

(ii) Multiplying the result of section 10(d)(2)(i) by the applicable Fresh Fruit Factor located in the Special Provisions; and

(iii) Adding the result of section 10(d)(2)(ii) to the result of section 10(d)(1)(ii).

(e) Notwithstanding section 10(d), for citrus fruit insured as fresh that do not have a default juice content or a Fresh Fruit Factor provided in the Special Provisions, any individual citrus fruit not meeting the United States standards for packing as fresh fruit due to an insured cause of loss, will be considered 100 percent damaged.

* * * * *

Signed in Washington, DC, on July 10, 2012.

William J. Murphy,
Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

[FR Doc. 2012-17235 Filed 7-13-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Parts 1 and 2

[Docket No. APHIS-2011-0003]

RIN 0579-AC36

Animal Welfare; Retail Pet Stores and Licensing Exemptions

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: We are extending the comment period for our proposed rule that would revise the definition of *retail pet store* and related regulations to bring more pet animals sold at retail under the protection of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). We are also announcing the availability of a revised factsheet regarding our proposal. These actions will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments.

DATES: We will consider all comments that we receive on or before August 15, 2012.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov/documentDetail;D=APHIS-2011-0003>.

- *Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:* Send your comment to Docket No. APHIS-2011-0003, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A-03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737-1238.

Supporting documents and any comments we receive on this docket may be viewed at <http://www.regulations.gov/documentDetail;D=APHIS-2011-0003> or in our reading room, which is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 799-7039 before coming.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Gerald Rushin, Veterinary Medical Officer, Animal Care, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 84, Riverdale, MD 20737-1231; (301) 851-3740.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 16, 2012, we published in the **Federal Register** (77 FR 28799-28805, Docket No. APHIS-2011-0003) a proposal to revise the definition of *retail pet store* and related regulations to bring more pet animals sold at retail under the protection of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA).

“Retail pet stores” are not required to obtain a license under the AWA or comply with the AWA regulations and standards. Currently, anyone selling, at retail, the following animals for use as pets are considered retail pet stores: Dogs, cats, rabbits, guinea pigs, hamsters, gerbils, rats, mice, gophers, chinchilla, domestic ferrets, domestic farm animals, birds, and cold-blooded species.

Under the proposed rule, “retail pet store” status would not apply to such retailers if buyers do not physically enter the seller’s place of business or residence in order to personally observe the animals available for sale prior to purchase and/or to take custody of the animals after purchase. Unless otherwise exempt under the regulations, these entities would be required to obtain a license from APHIS and would become subject to the requirements of the AWA. The proposed rule would exempt from regulation anyone who sells or negotiates the sale or purchase of any animal, except wild or exotic animals, dogs, or cats, and who derives no more than \$500 gross income from the sale of such animals. In addition, the proposed rule would increase from three to four the number of breeding female dogs, cats, and/or small exotic or wild mammals that a person may maintain on his or her premises and be exempt from licensing and inspection if he or she sells only the offspring of those animals born and raised on his or

her premises for use as pets or exhibition, regardless of whether those animals are sold at retail or wholesale.

Comments on the proposed rule were required to be received on or before July 16, 2012. We are extending the comment period on Docket No. APHIS-2011-0003 for an additional 30 days. This action will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments.

We are also announcing the availability of a revised factsheet to clarify our proposed actions. The revised factsheet is available on the Web at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/publications/animal_welfare/2012/retail_pets_faq.pdf.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2131-2159; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.7.

Done in Washington, DC, this 11th day of July 2012.

Edward Avalos,
Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.

[FR Doc. 2012-17283 Filed 7-13-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employee Benefits Security Administration

29 CFR Part 2550

RIN 1210-AB54

Amendment Relating to Reasonable Contract or Arrangement Under Section 408(b)(2)—Fee Disclosure/Web Page

AGENCY: Employee Benefits Security Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule is a companion to the Department of Labor (Department) Employee Benefits Security Administration’s direct final rule (published today in the “Rules and Regulations” section of the **Federal Register**) amending the Department’s fiduciary-level fee disclosure regulation under section 408(b)(2) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) to revise the mailing address and enhance the web-based submission procedure for notices filed under the regulation’s fiduciary class exemption provision.

The Department is publishing this amendment as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Department views this as highly technical and anticipates no significant adverse comment. The Department has explained its reasons in the preamble to