spread of the disease. The restrictions pertaining to the interstate movement of swine and swine products from or through quarantined areas as contained in 9 CFR Part 76, as amended, will apply to the quarantined portion of such county.

The amendment imposes certain further restrictions necessary to prevent the interstate spread of hog cholera and must be made effective immediately to accomplish its purpose in the public interest. Accordingly, under the administrative procedure provisions in 5 U.S.C. 553, it is found upon good cause that notice and other public procedure with respect to the amendment are impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and good cause is found for making it effective less than 30 days after publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 19th day of March 1971.

GEORGE W. IRVING, Jr.,
Administrator,
Agricultural Research Service.

[FR Doc.71-4015 Filed 3-23-71;8:49 am]

[Docket No. 71-533]

PART 76—HOG CHOLERA AND OTHER COMMUNICABLE SWINE DISEASES

Areas Quarantined

Pursuant to provisions of the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the Act of February 2, 1903, as amended, the Act of March 3, 1905, as amended, the Act of September 6, 1961, and the Act of July 2, 1962 (21 U.S.C. 111-113, 114g, 115, 117, 120, 121, 123-126, 134b, 134f), Part 76, Title 9, Code of Federal Regulations, restricting the interstate movement of swine and certain products because of hog cholera and other communicable swine diseases, is hereby amended in the following respects:

In § 76.2, the introductory portion of paragraph (e) is amended by adding the name of the State of Arkansas; paragraph (f) is amended by deleting the name of the State of Arkansas; and a new paragraph (e)(19) relating to the State of Arkansas is added to read:

(19) *Arkansas.* That portion of Mississippi County bounded by line beginning at the junction of State Highway 18 and the Mississippi-Craighead County line; thence, following State Highway 18 in an easterly direction to State Highway 18B; thence, following State Highway 18B in a southerly direction to State Highway 18; thence, following State Highway 18 in a southeasterly direction to Little River; thence, following the west bank of the Little River in a generally southwesterly direction to State Highway 77; thence, following State Highway 77 in a northerly direction to State Highway 158; thence, following State Highway 158 in a westerly direction to the Mississippi-Craighead County line; thence, following the Mississippi-Craighead County line in a northerly direction to its junction with State Highway 18.

(Secs. 4-7, 23 Stat. 32, as amended, secs. 1, 2, 32 Stat. 791-792, as amended, secs. 1-4, 33 Stat. 1264, 1265, as amended, sec. 1, 75 Stat. 481, secs. 3 and 11, 76 Stat. 130, 132; 21 U.S.C. 111, 112, 113, 114g, 115, 117, 120, 121, 123-126, 134b, 134f; 29 F.R. 16210, as amended)

Effective date. The foregoing amendment shall become effective upon issuance.

The amendment quarantines a portion of Mississippi County, Ark., because of the existence of hog cholera. This action is deemed necessary to prevent further spread of the disease. The restrictions pertaining to the interstate movement of swine and swine products from or through quarantined areas as contained in 9 CFR Part 76, as amended, will apply to the quarantined portion of such county.

The amendment also deletes Arkansas from the list of hog cholera eradication States in § 76.2(f), and the special provisions pertaining to the interstate movement of swine and swine products from or to such eradication States are no longer applicable to Arkansas.

Insofar as the amendment imposes certain further restrictions necessary to prevent the interstate spread of hog cholera, it must be made effective immediately to accomplish its purpose in the public interest. The amendment also relieves restrictions on shipments into Arkansas. Such restrictions are deemed unnecessary in view of the existence of hog cholera in that State. It does not appear that public participation in this rule making proceeding would make additional relevant information available to the Department.

Accordingly, under the administrative procedure provisions in 5 U.S.C. 553, it is found upon good cause that notice and other public procedure with respect to the amendment are impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and good cause is found for making it effective less than 30 days after publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 19th day of March 1971.

GEORGE W. IRVING, JR.,
Administrator,
Agricultural Research Service.

[FR Doc.71-4016 Filed 3-23-71;8:49 am]

Title 49—TRANSPORTATION

Chapter V—National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation

[Docket No. 69-23; Notice 2]

PART 571—FEDERAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

Seat Belt Assemblies in Passenger Cars, Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles, Trucks, and Buses

Correction

In F.R. Doc. 71-3257 appearing at page 4607 in the issue for Wednesday, March 10, 1971, the penultimate sentence of paragraph (d) in amendment VI should read, "The reciprocating device shall be operated for 2,500 cycles at a rate of 18 cycles per minute with a stroke length of 8 inches."

Title 14—AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

Chapter I—Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation

[Docket No. 9464; Amdts. Nos. 25-26, 27-5, 33-4]

PART 25—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: TRANSPORT CATEGORY AIRPLANES

PART 27—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: NORMAL CATEGORY ROTORCRAFT

PART 33—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: AIRCRAFT ENGINES

Fire Detectors and Engine Power Response

The purpose of these amendments is to expand the design and installation requirements for fire detector devices in transport category airplanes, to require a fire detector system in normal category rotorcraft, and to establish more specific requirements concerning engine response to throttle control movement under various load conditions.

These amendments are based on Notice 69-7, issued March 8, 1969 (34 F.R. 5020). Numerous comments were received in response to Notice 69-7 and changes have been made in the proposal based thereon. These changes are discussed hereinafter.

One of the comments stated that fire detectors should be capable of monitoring the worst fire foreseeable and suggested that this language be incorporated into § 25.1203. The FAA does not consider that such a change is necessary. The regulations now require that fire detectors be installed in each designated fire zone and in the combustion, turbine, and tailpipe sections in sufficient numbers and locations to insure prompt detection of a fire. This regulation is not limited to any particular type of fire, but applies to all fires in the designated areas. It would, therefore, include the worst fire foreseeable. The commentator also requested that the regulation be changed to prevent the fire detectors from being rendered inoperative by a type of fire, such as blowtorching. The FAA is aware that there have been instances in which detectors were rendered inoperable due to blowtorching. However, this has occurred infrequently. Under this regulation, the detector system must still function in the event the sensor or wiring is severed at one point, unless there is a means to warn the crew of the severing, whether or not the severing results from "blowtorching". Moreover, if the system does become inoperative

due to a short circuit in the system, a means is required to alert the crew to this condition. The FAA, therefore, believes that the matters raised by the commentator are already adequately covered and that the suggested changes to the proposal are unnecessary.

One commentator suggested that fire detector systems should provide both visual and aural fire warning, contending that visual lights are ineffective in sunlight and that taller pilots are unable to see some warning lights from the normal sitting position. The commentator also urged that all transport category aircraft be required to have installed the newer and more reliable types of fire detection equipment as they become available, and observed that some aircraft presently in service do not provide fire extinguishing for certain combustion heaters which burn JP-1 fuel and are located in the tail compartment, inaccessible to the crew in flight. With respect to the first comment, the FAA does not believe it is necessary to require both visual and aural fire warning indicators. So long as the type of warning means selected by the manufacturer provides prompt and effective warning of fire to the crew, either visual or aural means may be used. If both visual and aural means are needed to provide effective fire warning, then both means would have to be used. Further evaluation of the proposal has revealed that the term "alert" as used in the proposed § 25.1203(b)(3) may cause some confusion. The intent of the requirement was to provide a warning for the crew and this term is consistently used throughout the regulations. Therefore, the regulation has been revised to require a means to warn the crew in the event that a short circuit occurs. With regard to the second comment, the FAA does not believe it is either necessary or feasible to require that the newer fire detection equipment be installed in the older transport category airplanes. In many instances the installation of the newer detection systems in the older airplanes would be extremely burdensome, if not impossible. Moreover, the FAA is not aware that fire detection systems on older aircraft are inadequate or that they need to be replaced with the newer equipment. In any event, if an unsafe condition were found involving the fire detector system of any airplane now in operation, appropriate action, including an airworthiness directive, would be taken to correct that condition. Regarding the commentator's observation concerning JP-1 combustion heaters, it should be noted that the current airworthiness regulations (§ 25.859) do not require fire protection for all combustion heaters. Section 25.859 requires that combustion heater fire protection must be provided for the region surrounding the heater only if this region contains any flammable fluid system components (excluding the heater fuel system) that could be damaged by heater malfunctioning or could allow flammable fluids or vapors to reach the heater in case of leakage, or if the heater fuel system has fittings that, if they leaked, would allow fuel or vapors to enter this region. Thus, in any region surrounding a heater where the conditions covered in the regulation do not exist, fire protection would not be required. This rule would apply to the situation referred to by the commentator. A change in the current requirements is not considered necessary in the interest of safety.

After further evaluation in the light of various comments received, the FAA has determined that the proposed requirement that a fire detector remain in an operable condition in the event it is severed at one point is unnecessarily restrictive. The FAA has determined that it is not necessary in the interest of safety to require that a fire detector system remain operable after it has been severed at one point or, for that matter, after a short circuit, if there is a means to warn the crew that the system has been severed or that there has been a short circuit. The proposal has, therefore, been changed to require that there be a means to warn the crew in the event that the fire detector system does not continue to function as a satisfactory detection system after the sensor or the associated wiring has been severed at one point or after there has been a short circuit in the sensor or associated wiring.

Another commentator observed that single spot detectors would not meet the proposed requirements since they do not remain operable if severed at any one point, and stated further that the regulation would dictate the use of dual loop detector systems. However, in view of the change to the proposal discussed in the preceding paragraph, single spot detectors could be used if the fire detection system provided the required warning to the crew.

One commentator suggested that the term "fire detector system" be defined to include the sensors, control means, indicating panel, and associated wiring. The commentator also suggested that § 25.-1203(b)(1) be changed to refer to the severing of sensors and associated interconnecting means. However, the FAA's recent evaluation of fire detector systems failures has shown that only the fire detector sensors and associated wiring located in designated fire zones need to be protected from severing and that failures due to shorts are most likely to occur in designated fire zones. The proposal has, therefore, been revised to refer only to the "sensor or associated wiring within a designated fire zone".

The FAA has also determined on the basis of comments received, that the phrase "remain in an operable condition" does not accurately convey the intent of the proposal. Safety requires that the crew must be warned in the event that the fire detecting sensor or associated wiring in any designated fire zone is severed unless the system "continues to function as a satisfactory detection system." The proposal has been changed accordingly.

It was proposed to require a means to alert the pilot in the event of a short circuit in the detector system. However, after further consideration the FAA believes that it is not appropriate in the interest of safety to restrict the warning to the pilot and the regulation now provides for a means to warn the crew in the event of a short circuit.

Two of the comments pointed out that the proposal would require an alert in the event of a short circuit even though in a given case the short circuit might not impair the performance of the fire detector system. The FAA agrees that the proposal is not clear in that respect, and that it is not necessary in the interest of safety to require that the system provide an alert to the crew of any short circuit which does not render the detector system incapable of detecting a fire. The proposal has been changed accordingly.

Several comments objected to the proposed requirement that the fire detector be constructed or protected so that when it is in the configuration for installation it would withstand mechanical damage that might occur as a result of routine maintenance performed on the powerplant. The comments indicated difficulty with the scope of routine maintenance and with the requirement that the detector withstand mechanical damage. However, in view of the changes being made to the proposal permitting a warning to the crew in the event that a fire detector sensor or associated wiring is severed at one point, the FAA considers that the subject requirement is no longer necessary. Section 25.1203(g), as proposed in Notice 69-7, has been revised accordingly.

Some commenators contended that the present fire detector TSO (TSO-C11d) should be changed so that the required response time test will allow more than the presently prescribed 5 seconds for high alarm temperature sensors. One of the commentators also suggested that TSO-C11d allow for the effect of airframe structure on response time, and that a preflight check be required in order to verify the performance of the detector system if the system is not demonstrated to be unaffected by damage or age. With respect to the first comment, the FAA believes that the 5-second response time now permitted by TSO-C11d is the maximum that can be allowed consistent with safety. However, the TSO does provide for a higher initial temperature for high alarm temperature sensor tests, provided those sensors are used only in the corresponding high alarm temperature installation. Regarding the effect of airframe structure on detector response time, the TSO requirements pertain to the performance of the detectors separate from the many types of aircraft in which they may be installed. However, with respect to the commentator's suggestion, the FAA does not agree that the detector response time in the TSO should be increased to take into consideration the effect of airframe structure. Safety dictates that the TSO detector response time must be met with the detectors in

the installed configuration and the proposal is unchanged in this respect. In regard to the last comment, while § 25.1203 (d) presently requires that there must be a means to check the functioning of each fire detector circuit in flight, service experience has not indicated that there is a need to require a preflight check to verify performance of the detector system.

There was also a comment which recommended that the system remain in an operable condition or, in the alternative, that there be a means to warn the crew in the event of a break or short in a fire detector element. As previously pointed out, the proposal has been changed to provide for a crew warning unless the system continues to function as a satisfactory detection system after the severing or short circuit.

Upon further review of the proposed amendments to § 25.1203, and in view of some of the above comments, the arrangement of the section is being changed slightly in the interest of clarity. Therefore, that part of the proposed § 25.1203(g) requiring that fire detectors withstand vibration, inertia, and other loads is being incorporated into § 25.1203 (b), where it is logically associated with the requirements concerning severing and shorting of the fire detectors.

In regard to the proposed new § 27.1195, one comment was received which urged that the proposed regulation be omitted from the final amendment. The commentator contended that the lower rate of engine failures, including engine fires, for turbine engine powered rotorcraft as compared to the rate for reciprocating engine powered rotorcraft shows that there is no need for the proposed requirement for fire detectors. The commentator also stated that the provisions in Part 27 requiring that the flammable fluid line and fitting in any area subject to engine fire conditions must be located or shielded to prevent fluid leakage on surfaces hot enough to ignite the fluid, provide a level of safety equivalent to that provided by the present § 29.1203, which requires fire detectors in transport category rotorcraft. Further, the commentator questioned whether the greater fuel load of turbine engine powered rotorcraft was a valid factor in requiring fire detectors, and maintained that engine fires can be detected by the pilot via normal engine instruments. The FAA does not agree that the proposed § 27.1195 is unnecessary. The FAA is not aware that the rate of engine failures, including fires is lower for turbine engine powered rotorcraft and the commentator has submitted no data to substantiate this claim. In any event, the FAA does not agree that the present § 27.1183(a)(3) provides a level of safety equivalent to that provided by § 29.1203. Although § 27.1183(a)(3) does prescribe standards of safety for flammable fluid line and fitting leakage which are not now provided for Transport Category Rotorcraft, Part 29 is currently being amended in conjunction with other airworthiness parts and the FAA is updating the standards for flammable fluid lines, fittings, and other components. Further, the additional hot surface area of turbine engines poses a hazardous source for the ignition of leaking flammable fluids on turbine engine powered rotorcraft. It should be noted that § 27.1195 will apply only to turbine engine powered rotorcraft. The FAA does not agree that engine fires on Part 27 rotorcraft are detectable by the pilot through normal engine instruments and the commentator has submitted no data in support of this contention. Finally, the FAA notes that turbine engine powered rotorcraft have higher altitude performance capability than do reciprocating engine powered rotorcraft. The time required for an emergency descent and landing following an engine fire may thus be appreciably greater for turbine engine powered rotorcraft and could exceed the 5-minute period provided by § 27.861 for the protection of the rotorcraft structure, controls, rotor mechanism, and other essential parts in the event of powerplant fires. The immediate detection of turbine engine fires by means of a fire detector system is therefore required in the interest of safety.

A number of comments were received in regard to the proposed §§ 33.73 and 33.89. Two commentators questioned whether the maximum rated power or thrust specified in § 33.73 would include the augmented thrust resulting from afterburning. The intention of the proposal was that the takeoff power or thrust rating used in showing compliance with that section be a rating selected by the applicant for the certification of its engine. However, if the applicant elects to use augmented thrust in establishing the rated thrust of the engine for certification, the augmented thrust need not be used in showing compliance with § 33.73. The manufacturer will have the option of using either augmented thrust or unaugmented thrust in demonstrating compliance with § 33.73, and proposed § 33.73 (b) has been revised to make this clear. In addition, after further study it has been determined that the word "maximum" as used in the proposed § 33.73 is not necessary and may cause confusion. The definitions in Part 1 of the FAR's refer to "rated takeoff power" and "rated takeoff thrust", and in the interest of consistency, the phrases "maximum rated power or thrust" and "maximum rated takeoff power or thrust" in § 33.73 have been changed to "rated takeoff power" and "rated takeoff thrust".

Various changes to the wording of proposed § 33.73(b) were recommended to make provision for the differences in power management of the primary propulsion systems of fixed wing and rotary wing aircraft, and to improve compatability between Part 33 requirements and the landing climb requirements of Part 25. The FAA does not agree that the suggested changes are necessary. The language of proposed § 33.73(b) was selected to represent the minimum power setting to be used in the certification of all engines. Furthermore, § 33.73(b) is a design requirement for a specific engine thrust response capability without relation to the many power management systems that may be used. Insofar as compatibility of the new regulation with Part 25 is concerned, the FAA sees no conflict. Section 25.119 allows 8 seconds between the movement of the power lever from minimum flight idle to maximum takeoff position and demonstration of the required minimum climb gradient capability. The extra 3 seconds provided by § 25.119 over the 5 seconds provided by § 33.73(b) should be adequate to provide for any engine power losses due to engine installation, accessory loads, and air bleed. In any event, it is the airframe manufacturer's responsibility to select an engine having adequate thrust response characteristics to match the expected performance characteristics of the airplane and to comply with the regulations, including § 25.119. The intent of § 33.73(b) is to establish minimum engine thrust response characteristics, and not to deal with airplane performance requirements.

Several comments were received in response to the proposed § 33.89. One commentator suggested that § 33.89(c) be reworded to incorporate the more precise definition of idle power and the 5-second response time provided in § 33.73(b). The agency does not agree with the suggested change. Section 33.73(b) prescribes design requirements, whereas § 33.89 is concerned with operational test requirements. From the standpoint of engine operation, the precise idle power setting used to demonstrate design power or thrust response time is not appropriate, since the variables introduced during the operational test may cause the power or thrust produced by the engine when the power level is at the specified idle power setting to be somewhat different from the design idle power or thrust. Requiring this test to be run with prescribed power lever positions will result in more realistic test times. The commentator also suggested that a new paragraph (d) be added to include engine operation with variable geometry inlet and exhaust nozzles, and with thrust augmentation. However, this comment is beyond the scope of Notice 69-7 and will be considered in future revisions to Part 33. Another commentator suggested that the requirements of § 33.89(c) be deleted, except for paragraph (c)(1), and be transferred to Subpart E of Part 33 as design and construction standards since the test facilities necessary to make the determinations required under § 33.89 are not widely available. The FAA does not agree that the requirements of § 33.89 should be transferred to Subpart E. However, the FAA is aware that the necessary test facilities for power extraction may not be available, and analytical means could be used in lieu of the test prescribed for power extraction by § 33.89(c) (2) and (3). Therefore, a new paragraph (d) has been added to permit the use of analytical means for the tests prescribed by § 33.89(c) (2) and (3) for power ex- by § 33.89 (c) (2) and (3) for power ex- traction if necessary test facilities are not available.

Interested persons have been given an opportunity to participate in the making of these amendments. All relevant material submitted has been fully considered.

In consideration of the foregoing, Parts 25, 27, and 33 of the Federal Aviation Regulations are amended as follows, effective April 23, 1971:

1. Part 25 is amended by paragraph (b) and by adding a new paragraph (g) to § 25.1203 to read as follows:

§ 25.1203 Fire-detector system.

* * * * *

(b) Each fire detector system must be constructed and installed so that—

(1) It will withstand the vibration, inertia, and other loads to which it may be subjected in operation;

(2) There is a means to warn the crew in the event that the sensor or associated wiring within a designated fire zone is severed at one point, unless the system continues to function as a satisfactory detection system after the severing; and

(3) There is a means to warn the crew in the event of a short circuit in the sensor or associated wiring within a designated fire zone, unless the system continues to function as a satisfactory detection system after the short circuit.

* * * * *

(g) Each fire detector system must be constructed so that when it is in the configuration for installation it will not exceed the alarm activation time approved for the detectors using the response time criteria specified in the appropriate Technical Standard Order for the detector.

2. Part 27 is amended by adding a new § 27.1195 titled "Fire Detector Systems" following § 27.1194 to read as follows:

§ 27.1195 Fire detector systems.

Each turbine engine powered rotorcraft must have approved quick-acting fire detectors in numbers and locations insuring prompt detection of fire in the engine compartment which cannot be readily observed in flight by the pilot in the cockpit.

3. Part 33 is amended as follows:

a. By amending § 33.73 to read as follows:

§ 33.73 Power or thrust response.

The design and construction of the engine must enable an increase—

(a) From minimum to rated takeoff power or thrust with the maximum bleed air and power extraction to be permitted in an aircraft, without overtemperature, surge, stall, or other detrimental factors occurring to the engine whenever the power control lever is moved from the minimum to the maximum position in not more than 1 second, except that the Administrator may allow additional time increments for different regimes of control operation requiring control scheduling; and

(b) From the fixed minimum flight idle power lever position when provided, or if not provided, from not more than 15 percent of the rated takeoff power or thrust available to 95 percent rated takeoff power or thrust in not over 5 seconds. The 5-second power or thrust response must occur from a stabilized static condition using only the bleed air and accessories loads necessary to run the engine. This takeoff rating is specified by the applicant and need not include thrust augmentation.

b. By amending § 33.89 to read as follows:

§ 33.89 Operation test.

The operation test must include testing found necessary by the Administrator to demonstrate—

(a) Starting, idling, acceleration, overspeeding, ignition, functioning of the propeller (if the engine is designated to operate with a propeller);

(b) Compliance with the engine response requirements of § 33.73; and

(c) The minimum power or thrust response time to 95 percent rated takeoff power or thrust, from power lever positions representative of minimum idle and of minimum flight idle, starting from stabilized idle operation, under the following engine load conditions:

(1) No bleed air and power extraction for aircraft use.

(2) Maximum allowable bleed air and power extraction for aircraft use.

(3) An intermediate value for bleed air and power extraction representative of that which might be used as a maximum for aircraft during approach to a landing.

(d) If testing facilities are not available, the determination of power extraction required in subparagraphs (2) and (3) of paragraph (c) of this section may be accomplished through appropriate analytical means.

(Secs. 313(a), 601, 603, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, 1423; sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c))

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 16, 1971.

J. H. SHAFFER,
Administrator.

[FR Doc.71-3983 Filed 3-23-71;8:47 am]

[Airspace Docket No. 70-SO-106]

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS, AREA LOW ROUTES, CONTROLLED AIRSPACE, AND REPORTING POINTS

Designation of Transition Area

On March 5, 1971, F.R. Doc. 71-3092 was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (36 F.R. 4374), amending Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations by designating the Louisville, Miss., transition area.

In the amendment, an extension was predicated on the 357° bearing from Louisville RBN. Subsequent to publication of the rule, it was determined that this bearing was in error and should have been published as "353°." Since this amendment is minor in nature, notice and public procedure hereon are unnecessary.

In consideration of the foregoing, effective immediately, F.R. Doc. 71-3092 is amended as follows: In line five of the Louisville, Miss., transition area description "* * * 357° * * *" is deleted and "* * * 353° * * *" is substituted therefor.

(Sec. 307(a), Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1348(a), sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c))

Issued in East Point, Ga., on March 11, 1971.

GORDON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Acting Director, Southern Region.

[FR Doc.71-3984 Filed 3-23-71;8:47 am]

[Airspace Docket No. 71-WE-4]

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS, AREA LOW ROUTES, CONTROLLED AIRSPACE, AND REPORTING POINTS

Alteration of Transition Area

On February 4, 1971, a notice of proposed rule making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (36 F.R. 2404) stating that the Federal Aviation Administration was considering an amendment to Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations that would alter the description of the Battle Mountain, Nev., transition area.

Interested persons were given 30 days in which to submit written comments, suggestions, or objections. No objections have been received and the proposed amendment is hereby adopted without change.

Effective date. This amendment shall be effective 0901 G.m.t., May 27, 1971.

(Sec. 307(a), Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 49 U.S.C. 1348(a); Sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c))

Issued in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 15, 1971.

LEE E. WARREN,
Acting Director, Western Region.

In § 71.181 (36 F.R. 2140) the description of the Battle Mountain, Nev., transition area is amended to read as follows:

BATTLE MOUNTAIN, NEV.

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 5-mile radius of Lander County Airport (latitude 40°36'03" N., longitude 116°52'25" W.) and within 5 miles each side of the Battle Mountain VORTAC 218° radial, extending from the VORTAC to 16 miles southwest of the VORTAC; that airspace extending upward from 1,200 feet above the surface within 5 miles southeast and 9.5 miles northwest of the Battle Mountain 218° radial, extending from the VORTAC to 23 miles southwest of the VORTAC, and within 6.5 miles south and 9 miles north of the Battle Mountain VORTAC 077° and 257° radials, extending from 8 miles west to 18.5 miles east of the VORTAC.

[FR Doc.71-3985 Filed 3-23-71;8:47 am]

[Airspace Docket No. 71-WE-14]

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS, AREA LOW ROUTES, CONTROLLED AIRSPACE, AND REPORTING POINTS

Revocation of Reporting Points

The purpose of these amendments to Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is to revoke several domestic low altitude reporting points.

There is no longer a need for the following compulsory low altitude reporting points: Barstow INT, Calif.; Bay Point INT, Calif.; Doby INT, Nev.; Hidden Hills INT, Calif.; Ilwaco INT, Wash.; and Stansbury INT, Utah. Accordingly, action is taken herein to revoke them.

Since these amendments are minor in nature and relieve a burden on the public, notice and public procedure thereon are unnecessary, and good cause exists for making these amendments effective on less than 30 days notice.

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is amended, effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (3-24-71), as hereinafter set forth.

In § 71.203 (36 F.R. 2301) the following low altitude reporting points are revoked: Barstow INT, Bay Point INT, Doby INT, Hidden Hills INT, Ilwaco INT, and Stansbury INT.

(Sec. 307(a), Federal Aviation Act of 1958, 49 U.S.C. 1348(a); sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c))

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 16, 1971.

T. MCCORMACK,
Acting Chief, Airspace and Traffic Rules Division.

[FR Doc.71-3986 Filed 3-23-71;8:47 am]

Title 7—AGRICULTURE

Chapter II—Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture

PART 215—SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Appendix—Third Apportionment of Special Milk Program Funds, Pursuant to Child Nutrition Act of 1966, Fiscal Year 1970

Amendments of reapportionment for the State and total as listed below.

A third apportionment pursuant to section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, Public Law 89-642, 80 Stat. 885-6 milk assistance funds available for fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on September 15, 1970 (35 F.R. 179). The third apportionment is amended for the State and total listed as follows:

State	Total apportionment	State agency	Withheld for private schools
New Mexico	$670,760	$398,240	$272,520
Total	101,607,317	95,170,418	6,436,899

(Secs. 2, 3, 6, 8-16, 80 Stat. 885-890, 42 U.S.C. 1771, 1772, 1775, 1777-1785)

Dated: March 18, 1971.

HOWARD P. DAVIS,
Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc.71-4017 Filed 3-23-71;8:50 am]

Chapter IX—Consumer and Marketing Service (Marketing Agreements and Orders; Fruits, Vegetables, Nuts), Department of Agriculture

[Orange Reg. 67, Amdt. 7]

PART 905—ORANGES, GRAPEFRUIT, TANGERINES, AND TANGELOS GROWN IN FLORIDA

Limitation of Shipments

Findings. (1) Pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 905, as amended (7 CFR Part 905), regulating the handling of oranges, grapefruit, tangerines, and tangelos grown in Florida, effective under the applicable provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674), and upon the basis of the recommendations of the committees established under the aforesaid amended marketing agreement and order, and upon other available information, it is hereby found that the limitation of shipments of Temple and Murcott Honey oranges, as hereinafter provided, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(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 amendment until 30 days after publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 553) because the time intervening between the date when information upon which this amendment is based became available and the time when this amendment must become effective in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act is insufficient; and this amendment relieves restrictions on the handling of Temple and Murcott Honey oranges grown in Florida.

Order. In § 905.529 (Orange Reg. 67; 35 F.R. 18741, 19245, 19246; 36 F.R. 1522, 2860, 3194, 3460, and 3884), the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) (v), (vi) and (viii) are amended to read as follows:

§ 905.529 Orange Regulation 67.

(a) * * *

(2) * * *

(v) Any Temple oranges, grown in the production area, which do not grade at least U.S. No. 2;

(vi) Any Temple oranges, grown in the production area, which are of a size smaller than 2 1/16 inches in diameter, except that a tolerance of 10 percent, by count, of Temple oranges smaller than such minimum diameter shall be permitted, which tolerance shall be applied in accordance with the provisions for the application of tolerances specified in said United States Standards for Florida Oranges and Tangelos;

* * * * *

(viii) Any Murcott Honey oranges, grown in the production area, which are of a size smaller than 2 1/16 inches in diameter, except that a tolerance of 10 percent, by count, of Murcott Honey oranges smaller than such minimum diameter shall be permitted, which tolerance shall be applied in accordance with the provisions for the application of tolerances specified in said United States Standards for Florida Oranges and Tangelos.

* * * * *

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

Dated, March 19, 1971, to become effective March 22, 1971.

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

[FR Doc.71-4018 Filed 3-23-71;8:50 am]

[Navel Orange Reg. 229, Amdt. 1]

PART 907—NAVEL ORANGES GROWN IN ARIZONA AND DESIGNATED PART OF CALIFORNIA

Limitation of Handling

Findings. (1) Pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 907, as amended (7 CFR Part 907, 35 F.R. 16359), regulating the handling of Navel oranges grown in Arizona and designated part of California, effective under the applicable provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674), and upon the basis of the recommendations and information submitted by the Navel Orange Administrative Committee, established under the said amended marketing agreement and order, and upon other available information, it is hereby found that the limitation of handling of such Navel oranges, as hereinafter provided, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(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 amendment until 30 days after publication thereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 553) because the time intervening between the date when information upon which this amendment is based became available and the time when this amendment must become effective in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act is insufficient, and this amendment relieves restrictions on the handling of Navel oranges grown in Arizona and designated part of California.

Order, as amended. The provisions in paragraph (b)(1) (i), and (ii) of § 907.529 (Navel Orange Regulation 229, 36 F.R. 4705) during the period March 12, through March 18, 1971, are hereby fixed as follows: