facilities and geographic features criteria favor the Memphis wage area because Interstate Highway 55 provides direct access from Panola County to the Memphis survey area while access to the major cities in the Northern Mississippi survey area (Columbus, Greenwood, and Tupelo) is mainly by secondary and multilane divided highways. Similarities in overall population, total private sector employment, and kinds and sizes of private industrial establishments favor the Northern Mississippi wage area. Based on this analysis, we recommend that Panola County be redefined to the Memphis wage area.

The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC), the national labormanagement committee responsible for advising OPM on matters concerning the pay of FWS employees, recommended this change by consensus. This change would be effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period for FWS employees in Panola County beginning on or after 30 days following publication of final regulations. FPRAC did not recommend other changes in the geographic definitions of the Northern Mississippi and Memphis wage areas at this time.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

I certify that these regulations would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they would affect only Federal agencies and employees.

List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 532

Administrative practice and procedure, Freedom of information, Government employees, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wages.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

John Berry,

Director.

Accordingly, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management is proposing to amend 5 CFR part 532 as follows:

PART 532—PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS

1. The authority citation for part 532 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 5343, 5346; § 532.707 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 552.

Appendix C to Subpart B of Part 532— Appropriated Fund Wage and Survey Areas

2. Appendix C to subpart B is amended by revising the wage area listings for the Northern Mississippi and Memphis, TN, wage areas to read as follows:

MISSISSIPPI

Northern Mississippi

Survey Area

Mississippi:

Clay

Grenada

Lee

Leflore

Lowndes Monroe

Oktibbeha

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Mississippi:

Alcorn

Bolivar

Calhoun Carroll

Chickasaw

Choctaw

Coahoma

Itawamba

Lafayette (Does not include the Holly

Springs National Forest portion)

Montgomery

Noxubee

Pontotoc (Does not include the Holly

Springs National Forest portion)

Prentiss

Quitman

Sunflower Tallahatchie

Tishomingo

Union (Does not include the Holly Springs

National Forest portion)

Washington

Webster

Winston

Yalobusha

TENNESSEE

Memphis

Survey Area

Arkansas:

Crittenden

Mississippi

Mississippi:

De Soto Tennessee:

Shelby

Tipton

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Arkansas:

Craighead

Cross

Lee

Poinsett St. Francis

Mississippi:

Benton

Lafayette (Holly Springs National Forest

portion only) Marshall

Panola

Pontotoc (Holly Springs National Forest portion only)

Tate

Tippah Tunica

Union (Holly Springs National Forest

portion only)

Missouri:

Dunklin Pemiscot

Tennessee:

Carroll

Chester Crockett

Dyer

Fayette

Gibson

Hardeman

Hardin

Haywood Lake

Lauderdale

Madison McNairy

Obion

[FR Doc. 2011-13698 Filed 6-1-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-39-P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL **MANAGEMENT**

5 CFR Chapters I and XXXV

45 CFR Chapter VIII

48 CFR Chapters 16, 17, and 21

Reducing Regulatory Burden; Retrospective Review Under E.O. 13563

AGENCY: Office of Personnel

Management.

ACTION: Request for information.

SUMMARY: The Office of Personnel Management has posted on its public open government Web site a preliminary plan for retrospective review of its existing regulations. OPM prepared this plan in compliance with Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, issued January 18, 2011. The Executive Order outlines the President's plan to create a 21st-century regulatory system that is simpler and smarter and that protects the interests of the American people in a pragmatic and cost-effective wav.

DATES: The deadline for submitting comments is July 1, 2011.

ADDRESSES: The public is encouraged to submit comments through OPM's public Web site (http://www.opm.gov/open).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mauro Morales, Policy Counsel, Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street NW., Room 1342, Washington, DC

20415. Phone (202) 606–1700 or e-mail at *Mauro.Morales@opm.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OPM's plan sets forth a process for obtaining input from the public on an annual basis concerning the regulations that OPM should review. The plan also identifies the regulations that OPM plans on examining this year.

OPM is now seeking public comment on its plan. Any comments that are submitted will also be viewable by the public. OPM will review the comments and post the final plan to its public open government Web site.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management. **John Berry**,

Director.

[FR Doc. 2011-13699 Filed 6-1-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-48-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 36

[Document No. AMS-FV-07-0100]

Procedures by Which the Agricultural Marketing Service Develops, Revises, Suspends, or Terminates Voluntary Official Grade Standards: United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Okra

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) of the Department of Agriculture (USDA) proposes to revise the United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Okra. The standards for frozen okra would be changed from a "variable score point" system to an "individual attribute" grading system; the "dual grade nomenclature" would be replaced with single letter grade designation and editorial changes would be included. These changes would bring the standards for frozen okra in line with the present quality levels being marketed today and would provide guidance in the effective utilization of frozen okra.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before August 1, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be mailed to Brian E. Griffin, Inspection and Standardization Section, Processed Products Branch, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 0709, South Building; STOP 0247,

Washington, DC 20250; fax: (202) 690-1527; or Internet: http:// www.regulations.gov. The proposed United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Okra are available through the address cited above. All comments should reference the document number, date, and page number of this issue of the Federal Register. All comments will be posted without change, including any personal information provided. All comments submitted in response to this notice will be included in the record and will be made available to the public on the Internet via http:// www.regulations.gov. Comments will be made available for public inspection at the above address during regular business hours or can be viewed at: http://www.regulations.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Contact Brian E. Griffin, at the address above, or phone (202)720–5021; or fax (202) 690–1527. Copies of the proposed U.S. Standards for Grades of Frozen Okra are available on the Internet at http://www.regulations.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 203(c) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended, directs and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture "to develop and improve standards of quality, condition, quantity, grade, and packaging, and recommend and demonstrate such standards in order to encourage uniformity and consistency in commercial practices."

AMS is committed to carrying out this authority in a manner that facilitates the marketing of agricultural commodities and makes copies of official standards available upon request. Those United States Standards for Grades of Fruits and Vegetables no longer appear in the Code of Federal Regulations but are maintained by USDA, AMS, Fruit and Vegetable Programs. AMS is proposing revisions in the U.S. Standards for Grades of Frozen Okra using the procedures that appear in part 36 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (7 CFR part 36).

Background: AMS received a petition from the American Frozen Food Institute (AFFI) requesting the revision of the standards for frozen okra. The petitioners represent almost all of the processors of frozen okra in the United States. The grade standards are presently based on the variable score points grading system.

It is proposed that the standards be modified to convert them to a statistically-based individual attribute grading system, similar to the United States Standards for Grades of Canned Green and Wax Beans (58 FR 4295; January 14, 1993). The individual

attribute grading system uses sample size and acceptable quality levels (AQLs), as well as tolerances and acceptance numbers (number of allowable defects), to determine the quality level of a lot. This change would bring the standards in line with current marketing practices and innovations in processing techniques.

In addition, AMS proposes to replace the dual grade nomenclature with single letter designations, "U.S. Grade A"

(or "U.S. Fancy") and "U.S. Grade B" (or "U.S. Extra Standard") would become "U.S. Grade A" and "U.S. Grade B", respectively. These revisions would also include

These revisions would also include minor editorial changes. These changes provide a uniform format consistent with recent revisions of other U.S. grade standards. This format has been designed to provide industry personnel and agricultural commodity graders with simpler and more comprehensive standards. Definitions of terms and easy-to-read tables would be incorporated to assure a better understanding and uniform application of the standards.

Prior to undertaking research and other work associated with revising the standards, AMS sought public comments on the petition (see 64 FR 52266).

More recently, a notice requesting additional comments on the proposed revision to the United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Okra was published in the December 12, 2007, Federal Register (72 FR 70565). At the request of AFFI, a notice reopening and extending the comment period was published in the May 16, 2008, Federal Register (73 FR 28424). A 60 day period was provided for interested persons to submit comments on the proposed standards. AMS received a comment from AFFI that requested a tolerance be established for "Cap Ends" for both "Whole" and "Cut" styles as follows: Portion of "stem" extending between 3/8 and ½ inch beyond the cap scar equals "poor or excessive trim"; "Stem" extending greater than ½ inch beyond cap scar equals "EVM". In addition, the petitioner requested that in Table II, "Excessive Trim (included in Mechanical Damage)" be better defined.

The petitioner noted that this criterion was removed from the prior "Small Pieces/Misshapen" category and moved to the proposed 10 percent "Mechanical Damage" category. For cut style, AFFI stated that less than ¼ inch be the limit for small pieces, but AFFI suggested that tolerances should be based on percent by weight. In doing this, "Small Pieces" would be taken out of the "Mechanical Damage" category.