single-source reference for all HUD programs. HUD anticipates that this proposed streamlining effort could eliminate approximately 30 pages of unnecessary regulations from the CFR.

Because the subject is complex, HUD anticipates that it will require considerable time and effort to craft a rule that addresses the concerns of a multitude of different program areas. The development of a streamlining proposal will require the involvement of HUD's various program offices to resolve issues such as what constitutes ''initiation of negotiations,'' what is meant by ''project'', and what should be the dates from which eligibility for relocation benefits will be recognized. Because the URA itself is so pervasive, the terms of the statute—and those of the governmentwide rule—are necessarily broad. HUD's job in streamlining its rules on relocation is to construct a matrix for implementation that is concise, as uniform as practical, and as program-specific as needed. Furthermore, any changes made in the regulations would have to be consistent with statutory authority and the Department of Transportation's government-wide rule.

HUD's various program offices have raised a number of questions about the practicality of this consolidation effort. HUD will try to streamline current relocation provisions throughout its regulations as described above; however, as part of its streamlining effort HUD is seeking public input on the consolidation of the various relocation provisions into a single part of its regulations. Therefore, by this notice the public is invited to comment on the following questions that HUD's offices have raised, and any other related matters or suggestions, including whether such a consolidation would be helpful to HUD's clients:

(1) Should HUD change the definition of ''displaced person'' to simplify its provisions or to expand or limit the circumstances under which a person will be considered displaced?

(2) In an effort to ensure some consistency between the eligibility thresholds for relocation benefits at URA and Section 104(d) levels, HUD has defined the thresholds using the same terminology, but with slight differences in the requirements applicable under the alternative (i.e., URA vs. Section 104(d)) levels of benefits. To the extent possible under the statutes, should HUD standardize these eligibility thresholds, and if so, what is the appropriate threshold: Total Tenant Payment (TTP), 30 percent of gross income, Fair Market Rent (as defined in HUD regulations), or some other threshold?

(3) Can HUD standardize other terminology used in the various program regulations on relocation? For example, can HUD define the following, or substitute, terms in a manner that could apply to most or all HUD programs: ''low-income person,'' ''low-income housing,'' ''recipient,'' and ''initiation of negotiations''?

(4) In particular, can HUD make the dates from which eligibility for relocation benefits will be recognized (a concept currently captured within the term ''initiation of negotiations'') clearer and more uniform throughout HUD's programs?

(5) Should HUD define the term ''project''?

(6) Under the current rule, is there confusion about who may appeal an agency's decision, and if so, how can HUD eliminate that confusion?

(7) How should household income be computed for purposes of calculating payments under the URA and of calculating payments and determining eligibility for Section 104(d) relocation benefits?

(8) How should HUD define ''eviction for cause'' when providing that relocation benefits do not have to be extended to persons evicted for cause?

(9) Should HUD develop a uniform standard for measuring size of units and determining replacement housing requirements?

(10) Do the current regulations accurately reflect the role of States that are CDBG grantees?

(11) Are the regulations unclear about when benefits must be paid for temporary relocation and about what constitutes a ''temporary relocation''?

(12) Should HUD reconsider its policy on minimizing displacement; if so, how should HUD change the policy; if not, what assurances should HUD require?

(13) What is the effect and usefulness of the specific requirement that displaced persons be advised of the availability of replacement housing outside areas of minority concentration?

(14) HUD is considering interpreting certain definitions in a way that would impose requirements for replacement of housing units and other relocation requirements when assisted activities result in displacement and the removal or reduction of housing stock through such events as reconfiguration of existing units and the placarding of units as unfit for human habitation, pursuant to local housing and occupancy codes under assisted code enforcement programs. Thus, for example, should HUD define the term ''demolition'' to recognize that such events may reduce the total available housing stock and displace occupants just as effectively as would actually razing structures?

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 3535(d), 4601, 5304, and 12705(b).

Dated: October 2, 1996.

Henry G. Cisneros,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–26119 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–32–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[CGD07–96–053]

RIN 2115–AE46

Special Local Regulations; Holiday Boat Parade of the Palm Beaches; Palm Beach, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish special local Regulations for the Holiday Boat Parade of the Palm Beaches. This event would be held annually during the second Saturday of December, from 6:30 p.m. until 9 p.m. EST (Eastern Standard Time). Historically, there have been approximately 60 parade event participant vessels and 200 spectator craft during the boat parade. The resulting congestion of navigable channels creates an extra or unusual hazard in the navigable waters. These proposed regulations are necessary to