W.) within 2 miles each side of the Mather TACAN 048° radial, extending from the 5-mile radium zone to 7 miles northeast of the TACAN, excluding the portion subtended by a chord drawn between the points of intersection of the Mather AFB 5-mile radius zone with the Sacramento, Calif. (McClellan AFB) 5-mile radius zone.

[FR Doc.71-8965 Filed 6-24-71;8:48 am]

[Airspace Docket No. 71-SW-18]

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

Alteration of Control Zone and Transition Area

The purpose of this amendment to Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is to alter the Las Vegas, N. Mex., control zone and transition area.

On May 11, 1971, a notice of proposed rule making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (36 F.R. 8696) stating the Federal Aviation Administration proposed to alter controlled airspace in the Las Vegas, N. Mex., terminal area.

Interested persons were afforded an opportunity to participate in the rule making through submission of comments. All comments received were favorable.

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is amended, effective 0901 G.m.t., August 19, 1971, as hereinafter set forth.

(1) In § 71.171 (36 F.R. 2055), the Las Vegas, N. Mex., control zone is amended to read:

LAS VEGAS, N. MEX.

Within a 5-mile radius of the Las Vegas Municipal Airport (lat. 35°39'20" N., long. 105°08'30" W.), within 3.5 miles each side of the Las Vegas, N. Mex., VORTAC 025° radial extending beyond the 5-mile-radius zone to a point 11 miles northeast of the VORTAC; and within 3.5 miles each side of the Las Vegas, N. Mex., VORTAC 220° radial extending beyond the 5-mile-radius zone to a point 10 miles southwest of the VORTAC.

(2) In § 71.181 (36 F.R. 2140), the Las Vegas, N. Mex., transition area is amended to read:

LAS VEGAS, N. MEX.

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 9-mile radius of the Las Vegas Municipal Airport (lat. 35°39'20" N., long. 105°08'30" W.), and within 3.5 miles each side of the Las Vegas, N. Mex., VORTAC 025° radial, extending beyond the 9-mile-radius area to 11.5 miles northeast of the VORTAC; and within 3.5 miles each side of the Las Vegas, N. Mex., VORTAC 220° radial, extending beyond the 9-mile-radius area to 11.5 miles southwest of the VORTAC.

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

Issued in Fort Worth, Tex., on June 16, 1971.

R. V. REYNOLDS,
Acting Director, Southwest Region.

[FR Doc.71-8966 Filed 6-24-71;8:48 am]

[Docket No. 11168; Amdt. 762]

PART 97—STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES

Miscellaneous Amendments

This amendment to Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations incorporates by reference therein changes and additions to the Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAP's) that were recently adopted by the Administrator to promote safety at the airports concerned.

The complete SIAP's for the changes and additions covered by this amendment are described in FAA Forms 3139, 8260-3, 8260-4, or 8260-5 and made a part of the public rule making dockets of the FAA in accordance with the procedures set forth in Amendment No. 97-696 (35 F.R. 5610).

SIAP's are available for examination at the Rules Docket and at the National Flight Data Center, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20590. Copies of SIAP's adopted in a particular region are also available for examination at the headquarters of that region. Individual copies of SIAP's may be purchased from the FAA Public Document Inspection Facility, HQ-405, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20590, or from the applicable FAA regional office in accordance with the fee schedule prescribed in 49 CFR 7.85. This fee is payable in advance and may be paid by check, draft or postal money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States. A weekly transmittal of all SIAP changes and additions may be obtained by subscription at an annual rate of $125 per annum from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Since a situation exists that requires immediate adoption of this amendment, I find that further notice and public procedure hereon is impracticable and good cause exists for making it effective in less than 30 days.

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is amended as follows, effective on the dates specified:

1. Section 97.11 is amended by establishing, revising or canceling the following L/MF-ADF(NDB)-VOR SIAP's, effective July 22, 1971:

Tucson, Ariz.—Tucson International Airport; ADF-1, Amdt. 1; Canceled.
Tucson, Ariz.—Tucson International Airport; VOR-1, Amdt. 5; Canceled.

2. Section 97.15 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following VOR/DME SIAP's, effective July 22, 1971:

Tucson, Ariz.—Tucson International Airport; VOR/DME 2, Amdt. 2; Canceled.

3. Section 97.23 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following VOR-VOR/DME SIAP's, effective July 22, 1971:

Casper, Wyo.—Casper Air Terminal Airport; VOR Runway 21, Amdt. 12; Revised.
Indianapolis, Ind.—Indianapolis Municipal Weir-Cook Airport; VOR Runway 13R, Amdt. 15; Revised.
Liberal, Kans.—Liberal Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 17, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Liberal, Kans.—Liberal Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 35, Amdt. 6; Revised.
Medford, Oreg.—Medford-Jackson County Airport; VOR-A, Original; Established.
Medford, Oreg.—Medford-Jackson County Airport; VOR Runway 14, Amdt. 10; Canceled.
Olive Branch, Miss.—Municipal Airport; VOR-A, Original; Established.
Perry, Ga.—Perry-Fort Valley Airport; VOR-A, Original; Established.
St. Petersburg-Clearwater, Fla.—St. Petersburg-Clearwater International Airport; VOR Runway 17, Amdt. 4; Revised.
Tucson, Ariz.—Tucson Internatonal Airport; VOR-A, Original; Established.
Casper, Wyo.—Casper Air Terminal Airport; VOR/DME Runway 21, Amdt. 2; Revised.
Douglas, Ariz.—Bisbee-Douglas International Airport; VOR/DME Runway 17, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Hilton Head Island, S.C.—Hilton Head Airport; VOR/DME-A, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Medford, Oreg.—Medford-Jackson County Airport; VOR/DME 1, Amdt. 5; Canceled.
Medford, Oreg.—Medford-Jackson County Airport; VOR/DME 2, Amdt. 3; Canceled.
Medford, Oreg.—Medford-Jackson County Airport; VOR/DME 1, Runway 14, Original; Established.
Medford, Oreg.—Medford-Jackson County Airport;VOR/DME 2, Runway 14, Original; Established.
Pellston, Mich.—Emmett County Airport; VOR/DME Runway 5, Original; Established.
Rockwood, Tenn.—Rockwood Municipal Airport; VOR/DME Runway 22, Original; Established.
Tucson, Ariz.—Tucson International Airport; VOR/DME-A, Original; Established.
Vernon, Ala.—Lamar County Airport; VOR/DME-A, Original; Established.

4. Section 97.25 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following LOC-LDA SIAPs, effective July 22, 1971:

Casper, Wyo.—Casper Air Terminal Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 25, Amdt. 11; Revised.
Indianapolis, Ind.—Indianapolis Municipal Weir-Cook Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 13R, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Indianiapolis, Ind.—Indianapolis Municipal Weir-Cook Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 22R, Amdt. 10; Revised.
Moline, Ill.—Quad City Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 27, Amdt. 12; Revised.
Philadelphia, Pa.—Philadelphia International Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 27, Original; Established.
Washington, D.C.—Dulles International Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 1L, Original; Established.
Wilkes-Barre Scranton, Pa.—Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 22, Admdt. 2; Revised.

5. Section 97.27 is amended by establishing, revising or canceling the following NDB/ADF SIAPs, effective July 22, 1971:

Atlantic, Iowa—Atlantic Municipal Airport; NDB Runway 12, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Casper, Wyo.—Casper Air Terminal Airport; NDB Runway 7, Amdt. 8; Revised.
Corinth, Miss.—Roscoe Turner Airport; NDB Runway 17, Original; Established.
Corinth, Miss.—Roscoe Turner Airport; NDB Runway 35, Original; Established.
Great Bend, Kans.—Great Bend Municipal Airport; NDB Runway 11, Amdt. 2; Revised.
Indianapolis, Ind.—Indianapolis Municipal Weir-Cook Airport; NDB Runway 4L, Amdt. 11; Revised.
Indianapolis, Ind.—Indianapolis Municipal Weir-Cook Airport; NDB Runway 31L, Amdt. 4; Revised.
Jacksonville, N.C.—Albert J. Ellis Airport; NDB-A, Original; Established.
Jacksonville, N.C.—Albert J. Ellis Airport; NDB Runway 5, Original; Established.
Moline, Ill.—Quad-City Airport; NDB Runway 9, Amdt. 16; Revised.
Sanford, Fla.—Sanford Airport; NDB Runway 9, Original; Established.
Storm Lake, Iowa—Storm Lake Municipal Airport; NDB Runway 31, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Tucson, Ariz.—Tucson International Airport; NDB-A, Original; Established.
Wilkes-Barre-Scranton, Pa.—Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Airport; NDB-A, Amdt. 11; Revised.

6. Section 97.29 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following ILS SIAPs, effective July 22, 1971:

Casper, Wyo.—Casper Air Terminal Airport; ILS Runway 7, Amdt. 17; Revised.
Indianapolis, Ind.—Indianapolis Municipal Weir-Cook Airport; ILS Runway 4L, Amdt. 13; Revised.
Indianapolis, Ind.—Indianapolis Municipal Weir-Cook Airport; ILS Runway 31L, Amdt. 5; Revised.
Medford, Oreg.—Medford-Jackson County Airport; ILS Runway 14, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Moline, Ill.—Quad-City Airport; ILS Runway 9, Amdt., 16; Revised.
Wilkes-Barre-Scranton, Pa.—Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Airport; ILS Runway 4, Amdt. 26; Revised.

7. Section 97.31 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following Radar SIAPs, effective July 22, 1971:

Indianapolis, Ind.—Indianapolis Municipal Weir-Cook Airport; Radar-1, Amdt. 18; Revised.
Spokane, Wash.—Spokane International Airport; Radar-1 Amdt. 7; Revised.
Tucson, Ariz.—Tucson International Airport; Radar-1, Amdt. 6; Revised.
Wilkes-Barre-Scranton, Pa.—Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Airport; Radar-1, Amdt. 6; Revised.

(Secs. 307, 313, 601, 1110, Federal Aviation Act of 1958; 49 U.S.C. 1438, 1354, 1421, 1510; sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act; 49 U.S.C. 1655(c), 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(1))

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

R. S. SLIFF,
Acting Director,
Flight Standards Service.

NOTE: Incorporation by reference provisions in §§ 97.10 and 97.20 (35 F.R. 5610) approved by the Director of the Federal Register on May 12, 1969.

[FR Doc.71-8758 Filed 6-24-71;8:45 am]

Title 21—FOOD AND DRUGS

Chapter I—Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

SUBCHAPTER B—FOOD AND FOOD PRODUCTS

PART 121—FOOD ADDITIVES

Subpart A—Definitions and Procedural and Interpretative Regulations

ELIGIBILITY OF SUBSTANCES FOR CLASSIFICATION AS GENERALLY RECOGNIZED AS SAFE IN FOOD

In the FEDERAL REGISTER of December 8, 1970 (F.R. 18623), the Commissioner of Food and Drugs proposed to revise § 121.3 to set forth criteria under which substances would or would not be classified as generally recognized as safe (GRAS). The proposal provided for the filing of comments within 30 days and this was extended to January 22, 1971, by a notice published January 7, 1971 (36 F.R. 224).

Numerous substantive comments were received from the food, chemical, and drug industries, trade and professional associations, individual consumers, and other interested persons.

The principal objections were that accepting GRAS status without FEDERAL REGISTER promulgation only for substances of natural biological origin that have been widely consumed for their nutrient properties is too restrictive; that the Food and Drug Administration has no authority to reserve to itself the sole responsibility for determining the GRAS status of substances; that Congress did not intend to equate "food" and "food additive"; and that ample notice should be provided before specific changes in the GRAS list are made. Some misunderstood the proposal and its relationship to the total review of the GRAS list.

Having evaluated the comments received and other relevant information, the Commissioner concludes that:

1. A current review of GRAS substances is necessary because of new scientific knowledge, the development of modern toxicological techniques, and the expanded usage of some GRAS substances beyond the exposure patterns considered when the GRAS list was originally promulgated. Also, the President has specifically directed the Food and Drug Administration to reevaluate all items generally recognized as safe for their intended use and used in food without food additive clearance.

2. A plan should be provided whereby the GRAS status of a substance may be determined through an administrative process by the Food and Drug Administration after the substance's intended use has been presented to the scientific community and to the public for review. Thus, the revision of § 121.3 is necessary to establish the general administrative plan for classifying substances as GRAS.

3. A regulation should be established prescribing the type of toxicological data upon which the safety of a substance can be determined. Such a regulation is being developed and will be proposed later in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

4. The definition of "safe" in the proposed revision of § 121.3 should be located instead in the list of definitions in § 121.1, and a definition of "generally recognized as safe" also should be added to § 121.1.

5. The limitation of GRAS status without FEDERAL REGISTER promulgation to substances of natural biological origin that have been widely consumed for their nutrient properties is proper to assure appropriate safety review of as many substances as possible.

6. The contention that the terms "food" and "food additive" are mutually exclusive is without basis. Sections 201 (f) and (s) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as well as section 402 (a)(2)(C) which provides that a food additive for which no regulation or exemption is in effect is an adulterated food, establish their equivalency.

7. The GRAS status of particular substances will not be changed by the proposed revision of § 121.3. When changes are contemplated, the Commissioner will published proposals in the FEDERAL REGISTER and invite interested persons to submit comments, unless such prior notice is precluded by public health considerations.

8. The proposal, with changes, should be adopted as set forth below.

Therefore, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (secs. 201(s), 409, 701(a), 52 Stat. 1055, 72 Stat. 1784–88, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 321(s), 348, 371(a)) and under authority delegated to the Commissioner (21 CFR 2.120), Part 121 is amended as follows:

1. Section 121.1 is amended by revising paragraph (i) and adding a new paragraph (k), as follows:

§ 121.1 Definitions and interpretations.

* * * * *

(i) "Safe" means that after reviewing all available evidence, including:

(1) The probable consumption of the substance and of any substance formed in or on food because of its use;

(2) The cumulative effect of the substance in the diet of man and animals, taking into account any chemically or pharmacologically related substance or substances in such diet; and

(3) Safety factors which in the opinion of experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of foods and food ingredients are generally recognized as appropriate in the use of animal experimentation data;

the Food and Drug Administration can conclude that no significant risk of harm will result when the substance is used as intended.

* * * * *

(k) "Generally recognized as safe" means general recognition of safety by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of such a substance, as determined through the procedure prescribed by §121.3 (b)(2). On the basis of scientific data derived from published literature, available to experts generally, reporting on credible toxicological testing, or for those substances used in food prior to January 1, 1958, on the basis of a reasoned judgment founded in experience with common food use, the substance is recognized to have no significant risk of harm if used as intended, taking into account in either case:

(1) Reasonably anticipated patterns of consumption of the substance and of any substance formed in or on food because of the use of the substance;

(2) The cumulative effect of the substance, and any chemically or pharmacologically related substance, in the diet of man or animals; and

(3) Safety factors appropriate for the utilization of animal experimentation data.

2. Section 121.3 is revised to read as follows:

§ 121.3 Eligibility for classification as generally recognized as safe (GRAS).

(a) To provide assurance that any substance is absolutely safe for human or animal consumption is impossible. This is particularly true for substances intended for human consumption which have been tested in animals.

(b) A substance used as food, or the intended use of which results or may reasonably be expected to result directly or indirectly in its becoming a component of food or affecting the characteristics of food, may be eligible for classification as generally recognized as safe (GRAS) under the following criteria:

(1) Substances that will be considered as GRAS and for which a promulgation in the FEDERAL REGISTER is not required:

(i) Any substance of natural biological origin that has been widely consumed for its nutrient properties in the United States prior to January 1, 1958, without detrimental effect when used under reasonably anticipated patterns of consumption.

(ii) Substances defined in subdivision (i) of this subparagraph that have been modified by conventional processing as practiced prior to January 1, 1958.

(2) Substances that will be affirmed as GRAS by the Commissioner after he has given notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER that the status of such substance (and limitations, if any) is under consideration, invited experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of foods and food ingredients to submit comments, reviewed all available evidence and the comments received, and found convincing evidence of its general recognition of safety:

(i) Substances defined in subparagraph (1)(i) of this paragraph that have been modified by processes proposed for January 1, 1958, where such processes may reasonably be expected to significantly alter the composition of the substance.

(ii) Substances that have had significant alteration of composition by breeding or selection and the change may reasonably be expected to alter to a significant degree the nutritive value or the concentration of toxic constituents therein.

(iii) Distillates, isolates, extracts, concentrates of extracts, or reaction products of substances considered as GRAS.

(iv) Substances not of natural biological origin including those for which evidence is offered that they are identical with a GRAS counterpart or natural biological origin.

(v) Substances of natural biological origin intended for consumption for other than their nutrient properties.

(c) Substances that do not meet the criteria of paragraph (b) of this section are not eligible for GRAS status and hence require a food additive regulation promulgated under section 409 of the act, and no substance will be eligible for GRAS status if it has no history of food use or requires prescribed limitations for safe use.

(d) Any substance used in food must be of food-grade quality. The Commissioner regards the applicable specifications in the current edition of "Food Chemicals Codex" as establishing food grade unless he has by FEDERAL REGISTER promulgation established other specifications.

(e) If the Commissioner has not affirmed a given substance as GRAS on his own initiative, such affirmative ruling may be sought by submitting to the Commissioner a request containing all relevant usage and safety data.

(f) Substances listed as GRAS may require reclassification either because of the criteria established by this section or because of new information regarding safety. The initial results of a new investigation, even if not convincing with respect to potential harm, may establish that the substance in question can no longer be considered as GRAS. Newly reported information will be carefully evaluated by the Commissioner, along with other available information, to determine whether or not there has been a significant increase in risk to the public health from using the substance as intended. No change will be made in existing GRAS status until the Commissioner determines that the substance requires evaluation.

(g) If a responsible and substantial question of safety has been raised regarding a substance previously listed as GRAS, but the main weight of the scientific evidence still establishes safety within certain limits, an interim food additive regulation may be proposed in the FEDERAL REGISTER. This will permit further scientific investigations to define the conditions of safe use for a food additive regulation of indefinite duration.

Effective date. This procedural and defining order is effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (6-25-71).

(Secs. 201(s), 409, 701(a), 52 Stat. 1055, 72 Stat. 1784-88, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 321(s), 348, 371(a))

Dated: June 18, 1971.

CHARLES C. EDWARDS,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

[FR Doc.71-8976 Filed 6-24-71;8:49 am]

Chapter III—Environmental Protection Agency

PART 420—TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FROM TOLERANCES FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICALS IN OR ON RAW AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

O,O-Dimethyl Phosphorodithioate, S-Ester With 4-(Mercaptomethyl)-2-Methoxy-Δ^2-1,3,4-Thiadiazolin-5-One

A petition (PP 0F4892) was filed by Geigy Agricultural Chemicals, a division of Ciba-Geigy Chemical Corp., Ardsley, N.Y. 10205, in accordance with provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as amended (21 U.S.C. 346a), proposing establishment of tolerances for residues of the insecticide *O,O*-dimethyl phosphorodithioate, *S*-ester with 4-(mercaptomethyl)-2-methoxy-Δ^2-1,3,4-thiadiazolin-5-one and its oxygen analog *O,O*-dimethyl-*S*-[2-methoxy-1,3,4-thiadiazol-5-(4*H*)-onyl-(4)-methyl] phosphorothiolate in or on the raw agricultural commodities alfalfa, alfalfa hay, clover, clover hay, grass, and grass hay at 10 parts per million; citrus fruit at 6 parts per million; and cottonseed at 0.2 part per million.

Subsequently, the petitioner amended the petition by proposing tolerances of 6 parts per million for residues in or on alfalfa, alfalfa hay, clover, clover hay, grass, and grass hay, and withdrawing the request for a tolerance for residues in or on citrus fruit.

Prior to December 2, 1970, the Secretary of Agriculture certified that this pesticide chemical is useful for the purposes for which tolerances are being established, and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior advised that it has no objection to these tolerances.

Part 120, Chapter I, Title 21 was redesignated Part 420 and transferred to Chapter III (36 F.R. 424).

Based on consideration given data submitted in the petition and other relevant material, it is concluded that:

1. The proposed usage is not reasonably expected to result in residues of the herbicide in meat, milk, poultry, and eggs. The uses are classified in the category specified in § 420.6(a)(3).

2. The tolerances established by this order will protect the public health.

3. There is no need to include the oxygen analog in the tolerance since it will not be present in significant amounts.

Therefore, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d)(2), 68 Stat. 512; 21

U.S.C. 346a(d)(2)), the authority transferred to the Administrator (35 F.R. 15623), and the authority delegated by the Administrator to the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Pesticides Programs of the Environmental Protection Agency (36 F.R. 9038), Part 420 is amended as follows:

1. Section 420.3(e)(5) is amended by alphabetically inserting in the list of cholinesterase-inhibiting pesticides a new item, as follows:

§ 420.3 **Tolerances for related pesticide chemicals.**

* * * * *

(e) * * *

(5) * * *

O,O-Dimethyl phosphorodithioate, *S*-ester with 4-(mercaptomethyl)-2-methoxy-Δ^2-1,3,4-thiadiazolin-5-one.

* * * * *

2. The following new section is added to Subpart C:

§ 420.298 ***O,O*-Dimethyl phosphorodithioate, *S*-ester with 4-(mercaptomethyl)-2-methoxy-Δ^2-1,3,4-thiadiazolin-5-one; tolerances for residues.**

Tolerances for residues of the insecticide *O,O*-dimethyl phosphorodithioate, *S*-ester with 4-(mercaptomethyl)-2-methoxy-Δ^2-1,3,4-thiadiazolin-5-one are established in or on raw agricultural commodities as follows:

6 parts per million in or on alfalfa, alfalfa hay, clover, clover hay, grass, and grass hay.

0.2 part per million in or on cottonseed.

Any person who will be adversely affected by the foregoing order may at any time within 30 days after its date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER file with the Objections Clerk, Environmental Protection Agency, 1626 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20460, written objections thereto in quintuplicate. Objections shall show wherein the person filing will be adversely affected by the order and specify with particularity the provisions of the order deemed objectionable and the grounds for the objections. If a hearing is requested, the objections must state the issues for the hearing. A hearing will be granted if the objections are supported by grounds legally sufficient to justify the relief sought. Objections may be accompanied by a memorandum or brief in support thereof.

Effective date. This order shall become effective on its date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (6–25–71).

(Sec. 408(d)(2), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(2))

Dated: June 17, 1971.

WILLIAM M. UPHOLT,
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Pesticides Programs.

[FR Doc.71-8986 Filed 6-24-71;8:49 am]

PART 420—TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FROM TOLERANCES FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICALS IN OR ON RAW AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

N-1-Naphthyl Phthalamic Acid

A petition (PP 0F0904) was filed by Uniroyal Chemical, division of Uniroyal, Inc., Bethany, CT 06525, proposing establishment of tolerances for negligible residues of the herbicide *N*-1-naphthyl phthalamic acid in or on the raw agricultural commodities peanuts at 0.2 part per million; and cantaloups, castor beans, cranberries, cucumbers, muskmelons, peaches, peanut forage, plums, potatoes, pumpkins, soybeans, soybean forage, squash, sweetpotatoes, and watermelons at 0.1 part per million.

Subsequently, the petitioner amended the petition by changing peanut and soybean forage to peanut and soybean hay, reducing the proposed tolerance of 0.2 part per million to 0.1 part per million in or on peanuts, and withdrawing the raw agricultural commodities castor beans, peaches, plums, potatoes, pumpkins, squash, and sweetpotatoes.

Prior to December 2, 1970, the Secretary of Agriculture certified that this pesticide chemical is useful for the purposes for which the tolerances are being established, and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior advised that it has no objection to these tolerances.

Part 120, Chapter I, Title 21 was redesignated Part 420 and transferred to Chapter III (36 F.R. 424).

Based on consideration given data submitted in the petition and other relevant material, it is concluded that:

1. Residues of the herbicide are not reasonably expected to transfer to eggs, meat, milk, and poultry from the proposed use, as specified in § 420.6(a)(3).

2. The tolerances established by this order will protect the public health.

Therefore, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d)(2), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(2)), the authority transferred to the Administrator 35 F.R. 15623), and the authority delegated by the Administrator to the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Pesticides Programs of the Environmental Protection Agency (36 F.R. 9038), Part 420 is amended by adding a new section to Subpart C, as follows:

§ 420.297 ***N*-1-Napthyl phthalamic acid; tolerances for residues.**

A tolerance of 0.1 part per million is established for negligible residues of the herbicide *N*-1-napthyl phthalamic acid from application of its sodium salt in or on the raw agricultural commodities cantaloups, cranberries, cucumbers, muskmelons, peanuts, peanut hay, soybeans, soybean hay, and watermelons.

Any person who will be adversely affected by the foregoing order may at any time within 30 days after its date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER file with the Objections Clerk, Environmental Protection Agency, 1626 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20460, written objections thereto in quintuplicate. Objections shall show wherein the person filing will be adversely affected by the order and specify with particularity the provisions of the order deemed objectionable and the grounds for the objections. If a hearing is requested, the objections must state the issues for the hearing. A hearing will be granted if the objections are supported by grounds legally sufficient to justify the relief sought. Objections may be accompanied by a memorandum or brief in support thereof.

Effective date. This order shall become effective on its date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (6–25–71).

(Sec. 408(d)(2), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(2))

Dated: June 17, 1971.

WILLIAM M. UPHOLT,
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Pesticides Programs.

[FR Doc.71-8985 Filed 6-24-71;8:49 am]

Title 24—HOUSING AND HOUSING CREDIT

Chapter II—Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development

SUBCHAPTER A—GENERAL

[Docket No. R-71-120]

PART 200—INTRODUCTION

Subpart D—Delegations of Basic Authority and Functions

DIRECTOR, PRODUCTION DIVISION, AND DEPUTY

Section 200.116(a) of the Delegations of Basic Authority and Functions published March 16, 1971 (36 F.R. 4980) under Part 200 of Title 24 provided that the Director, and Deputy Director, Production Division, were authorized to approve construction change orders, and mortgage insurance advances during construction. This authority had been previously delegated to the Assistant Director for Technical Services under § 200.113(a) of the delegations of authority published October 30, 1970 (35 F.R. 16797).

Accordingly, the phrase "* * * construction change orders, mortgage insurance advances during construction, * * *" is revoked from paragraph (a) of § 200.116, which shall read as follows: