HACCP Model for Raw, Ground Meat and Poultry Products; HACCP–4, Generic HACCP Model for Raw, Not Ground Meat and Poultry Products; HACCP–5, Generic HACCP Model for Poultry Slaughter; HACCP–6, Generic HACCP Model for Mechanically Separated (Species)/Mechanically Deboned Poultry; HACCP–7, Generic HACCP Model for Thermally Processed Commercially Sterile Meat and Poultry Products;
HACCP–8, Generic HACCP Model for Irradiation; HACCP–9, Generic HACCP Model for Meat and Poultry Products with Secondary Inhibitors, Not Shelf-Stable; HACCP–10, Generic HACCP Model for Heat Treated, Shelf-Stable Meat and Poultry Products; HACCP–11, Generic HACCP Model for Not Shelf-Stable Heat Treated, Not Fully Cooked Meat and Poultry Products;
HACCP–12, Generic HACCP Model for Fully Cooked, Not Shelf-Stable Meat and Poultry Products; HACCP–13, Generic HACCP Model for Beef Slaughter; HACCP–14, Generic HACCP Model for Pork Slaughter; and HACCP–15, Generic HACCP Model for Not Heat Treated, Shelf-Stable Meat and Poultry Products.

Ten of the models were developed by the International Meat and Poultry HACCP Alliance, a consortium of academics, industry, and consumer group representatives, on a contractual basis with FSIS. The remaining three models were developed in-house at FSIS in consultation with representatives from other Federal agencies, academia, and industry, who peer reviewed the models. The previously published Guidebook and Guide have been revised and are being reissued for public comment with the HACCP models.

Since each HACCP system should be developed by an individual establishment for its specific processes and practices, the generic models are meant to serve as illustrations and were developed as conceptual, informational models. They are not intended and should not serve as blueprints for a specific plant's HACCP plan. Interested persons are invited to evaluate the materials in the 13 generic HACCP models and comment on their use and adaptability, especially by ''small'' and ''very small'' establishments in developing their own plant-specific HACCP plans. Comments are invited on: (a) whether the materials clearly are appropriate as generic models and not blueprints; (b) whether the language conveys unequivocally throughout the document that these are models; (c) whether the models are ''user friendly'' to the extent that they will guide plant owners in developing their own plans at reduced costs; and (d) whether the methodology and the technical assumptions used in the models have validity and utility as guidelines for plant owners. In addition, FSIS is interested in comments on the preferred format for publication of these guidance materials.

Done at Washington, DC, on: June 4, 1997.

**Thomas J. Billy,**

*Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 97–15333 Filed 6–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–DM–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### 14 CFR Part 150

**[Docket No. 28149]**

### Proposed Final Policy on Part 150 Approval and Funding of Noise Mitigation Measures

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of Proposed Final Policy on Part 150 Approval and Funding of Noise Mitigation Measures, and request for supplemental comment on its Impacts on Passenger Facility Charges; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document contains a correction to the notice of proposed policy and request for supplementary comments published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 28816) on May 28, 1997. The address to which comments should be sent was omitted from the notice. The notice announces that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has prepared for issuance a final policy concerning approval and eligibility for Federal funding of certain noise mitigation measures. Under this policy, as of January 1, 1998, the FAA will approve under 14 CFR part 150 (part 150) only remedial noise mitigation measures for existing noncompatible development and only preventive noise mitigation measures in areas of potential new noncompatible development. As of the same effective date, eligibility for Airport Improvement Program (AID) funding under the noise set-aside will be determined using criteria consistent with this policy. This policy also applies to projects that are eligible for noise set-aside funds without a part 150 program. This change in AIP eligibility will change in a similar way the eligibility of noise projects for passenger facility charge (PFC) funding. FAA is requesting supplemental comment on the impact of its limitations on PFC eligibility, and will consider any comments on PFC eligibility thus received and revise the policy as may be appropriate prior to issuing the final policy.

**DATES:** Comments are due on or before June 27, 1997. This policy will be effective January 1, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments on the impacts of this policy's limitations on PFC eligibility to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Attn.: Rules Docket (AGC–10), Docket No. 28149, 800 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 915G, Washington, DC 20591. Comments may also be submitted electronically to the following internet address: nprmcmts@mail.hq.faa.gov. Comments may be inspected in Room 915G between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. weekdays, except Federal Holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. William W. Albee (202–267–3553).

### Correction of Publication

In the Notice of proposed final policy (FR Doc. 97–13953) on page 28816 in the issue of Wednesday, May 28, 1997, the address to which comments should be sent was omitted. Please make the following correction: On page 28816, column 2, after the **DATES** paragraph and before the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, insert **ADDRESSES** paragraph as set forth above.

Issued in Washington, DC on June 6, 1997.

**Michael E. Chase,**

*Acting Assistant Chief Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 97–15431 Filed 6–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Internal Revenue Service

### 26 CFR Part 1

**[REG–208288–90]**

**RIN 1545–AP36**

### Filing Requirements for Returns Claiming the Foreign Tax Credit; Hearing Cancellation

**AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service, Treasury.

**ACTION:** Cancellation of notice of public hearing on proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This document provides notice of cancellation of a public hearing on proposed regulations relating to the substantiation requirements for taxpayers claiming foreign tax credits.

**DATES:** The public hearing originally scheduled for June 18, 1997, beginning at 10 a.m., is cancelled.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Evangelista C. Lee of the Regulations Unit, Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate), (202) 622–7190 (not a toll-free number).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The subject of the public hearing is proposed amendments to the Income Tax Regulations under section 905 of the Internal Revenue Code. A notice of public hearing on proposed rulemaking appearing in the **Federal Register** on Thursday, April 17, 1997 (62 FR 18730), announced that a public hearing would be held on Wednesday, June 18, 1997, beginning at 10 a.m., in room 3313, Internal Revenue Building, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20224.

The public hearing scheduled for Wednesday, June 18, 1997, is cancelled.

**Cynthia E. Grigsby,**

*Chief, Regulations Unit, Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate).*

[FR Doc. 97–15443 Filed 6–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–U

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## 40 CFR Part 52

**[WI75–01–7304; FRL–5840–7]**

## Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Wisconsin

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposes to approve Wisconsin's request to grant an exemption for the Milwaukee severe and Manitowoc County moderate ozone nonattainment areas from the applicable Oxides of Nitrogen ($NO_X$) transportation conformity requirements. On July 10, 1996, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resource (WDNR) submitted to the EPA a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision request for an exemption under section 182(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act (Act) from the transportation conformity requirements for $NO_X$ for the Milwaukee severe and Manitowoc County moderate ozone nonattainment areas. The request is based on the urban airshed modeling (UAM) conducted for the attainment demonstration for the Lake Michigan Ozone Study (LMOS) modeling domain. The rationale for this proposed approval is set forth in **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**; additional information is available at the address indicated.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposed action must be received by July 14, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), USEPA, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604–3590. Copies of the SIP revision, public comments and EPA's responses are available for inspection at the following address: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. (It is recommended that you telephone Michael Leslie at (312) 353–6680 before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

A copy of this SIP revision is available for inspection at the following location: Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) Docket and Information Center (Air Docket 6102), room M1500, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 260–7548.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael G. Leslie, Regulation Development Section (AR–18J), Air Programs Branch, Air and Radiation Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, Telephone Number (312) 353–6680.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### I. Background

Clean Air Act section 176(c)(3)(A)(iii) requires, in order to demonstrate conformity with the applicable SIP, that transportation plans and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) contribute to emissions reductions in ozone and carbon monoxide nonattainment areas during the period before control strategy SIPs are approved by USEPA. This requirement is implemented in 40 CFR 51.436 through 51.440 (and §§ 93.122 through 93.124), which establishes the so-called ''build/no-build test.'' This test requires a demonstration that the ''Action'' scenario (representing the implementation of the proposed transportation plan/TIP) will result in lower motor vehicle emissions than the ''Baseline'' scenario (representing the implementation of the current transportation plan/TIP). In addition, the ''Action'' scenario must result in emissions lower than 1990 levels.

The November 24, 1993, final transportation conformity rule [1] does not require the build/no-build test and less-than-1990 test for $NO_X$ as an ozone precursor in ozone nonattainment areas, where the Administrator determines that additional reductions of $NO_X$ would not contribute to attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone. Clean Air Act section 176(c)(3)(A)(iii), which is the conformity provision requiring contributions to emission reductions before SIPs with emissions budgets can be approved, specifically references Clean Air Act section 182(b)(1). That section requires submission of State plans that, among other things, provide for specific annual reductions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and $NO_X$ emissions ''as necessary'' to attain the ozone standard by the applicable attainment date. Section 182(b)(1) further states that its requirements do not apply in the case of $NO_X$ for those ozone nonattainment areas for which USEPA determines that additional reductions of $NO_X$ would not contribute to ozone attainment.

For ozone nonattainment areas, the process for submitting waiver requests and the criteria used to evaluate them are explained in the December 1993 USEPA document ''Guidelines for Determining the Applicability of Nitrogen Oxides Requirements Under Section 182(f),'' and the May 27, 1994, and February 8, 1995, memoranda from John S. Seitz, Director of the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, to Regional Air Division Directors, titled ''Section 182(f) $NO_X$ Exemptions—Revised Process and Criteria.''

On July 13, 1994, the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin (the States) submitted to the USEPA a petition for an exemption from the requirements of section 182(f) of the Clean Air Act (Act). The States, acting through the Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium (LADCo), petitioned for an exemption from the Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) and New Source Review (NSR) requirements for major stationary sources of $NO_X$. The petition also asked for an exemption from the transportation and general conformity requirements for $NO_X$ in all ozone nonattainment areas in the Region.

On March 6, 1995, the USEPA published a rulemaking proposing approval of the $NO_X$ exemption petition

[1] ''Criteria and Procedures for Determining Conformity to State or Federal Implementation Plans of Transportation Plans, Programs, and Projects Funded or Approved under Title 23 U.S.C. of the Federal Transit Act'' November 24, 1993 (58 FR 62188).