congestion in several terminal areas. This action completes an additional segment of the EECP.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore—(1) is not a "major rule" under Executive Order 12291; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 75

Aviation safety, Jet routes.

Adoption of the Amendment

PART 75—[AMENDED]

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, Part 75 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 75) is amended, as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 75 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1348(a), 1354(a), 1510; Executive Order 10854; 49 U.S.C. 106(g) (Revised Pub. L. 97–449, January 12, 1983); 14 CFR 11.69.

§ 75.100 [Amended]

2. § 75.100 is amended as follows:

J–79 [Amended]

By removing the words "Charleston; Wilmington, NC; Norfolk, VA; INT of Norfolk 023° and Coyle, NJ, 208° radials; Coyle; Kennedy, NY;" and substituting the words "Charleston; Tar River, NC; Franklin, VA; Salisbury, MD; Sea Isle, NJ; Kennedy, NY;"

J–193 [New]

From Wilmington, NC, via INT of Wilmington 058° and Franklin, VA 190° radials; to Franklin.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 21, 1986.

Shelomo Wugalter,

Manager, Airspace-Rules and Aeronautical Information Division.

[FR Doc. 86–4368 Filed 2–27–86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

14 CFR Part 97

[Docket No. 24918; Amdt. No. 1315]

Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment establishes, amends, suspends, or revokes Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs) for operations at certain airports. These regulatory actions are needed because of the adoption of new or revised criteria, or because of changes occurring in the National Airspace System, such as the commissioning of new navigational facilities, addition of new obstacles, or changes in air traffic requirements. These changes are designed to provide safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace and to promote safe flight operations under instrument flight rules at the affected airports.

DATES: Effective: An effective date for each SIAP is specified in the amendatory provisions.

Incorporation by reference—approved by the Director of the Federal Register on December 31, 1980, and reapproved as of January 1, 1982.

ADDRESSES: Availability of matters incorporated by reference in the amendment is as follows:

For Examination—

1. FAA Rules Docket, FAA Headquarters Building, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591;

2. The FAA Regional Office of the region in which the affected airport is located; or

3. The Flight Inspection Field Office which originated the SIAP.

For Purchase—

Individual SIAP copies may be obtained from:

1. FAA Public Inquiry Center (APA-430), FAA Headquarters Building, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; or

2. The FAA Regional Office of the region in which the affected airport is located.

By Subscription—

Copies of all SIAPs mailed once every 2 weeks, are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald K. Funai, Flight Procedures Standards Branch (AFO–230), Air Transportation Division, Office of Flight Operations, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone (202) 426–8277.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This amendment to Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 97) prescribes new, amended, suspended, or revoked Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs). The complete regulatory description of each SIAP is contained in official FAA form documents which are incorporated by reference in this amendment under 5 U.S.C. 552(a), 1 CFR Part 51, and § 97.20 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (FARs). The applicable FAA Forms are identified as FAA Forms 8260–3, 8260–4, and 8260–5. Materials incorporated by reference are available for examination or purchase as stated above.

The large number of SIAPs, their complex nature, and the need for a special format make their verbatim publication in the **Federal Register** expensive and impractical. Further, airmen do not use the regulatory text of the SIAPs, but refer to their graphic depiction on charts printed by publishers of aeronautical materials. Thus, the advantages of incorporation by reference are realized and publication of the complete description of each SIAP contained in FAA form document is unnecessary. The provisions of this amendment state the affected CFR (and FAR) sections, with the types and effective dates of the SIAPs. This amendment also identifies the airport, its location, the procedure identification and the amendment number. This amendment to Part 97 is effective on the date of publication and contains separate SIAPs which have compliance dates stated as effective dates based on related changes in the National Airspace System or the application of new or revised criteria. Some SIAP amendments may have been previously issued by the FAA in a National Flight Data Center (FDC) Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) as an emergency action of immediate flight safety relating directly to published aeronautical charts. The circumstances which created the need for some SIAP amendments may require making them effective in less than 30 days. For the remaining SIAPs, an effective date at least 30 days after publication is provided.

Further, the SIAPs contained in this amendment are based on the criteria contained in the U.S. Standard for

Terminal Instrument Approach Procedures (TERPs). In developing these SIAPs, the TERPs criteria were applied to the conditions existing or anticipated at the affected airports. Because of the close and immediate relationship between these SIAPs and safety in air commerce, I find that notice and public procedure before adopting these SIAPs is unnecessary, impracticable, and contrary to the public interest and, where applicable, that good cause exists for making some SIAPs effective in less than 30 days.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore—(1) is not a "major rule" under Executive Order 12291; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. For the same reason, the FAA certifies that this amendment will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in CFR Part 97

Approaches, Standard instrument, Incorporation by reference.

Issued in Washington, DC on February 21, 1986.

John S. Kern,

Acting Director of Flight Standards.

Adoption of the Amendment

PART 97—[AMENDED]

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 97) is amended by establishing, amending, suspending, or revoking Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, effective at 0901 G.m.t. on the dates specified, as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 97 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354(a), 1421, and 1510; 49 U.S.C.106(g) (revised, Pub. L. 97-449, January 12, 1983; and 14 CFR 11.49(b)(2)).

By amending: § 97.23 VOR/DME, VOR or TACAN, and VOR/DME or TACAN; § 97.25 LOC, LOC/DME, LDA, LDA/DME, SDF, SDF/DME; § 97.27 NDB, NDB/DME; § 97.29 ILS, ILS/DME, ISMLS, MLS, MLS/DME, MLS/RNAV; § 97.31 RADAR SIAPs; § 97.33 RNAV SIAPs; and § 97.35 COPTER SIAPs, identified as follows:

* * * *Effective 8 May 1986*

Camden, AR—Harrell Field, VOR/DME Rwy 36, Amdt. 5
Camden, AR—Harrell Field, NDB Rwy 18, Amdt. 8
Fargo, ND—Hector Field, NDB Rwy 17, Amdt. 13
Fargo, ND—Hector Field, ILS Rwy 17, Amdt. 2
Wahpeton, ND—Harry Stern, NDB Rwy 33, Amdt. 2
Williston, ND—Sloulin Fld Intl, VOR Rwy 11, Amdt. 11
Williston, ND—Sloulin Fld Intl, VOR/DME Rwy 29, Amdt. 2
Williston, ND—Sloulin Fld Intl, ILS Rwy 29, Amdt. 1
Williston, ND—Skoulin Fld Intl, ILS Rwy 29, Amdt. 1

* * * *Effective 10 April 1986*

Harrison, AR—Boone County, LOC Rwy 36, Amdt. 5
Harrison, AR—Boone County, NDB Rwy 18, Amdt. 4
Harrison, AR—Boone County, NDB Rwy 36, Amdt. 4
Atlanta, GA—The William B. Hartsfield Atlanta Intl, ILS Rwy 8R, Amdt. 58
Cartersville, GA—Cartersville, VOR/DME-A, Amdt. 2, Cancelled
Moline, IL—Quad-City, ILS Rwy 9, Amdt. 27
Bellaire, MI—Antrim County, VOR Rwy 2, Orig.
West Branch, MI—West Branch Community, VOR Rwy 27, Orig.
West Branch, MI—West Branch Community, NDB Rwy 27, Amdt. 6
Cape Girardeau, MO—Cape Girardeau Muni, VOR Rwy 2, Amdt. 8
Cape Girardeau, MO—Cape Girardeau Muni, VOR Rwy 10, Amdt. 1
Cape Girardeau, MO—Cape Girardeau Muni, VOR Rwy 20, Amdt. 1
Buffalo, NY—Greater Buffalo Intl, VOR-A, Amdt. 17
Buffalo, NY—Greater Buffalo Intl, NDB Rwy 5, Amdt. 10
Buffalo, NY—Greater Buffalo Intl, NDB Rwy 23, Amdt. 14
Buffalo, NY—Greater Buffalo Intl, ILS Rwy 5, Amdt. 13
Buffalo, NY—Greater Buffalo Intl, ILS Rwy 23, Amdt. 27
Buffalo, NY—Greater Buffalo Intl, RADAR-1, Amdt. 13
Syracuse, NY—Syracuse Hancock Intl, RADAR-1, Amdt. 5, Cancelled
Mandan, ND—Mandan Muni, RADAR-1 Amdt. 1
Merrill, WI—Merrill Muni, NDB Rwy 7, Amdt. 1
Merrill, WI—Merrill Muni, NDB Rwy 16, Amdt. 5

* * * *Effective 13 March 1986*

Fort Huachuca-Sierra Vista, AZ—Libby AAF/Sierra Vista Muni, VOR-A, Amdt. 1, Cancelled
Fort Huachuca-Sierra Vista, AZ—Libby AAF/Sierra Vista Muni, NDB Rwy 26, Orig.

The FAA published an Amendment in Docket No. *24902,* Amdt. No. *1313* to Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (VOL *51* FR No. *22* Page *4159;* dated *3 FEB 1986*) under Section 97.*25* effective *13 MAR 86*, which is hereby amended as follows:

Lake Charles, LA—Lake Charles Muni, LOC BC Rwy 33, Amdt. 16, Rescinded.

[FR Doc. 86-4280 Filed 2-27-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Social Security Administration

20 CFR Parts 404 and 416

[Regulations No. 4 and 16]

Supplemental Security Income; Disability and Blindness Determinations

Correction

In FR Doc. 85-28887, beginning on page 50118, in the issue of Friday, December 6, 1985, make the following corrections:

1. On page 50127, second column, fifth line from bottom in § 404.1579(b)(5), "lastest" should read "latest".

2. On the same page, third column, fifth line, in § 404.1579(c)(4), "medica" should read "medical".

3. On page 50131, third column, in § 404.1594(b)(3) Example 2, second paragraph, first line, "had" should read "has".

4. On page 50132, first column, twenty-fourth line in § 404.1594(b)(4), "had" should read "has". In the thirty-second line, after the word "these" insert "basic".

5. On the same page, second column, fourth line in § 404.1594(b)(4)(ii), "in" should read "is". In the eleventh line, the second "to sustained" should be removed.

6. On page 50133, first column, second line in § 404.1594(c)(3), "consideration" should read "considerations."

7. On the same page, third column, twenty-eighth line in § 404.1594(c)(3)(v), "effects" should read "efforts".

8. On page 50137, first column, first line of § 416.986(a), "you" should read "your". In the second line, "yor" should read "you". In paragraph (a)(2) of same section and column, second line, "no" should read "not".

9. On page 50139, in § 416.994(b)(1)(iv)(C), second column, first line, "evaluation" should read "evaluations".

10. On page 50140, first column, fifth line in § 416.994(b)(2)(iv)(C), "our" should read "your".

11. On the same page, third column, twentieth line in § 416.994(b)(3), before "medical" insert "any".

12. On page 50141, second column, third line in § 416.994(b)(3)(iii)(B)*(1)*, "Subchapter" should read "Subpart". In the same section, paragraph (b)(3)(iii))(B)*(2)*, first line, "or" should read "of".

13. On the same page, third column, sixth line in § 416.994(b)(3)(iv)(A), Example 1, "electroencephalogram" was misspelled.

14. On page 50142, first column, eighth line in § 416.994(b)(3)(iv)(B), Example, "original" was misspelled.

15. On page 50143, third column, third line in § 416.994(c)(1)(i) Example 1, "has" should read "had".

16. On page 50145, in § 416.994(c)(3)(i), second column, twenty-second line, "The" should read "This".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 558

New Animal Drugs for Use in Animal Feeds; Lasalocid

Correction

In FR Doc. 86-3005 beginning on page 5162 in the issue of Wednesday, February 12, 1986, make the following corrections:

1. On page 5162, third column, in Part 558, in the first line of the Authority, insert "82" before "Stat.".

2. On page 5163, in the table at the top of the page, under "Limitations", first line, insert "cattle" after "pasture".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Parole Commission

28 CFR Part 2

Paroling, Recommitting and Supervising Federal Prisoners

AGENCY: United States Parole Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Parole Commission is making procedural clarifications and revisions to its rules at 28 CFR 2.19 (Information Considered) and § 2.27 (Appeal of Original Jurisdiction Cases). The amendment to 28 CFR 2.19 provides that the procedures for submission of materials to be considered by the Commission also are applicable to preliminary interviews and the amendment to 28 CFR 2.27 revises the date at which material supporting the appeal of an original jurisdiction case must be submitted to the Commission.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 31, 1986.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alan J. Chaset, Deputy Director of Research and Program Development, U.S. Parole Commission, 5550 Friendship Blvd., Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815, Telephone (301) 492-4980.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. Parole Commission is making procedural changes to two of its rules related to the Submission by offenders of materials and information for consideration by the Commission.

First, in making a parole or reparole determination, the Commission considers a number of reports and other documents concerning the prisoner. It will also take into consideration additional information concerning the prisioner, including information submitted by the prisoner or by other interested persons. The rules governing the information so considered are at 28 CFR 2.19.

Occasionally, at the hearing, a prisoner or his representative will submit for the first time voluminous material concerning the prisoner to be considered by the panel. In such instances, it is generally impossible for the examiners to read all the material submitted without seriously disturbing the hearing schedule. To remedy this situation and to ensure that the information contained in the submitted materials receives appropriate attention and review, the Commission adopted procedures which limit the amount of material to be first submitted at a hearing, which establish the timing of that submission, which allow for summarization of the submitted material, and which provides for Commission consideration of all the material submitted as part of the review of the panel's recommendation. A final rule in this regard was published in the Federal Register (50 FR 36422, September 6, 1985).

The submission of voluminous materials concerning prisoners are equally problematic to the individuals who conduct preliminary interviews as part of the parole revocation process. To remedy this similar situation and again to ensure that the submitted material receives appropriate attention, the Commission is amending 28 CFR 2.19 to extend the coverage of those procedures to preliminary interviews.

Second, as part of the procedures regarding the Commission's consideration of an appeal of original jurisdiction cases, the Commission receives and reviews written information concerning prisoners as submitted by attorneys, relatives and other interested parties. Presently, these supporting materials are to be submitted at least two weeks in advance of the Commission meeting at which the appeal will be heard. 28 CFR 2.27(b). The Commission has determined that this two-week deadline does not provide ample time for the material to be reviewed, a summary prepared, typed, rechecked for accuracy, photocopied for the National and Regional Commissioners' packets and mailed out. These necessary steps take considerable time and delay review by the Commissioners beyond the two-week period.

To remedy this situation and to ensure adequate time for review, the Commission is amending 28 CFR 2.27(b) to require that the supporting materials be submitted thirty days in advance of the meeting at which the appeal will be considered.

These such changes will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 2

Administrative practice and procedures, Prisoners, Probation and parole.

PART 2—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 28 CFR Part 2 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 18 U.S.C. 4203(a)(1) and (4204(a)(6).

2. 28 CFR 2.19, *Information Considered,* is amended by revising paragraph (b)(3) to read as follows:

§ 2.19 Information Considered.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) If material of more than six (6), double-spaced, letter-sized pages is first submitted at the time of the hearing (or preliminary interview) and the hearing panel (or person conducting the hearing or preliminary interview) concludes that it is not feasible to read all the material at that time, the person submitting the material will be permitted to summarize it briefly at the hearing (or preliminary interview). All of the material submitted will become part of the record to be considered by the Commission in its review of the proceedings.

* * * * *

3. 28 CFR § 2.27, *Appeal of Original Jurisdiction Cases,* is amended by

revising paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 2.27 Appeal of Original Jurisdiction Cases.

* * * * *

(b) Attorneys, relatives, and other interested parties who wish to submit written information concerning a prisoner's appeal should send such information to the National Appeals Board Analyst, United States Parole Commission, 5550 Friendship Boulevard, Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815. Appeals and all supporting material are to be submitted thirty days in advance of the meeting at which the appeals will be considered.

* * * * *

Dated: February 12, 1986.

Benjamin F. Baer,

Chairman, U.S. Parole Commission.

[FR Doc. 86-4237 Filed 2-27-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

---

28 CFR Part 2

Paroling, Recommitting and Supervising Federal Prisoners

AGENCY: United States Parole Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Parole Commission is making several interpretative clarifications, revisions and additions to its paroling policy guidelines contained in 28 CFR 2.20 and 2.36. These changes and additions are intended to remove ambiguities, to conform to other parts of the guidelines, and to make the guidelines more comprehensive.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 31, 1986.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alan J. Chaset, Deputy Director of Research and Program Development, U.S. Parole Commission, 5550 Friendship Blvd., Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815, Telephone (301) 492-4980.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. The Interim Rule and its Purposes

On October ?, 1985, the U.S. Parole Commission published in the **Federal Register** (50 FR 40368) an interim rule, with request for public comment, that made a number of amendments to the Commission's paroling policy guidelines. Among those amendments were the following:

1. A revision was made to 28 CFR 2.20(j)(1) to conform to amendments made to 28 CFR 2.21 concerning the recalculation of the salient factor score for parole violators. And a revision was made to 28 CFR 2.36(a)(1) to make it more consistent with amendments made to 28 CFR 2.21 concerning the grading of administrative violations as Category One.

2. Several changes were made to the offense examples in the Offense Severity Index of 28 CFR 2.20. These amendments were, for the most part, editorial and served to clarify the offense examples. Other revisions added new offense examples, making the offense severity index more comprehensive by including behaviors previously not specifically covered. Offense Example 211(a) was revised for clarity as were Offense Examples 212(a), 221(e), 615, and 621(b). (For consistency, an amendment was made to Definition 17 in Subchapter B of Chapter Thirteen to conform to the revision in Offense Examples 211(e) and 212(a)). The titles of Offense Examples 232 and 801 were revised for clarity and consistency and the statutory reference in the title of Offense Example 361 was removed. New subparagraph (c) was added to Offense Example 322 to clarify the relationship of extortion to non-governmental corruption. Operating video gambling machines were added to the list of gambling law violations in Offense Example 1111 and, for consitsency, Offense Example 1112 was revised for grading by reference to Offense Example 1111. Offense Example 803 was removed; the underlying statute had been repealed and involuntary manslaughter is covered elsewhere in the guidelines. New Offense Example 363 was added to make the index more comprehensive by providing coverage for "insider trading" offenses. The grading of the severity of those offenses paralleled that of the antitrust offenses in Offense Example 361. New Offense Examples 1171 and 1172, rating environmental offenses, were added. The Commission proposed the creation of a subchapter on these offenses in the proposed rule published on June 10, 1985 (50 FR 24236). No comment was received, and the Commission had developed these two offense examples pursuant to that proposal. Also, new General Note (7) was added to Subchapter A of Chapter Thirteen to clarify the grading of state offenses committed at or about the same time as the current federal offense.

3. To make the rules more comprehensive, the Commission revised several offense examples and other paragraphs by incorporating, as part of the rules, instructional material previously included in the Commission's internal Rules and Procedures Manual. These changes were also to help clarify the rules and examples. In this regard, amendments were made to Offense Examples 232(c), 331(f)(3), 331(g)(2), 362(d), and 618 (a) and (b). Similarly, Note (3) was added to the Notes to Chapter Nine; subparagraphs (a) through (e) were added to General Note (2) of Subchapter A of Chapter Thirteen; and the salient factor scoring instructions were incorporated into the rules.

B. Public Comment

With the exception of the addition of new Offense Example 363 regarding insider trading (discussed below), no public comment was received on any of the revisions, additions or clarifications contained in the interim rule.

As regards the addition of new Offense Example 363 to Chapter 3, Subchapter G of the Offense Behavior Severity Index of § 2.20, significant response was received questioning the severity ratings developed for insider trading. An amemdment was attached to the Continuing Resolution (House Joint Resolution 465, Further Continuing Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1986; Pub. L. 99-190) prohibiting the Parole Commission from enforcing this offense example for a six month period, except with respect to pending offenses. Letters were forwarded by various Senators and Congressmen expressing their views on the subject. Additionally, a letter was received from the Secretary of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission noting that Commission's position on the matter and another received from the Deputy Attorney General passing on the comments of the Economic Crime Council.

The thrust of all the comments received was basically the same: insider trading is a very serious offense that has consequences beyond the illegal profits generated by the inside trader; as a comparative, the severity level of insider trading should be graded as similar to fraud type offenses rather than to antitrust offenses as provided for in the interim rule; the severity ratings contained in the interim rule do not adequately reflect the seriousness of the offense and the resultant harm caused and, further, do not reflect recent legislative and prosecutorial initiatives aimed at both deterring and more appropriately sanctioning this behavior.

The U.S. Parole Commission has reviewed the letters and comments received and has determined to amend the portion of the interim rule that deals with insider trading. Rather than paralleling the severity categories for insider trading offenses with violations of the antitrust laws, such offenses will be treated as similar to traditional frauds and will be rated accordingly.