

(b) Required to be in possession or control as of the audit date for which the required action was not taken by respondent within the time frames specified by Rules 15c3-3 (Note 7).

2. Market value of excess margin securities and fully paid securities in cash accounts having either credit or no money balance for which instructions to place in possession or control were not reflected on the books and records of the respondent as of the audit date.

(a) Arising from "temporary lags which result from normal business operations" permitted pursuant to Rule 15c3-3.

(b) Not arising from "temporary lags which result from normal business operations" permitted pursuant to Rule 15c3-3.

H. Fully paid securities borrowed from customers pursuant to specific agreement.

I. Allowance for customers' accounts doubtful of collection.

NOTES: 1. All unsecured cash accounts shall be reported under D and partly secured accounts deemed doubtful of collection shall be reported under C.

6. State separately or in a footnote, description, quantity, price and valuation of any specific security (other than an exempted security) which is collateral for margin accounts included in the long security valuations at B.1 and C.1 and which exceeds in aggregate value 15 percent of the aggregate value of all securities which collateralize all margin accounts receivable reported at these two questions. A specific security is deemed to be collateral for a margin account only to the extent it represents in value not more than 140% of the customer debit balance in a margin account.

7. State separately or in a footnote whether securities reported in 8G(1)(b) above were subsequently reduced to possession or control by the respondent. Also state the number of individual items which were reported in 6G(1)(b) above.

Question 8—Accounts of Officers and Directors.

The Note is redesignated Note 1 and Note 2 is added:

NOTES: 1. * * *

2. All "excess margin" and "fully paid securities" of officers and directors shall be reported together and Notes 6 and 7 to Question 6 shall not apply to this Question.

Question 9—General Partners' Individual Accounts.

A new Note 3 is added as follows:

NOTES: 1. * * *

3. All "excess margin" and "fully paid securities" shall be reported together and Notes 6 and 7 to Question 6 shall not apply to this Question.

Question 10—Trading and Investment Accounts of Respondent.

A new Note 4 is added as follows:

NOTES: * * *

4. State separately or in a footnote both long and short security valuations attributable to principal purchases or sales from or to customers which are included in the answer to Question 10A.

Question 13—Other Accounts, etc.

This Question is amended to read as follows:

State details (ledger balances, valuations of securities and spot (cash) commodities; status of future commodity positions; and any other relevant information) of any accounts which have not been included in one of the answers to the above questions. These

shall include: accounts for exchange memberships; furniture, fixtures, and other fixed assets; valuation reserves; funds provided or deposited by the respondent as margin in joint accounts; revenue stamps; dividends receivable, payable and unclaimed; floor brokerage receivable and payable, commissions receivable and payable, advances to salesmen and other employees; commodity difference account; goodwill; organization expense, prepaid expenses and deferred charges; liability reserves; mortgages payable; other liabilities and deferred credits; market value of securities borrowed (other than for delivery against customers' sales) to the extent to which no equivalent value is paid or credited (other than securities borrowed from customers which are reported in Question 6H); drafts payable (issued in settlement of customers' credit balances); long security count difference valuations; short security count difference valuations; and other accounts not specifically mentioned herein.

NOTES: * * *

3. State in a footnote the number of securities in which there were long security count differences; the number in which there were short security count differences; and the total number of securities in which there were positions as of the date of the accountant's report.

4. State separately or in a footnote as of the audit date (a) the market value of stock dividends, stock splits and similar distributions receivable outstanding over 30 calendar days, (b) market value of short security count difference valuations over 30 calendar days old, and (c) ledger credit balances and short security valuations in all suspense accounts over 30 calendar days.

AUDIT REQUIREMENTS

The introductory paragraph and Items 2, 10 and 11 are amended as follows:

The audit shall be made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and shall include a review of the accounting system, the internal accounting control and procedures for safeguarding securities including appropriate tests thereof for the period since the prior examination date. The scope of such review and tests shall be sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that any material inadequacies existing at the date of the examination would be disclosed. The audit shall include all procedures necessary under the circumstances to substantiate the assets and liabilities and securities and commodities positions as of the date of the responses to the financial questionnaire and to permit the expression of an opinion by the independent public accountant as to the financial condition of the respondent at that date. Based upon such audit, the accountant shall concurrently comment upon any material inadequacies found to exist in: (a) The accounting system; (b) the internal accounting control; (c) procedures for safeguarding securities and (d) the practices and procedures whose review is specified in Items 8, 9, 10 and 11 below; and shall indicate any corrective action taken or proposed. If the audit did not disclose any material inadequacies, the accountant shall so report.

The independent public accountant may perform audit procedures at any time which he may deem appropriate; however, if the procedures prescribed in Items 2, 3, 4 and 6(c)-(g), excluding Item 6(e)(v), are performed at a date other than the audit date, then all such aforementioned procedures shall be performed as of the same date, which shall not be more than 180 days prior to the financial statement date.

The scope of the audit shall include the following procedures, but nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the audit or

permitting the omission of any additional audit procedures which an independent accountant would deem necessary under the circumstances. As part of his audit the independent public accountant shall:

(2) Account for by physical examination and comparison with the books and records: all securities, including customers' fully paid and excess margin securities; material amounts of currency and tax stamps; warehouse receipts; and other assets on hand, in vault, in box or otherwise in physical possession. Control shall be maintained over such assets during the course of the physical examination and comparison.

(10) Review and test respondent's procedures relating to compliance with the requirement for the prompt payment for securities pursuant to section 4(c) of Regulation T of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and,

(11) (a) Review the procedures followed in making the periodic computations and deposits required under the provisions of paragraph (e) and Exhibit A of Rule 15c3-3.

(b) Review the procedures followed in obtaining and maintaining physical possession or control of all fully paid and excess margin securities of customers as required under the provisions of Rule 15c3-3.

(c) If respondent is exempt from Rule 15c3-3, the independent public accountant shall ascertain that the conditions of the exemption were being complied with as of the examination date and that no facts came to his attention to indicate that the exemption had not been complied with during the period.

Section 249.617—No change in description in text.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] GEORGE A. FITZSIMMONS,
Secretary.

MAY 24, 1974.

[FR Doc. 74-13319 Filed 6-10-74; 8:45 am]

Title 21—Food and Drugs

CHAPTER I—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SUBCHAPTER D—DRUGS FOR HUMAN USE

PART 310—NEW DRUGS

PART 314—NEW DRUG APPLICATIONS

Special Packaging

In a proposal published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of December 13, 1973 (38 FR 34329), the Commissioner of Food and Drugs set forth guidelines to define when premarket clearance is required for anticipated packaging changes for drugs as a result of "special packaging" standards promulgated by the Consumer Product Safety Commission pursuant to section 3 of the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970.

Seven comments were received: five from pharmaceutical manufacturers, one from a pharmaceutical manufacturer's association, and one from a government agency. A summary of these comments and the Commissioner's responses are as follows:

1. The majority of the comments expressed concern over the requirement for advance approval of changes in the

closure system where the composition of the material in contact with the drug (e.g., cap liner, inside surface of the plastic laminate, etc.) remains unchanged and the only other change is in the outer shell of the closure. It was argued by some that in this instance there would be no adverse effect on water vapor and gas transmission and therefore immediate implementation should be permitted. Some felt that this type of change could be put into effect immediately if certain supporting data and necessary commitments for ongoing tests are submitted. These comments also stated that the requirement that the package be "at least comparable" to that provided for in the approved application is unduly rigid and fails to take into account difference in physical characteristics and capabilities of various types of closures and the virtual impossibility of proving "comparability" of some of these.

While the Commissioner recognizes that in some cases a liner or innerseal which is identical to that in the approved application may provide the necessary protection for the drug product, data are not available to substantiate a claim that an across-the-board exemption can be provided for all changes of this type. The Commissioner has accepted, and this was the intent of the proposal, that if the closure component in contact with the drug remains the same, the change to the composition and/or physical characteristics of the outer cap or lid may be placed into effect before approval of the supplements provided certain supporting data and necessary commitments are submitted. Further, the Commissioner recognizes the difficulties which may occur in requiring comparability of special packaging with that provided in an approved application which may actually be more than adequate to protect the integrity of the product. Therefore, § 314.8(d)(5) (21 CFR 314.8(d)(5)) has been modified to provide that changes in the composition and/or physical characteristics of the lid, or the cap liner when an innerseal is used, provided there is no change in the closure component in contact with the drug (cap liner or innerseal) and in the torque of the closure, may be made in advance of approval of the supplemental application. Such applications shall include, however, data showing that the package is satisfactory as a barrier to moisture and gas transmission or 3 months accelerated stability data which include assay data, as well as data on other significant properties of the product at room temperature and at exaggerated temperatures and conditions of high humidity. In the event that the change in the package is in the composition and/or configuration of the cap, but not in the cap liner, other data or information which demonstrate the adequacy of the liner will be accepted in lieu of moisture and gas transmission or the accelerated stability studies. The applicant must also agree to test the stability of initially marketed batches of the drug.

2. Several comments addressed the issue of application/removal torque or tightness of the closure and the protection it provides the product when applied consistently as specified in the approved new-drug application thus making it unnecessary to require time-consuming and expensive stability testing.

The Commissioner disagrees that tightness of the container/closure alone should be controlling in this regard. It is an important factor which must be considered in developing packaging standards along with the physical and chemical characteristics of the container/closure systems for drug products and in cognizance of this, as indicated above, the regulation has been modified to add tightness of the closure as an additional parameter for testing when compared with the currently approved packaging. Such data when submitted along with accelerated stability data or data showing that the package is satisfactory as a barrier to moisture and gas transmission may be used to justify changes put into effect in advance of approval of a supplemental application providing no change has been made in the composition of the container and the closure component in contact with the drug remains unchanged.

3. One comment stated that stability data other than that relating to vapor and gas transmission may be more appropriate for a particular drug product and that it should be permitted to demonstrate the suitability of a package.

The Commissioner agrees that appropriate stability studies may actually provide a more accurate assessment of the adequacy of a particular contained closure system for a drug product. Accordingly, the regulation has been amended to provide for the alternative submission of accelerated stability data.

4. Comments were submitted concerning the implication that all marketed batches produced must be tested for stability.

The Commissioner finds that this implication was unintentional, and the final order has been modified to state explicitly that only initially marketed batches of the drug are to be tested and that reports be submitted at specified intervals.

5. A comment questioned the requirement that the applicant withdraw from the market any batch found to fall outside the approved specifications for the drug, thus requiring a recall or market withdrawal of a product regardless of whether the deviation was minor and irrespective of any pertinent facts. The comment contended that recalls or withdrawals for minuscule violations tend to dilute the effectiveness of such removal actions and provide little or no additional protection to the public health. Several examples were presented.

The Commissioner advises that it is not the policy of the Food and Drug Administration to require recalls or withdrawals for minor deviations from acceptable specifications. In order to clarify this intent the final order has been

modified to indicate that if the applicant does not believe the deviation is significant and does not justify a withdrawal from the market, the deviation shall be discussed with the Food and Drug Administration.

6. A general comment was made that clarification is necessary to show that these regulations have been written to include all forms of packaging such as bottles, plastic blisters, strip packages, etc.

The Commissioner concludes that although it is not necessary for the regulation to be amended in this regard, such is the intent of the requirements of § 314.8. Supplements for changes in these types of packaging must have prior approval.

7. A single comment expressed concern that implementation of these requirements at this time might cause reversals in industry plans to implement "special packaging" and cause discontinued marketing of necessary life-saving drugs. Extension of the April 15, 1974 "special packaging" deadline for prescription drug packaging was requested.

The Commissioner concludes that he has no authority to extend the deadline for use of "special packaging" which currently lies with the Consumer Product Safety Commission. The Commission stated in comments submitted on the proposed regulations that it has no reason at the present time to believe that special packaging adequate to protect the purity and effectiveness of drugs is not available, thus enabling manufacturers to comply with requirements of both the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Poison Prevention Packaging Act. The Commission also stated that it believes that the time provided from the date on which a packaging standard is proposed until the effective date of the subsequent final order is adequate to allow the affected industry to comply with the requirements of such packaging standards as well as to obtain the necessary Food and Drug Administration approval of a supplemental new-drug application, and that the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, in promulgating packaging standards for drugs prior to the activation of the Consumer Product Safety Commission on May 14, 1973, made the finding that special packaging was available which would protect the integrity of drugs. As expressed in its comment, the Commission is, however, willing to consider those individual cases where unusual circumstances may result in a drug manufacturer who has acted in good faith being unable to comply with requirements imposed by the Food and Drug Administration to assure purity and effectiveness of the drug within the effective date specified in the packaging standards.

The Commissioner emphasizes that these regulations require that supplements submitted to provide for special packaging be plainly marked "Special Container Packaging Supplement." Such identification is to expedite the handling and review of such supplements.

On March 29, 1974, there was published in the *FEDERAL REGISTER* (39 FR 11680) a recodification of Part 130 of the Food and Drug Regulations. These amendments reflect the recodified section numbers rather than the section numbers used in the proposal.

Therefore, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (secs. 502, 505, 507, 701; 52 Stat. 1050-1053, as amended; 1055-1056, as amended by 70 Stat. 919 and 72 Stat. 948; 59 Stat. 463, as amended (21 U.S.C. 352, 255, 357, 371)) and under authority delegated to the Commissioner (21 CFR 2.120), Parts 310 and 314 of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations are amended as follows:

1. In § 310.3 by adding a new paragraph (1) as follows:

§ 310.3 Definitions and interpretations.

(1) "Special packaging" as defined in section 2(4) of the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970 means packaging that is designed or constructed to be significantly difficult for children under 5 years of age to open or obtain a toxic or harmful amount of the substance contained therein within a reasonable time and not difficult for normal adults to use properly, but does not mean packaging which all such children cannot open or obtain a toxic or harmful amount within a reasonable time.

2. In § 314.8, by adding a new paragraph (a) (4) (vi), by revising the last three sentences in (a) (4), by adding new paragraphs (a) (5) (xi) and (xii) and (d) (5) as follows:

§ 314.8 Supplemental applications.

(a) * * *

(4) * * *

(vi) A change in container to provide for "special packaging" as defined in § 310.3(1) of this chapter pursuant to the requirements of regulations under the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970. The mailing cover and supplement shall be plainly marked "Special Container Packaging Supplement."

Any number of changes may be submitted at any one time; but if they fall into different categories as listed in paragraph (a) (4) (i) through (vi) of this section, the proposed changes should be covered by separate communications. Where, however, a change necessitates an "overcap" to the existing closure of a submitted in a single communication. For example, a change in tablet potency would require other changes such as in components, composition, and labeling and should be submitted in a single communication.

(5) * * *

(xi) Changes which provide for "special packaging" as defined in § 310.3(1) of this chapter which are in the form of an "overlap" to the existing closure of a container without any other changes in the container/closure system. The report or written communication shall contain

information as to the manufacturer of the safety closure and any identification applied to such closure.

(xii) Addition to the labeling of such statements as required by the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970 or regulations promulgated thereunder.

(d) * * *

(5) Changes which provide for "special packaging" as defined in § 310.3(1) of this chapter other than the use of an additional closure as provided for in paragraph (a) (5) (xi) of this section, where the composition of the container, the torque (tightness) of the container, and the composition of the closure component in contact with the drug (cap liner or innerseal) remain the same as provided in the approved new-drug application. Each such supplement shall include:

(i) A representative market package and any identification applied to such package and

(ii) Preliminary data showing that the package is satisfactory as a barrier to moisture and gas transmission or 3 months accelerated stability data which include assay data, as well as data on other significant properties of the product at room temperature and at exaggerated temperatures and conditions of high humidity. In the event that the sole change in package is in the composition or configuration of the cap (outer shell not in contact with the drug) other data or information which demonstrate the adequacy of the liner alone to serve as an effective barrier will be acceptable in lieu of moisture and gas transmission or accelerated stability data. For any changes instituted under the provisions of this paragraph, the applicant shall submit a written commitment that he will test the stability of initially marketed batches of the drug; submit the information at intervals of 3 months beginning with the date of initial packaging during the first year following such date, at intervals of 6 months during the second year following such date, and at yearly intervals thereafter for as long as necessary to support or establish an assigned expiration date, unless otherwise ordered in a written communication by the Food and Drug Administration; and withdraw from the market any batch found to fall outside the approved specifications for the drug or discuss the deviation with the Food and Drug Administration if the applicant believes the deviation is not significant.

Effective date. This order shall be effective July 11, 1974.

(Secs. 502, 505, 507, 701; 52 Stat. 1050-1053, as amended; 1055-1056, as amended by 70 Stat. 919 and 72 Stat. 948; 59 Stat. 463, as amended (21 U.S.C. 352, 355, 357, 371))

Dated: June 4, 1974.

SAM D. FINE,
Associate Commissioner
for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 74-13193 Filed 6-10-74; 8:45 am]

Title 40—Protection of Environment

CHAPTER I—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SUBCHAPTER C—AIR PROGRAMS

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Revisions to Utah Plan

On May 31, 1972 (37 FR 10842), pursuant to section 110 of the Clean Air Act and 40 CFR Part 51, the Administrator approved, with specific exceptions, a plan for implementation of the national ambient air quality standards submitted by Utah. On July 27, 1972 (37 FR 15094), the Administrator proposed regulations to correct deficiencies in the regulatory provisions of the Utah plan. On March 23, 1973 (38 FR 7584), the Administrator set forth a regulation limiting sulfur dioxide emissions from the first operating unit of Utah Power and Light Company's Huntington Canyon power plant located in the Utah portion of the Four Corners Interstate Region. The basis for the regulation was the diffusion modeling performed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for the Southwest Energy Study, which indicated that emissions from the first operating unit at Huntington Canyon would violate the primary and secondary short-term national ambient air quality standards for sulfur dioxide.

Subsequent to the promulgation of the sulfur dioxide regulation, the Administrator received the results of smoke and fluorescent particle tracer studies conducted at the Huntington Canyon site by Air Resources Laboratory, NOAA, and North American Weather Consultants, a firm retained by Utah Power and Light Company. These studies indicated that the dispersion rate of sulfur oxides under stable conditions was significantly greater than the rate used in the original NOAA model and that a correction factor was appropriate to compensate for the initial dilution of the plume before it reaches the effective stack height.

Based on projections developed from the results of these studies, the Administrator determined that emissions from the first operating unit of the Huntington Canyon power plant would not violate the short-term national standards for sulfur dioxide. On December 7, 1973, (38 FR 33777), the Administrator proposed to withdraw the sulfur dioxide regulation promulgated for the facility, revoke the extension provided for the attainment of the primary standards for sulfur dioxide, amend the Federal compliance schedule to exclude sulfur dioxide control for the first operating unit at Huntington Canyon, and indicate that ambient levels of sulfur dioxide in the Utah portion of the Four Corners Interstate Region are below the national standards. A public hearing on the proposed amendments was held in Salt Lake City on March 20, 1974. There was no challenge to the technical information supporting the proposals. Consequently, the Administrator is promulgating the amendments as proposed.

In order to insure that the national standards are not exceeded at Huntington Canyon, The Administrator intends to utilize his authority under Section 114 of the Act to require Utah Power and Light Company to perform ambient air quality monitoring. Should such monitoring indicate that some degree of control is necessary for the power plant to achieve the national standards, the Administrator will propose the required regulations.

Since these amendments remove, rather than enlarge or amplify, previously existing regulations, the Administrator has determined that good cause exists for not deferring the effective date of this promulgation. In addition, immediate effectiveness will allow Utah Power and Light to proceed with certainty in conducting its affairs and will afford other interested parties an opportunity to immediately seek judicial review.

(Sec. 110(c), 301(a), Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857 et seq.))

Dated: June 4, 1974.

JOHN QUARLES,
Administrator.

Part 52 of Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

Subpart TT—Utah

§ 52.2322 [Amended]

1. In § 52.2322, paragraph (d) is revoked.

§ 52.2325 [Amended]

2. In § 52.2325, paragraph (c) is revoked.

3. In § 52.2327, paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.2327 Compliance Schedules.

(b) *Federal compliance schedule.* (1) Except as provided in paragraph (b) (2)

of this section, the owner or operator of any stationary source subject to § 52.2330 (c) shall comply with such regulation on or before January 31, 1974. The owner or operator of the source subject to § 52.2330 (b) shall comply with such regulation at initial startup of such source unless a compliance schedule has been submitted pursuant to paragraph (b) (2) of this section.

(i) Any owner or operator in compliance with § 52.2330(c) on the effective date of such section shall certify compliance to the Administrator no later than 120 days following the effective date of § 52.2330(c).

(ii) Any owner or operator who achieves compliance with § 52.2330 (b) or (c) after the effective date of this regulation shall certify such compliance to the Administrator within 5 days of the date compliance is achieved.

(2) Any owner or operator of a stationary source subject to paragraph (b) (1) of this section may, no later than 120 days following the effective date of § 52.2330 (b) or (c), submit to the Administrator for approval a proposed compliance schedule that demonstrates compliance with § 52.2330 (b) or (c) as expeditiously as practicable but no later than July 31, 1975.

(3) The compliance schedule shall provide for periodic increments of progress toward compliance. The dates for achievement of such increments shall be specified. Increments of progress shall include, but not be limited to: Submittal of the final control plan to the Administrator; letting of necessary contracts for construction or process change or issuance of orders for the purchase of component parts to accomplish emission control or process modification; initiation of on-site construction or installation of emission control equipment or process modification; and final compliance.

(4) Any owner or operator who submits a compliance schedule pursuant to this paragraph shall, within 5 days after the deadline for each increment of progress, certify to the Administrator whether or not the required increment of the approved compliance schedule has been met.

§ 52.2331 [Amended]

4. In § 52.2331, the attainment date table is amended by replacing the date "March 1976" for attainment of the primary and secondary standards for sulfur oxides in the Four Corners Interstate Region with the letter "c".

[FR Doc.74-13280 Filed 6-10-74;8:45 am]

Title 47—Telecommunication

CHAPTER I—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

PART 73—RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES

United States-Mexico FM Broadcasting Requirement; Correction

In the matter of amendment of the Commission's rules and regulations to effectuate the United States-Mexico FM Broadcasting Agreement.

The Order, adopted March 28, 1974, promulgating amendments to various Rules and Regulations to further implement the United States-Mexico FM Broadcasting Agreement (FCC 74-309; 39 FR 12989; 46 F.C.C. 2d 153), is hereby corrected. In the Note to § 73.207(a), which was supplemented to set forth additional mileage separations to Mexican channel assignments and authorizations, for Class D to Class B, the 1st Adjacent Channel mileage should read "60" instead of "69".

Released: June 5, 1974.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,

[SEAL] VINCENT J. MULLINS,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.74-13326 Filed 6-10-74;8:45 am]

Title 24—Housing and Urban Development

CHAPTER X—FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SUBCHAPTER B—NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

[Docket No. FI 283]

PART 1914—AREAS ELIGIBLE FOR THE SALE OF INSURANCE

Status of Participating Communities

Section 1914.4 of Part 1914 of Subchapter B of Chapter X of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended by adding in alphabetical sequence a new entry to the table. In this entry, a complete chronology of effective dates appear for each listed community. Each date appearing in the East column of the table is followed by a designation which indicates whether the date signifies the effective date of the authorization of the sale of flood insurance in the area under the emergency or the regular flood insurance program. The entry reads as follows:

§ 1914.4 Status of participating communities.

State	County	Location	Effective date of authorization of sale of flood insurance for area	Hazard area identified	State map repository	Local map repository
Arkansas	Mississippi	Osceola, city of	June 5, 1974. Emergency.	Dec. 17, 1973		
Delaware	Kent and Sussex Counties	Milford, city of	do.	May 24, 1974		
New York	Ontario	Richmond, town of	do.	May 17, 1974		
Oregon	Douglas	Canyonville, city of	do.			
Do.	Jackson	Eagle Point, city of	do.			
Texas	Jim Wells	Alice, city of	do.	Dec. 28, 1973		
Washington	Walla Walla	Waitsburg, city of	do.	Apr. 12, 1974		
West Virginia	Kanawha	South Charleston, city of	do.			
Wisconsin	St. Croix	New Richmond, city of	do.	Dec. 28, 1973		

(National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (title XIII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968), effective Jan. 28, 1969 (33 FR 17804, Nov. 28, 1968), as amended (secs. 408-410, Public Law 91-152, Dec. 24, 1969), 42 U.S.C. 4001-4127; and Secretary's delegation of authority to Federal Insurance Administrator, 34 FR 2680, Feb. 27, 1969)

Issued: May 29, 1974.

GEORGE K. BERNSTEIN,
Federal Insurance Administrator.

[FR Doc.74-13255 Filed 6-10-74; 8:45 am]

[Docket No FI 284]

PART 1914—AREAS ELIGIBLE FOR THE SALE OF INSURANCE

Status of Participating Communities

Section 1914.4 of Part 1914 of Subchapter B of Chapter X of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended by adding in alphabetical sequence a new entry to the table. In this entry, a complete chronology of effective dates appear for each listed community. Each date appearing in the East column of the table is followed by a designation which indicates whether the date signifies the effective date of the authorization of the sale of flood insurance in the area under the emergency or the regular flood insurance program. The entry reads as follows:

§ 1914.4 Status of participating communities.

State	County	Location	Effective date of authorization of sale of flood insurance for area	Hazard area identified	State map repository	Local map repository
Illinois	Madison	Madison, city of	May 28, 1974. Emergency.	Nov. 23, 1973		
Do.	Randolph	Sparta, city of	do.	Mar. 1, 1974		
Minnesota	Anoka	Columbia Heights, city of	do.	May 10, 1974		
Do.	Nobles	Worthington, city of	do.	May 3, 1974		
Nebraska	Hall	Grand Island, city of	do.	Apr. 5, 1974		
New Hampshire	Hillsborough	Amherst, town of	do.	Mar. 22, 1974		
New Jersey	Mercer	Washington, township of	do.	May 17, 1974		
New York	Ontario	Naples, town of	do.			
Oregon	Yamhill	Unincorporated areas	do.			
South Dakota	Pennington	do.	do.			
Virginia	Brunswick	Lawrenceville, town of	do.	May 24, 1974		
Wisconsin	Buffalo	Mondovi, city of	do.	Jan. 9, 1974		
Do.	Dane	Oregon, village of	do.	May 24, 1974		

(National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (title XII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968), effective Jan. 28, 1969 (33 FR 17804, Nov. 28, 1968), as amended (secs. 408-410, Public Law 91-152, Dec. 24, 1969), 42 U.S.C. 4001-4127, and Secretary's delegation of authority to Federal Insurance Administrator, 34 FR 2680, Feb. 27, 1969)

Issued: May 29, 1974.

GEORGE K. BERNSTEIN,
Federal Insurance Administrator.

[FR Doc.74-13256 Filed 6-10-74; 8:45 am]