

compliance with this section will not require any special preparation on the part of persons subject hereto which cannot be completed on or before the effective date hereof. Such committee meeting was held on October 26, 1967.

(b) *Order.* (1) The quantity of grapefruit grown in the Indian River District which may be handled during the period October 30, 1967, through November 5, 1967, is hereby fixed at 125,000 standard packed boxes.

(2) As used in this section, "handled," "Indian River District," "grapefruit," and "standard packed box" have the same meaning as when used in said amended marketing agreement and order.

(Secs. 1-19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601-674)

Dated: October 27, 1967.

PAUL A. NICHOLSON,
Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Consumer and Marketing Service.

[F.R. Doc. 67-12843; Filed, Oct. 27, 1967; 11:15 a.m.]

[Grapefruit Reg. 13]

PART 913—GRAPEFRUIT GROWN IN INDIAN DISTRICT IN FLORIDA

Limitation of Shipments

§ 913.313 Grapefruit Regulation 13.

(a) *Findings.* (1) Pursuant to the marketing agreement and Order No. 913 (7 CFR Part 913), regulating the handling of grapefruit grown in the Interior District in Florida, effective under the applicable provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674), and after consideration of the recommendations and information submitted by the Interior Grapefruit Marketing Committee, established under the said marketing agreement and order, and upon other available information, it is hereby found, on the basis hereinafter set forth, that the limitation of handling of such grapefruit, as hereinafter provided, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act. The committee reports that the market for Interior grapefruit is slow with excessive supplies in the market; there is seasonal consumer resistance to the purchase of large supplies of fresh grapefruit; and thus additional supplies should not be permitted in the market as they could tend to further depress the market. The current average auction price for Interior grapefruit shows a reduction to \$2.76 per ½-bushel carton from \$3.14 per ½-bushel carton at the beginning of the previous week which had declined from a somewhat higher average price for the week prior thereto. A limitation of grapefruit shipments at this time of season would tend to prevent market gluts; and such limitation would also tend to establish

and maintain such orderly marketing conditions for such grapefruit as will provide, in the interest of producers and consumers, an orderly flow of the supply thereof to market throughout its normal marketing season so as to avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supplies and prices, which could result in part from an Interior grapefruit crop which is currently estimated to be significantly smaller than that of last year. The committee concluded on the basis of the foregoing and other pertinent factors that shipment of Interior grapefruit should be fixed at 550 carloads (275,000 standard packed boxes); and it so recommended.

(2) It is hereby further found that it is impracticable and contrary to the public interest to give preliminary notice, engage in public rule-making procedure, and postpone the effective date of this section until 30 days after publication hereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 553) because the time intervening between the date when information upon which this section is based became available and the time when this section must become effective in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act is insufficient, and a reasonable time is permitted, under the circumstances, for preparation for such effective time; and good cause exists for making the provisions hereof effective as herein-after set forth. The committee held an open meeting during the current week, after giving due notice thereof, to consider supply and market conditions for Interior grapefruit, and the need for regulation; interested persons were afforded an opportunity to submit information and views at this meeting; the recommendation and supporting information for regulation during the period specified herein were promptly submitted to the Department after such meeting was held; the provisions of this section, including its effective time, are identical with the aforesaid recommendation of the committee; and information concerning such provisions and effective time has been disseminated among handlers of such Interior grapefruit; it is necessary, in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act, to make this section effective during the period herein specified; and compliance with this section will not require any special preparation on the part of persons subject hereto which cannot be completed on or before the effective date hereof. Such committee meeting was held on October 24, 1967.

(b) *Order.* (1) The quantity of grapefruit grown in the Interior District which may be handled during the period October 30, 1967, through November 5, 1967, is hereby fixed at 275,000 standard packed boxes.

(2) As used in this section, "handled," "Interior District," "grapefruit," and "standard packed box" have the same meaning as when used in said marketing agreement and order.

(Secs. 1-19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601-674)

Dated: October 25, 1967.

PAUL A. NICHOLSON,
Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Consumer and Marketing Service.

[F.R. Doc. 67-12761; Filed, Oct. 27, 1967; 8:49 a.m.]

Title 14—AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

Chapter I—Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation

SUBCHAPTER C—AIRCRAFT

[Docket No. 7411; Amdt. 21-17]

PART 21—CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES FOR PRODUCTS AND PARTS

Conformity of Products to Their Type Designs

The purpose of these amendments to Part 21 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is to specify the showing of conformity to type design data that must be made before an aircraft or part thereof may be presented for type certification tests and to set forth the requirements applicable to the issuance of a standard airworthiness certificate for certain aircraft not built under a type or production certificate.

These amendments are based on a notice of proposed rule making (Notice 66-21) published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on June 8, 1966 (31 F.R. 8075).

One of the comments received in response to the notice expressed concern that the proposed change to § 21.33(a) might be interpreted as requiring that all aircraft presented for a flight test must completely conform to the type design. It was pointed out that under present practice, aircraft that do not fully conform to the type design but which, to the satisfaction of all FAA personnel involved, sufficiently conform to achieve the necessary test results and which have been determined by the FAA to be safe for flight, may be tested.

While complete conformity is, of course, desirable, the FAA recognizes that conformity to all the type design data at any given point during a test program may not be possible in all cases. Therefore, the proposed regulation expressly provided for deviations where authorized by the Administrator. This is consistent with the present practice and assures that the FAA is made aware of the extent to which an aircraft or part thereof does not conform to the submitted type design data prior to testing.

Contrary to the views expressed in one of the comments, the proposed change to § 21.33(a) is not directed to manufacturers producing aircraft under type or production certificates. The proposal is concerned with conformity of aircraft prior to testing during the type certification program and not with the

conformity of production aircraft. Moreover, there is no change to the present procedures governing the approval of engineering changes and drawings by a Designated Engineering Representative (DER) during type certification intended under this amendment.

Another comment concerned the proposal to delete the word "flight" in § 21.33(a) to make it clear that each applicant must allow the Administrator to make any tests, ground or flight, necessary to determine that an aircraft meets the applicable requirements. In this connection, it was suggested that rather than delete the word "flight" it would be more appropriate to refer to both "flight" and "ground" tests. The FAA sees merit in this suggestion and the proposal has been changed accordingly.

One of the comments received questioned the need for the amendments concerning the statements of conformity on the grounds that the present FAA Form 317 contains the same detail as that proposed. However, contrary to this commentator's understanding, the present FAA Form 317 does not contain all the details concerning statements of conformity proposed in Notice 66-21. Moreover, even though the FAA Form 317 has been revised to accommodate the proposal, the FAA considers that the requirements concerning the statements of conformity should be set forth in the FARs.

Numerous comments were received objecting to the proposed amendment to § 21.183 in the belief that it was designed to change the present requirements concerning the certification of modified "surplus military helicopters". These comments invariably requested the retention of the present rules insofar as the airworthiness certification of such surplus military aircraft is concerned. As expressly pointed out in the preamble to Notice 66-21, it is not the intent of the FAA to change the regulations governing the airworthiness certification of aircraft which were used in military service and later released for civil use. Surplus military aircraft are currently covered under § 21.183(d) and the proposal would merely redesignate paragraph (d) as paragraph (e) without any change to the substantive provisions of that paragraph. On the other hand, the FAA did propose to add a new paragraph (c) to § 21.183 applicable to aircraft built from spare and surplus parts. Such aircraft are currently being certificated in accordance with the broad provisions of paragraph (d) of § 21.183 which merely requires evidence that the aircraft conform to a type design. However, since aircraft built from spare and surplus parts may, in many cases, be built entirely outside of any approved system designed to ensure conformity, the FAA believed that the industry should have the benefit of a more definitive regulation when applying for certification of such aircraft. For this reason, a new paragraph (c) was proposed describing in detail the kind of evidence needed to show conformity of an aircraft built from spare and surplus parts to a

type design. This proposal was issued in the belief that aircraft built from spare and surplus parts are sufficiently definable as a class to differentiate them from the other aircraft covered under the proposed new paragraph (e). However, such is not the case. From the comments received in response to the notice, it is apparent that considerable confusion exists concerning the applicability of the proposed new paragraph (e), particularly with respect to aircraft obtained as surplus from the military, but modified for commercial use by the incorporation of spare and surplus parts. For the foregoing reasons, the FAA is aware that adoption of this aspect of the proposal would not be appropriate at this time. However, as the notice pointed out, the FAA is currently administering the detailed procedures set forth in the proposal under the broad requirements of paragraph (d) of the present rule. There was no intent to change these detailed procedures and since, as the notice stated, they are necessary to provide the same degree of assurance of conformity to approved type design data as is now provided for aircraft individually produced under a type certificate only, they will continue to be administered in appropriate cases under the requirements of paragraph (d).

In addition to the foregoing, the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of § 21.183 are amended as proposed to make it clear that they apply to newly manufactured aircraft. Paragraph (a) is also amended to make it clear that the Administrator's power to inspect the aircraft is not limited to inspections for conformity to type design but includes inspections to determine condition for safe operation. Paragraph (b) is also amended as proposed to make it clear that the statement of conformity referred to is the same statement of conformity prescribed in § 21.130 and, as such, must be submitted by the holder or licensee of the type certificate.

As proposed in the notice, § 21.53 required each applicant for a type certificate to submit a statement of conformity for each aircraft presented to the Administrator for tests. On the other hand, the proposal also required an applicant for a supplemental type certificate (STC) to meet § 21.53 with respect to each change in the type design. Thus, the proposal could be read as requiring that an applicant for an STC must, with respect to each and every change in the type design of an aircraft, submit a statement of conformity for the entire aircraft. This was not intended by the FAA, and the requirements of § 21.53 have been changed to make it clear that the statement of conformity is required for each aircraft or part thereof presented to the Administrator for tests.

In response to comments received, the requirements set forth with respect to import aircraft have been changed to refer to "standard" airworthiness certificates rather than "original" airworthiness certificates to make them consistent with the other requirements of that section.

In connection with the proposal to amend the supplemental type certification (STC) requirements, one comment expressed the opinion that the proposed rules would prohibit changes to an aircraft between the time that the statement of conformity governing the STC modification is submitted and the time that the appropriate tests are performed. Actually, the proposal is concerned only with changes between the time that a showing of compliance with the appropriate design data is shown and the time the aircraft is presented for tests. Under the proposal, the statement of conformity need not be submitted until the time for conducting the necessary tests has been established. Therefore, there need not be any appreciable lapse of time between the submission of the statement of conformity and the date the FAA tests are conducted.

Other minor changes of an editorial or clarifying nature have been made. They are not substantive and do not impose an additional burden on any person.

Interested persons have been afforded the opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. All relevant material submitted has been fully considered.

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 21 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is amended effective January 26, 1968, as follows:

1. By amending § 21.33(a) to read as follows:

§ 21.33 Inspection and tests.

(a) Each applicant must allow the Administrator to make any inspection and, in the case of aircraft, any flight and ground tests necessary to determine compliance with the applicable requirements of the Federal Aviation Regulations. However, unless otherwise authorized by the Administrator—

(1) No aircraft or part thereof may be presented to the Administrator for tests unless compliance with paragraph (b) (2) through (4) of this section has been shown for that aircraft or part thereof; and

(2) No change may be made to an aircraft or part thereof between the time that compliance with paragraph (b) (2) through (4) of this section is shown for that aircraft or part thereof and the time that the aircraft or part thereof is presented to the Administrator for tests.

2. By amending § 21.53 to read as follows:

§ 21.53 Statement of conformity.

(a) Each applicant must submit a statement of conformity (FAA Form 317) to the Administrator for each aircraft engine and propeller presented to the Administrator for type certification. This statement of conformity must include a statement that the aircraft engine or propeller conforms to the type design therefor.

(b) Each applicant must submit a statement of conformity to the Administrator for each aircraft or part thereof presented to the Administrator for tests.

This statement of conformity must include a statement that the applicant has complied with § 21.33(a) (unless otherwise authorized under that paragraph).

3. By amending § 21.115 to read as follows:

§ 21.115 Applicable airworthiness requirements.

(a) Each applicant for a supplemental type certificate must show that the altered product meets applicable airworthiness requirements as specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of § 21.101.

(b) Each applicant for a supplemental type certificate must meet §§ 21.33 and 21.53 with respect to each change in the type design.

4. By amending § 21.130 to read as follows:

§ 21.130 Statement of conformity.

Each holder or licensee of a type certificate only shall, upon the initial transfer by him of the ownership of each product manufactured under that type certificate, or upon application for the original issue of an aircraft airworthiness certificate or an aircraft engine or propeller airworthiness approval tag (FAA Form 186), give the Administrator a statement of conformity (FAA Form 317). This statement must be signed by an authorized person who holds a responsible position in the manufacturing organization, and must include—

(a) For each product, a statement that the product conforms to its type certificate and is in condition for safe operation;

(b) For each aircraft, a statement that the aircraft has been flight checked; and

(c) For each aircraft engine or variable pitch propeller, a statement that the engine or propeller has been subjected by the manufacturer to a final operational check.

However, in the case of a product manufactured for an Armed Force of the United States, a statement of conformity is not required if the product has been accepted by that Armed Force.

5. By amending § 21.183 to read as follows:

§ 21.183 Issue of standard airworthiness certificates for normal, utility, acrobatic, and transport category aircraft.

(a) *New aircraft manufactured under a production certificate.* An applicant for a standard airworthiness certificate for a new aircraft manufactured under a production certificate is entitled to a standard airworthiness certificate without further showing, except that the Administrator may inspect the aircraft to determine conformity to the type design and condition for safe operation.

(b) *New aircraft manufactured under type certificate only.* An applicant for a standard airworthiness certificate for a new aircraft manufactured under a type certificate only is entitled to a standard airworthiness certificate upon presentation, by the holder or licensee of the type

certificate, of the statement of conformity prescribed in § 21.130 if the Administrator finds after inspection that the aircraft conforms to the type design and is in condition for safe operation.

(c) *Import aircraft.* An applicant for a standard airworthiness certificate for an import aircraft type certificated in accordance with § 21.29 is entitled to an airworthiness certificate if the country in which the aircraft was manufactured certifies, or the Administrator finds, that the aircraft conforms to the type design and is in condition for safe operation.

(d) *Other aircraft.* An applicant for a standard airworthiness certificate for aircraft not covered by paragraphs (a) through (c) of this section is entitled to a standard airworthiness certificate if—

(1) He presents evidence to the Administrator that the aircraft conforms to a type design approved under a type certificate or a supplemental type certificate and to applicable Airworthiness Directives;

(2) The aircraft (except an experimentally certificated aircraft that previously had been issued a different airworthiness certificate under this section) has been inspected and found airworthy—

(i) By the manufacturer;

(ii) By an appropriately certificated domestic repair station;

(iii) By a certificated Air carrier having adequate overhaul facilities and having a maintenance and inspection organization appropriate to the aircraft type; or

(iv) In the case of a single-engine airplane, by the holder of an inspection authorization issued under Part 65 of this chapter; and

(3) The Administrator finds after inspection, that the aircraft conforms to the type design, and is in condition for safe operation.

(Secs. 313(a), 601, 603, Federal Aviation Act of 1958; 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, 1423)

NOTE: The recordkeeping and reporting requirements contained herein have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on October 23, 1967.

WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 67-12731; Filed, Oct. 27, 1967; 8:45 a.m.]

[Docket No. 67-CE-AD-8; Amdt. 39-487]

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

Weston-Garwin Carruth Model 22-374 Series Altimeters

Amendment 39-479 (32 F.R. 13183), requires modification or replacement of those Model 22-374 altimeters which have not been modified and marked with a white "M-1" on the back of the instrument, produced by Weston-Garwin Carruth Division. At the time of issuance the agency had been advised that the instruments in question had been installed on those Cessna, Beech, Mooney,

and Aero Commander aircraft and Bell Model helicopters listed in the AD. Following the issuance of Amendment 39-479, it appeared that they may have been installed on other aircraft produced by Cessna Aircraft Corp. and Beech Aircraft Corp. After discussions with Cessna, Beech, and the altimeter manufacturer, the agency has determined that the airworthiness directive must be amended so as to clarify its applicability and to include certain model airplanes and their serial numbers, where available, which were either incorrectly listed or omitted from the applicability statement.

Model identification of the 22-374 series altimeter varies. These instruments may be identified as 22-374, 22-374A, or 22-374B and contain additional suffix or adjunct material. According to the manufacturer, they may even lack the prefix 22-. Since the problem caused by the AD exists in all unmodified Model 22-374 series altimeters, the AD is being revised to remove any doubts as to its applicability by adding the word "series" between Model 22-374 and altimeter wherever this phrase appears in the AD. It should be noted that the Model 22-374 series altimeter may contain the name of the aircraft manufacturer on the face of the instrument when it is installed in certain of the model aircraft listed in the AD.

While Cessna is unable to identify with certainty the serial numbers of its commercial model airplanes in which the affected altimeters are installed, Cessna has advised that the applicability statement of the airworthiness directive as to Cessna commercial model airplanes should remain unchanged. However, to assist operators of Cessna commercial and military model airplanes in determining if their aircraft are affected by the AD, Cessna has issued Service Letter 67-52 dated September 23, 1967, which identifies affected single engine aircraft and Super Skymaster by model number and multiengine aircraft except Super Skymaster by model and serial number. To the extent that the information in the service letter is different, the applicability statement of Amendment 39-479 should be supplemented and the service letter is being incorporated therein by reference.

Finally, Beech has furnished the agency one additional model airplane with serial numbers and corrected serial numbers on their Model V35 aircraft for inclusion in the applicability statement of the AD.

Since these revisions to the AD are clarifying in nature, it is found that notice and public procedure hereon are impracticable and good cause exists for making this amendment effective in less than thirty (30) days.

In consideration of the foregoing and pursuant to authority delegated to me by the Administrator, 14 CFR 11.85 (31 F.R. 13697), § 39.13 of Part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations, Amendment 39-479 (32 F.R. 13183), is amended as follows:

1. Add the word "series" between Model 22-374 and altimeter(s) anywhere the phrase appears in the AD.

2. Modify the applicability statement by incorporating therein by reference Cessna Service Letter 67-52 dated September 23, 1967.

3. Modify the applicability statement by correcting the Beech Model V35 serial numbers to read "Serial Nos. D8250 through D8574 except D8567 and D8571" and adding thereto "Beech Model 95-B55, Serial Nos. TC-1005 through TC-1039 aircraft."

This amendment becomes effective October 27, 1967.

(Secs. 313(a), 601, 603, Federal Aviation Act of 1958; 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, 1423)

Issued in Kansas City, Mo., on October 20, 1967.

EDWARD C. MARSH,
Director, Central Region.

[F.R. Doc. 67-12722; Filed, Oct. 27, 1967; 8:46 a.m.]

SUBCHAPTER F—AIR TRAFFIC AND GENERAL OPERATING RULES

[Reg. Docket No. 8493; Amdt. 95-160]

PART 95—IFR ALTITUDES

Miscellaneous Amendments

The purpose of this amendment to Part 95 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is to make changes in the IFR altitudes at which all aircraft shall be flown over a specified route or portion thereof. These altitudes, when used in conjunction with the current change-over points for the routes or portions thereof, also assure navigational coverage that is adequate and free of frequency interference for that route or portion thereof.

As a situation exists which demands immediate action in the interest of safety, I find that compliance with the notice and procedure provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act is impracticable and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective within less than 30 days from publication.

In consideration of the foregoing and pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 5662), Part 95 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is amended, effective December 7, 1967, as follows:

1. By amending Subpart C as follows:

Section 95.48 *Green Federal airway 8* is amended to read in part:

From, to, and MEA

King Salmon, Alaska, LFR; Big Mountain, Alaska, LFR; Big Mountain, Alaska, LFR; Kakhonak INT, Alaska; 5,000.
Kakhonak INT, Alaska; Homer, Alaska, LFR; 6,000.
Homer, Alaska, LFR; Kenai, Alaska, LFR; 4,000.

Section 95.240 *Red Federal airway 40* is amended to read in part:

Kodiak, Alaska, LFR; Dark Island INT, Alaska; 4,000.
Dark Island INT, Alaska; Homer, Alaska, LFR; 6,000.

Section 95.299 *Red Federal airway 99* is amended to read:

From, to, and MEA

Big Mountain, Alaska, LFR; Ilamna, Alaska, LFR; 4,000.
Ilamna, Alaska, LFR; Kakhonak INT, Alaska, northwestbound 5,000, southeastbound 6,000.

Section 95.627 *Blue Federal airway 27* is amended to read in part:

*Kodiak, Alaska, LFR; King Salmon, Alaska, LFR; 9,000. *4,000—MCA Kodiak LFR, Westbound.

Section 95.665 *Blue Federal airway 65* is deleted:

Section 95.1001 *Direct routes—United States* is amended by adding:

Bagby INT, Calif.; Fresno, Calif., VOR; *7,000. *6,200—MOCA.

Campo INT, Calif.; Int. 124° M rad, Linden VOR and 322° M rad, Castle VOR; 5,000.

*Campo INT, Calif.; Friant, Calif., VOR; *12,000. *12,000—MCA Campo INT, southeast bound. *6,200—MOCA.

Eglin AFB, Fla., VOR; Glendale INT, Fla.; *2,000. *1,700—MOCA.

Sault, Fla., VOR; Eglin AFB, Fla., VOR; *2,000. *1,500—MOCA.

Harold INT, Fla.; Eglin AFB, Fla., VOR; *2,000. *1,400—MOCA.

Eglin AFB, Fla., VOR; Montgomery, Ala., VOR COP, 58 NM MGM; 2,500.

Honey INT, Tex.; Gilberg INT, Tex.; *2,200. *1,600—MOCA.

Woodward INT, Calif.; Sacramento, Calif., VOR; *3,000. *2,600—MOCA.

Section 95.1001 *Direct routes—United States* is amended to read in part:

Columbia, S.C., VOR; *Langley INT, S.C.; *2,000. *2,900—MCA Langley INT, southwestbound. *1,700—MOCA.

Section 95.6001 *VOR Federal airway 1* is amended to read in part:

Cape Charles, Va.; VOR; Int. 013° M rad, Cape Charles VOR and 214° M rad, Salisbury VOR; *2,000. *1,800—MOCA.

Int. 013° M rad, Cape Charles VOR and 214° M rad, Salisbury VOR; Crisfield INT, Md.; *2,000. *1,700—MOCA.

Crisfield INT, Md.; Salisbury, Md., VOR; 2,000.

Section 95.6002 *VOR Federal airway 2* is amended to read in part:

Jamestown, N. Dak., VOR, via N alter.; Fargo, N. Dak., VOR, via N alter.; *3,200. *2,800—MOCA.

Section 95.6004 *VOR Federal airway 4* is amended to read in part:

Malad City, Idaho, VOR, via S alter.; *Cornish INT, Utah, via S alter.; 10,100. *10,700—MCA Cornish INT, eastbound.

Denver, Colo., VOR; Byers INT, Colo.; 7,500. Byers INT, Colo.; Thurman, Colo., VOR; 7,000.

Thurman, Colo., VOR; Goodland, Kans., VOR; *7,000. *6,000—MOCA.

Section 95.6006 *VOR Federal airway 6* is amended to read in part:

Carson INT, Iowa; *Lyman INT, Iowa; *3,000. *3,500—MRA. *2,600—MOCA.

Section 95.6008 *VOR Federal airway 8* is amended to read in part:

Carson INT, Iowa; *Lyman INT, Iowa; *3,000. *3,500—MRA. *2,600—MOCA.

Denver, Colo., VOR via S alter.; Byers INT, Colo., via S alter.; 7,500.

From, to, and MEA

Byers INT, Colo., via S alter.; Akron, Colo., VOR via S alter.; 7,000.

Akron, Colo., VOR via S alter.; Int. 081° M rad, Akron VOR and 235° M rad, Hayes Center VOR, via S alter.; *6,500. *5,700—MOCA.

Int. 081° M rad, Akron VOR and 235° M rad, Hayes Center VOR, via S alter.; *7,000. *6,000—MOCA.

Ashburn INT, Md.; Washington, D.C., VOR; 2,200.

Section 95.6009 *VOR Federal airway 9* is amended to read in part:

Greenwood, Miss., VOR via E alter.; Sardis INT, Miss., via E alter.; *2,000. *1,600—MOCA.

Sardis INT, Miss., via E alter.; Independence INT, Miss., via E alter.; *2,000. *1,700—MOCA.

Section 95.6012 *VOR Federal airway 12* is amended by adding:

Booneville INT, Mo., via S alter.; Jamestown INT, Mo., via S alter.; *4,000. *2,300—MOCA.

Jamestown INT, Mo., via S alter.; Jefferson City, Mo., VOR via S alter.; *2,400. *2,000—MOCA.

Jefferson City, Mo., VOR via S alter.; Guthrie INT, Mo., via S alter.; *3,000. *2,800—MOCA.

Guthrie INT, Mo., via S alter.; Readsville INT, Mo., via S alter.; *4,000. *2,100—MOCA.

Section 95.6012 *VOR Federal airway 12* is amended to read in part:

Anthony, Kans., VOR; *Milton INT, Kans.; *3,000. *3,400—MRA. *2,500—MOCA.

*Lava INT, N. Mex., via S alter.; Grants, N. Mex., VOR via S alter.; *12,000. *12,000—MRA. *10,700—MOCA.

Section 95.6013 *VOR Federal airway 13* is amended to read in part:

Houston, Tex., VOR via E alter.; *Crosby INT, Tex., via E alter.; 1,600. *2,000—MRA.

Section 95.6015 *VOR Federal airway 15* is amended to read in part:

Sealy INT, Tex., via W alter.; Independence INT, Tex., via W alter.; *3,500. *1,700—MOCA.

Section 95.6016 *VOR Federal airway 16* is amended to read in part:

Hope INT, Ark.; *Grapevine INT, Ark.; *7,000. *6,000—MCA Grapevine INT, southwestbound. *1,800—MOCA.

Millis INT, Mass.; Boston, Mass., VOR; *2,300. *1,800—MOCA.

Section 95.6019 *VOR Federal airway 19* is amended to read in part:

Kiowa, Colo., VOR; Denver, Colo., VOR; *8,000. *7,700—MOCA.

Section 95.6020 *VOR Federal airway 20* is amended to read in part:

Fry INT, Tex.; Beaumont, Tex., VOR; *1,600. *1,300—MOCA.

Houston, Tex., VOR via N alter.; *Crosby INT, Tex., via N alter.; 1,600. *2,000—MRA.

Crosby INT, Tex., via N alter.; Beaumont, Tex., VOR via N alter.; *2,000. *1,300—MOCA.

Beaumont, Tex., VOR via N alter.; Orange INT, Tex., via N alter.; *1,500. *1,400—MOCA.

Orange INT, Tex., via N alter.; Sulphur INT, Tex., via N alter.; *1,500. *1,300—MOCA.