document. Received comments may be seen in the office above between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Dated: September 27, 1982.

William F. Randolph,

Acting Associate Commissioner for Regulatory Affairs.

[FR Doc. 82-28348 Filed 10-14-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-M

21 CFR Part 347

[Docket No. 78N-0021]

Skin Protectant Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Establishment of a Monograph; and Reopening of Administrative Record

Correction

In FR Doc. 82-24422, appearing at page 39436, as Part IV, in the issue of Tuesday, September 7, 1982, make the following changes.

On page 39447, in the second column, under the heading "References", paragraph (2) the third sentence, change "3:3132" to "3:313".

On page 39447, in the 3rd column, under the heading "References", change paragraph (8) to read as follows:

(8) "Martindale, The Extra Pharmacopoeia," 26th Ed., edited by N.W. Blacow, The Pharmaceutical Press, London, England, p. 1417, 1972.

On page 39448, in the third column, in paragraph 2. Other ingredients., "Methol" to "Menthol".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

21 CFR Part 354

[Docket No. 80N-0228]

Drug Products for the Relief of Oral Discomfort for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Establishment of a Monograph

Correction

In FR Doc. 82-13917, beginning on page 22712 in the issue of Tuesday, May 25, 1982, the following changes should be made:

1. On page 22713, middle column, the first line should read, "Under § 330.10(a)(1) and (5), the".

2. On page 22718, first column, the words "topical anesthetics, and they are used as dental care agents by" should be inserted between the second and third lines of paragraph 2.

3. On page 22735, first column, the fourth line of the fifth complete paragraph should read, "of skin tumors following a single initiating dose".

4. On page 22750, third column, the second line under the heading **"Category II Active Ingredients"** should read, "chloride, and edetate disodium (in".

5. On page 22753, middle column, the formula at the beginning of the third line in paragraph (16) should read, "PO_3F Ion".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR—Ch. I

[BC Docket No. 81-742; FCC 82-433]

Formulation of Policies Relating to the Broadcast Renewal Applicant, Stemming from the Comparative Hearing Process

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Further Notice of Inquiry.

SUMMARY: Action taken herein invites further public comment and views in a proceeding initiated in November 1981 to formulate policies for broadcast renewal applicants in comparative hearings. The *Further Notice* Seeks comments on the matters raised in the United States Court of Appeals July 13, 1982 opinion in *Central Florida Enterprises, Inc.* v. *FCC,* particularly those relating to the need for a better definition of important terms under the Commission's comparative renewal policy. The Commission is primarily interested in exploring distinctions between "substantial" and "minimal" service of incumbent licensees.

DATES: Comments must be submitted by November 15, 1982, and reply comments by December 6, 1982.

ADDRESS: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sheldon M. Guttman, Office of General Counsel, (202) 632-6990.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Adopted: September 29, 1982.

Released: October 1, 1982.

By the Commission:

In the matter of formulation of policies relating to the broadcast renewal applicant, stemming from the comparative hearing process, BC Docket No. 81-742.

This proceeding was initiated on November 5, 1981, when we released a notice of inquiry, 46 FR 55279, 88 FCC 2d 21, in order to obtain information and views of interested parties and the public on the comparative renewal process, and particularly on "standards for 'meritorious broadcast service' for broadcasters seeking renewal of license." 46 FR at 55280. Comments and reply comments were filed earlier this year and are now being reviewed by the Commission's staff. In the meantime, the Court of Appeals recently affirmed our decision in the Daytona Beach, Florida comparative television renewal proceeding to renew the license of the incumbent licensee and to deny the challenger's application for a construction permit for the same facilities. *Cowles Broadcasting, Inc.,* 86 FCC 2d 993 (1981), *affirmed sub nom. Central Florida Enterprises, Inc.* v. *FCC,* D.C. Cir. Case No. 81-1795, decided July 13, 1982. The Court noted with approval our justification for a renewal expectancy for broadcast licensees, *Central Florida Enterprises, Inc.* v. *FCC,* Slip Op. at p. 8, citing 86 FCC 2d at 1013, but also indicated that it was "[o]f particular importance" how the Commission in its future evaluations of an incumbent's record interprets the term "substantial" and the Court suggested the need for an intelligible definition which would facilitate judicial review and help to insure that our policy serves the interests of broadcast consumers. Slip Op. at pp. 7-9.

In light of the Court's recent opinion, we are inviting further comments from all interested parties and the public, including those who may not have previously filed comments or reply comments in this proceeding, on the matters raised in the opinion, particularly those relating to the need for a better definition of important terms under the Commission's comparative renewal policy.[1] Comments should be filed no later than November 15, 1982, and reply comments no later than December 6, 1982. All comments and reply comments should be restricted to the matters raised by the Court's opinion in *Central Florida* which are relevant to this proceeding, as more fully described in this Further Notice.[2]

[1] In our last decision in the *Cowles* case, we described a continuum involving three types of service. These are (1) "minimal," which results in no preference for the incumbent, (2) "substantial," which resulted in the preference which Cowles got and (3) "superior," which would result in an even stronger preference. 86 FCC 2d at 1012, quoted in Slip Op. at pp. 6-7. We are primarily interested in exploring a more specific distinction between "substantial" and "minimal" service.

[2] Commenting parties are free to aruge for the adoption of general percentage of numerical guidelines but, in view of our continuing belief that such an approach is not appropriate, see para. 12 in the *Notice of Inquiry* in this proceeding, parties are urged to consider other alternatives for giving content to the concept of "substantial" service.