

(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/#/docketDetail;
D=APHIS-2011-0003](http://www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;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](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