AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Vol.41—No.112
6-9-76
PAGES
23179–23371

federal register

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1976



highlights

PART I:

ROMANIA
Presidential determination extending waiver under the Trade Act of 1974 23179

AEROSOL PRODUCTS
EPA recommends procedures for disposal of cans containing vinyl chloride 23226

MARINE MAMMALS
Commerce/NOAA regulations on taking and importation; effective 6–9–76 23204

ARCHEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL SITES
USDA/SCS sets forth procedures for preservation; effective 7–1–76; comments by 8–9–76 23181

SWIMMING POOL SLIDES
CPSC clarifies safety standards; effective 7–17–76 23186

PRIVACY ACT
Justice issues proposal and notice of systems of records (2 documents); comments by 7–9–76 ..... 23206, 23215

PENSION PLANS
PBGC proposes regulations on premium payment and declaration; comments by 7–6–76 23212

COAL MINE SAFETY
Interior/MESA regulations on electric face equipment; effective 6–9–76 23199

MINERAL LEASING
Interior/BLM proposes regulations; comments by 7–9–76 23206

CABLE TV
FCC terminates proceeding on General Citizenship and licensing requirements 23210

HEARINGS—
OMB: Public reports and recordkeeping requirements for Labor/ETA; 6–23–76 23253

CONTINUED INSIDE

CHANGED HEARINGS—
FEA: Energy conservation and rationing contingency plans, change in location; 6–21 and 6–22–76 23212

MEETINGS—
ERDA: High Energy Physics Advisory Panel, 6–29 thru 7–1–76 23224
DOD/Navy: Naval Research Advisory Committee, 7–8 and 7–9–76 23215
Justice/LEAA: National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 6–26–76 23216
Commerce/Census: Census Advisory Committee on Agricultural Statistics, 6–15–76 23222
HEW/ADAMHA: National Panel on Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health, 6–30–76 23222
Minority Advisory Committee, 6–28 and 6–29–76 23222
FDA: National Advisory Food and Drug Committee, 6–29 and 6–30–76 23223
Panel on Review of General and Plastic Surgery Devices, 6–24–76 23223

CHANGED MEETINGS—
Justice/LEAA: National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals; 7–7 thru 7–9–76 .. 23216
National Commission on Electronic Fund Transfers, change in time, 6–15–76 23253

PART II:

LOW INCOME HOUSING
HUD sets forth interim regulations on PHA acquisition; effective 6–9–76 23291

PART III:

EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERS' RELIEF PROGRAM
HUD adopts regulations; effective 6–9–76 23297

PART IV:

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING
HUD sets prototype cost limits; effective 6–9–76 23301

AGENCY PUBLICATION ON ASSIGNED DAYS OF THE WEEK

Ten agencies have agreed to a six-month trial period based on the assignment of two days a week beginning February 9 and ending August 6 (See 41 FR 5453). The participating agencies and the days assigned are as follows:

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
NRC	USDA/ASCS		NRC	USDA/ASCS
DOT/COAST GUARD	USDA/APHIS		DOT/COAST GUARD	USDA/APHIS
DOT/NHTSA	USDA/FNS		DOT/NHTSA	USDA/FNS
DOT/FAA	USDA/REA		DOT/FAA	USDA/REA
	CSC			CSC
	LABOR			LABOR

Documents normally scheduled on a day that will be a Federal holiday will be published the next work day following the holiday.

Comments on this trial program are invited. Comments should be submitted to the Director of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 20408.

ATTENTION: Questions, corrections, or requests for information regarding the contents of this issue only may be made by dialing 202–523–5284. For information on obtaining extra copies, please call 202–523–5240. To obtain advance information from recorded highlights of selected documents to appear in the next issue, dial 202–523–5022.

federal register
Area Code 202 Phone 523–5240

Published daily, Monday through Friday (no publication on Saturdays, Sundays, or on official Federal holidays), by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 20408, under the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C., Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The FEDERAL REGISTER provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by Federal agencies. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive orders and Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by Act of Congress and other Federal agency documents of public interest. Documents are on file for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register the day before they are published, unless earlier filing is requested by the issuing agency.

The FEDERAL REGISTER will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $5.00 per month or $50 per year, payable in advance. The charge for individual copies is 75 cents for each issue, or 75 cents for each group of pages as actually bound. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

contents

THE PRESIDENT

Memorandums

Romania; extension of waiver under the Trade Act of 1974 ---- 23179

EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Rules

Grapefruit, white seedless, and white and pink seeded; grade requirements ---- 23186
Oranges, grapefruit, tangerines, and tangelos grown in Fla ---- 23184
Pears, fresh, plums and peaches grown in Calif ---- 23185

Proposed Rules

Nectarines grown in Calif ---- 23207

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

See Agricultural Marketing Service; Farmers Home Administration; Soil Conservation Service.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Notices

Meetings:
Minority Advisory Committee ---- 23222
National Panel on Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health ---- 23222

CENSUS BUREAU

Notices

Meetings:
Agriculture Statistics, Census Advisory Committee on ---- 23222

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Notices

Staff task force report on service to small communities; request for public comments ---- 23224
Hearings, etc.:
Orbis Polish Travel Bureau, Inc. and Pargiello Services, Inc ---- 23224

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

See Census Bureau; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Rules

Poison prevention packaging; child-resistant packaging standards; correction ---- 23187
Safety standards:
Swimming pool slides ---- 23186

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

See Navy Department.

ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFERS, NATIONAL COMMISSION

Notices

Workshop, change in commencement time ---- 23253

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Notices

Meetings:
High Energy Physics Advisory Panel ---- 23224

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Rules

Air quality implementation plans:
Idaho ---- 23200

Proposed Rules

Air quality implementation plans; various States, etc.:
Delaware ---- 23208

Notices

Aerosol cans containing vinyl chloride; recommended procedures for disposal ---- 23226
Ambient air monitoring reference and equivalent methods; receipt of application ---- 23225
Chloralkylene fluids as dielectric fluids; opinion regarding use ---- 23225
Polydimethylsiloxane fluids as coolants for use in transformers; opinion regarding use ---- 23225

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Rules

Environmental impact statements:
Program-related instructions; correction ---- 23186

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Proposed Rules

Cable television:
General citizenship requirements and relay licensing; termination of proceeding ---- 23210
FM broadcast stations; table of assignments:
Oklahoma ---- 23209

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Notices

Securities trading suspensions:
Farmers Bank of the State of Delaware ---- 23228

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

Proposed Rules

Conservation and rationing contingency plans; hearing; change in location ---- 23212

FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

Rules

Flood Insurance Program, National:
Special hazard areas ---- 23187

Proposed Rules

Flood Insurance Program, National; flood elevation determinations, etc.:
Texas ---- 23207

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Notices

Complaints filed:
South American Shoe Corp. v. the Zim Israel Navigation Co., Ltd. ---- 23228
Transconex Inc.; proposed general rate increase in Virgin Islands domestic off-shore trade ---- 23228

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Notices

Committees; establishment, renewals, etc.:
National Power Survey Executive Advisory Committee and the Coordinating Committee ---- 23246
Hearings, etc.:
Appalachian Power Co ---- 23228
Arizona Public Service Co ---- 23228
Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co. (2 documents) ---- 23229
Arkansas Power & Light Co. (2 documents) ---- 23237
Columbia Gulf Transmission Co. and Northern Natural Gas Co ---- 23237
Connecticut Light & Power Co ---- 23238
Consolidated Gas Supply Corp ---- 23238
Consumers Power Co ---- 23239
Duke Power Co. (2 documents) ---- 23239, 23240
Eascogas LNG, Inc. and Distrigas Corp ---- 23241
Eastern Shore Natural Gas Co. (3 documents) ---- 23241, 23242
El Paso Electric Co ---- 23242
Escondido Mutual Water Co ---- 23242
Glasgow, Kent ---- 23244
Gulf States Utilities Co ---- 23242
Indiana & Michigan Electric Co. (3 documents) ---- 23243
Jeffery, Glen E ---- 23243
Kentucky Utilities Co. (2 documents) ---- 23244
Lake Superior District Power Co ---- 23244
Montaup Electric Co ---- 23246
National Fuel Gas Supply Corp ---- 23246
Northern States Power Co. (Wisconsin) ---- 23247
Northwestern Public Service Co ---- 23248
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co ---- 23248
Public Service Co. of North Carolina, Inc ---- 23248
Shepherd Offshore Ventures, et al ---- 23248
Southern Natural Gas Co ---- 23249
Superior Oil Co. and Texas Gas Transmission Corp ---- 23249
United Gas Pipe Line Co ---- 23250
Vanceburg, Ky., City of (2 documents) ---- 23237
Wisconsin Power & Light Co ---- 23253

FISCAL SERVICE

Notices

Surety companies acceptable on Federal bonds:
Farmland Mutual Insurance Co ---- 23215

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Rules

Sport fishing:
Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge, Minn. (2 documents) ... 23204

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Notices

Food additives; petitions filed or withdrawn:
Phelps Dodge Magnet Wire Co. 23223
3M Co ... 23223
Meetings:
General and Plastic Surgery Devices, Panel on Review; agenda change ... 23223
National Advisory Food and Drug Committee ... 23223

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Rules

Government-wide automated data management services ... 23203

Notices

Authority delegations:
Federal property management regulations; temporary regulations ... 23253

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE DEPARTMENT

See Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration; Food and Drug Administration.

HEARINGS AND APPEALS OFFICE

Notices

Applications, etc.:
Edd Potter Coal Co ... 23216
Grays Knob Coal Co ... 23217
Harlan Central Coal Co ... 23218
Harlan-Cumberland Coal Co ... 23218
Honey Camp Coal Co ... 23219
Royal Coal Co. (3 documents) ... 23219–23221

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

See also Federal Insurance Administration; Housing Production and Mortgage Credit, Office of Assistant Secretary.

Rules

Emergency relief program; homeowners' ... 23297
Low income housing:
PHA acquisition of HUD-owned properties and properties with HUD-insured and HUD-held mortgages ... 23291

Notices

Authority delegations:
Acting Area Director, Camden Area Office ... 23224
Acting Area Director, Newark Area Office ... 23224

HOUSING PRODUCTION AND MORTGAGE CREDIT, OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Rules

Low-income housing:
Prototype cost limits ... 23301

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

See Fish and Wildlife Service; Hearings and Appeals Office; Land Management Bureau; Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Notices

Agreements under section 5a, applications for approval, etc.:
National Bus Traffic Association, Inc ... 23260
Western Tank Truck Carriers ... 23260
Hearing assignments ... 23260
Irregular route property carriers; gateway eliminations ... 23261
Motor carriers:
Applications and certain other proceedings (2 documents) ... 23260

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

See also Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Rules

Authority delegation and organization:
Compromise settle, and close claims ... 23199

Proposed Rules

Privacy Act; implementation ... 23206

Notices

Privacy Act; systems of records ... 23215

LAND MANAGEMENT BUREAU

Proposed Rules

Minerals; prospecting permits and leasing ... 23206

Notices

Applications, etc.:
Montana ... 23216

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

Notices

Meetings:
National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (2 documents) ... 23216

MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET OFFICE

Notices

Determination on provisions for public reports and recordkeeping; hearing ... 23253

MINING ENFORCEMENT AND SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Rules

Coal mine health and safety:
Electric face equipment requirements; extension of time ... 23199

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Rules

Marine mammals; taking and importing regulations ... 23204

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Notices

Meetings:
Naval Research Advisory Committee ... 23215

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

Proposed Rules

Premiums; payment and declaration ... 23212

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Notices

Self-regulatory organizations; proposed rule changes:
Boston Stock Exchange ... 23253
Hearings, etc.:
National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc ... 23255
National Securities Clearing Corp ... 23255
Ohio Power Co ... 23258

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Rules

Environmental assessment:
Archeological and historical properties encountered in assisted programs; protection procedures ... 23181

Notices

Environmental statements on watershed projects, etc.; availability:
Cane Creek Improvement Area, Tenn ... 23221
Muddy Creek Watershed Project, Miss. and Tenn ... 23222

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

See also Fiscal Service.

Notices

Notes, Treasury:
Series D-1980 ... 23215

Eastern Central Motor Carriers 23260
Household Goods Forwarders 23260

list of cfr parts affected in this issue

The following numerical guide is a list of the parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published in today's issue. A cumulative list of parts affected, covering the current month to date, follows beginning with the second issue of the month.

A Cumulative List of CFR Sections Affected is published separately at the end of each month. The guide lists the parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

3 CFR

MEMORANDUMS:

June 2, 1976 23179

7 CFR

656 23181
905 23184
917 23185
944 23186
1901 23186

PROPOSED RULES

916 23207

10 CFR

PROPOSED RULES

700 23212

16 CFR

1207 23186
1700 23187

24 CFR

275 23302
845 23292
1915 23187
2700 23298

PROPOSED RULES

1917 23207

28 CFR

0 23198

PROPOSED RULES

16 23206

29 CFR

PROPOSED RULES

2602 23212

30 CFR

75 23199

40 CFR

52 23200

PROPOSED RULES

52 23208

41 CFR

101–32 23203

43 CFR

PROPOSED RULES

3520 23206
9230 23206

47 CFR

PROPOSED RULES

73 23209
76 23210
78 23210

50 CFR

33 (2 documents) 23204
216 23204

CUMULATIVE LIST OF PARTS AFFECTED DURING JUNE

The following numerical guide is a list of parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published to date during June.

3 CFR

PROCLAMATIONS:

4444 22237

EXECUTIVE ORDERS:

April 25, 1859 (Revoked in part by PLO 5585) 22939
July 21, 1871 (Revoked in part by PLO 5585) 22939
11643 (Amended by EO 11917) 22239
11649 (Amended by EO 11916) 22031
11916 22031
11917 22239
11918 22329

MEMORANDUMS:

May 31, 1976 22331
June 2, 1976 23179

4 CFR

400 22241
410 22241
414 22241

5 CFR

213 22549
332 22549
752 22549
771 22550

PROPOSED RULES:

890 22096

7 CFR

1 22333
2 22333
5 22333
26 22826
28 22923
210 22923
246 22070
265 22070
401 22251
402 22252
656 23181
731 22550
905 23184
907 22333
908 22550
910 22826
911 22827
916 22070
917 ..... 22071, 23185
932 22551
944 23186
953 22071
1207 22072
1250 22923
1421 22334
1475 22551
1824 22255
1901 ..... 22256, 23186
2006 22928

7 CFR—Continued

PROPOSED RULES:

51 22832
912 22568
914 22569
915 22075
916 23207
917 22952
923 22278
981 22075
984 22084
989 22569
1201 22579
1464 22580

8 CFR

212 22556

9 CFR

73 22556
76 22033
78 22034
325 ..... 22557, 22929

10 CFR

205 22341
211 22343
213 22341
700 ..... 22036, 23212

PROPOSED RULES:

211 22591
212 ..... 22591, 22959
215 22591
700 .....

11 CFR

PROPOSED RULES:

121 22912

12 CFR

225 22260
271 22261

PROPOSED RULES:

202 22592

13 CFR

PROPOSED RULES:

120 22103
121 22847

14 CFR

39 ..... 22044–22050, 22343, 22809
71 ..... 22050, 22344, 22809
97 22809
1213 22930

PROPOSED RULES:

39 ..... 22094, 22842
71 ..... 22095, 22370, 22843–22845
73 22844
75 ..... 22095, 22845
250 22280
372a 22096

15 CFR

376 22931

16 CFR

13 ..... 22810, 22811
1207 23186
1500 22931
1507 22931
1700 ..... 22261, 23187

PROPOSED RULES:

454 22593
455 22847
704 22099
1605 22956

17 CFR

240 22820

PROPOSED RULES:

150 22547
240 ..... 22595, 22847, 22959
275 22101

18 CFR

PROPOSED RULES:

Ch. 1 22591
157 22104
250 22104
803 22598

19 CFR

103 22936

PROPOSED RULES:

1 22952
10 22952

20 CFR

200 22557
260 22558
266 22558
405 ..... 22502, 22560

PROPOSED RULES:

405 22835
901 22101

21 CFR

121 ..... 22267, 22812
510 22267
558 22267

PROPOSED RULES:

4 22581
207 22835
212 22202

22 CFR

41 22560

PROPOSED RULES:

901 22828
902 22829
903 22829
904 22829

22 CFR—Continued

PROPOSED RULES—Continued

905 ... 22829
906 ... 22830
907 ... 22830
908 ... 22831

23 CFR

630 ... 22812

24 CFR

275 ... 22276, 23302
804 ... 22814
845 ... 23292
899 ... 22814
1914 ... 22277, 22949
1915 ... 23187
1916 ... 22814, 22815
1917 ... 22950, 22951
1920 ... 22036–22039
2700 ... 23298
3500 ... 22560, 22702

PROPOSED RULES:

10 ... 22583
250 ... 22682
1917 ... 22279, 22365–22369, 22835–22840, 22954, 22955, 23207

25 CFR

221 ... 22560
252 ... 22936

PROPOSED RULES:

43h ... 22566

26 CFR

1 ... 22267, 22561
301 ... 22561

28 CFR

0 ... 22815, 23198
2 ... 22344

PROPOSED RULES:

16 ... 23206

29 CFR

1928 ... 22267, 22561
1952 ... 22561

PROPOSED RULES:

1910 ... 22953
1952 ... 22580
2602 ... 23212

30 CFR

75 ... 23199

32A CFR

Ch. I ... 22562
Ch. VI ... 22562
Ch. VII ... 22562
Ch. VIII ... 22562
Ch. XV ... 22562
Ch. XVIII ... 22562
Ch. XIX ... 22563

32 CFR

770 ... 22344
2000 ... 22268

33 CFR

127 ... 22346
273 ... 22346
401 ... 22563

36 CFR

221 ... 22815

38 CFR

PROPOSED RULES:

3 ... 22103

39 CFR

111 ... 22039

PROPOSED RULES:

111 ... 22375

40 CFR

52 ... 22349, 22351, 22816, 23200
180 ... 22937

PROPOSED RULES:

52 ... 22845, 23208
60 ... 23060
180 ... 22113

41 CFR

1–7 ... 22816
1–12 ... 22817
3–3 ... 22351
3–26 ... 22040
101–32 ... 23203
101–35 ... 22938
101–38 ... 22938
101–42 ... 22268
101–43 ... 22268
101–44 ... 22271
101–45 ... 22273
101–46 ... 22273
101–47 ... 22354

PROPOSED RULES:

8–7 ... 22599
8–18 ... 22599

42 CFR

123 ... 22524

43 CFR

18 ... 22563
2900 ... 22939, 22940

PROPOSED RULES:

3520 ... 23206
9230 ... 23206

PUBIC LAND ORDERS:

5585 ... 22939
3520 ... 22051

45 CFR

248 ... 22055
249 ... 22055
250 ... 22055

46 CFR

PROPOSED RULES:

33 ... 22840
75 ... 22840
94 ... 22840
160 ... 22840
192 ... 22840
206 ... 22094
207 ... 22094

47 CFR

0 ... 22563
1 ... 22817
2 ... 22563
63 ... 22274
73 ... 22055, 22940
76 ... 22274
81 ... 22059, 22066
83 ... 22817
87 ... 22066, 22944
94 ... 22274

PROPOSED RULES:

2 ... 22370
15 ... 22280
73 ... 22281, 23209
76 ... 23210
78 ... 22096, 23210
87 ... 22370
89 ... 22096
91 ... 22096
93 ... 22096

49 CFR

10 ... 22564
301 ... 22355
385 ... 22355
386 ... 22355
389 ... 22356
571 ... 22356
802 ... 22357
1033 ... 22067, 22274, 22564, 22819
1062 ... 22275
1124 ... 22944
1307 ... 22067

PROPOSED RULES:

258 ... 22222
260 ... 22228
391 ... 22584
1201 ... 23172

50 CFR

17 ... 22041
26 ... 22361
28 ... 22565
33 ... 23204
216 ... 22565, 23204
260 ... 22818
285 ... 22818

PROPOSED RULES:

13 ... 22916
14 ... 22831
17 ... 22073, 22916
33 ... 22568
216 ... 22580

FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATES—JUNE

Pages	*Date*
22031–22236	June 1
22237–22327	2
22329–22547	3
22549–22807	4
22809–22922	7
22923–23177	8
23179–23371	9

reminders

(The items in this list were editorially compiled as an aid to FEDERAL REGISTER users. Inclusion or exclusion from this list has no legal significance. Since this list is intended as a reminder, it does not include effective dates that occur within 14 days of publication.)

Rules Going Into Effect Today

NOTE: There were no items eligible for inclusion in the list of RULES GOING INTO EFFECT TODAY.

Next Week's Deadlines for Comments On Proposed Rules

ACTION
Privacy Act implementation; comments by 6–14–76 ..... 19671; 5–13–76

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL PAY
Privacy Act of 1974, implementation; comments by 6–14–76. 19973; 5–14–76

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT
Agricultural Marketing Service—
Sweet cherries grown in Washington, handling, grade, size, container requirements; comments by 6–16–76..... 22278; 6–2–76

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD
Exemption of air carriers, agreements not required for filing; comments by 6–14–76..... 19974; 5–14–76

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT
Corps of Engineers—
Structures erected in navigable waters; comments by 6–14–76. 19649; 5–13–76

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Coal mining, effluent guidelines and standards; comments by 6–14–76. 9841; 5–13–76
Energy-related authority: Iowa; comments by 6–13 and 6–14–76 (2 documents)..... 19651–4; 5–13–76
Energy-related authority: Kansas; comments by 6–14–76 (2 documents). 19658–61; 5–13–76
Energy-related authority: Missouri; comments by 6–14–76 (2 documents). 19664–67; 5–13–76

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM
Interest on deposits; clarification; withdrawals from savings deposits; comments by 6–14–76.. 18523; 5–5–76

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE DEPARTMENT
Food and Drug Administration—
Canned green beans and canned wax beans; comments by 6–18–76. 16475; 4–19–76
Human and veterinary drugs; manufacturing, processing, and packing, or holding, good practice; comments by 6–14–76. 6878; 2–13–76

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT
Fish and Wildlife Service—
Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; proposal to list 27 species of primates; comments by 6–18–76..... 16466; 4–19–76

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION
Standards for determining commuter rail service continuation subsidies and emergency operating payments; comments by 6–15–76..... 20104; 5–14–76

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT
Drug Enforcement Administration—
Controlled substances; Nalbuphine; comments by 6–14–76. 19227; 5–11–76

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
Standards for protection against radiation; comments by 6–17–76. 18320; 5–3–76

POSTAL SERVICE
Bulk third class; reporting or segregating local mail; comments by 6–19–76. 21368; 5–25–76

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Exchange member trading; extension of comment period; comments by 6–15–76..... 18432; 5–4–76
Guides for disclosure of projections of future economic performance; comments by 6–18–76.. 19986; 5–14–76

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
Business loan interest rates and charges; fluctuations; comments by 6–16–76..... 22103; 6–1–76

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
Coast Guard—
Apra outer harbor Buam; regulated navigation; comments by 6–16–76. 20173; 5–17–76
Federal Aviation Administration—
Airworthiness directives; comments by 6–14 and 6–18–76.... 19673–4; 5–13–76
Airworthiness directives; Beech and British Aircraft Corp. (2 documents) comments by 6–16–76. 20174; 5–17–76
Alteration of Federal airways; Quincy, Ill., et al.; comments by 6–16–76. 20176; 5–17–76
Law enforcement officers; comments by 6–14–76..... 17933; 4–29–76
Transition area; comments by 6–14–76..... 19674; 5–13–76
Federal Railroad Administration—
Railroad operation rules; comments by 6–14–76..... 19675; 5–13–76
Road and switching locomotives; railroad safety applicance standard; comments by 6–15–76. 18317; 5–3–76

Next Week's Public Hearings

AMERICAN INDIAN POLICY REVIEW COMMISSION
Indian education, Pierre, S.D., 6–18–76. 22404; 6–3–76

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION
Kentucky, Louisville, Kentucky; 6–14–76..... 20009; 5–14–76

COMMISSION ON FEDERAL PAPERWORK
Recommendations for easing the burden of Federal paperwork, Des Moines, Iowa, 6–17 and 6–18–76..... 21855; 5–28–76

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT
Air Force Department—
Establishment of military operating area, New York, Albany, New York, 6–16–76..... 21799; 5–28–76

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION
Inclusion of Naphtha feedstocks imported into Puerto Rico under Entitlements Program, Washington, D.C., 6–15–76..... 21936; 5–28–76

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Hollow or cored ceramic brick and tile, Seattle, Wash.; 6–15–76..... 19383; 5–12–76

Next Week's Meetings

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT
Agricultural Marketing Service—
Flue-cured Tobacco Advisory Committee, Raleigh, N.C. (open), 6–17–76..... 21387; 5–25–76
Forest Service—
Boise National Forest Grazing Advisory Board, Boise, Idaho (open), 6–15–76..... 20725; 5–20–76
Nebraska National Forest Livestock Advisory Board, Halsey, Nebraska (open), 6–15–76.. 20200; 5–17–76

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
Federal Employees Pay Council, Washington, D.C. (closed), 6–15–76. 21855; 5–28–76

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT
Bureau of the Census—
Census Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics, Clarksville, Indiana (open), 6–16–76..... 19147; 5–10–76
Patent and Trademark Office—
Public Advisory Committee for Trademark Affairs, New York, N.Y. (open), 6–15–76.. 20728; 5–20–76

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D.C. (open), 6–16–76. 22320; 6–2–76

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION
Advisory Committee on the Economic Role of Contract Markets, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–17–76. 22406; 6–3–76

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION
Poison Prevention Packaging Technical Advisory Committee, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–15–76..... 21401; 5–25–76

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT
Army Department—
Army Financial Management Advisory Committee, Pentagon (open), 6–15 and 6–16–76..... 21208; 5–24–76
Ballistic Missile Defense Technology Advisory Panel; Huntsville Ala. (closed), 7–13 through 7–15–76. 20717; 5–20–76

Defense Communications Agency—
Scientific Advisory Group, Arlington and Reston, Va. (closed), 6–17 and 6–18–76..... 19356; 5–12–76

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Radio Technical Commission for Marine Services, Executive Committee, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–17–76. 22132; 6–1–76

Radio Technical Commission for Marine Services, Special Committee No. 68, "Marine Radiotelephone Operator Education," Washington, D.C. (open), 6–15–76..... 22132; 6–1–76

Radio Technical Commission for Marine Services, Special Committee No. 65, "Ship Radar," Washington, D.C. (open), 6–16–76..... 22131; 6–1–76

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

Consumer Affairs/Special Impact Advisory Committee, Kansas City, Mo. (open), 6–17–76..... 22310; 6–2–76

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

National Gas Survey, Wash., D.C. (open), 6–15 and 6–16–76.. 14217; 4–2–76

National Gas Survey, Supply-Technical Advisory Task Force—Regulatory Aspects of Substitute Gas; Study Subgroup II: Coal Based Substitute Gas, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–16–76. 22161; 6–1–76

National Gas Survey, Supply-Technical Advisory Task Force—Regulatory Aspects of Substitute Gas; Study Subgroup I: Substitute Pipeline Gas and LNG, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–16–76.....22161; 6–1–76

Supply-Technical Advisory Task Force—Regulatory Aspects of Substitute Gas, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–17–76. 15095; 4–9–76

FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Washington, D.C. (closed), 6–17–76. 20223; 5–17–76

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Regional Public Advisory Panel on Architectural and Engineering Services, Auburn, Wash. (closed), 6–18–76..... 22320; 6–2–76

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration—

Advisory committees, Alexandria, Va., Rockville, Md., Washington, D.C. (partially open), 6–15 through 6–19–76..... 19246; 5–11–76

Advisory Committee, Rockville, Md. (open with restrictions), 6–14 through 6–16–76.. 18696; 5–6–76

Education Office—

Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, Arlington, Va. (partially open), 6–16 thru 6–18–76..... 19997; 5–14–76

Community Education Advisory Council; Montgomery, Ala. and Tuskegee, Ala. (open), 6–18 and 6–19–76..... 22118; 6–1–76

Women's Education Programs Advisory Council, Madison, Wis. (open), 6–18 and 6–19–76. 22291; 6–2–76

Health Resources Administration—

Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics, St. Louis, Missouri (open), 6–14 through 6–16–76. 18460; 5–4–76

National Institutes of Health—

Board of Scientific Counselors, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina (open with restrictions), 6–14 and 6–15–76. 18462; 5–4–76

Cancer Center Support Grant Review Committee, Bethesda, Md. (open and closed), 6–18 and 6–19–76. 20729; 5–20–76

Cancer Control Community Activities Review Committee, Bethesda, Maryland (open), 6–18–76. 19149; 5–10–76

Communicative Disorders Review Committee, Bethesda, Md. (open), 6–19–76..... 17804; 4–28–76

High Blood Pressure Working Group, Bethesda, Maryland (open), 6–14–76..... 19150; 5–10–76

Immunobiology Conference, Hilton Head Island, S.C. (open), 6–13 through 6–16–76..... 17805; 4–28–76

National Advisory Allergy and Infectious Diseases Council, Bethesda, Maryland (open with restrictions), 6–17 and 6–18–76..... 19150; 5–10–76

National Advisory Dental Research Council, Bethesda, Md. (open), 6–17 and 6–18–76..... 17806; 4–28–76

National Arthritism Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases Advisory Council, Bethesda, Md. (open), 6–17–76..... 17806; 4–28–76

National Heart and Lung Advisory Council and the Manpower Subcommittee, Bethesda, Maryland (partially closed), 6–17 and 6–18–76..... 19151; 5–10–76

National Institute of Dental Research, Bethesda, Md. (open and closed), 6–14 and 6–15–76..... 17804; 4–28–76

Sickle Cell Disease Advisory Committee, Rockville, Md. (open), 6–14 and 6–15–76..... 17807; 4–28–76

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mishawaka, Indiana (open), 6–17–76. 21400; 5–25–76

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Land Management Bureau—

Idaho State Multiple Use Advisory Board, Challis, Idaho (open), 6–17 through 6–19–76.. 18334; 5–3–76

National Park Service—

Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, Recreation Subcommittee, New York, N.Y. (open), 6–16–76..... 22135; 6–1–76

Biscayne National Monument, environmental assessment, Homestead, Fla. (open), 6–16–76. 19356; 5–12–76

Minute Man National Historical Park Advisory Commission, Concord, Mass. (open), 6–18–76. 21385; 5–25–76

North Atlantic Region Advisory Committee, Morristown, New Jersey (open), 6–14 and 6–15–76. 19146; 5–10–76

Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore Advisory Committee, Sand Point, Mich. (open), 6–18–76. 21387; 5–25–76

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—

National Minority Advisory Council on Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–18 and 6–19–76. 22390; 6–3–76

LABOR DEPARTMENT

Bureau of Labor Statistics—

Business Research Advisory Council's Committee on Economic Growth, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–16–76. 21860; 5–28–76

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Meeting, Washington, D.C., 6–17 and 6–18–76..... 21224; 5–24–76

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

NASA Space Program Advisory Council (SPAC), Applications and the Physical Sciences Committee, Pasadena, Calif. (open with restrictions), 6–17–76..... 20930; 5–21–76

Physical Sciences Committee of the Space Program Advisory Council, Pasadena, Calif. (open), 6–18 and 6–19–76..... 21847; 5–28–76

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Advisory Group on Anticipated Advances in Science and Technology, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–17–76. 22165; 6–1–76

Advisory Group on Contributions of Technology to Economic Strength, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–18–76. 22165; 6–1–76

Advisory Group on Earthquake Prediction and Hazard Mitigation, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–14–76. 21848; 5–28–76

Advisory Panel for Developmental Biology, Washington, D.C. (closed), 6–14 and 6–15–76.... 21848; 5–28–76

Food and Nutrition Subgroup, Moffet Field, California (open), 6–14–76. 21413; 5–25–76

Subgroup on Basic Research of the Advisory Group on Anticipated Advances in Science & Technology, Boston, Massachusetts (open), 6–15–76. 21848; 5–28–76

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Actuarial Advisory Committee, Chicago, Ill. (open), 6–16–76.. 18737; 5–6–76

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

San Diego District Advisory Council, San Diego, Calif. (open), 6–17–76. 22172; 6–1–76

STATE DEPARTMENT

Shipping Coordinating Committee, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–15 through 6–17–76 (3 documents). 21207; 5–24–76

Shipping Coordinating Committee, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–18–76. 18688; 5–6–76

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—

Highway safety program standards, Washington, D.C. (open), 6–15–76. 20705; 5–20–76

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Station Committee on Educational Allowances, Nashville, Tennessee (open), 6–17–76.... 21228; 5–24–76

List of Public Laws

NOTE: No public bills which have become law were received by the Office of the Federal Register for inclusion in today's LIST OF PUBLIC LAWS.

presidential documents

Title 3—The President

Memorandum of June 2, 1976

Determination Under Section 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974

[Presidential Determination No. 76–17]

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 2, 1976.

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Trade Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–618, January 3, 1975; 88 Stat. 1978; hereinafter called the Act), I hereby determine, pursuant to section 402(d)(1) of the Act, that the extension of the waiver authority granted by subsection (c)(1) of section 402 of the Act will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act. I further determine, pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(C) of section 402 of the Act, that continuation of the waiver applicable to the Socialist Republic of Romania will substantially promote the objectives of section 402.

This determination shall be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Gerald R. Ford

[FR Doc.76–16955 Filed 6–8–76;11:26 am]

EDITORIAL NOTE: For the text of the President's message to Congress, dated June 2, 1976, recommending extension of the waiver for Romania under the Trade Act of 1974, see the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents (vol. 11, p. 991).

rules and regulations

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each month.

Title 7—Agriculture

CHAPTER VI—SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBCHAPTER F—SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

PART 656—PROCEDURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF ARCHEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL PROPERTIES ENCOUNTERED IN SCS-ASSISTED PROGRAMS

On September 3, 1974, the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (39 FR 31909) for comment, proposed guidelines entitled Related Environmental Concerns § 650.20 archeological and historical data and historical sites.

No written comments were received on the proposed guidelines. However, SCS personnel visited the offices of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the National Park Service, and others and solicited informal inputs and consultation. These inputs have been incorporated into these interim final guidelines.

On October 30, 1975, using the procedures of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation as a guide (36 CFR 800.1(b)(2)), the SCS issued interim procedures for the protection of archeological and historical properties to its field offices in the form of Environment Advisory EVT-25. Since that time the SCS has engaged in extensive consultations with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Park Service.

As a result of these consultations the SCS, in accordance with section 1(3) of Executive Order 11593, herewith publishes its interim final guidelines Part 656, "Procedures for the Protection of Archeological and Historical Properties Encountered in SCS-assisted Programs." These procedures are in effect for environmental assessments started after July 1, 1976. Comments will be received on these interim final guidelines until August 9, 1976, after which time, final guidelines will be published. Comments should be addressed to:

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Environmental Services Division, Room 6103 South Agriculture Building, Washington, D.C. 20250

Dated: June 1, 1976.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs numbered 10.901 and 10.904 National Archives Reference Services.)

R. M. DAVIS,
Administrator,
Soil Conservation Service.

Sec.

656.1 Purpose.
656.2 Archeological and historical laws and executive orders for administering SCS programs.
656.3 Policy.
656.4 Applicability.
656.5 SCS responsibilities for compliance with Section 106, Pub. L. 89-665 (16 U.S.C. 470f), Pub. L. 93-291 (16 U.S.C. 469 et seq.), and Section 1(3) of Executive Order 11593 in project-type actions
656.6 Steps necessary to determine the effects of proposed SCS-assisted actions on archeological and historical properties occurring on nonfederal land during the planning and environmental assessment stage. (See Parts 622.3 and 623 of this chapter.)
656.7 Steps necessary to determine the effects of planned SCS-assisted actions on archeological and historical properties occurring on nonfederal land, during the environmental assessment of a project in the operations stage. (See Parts 622.4, 622.5, and 623 of this chapter.)
656.8 Determination of the course of action when archeological properties are discovered during construction.
656.9 Determination of the effects of proposed or planned actions on archeological and historical properties occurring on federal land.
656.10 Recovery, protection, and/or preservation of significantly important archeological or historical properties which will be adversely affected by construction activities in SCS-assisted actions.

AUTHORITY: 7 CFR 2.62; Sec. 1(3), Executive Order 11593, 36 FR 8921, 3 CFR 1971 Comp. p. 154.

§ 656.1 Purpose.

This part prescribes Soil Conservation Service (SCS) policy, procedures, and guidelines for the implementation of archeological and historical laws and appropriate executive orders for administering SCS programs.

§ 656.2 Archeological and historical laws and executive orders applicable to SCE-assisted programs.

(a) *The Act of June 27, 1960,* relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data, Pub. L. 86-523, 74 Stat. 220, as amended May 24, 1974; Pub. L. 93-291, 88 Stat. 174 (16 U.S.C. 469 et seq.), provides for the preservation of historical and archeological materials or data, including relics and specimens, that might otherwise be lost or destroyed as a result of any federal or federally-assisted or licensed project, activity, or program.

(b) *The National Historic Preservation Act,* Pub. L. 89-665, 80 Stat. 915 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to maintain and expand a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including historic districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture. This law also establishes the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), to be appointed by the President. Section 106 of this Act (16 U.S.C. 470f), requires that prior to the approval of any federal or federally-assisted or licensed undertaking, the federal agency shall afford the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment, if National Register properties are affected.

(c) *Executive Order 11593 (36 FR 8921, 3 CFR 1971 Comp. P. 154), Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment,* provides that the federal government shall furnish leadership in preserving, restoring, and maintaining the historic and cultural environment of the nation, and that federal agencies shall administer the cultural properties under their control in a spirit of stewardship and trusteeship for future generations; initiate measures necessary to direct their policies, plans, and programs in such a way that federally owned sites, structures, and objects of historical, architectural, or archeological significance are preserved, restored, and maintained. Section 1(3) directs that agencies institute procedures to assure that federal plans and programs contribute to the preservation and enhancement of nonfederally owned sites, structures, and objects of historical, architectural, or archeological significance in consultation with the ACHP.

§ 656.3 Policy.

SCS recognizes that archeological and historical resources are an important part of our national heritage and that appropriate measures must be taken to protect those which have outstanding value and should be preserved. SCS will take all reasonable precautions to avoid damaging any important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage. The procedures contained in this part have been developed in accordance with Section 1(3) of Executive Order 11593.

§ 656.4 Applicability.

(a) (1) This section applies to Conservation Operations Technical Assistance, Part 610 of this chapter; and to the Great Plains Conservation Program, Part 631 of this chapter as they involve nonfederal land.

(2) Each field office will consult current data in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), prior to the expenditure of federal funds. If the undertaking is likely to affect properties listed in the NRHP, the field office will request the state conservationist to determine the course of action.

(3) In addition to historic and archeological sites, structures, or objects listed in the NRHP, important or significant sites may be encountered that have national, state, or local significance. Such sites occurring on nonfederal land may be brought to the attention of SCS during the course of SCS technical assistance activities. If it developes that these sites may be directly affected by the installation of a conservation measure, and are not listed in the NRHP, the SCS technician will encourage the landowner to notify the state historic preservation officer and/or the nearest office of the National Park Service (NPS). Any decision on the disposition of the site or other course of action is the joint responsibility of the concerned state agency and the landowner. Final decisions should be made a part of the administrative file at the appropriate SCS office.

(b) *Project-type technical and financial assistance programs (Watershed and Flood Prevention Projects, Parts 622 and 623 of this chapter, and Resource Conservation and Development Measure Plans (RC&D), Parts 640 and 643 of this chapter).*

The SCS determines environmental effects including archeological and historical impacts as an integral part of the planning process for proposed SCS-assisted project actions. (Pub. L. 91–190, 83 Stat. 852, 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) The procedures for compliance with existing laws are listed in section 656.5 of this part.

§ 656.5 SCS Responsibilities for Compliance with Section 106, Pub. L. 89–665 (16 U.S.C. 470f), Pub. L. 93–291 (16 U.S.C. 469 et seq.), and Section 1(3) of Executive Order 11593 in project-type actions.

(a) *SCS national office.* The Administrator is responsible for establishing and maintaining necessary contacts with other agencies and councils at the national level, and for the preparation and distribution of pertinent material and guidelines to state conservationists.

(b) *SCS state office.* The state conservationist is the responsible federal official for implementing the provisions of this section in his state. He is responsible for establishing and maintaining contacts with state agencies, preparing, and distributing pertinent information to personnel under his jurisdiction, appraising situations and determining the course of action, and distributing current data from the NRHP to field offices with instructions on use of the material.

(c) *Federal property under SCS control.* Inventories and evaluations of places that might qualify for inclusion in the NRHP will be made whenever federal property under SCS custody is to be sold, transferred, demolished, substantially altered, or affected by proposed actions of other agencies, or that is to be acquired for and placed under SCS custody. For actions affecting identified places eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and under SCS control, the state conservationist shall obtain the comments of the ACHP, in accordance with Section 106 of Pub. L. 89–665, and Executive Order 11593.

(d) *Types of archeological and historical investigations in SCS-assisted projects.* The SCS will identify cultural properties in project construction areas by initiating investigations during, and as a part of, the environmental assessment (part 650.5 of this chapter). These investigations will be as follows:

(1) *Archeological and historical review.* This will be made by SCS technicians as part of the field examination stage of plan formulation in consultation with the state historic preservation officer, state and university archeologists, archeological and historical societies, nearby libraries, etc. It will be a literature search and summation of data presently known concerning the area being studied. It will include a brief field review of any site(s) that appears to have archeological or historical values. This review is designed to provide the SCS with enough information on cultural values to determine what additional investigations are necessary. Close coordination and consultation with other agencies and professional organizations are essential. Results of the "Archeological and Historical Review" should be recorded in sufficient detail to document the findings and conclusions. The presentation of factual evidence that cultural properties are likely to be adversely affected by planned construction activities by the state historic preservation officer, state archeologist, and/or historian, or others with expertise, for further, more intensive investigations should weigh heavily in the decision by the state conservationist to make more intensive archeological investigations.

(2) *Archeological and historical reconnaissance.* This investigation will be made by a professional archeologist/historian when it is determined that more detailed investigations are needed. This may be accomplished under contract or cooperative agreement as required. This is an on-the-ground examination of selected portions of the area to be affected (specific sites and/or treatment areas) to assess the general nature and probable impact of the proposed measures on the archeological and historical resources. The "Reconnaissance" should include a detailed appraisal of probable archeological and historical values along with a proposed plan and the estimated cost of possible recovery, protection, and/or preservation of such resources. The results of this investigation will include the opinion of the professional archeologist or historian as to whether the resource in question is of significant value to warrant inclusion in the NRHP. In the final stages of planning, the investigation will also include adequate testing of probable sites to develop the plan for recovery, protection, or preservation, if such a plan is needed.

§ 656.6 Steps necessary to determine the effects of proposed SCS-assisted actions on archeological and historical properties occurring on nonfederal land during the planning and environmental assessment stages (parts 622.3 and 623 of this chapter).

(a) SCS will conduct, in consultation with the state historic preservation officer (SHPO), an "Archeological and Historical Review" of probable construction areas early in plan formulation. Findings should be documented and a determination made as to whether further investigation is necessary.

(b) (1) If the SHPO, state archeologist, or appropriate historical or archeological authority present factual evidence in step (a), that significant cultural properties are likely to be adversely affected by planned construction activities, and that further investigation is necessary; the state conservationist will decide whether to cause an "Archeological and Historical Reconnaissance" to be made. If it is determined that a reconnaissance investigation is necessary, it should be accomplished by contract or cooperative agreement.

(2) The contract or cooperative agreement for this investigation will require the professional archeologist/historian to provide his written opinion as to the eligibility of any identified cultural properties for inclusion in the NRHP. If the professional archeologist/historian recommends recovery, protection, and/or preservation of identified cultural properties, the contract or cooperative agreement should be broad enough to allow adequate testing of the sites to develop a proposed plan for such recovery, protection, and/or preservation.

(c) If no cultural properties are identified in step (b) as either listed in, or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, SCS will document its files and proceed. Findings should be included in the watershed plan or RC&D measure plan and EIS, if one is prepared.

(d) If the results of the investigation made in step (b) include an opinion by the professional archeologist and/or historian that identified cultural properties are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, and may be destroyed or adversely affected by construction activities, the state conservationist will request the SHPO to render an opinion on eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP. If, in the opinion of the SHPO, the properties are not of significant value to be included in the NRHP, the state conservationist will document such findings and proceed with the project or measure. The SHPO should be requested to respond within 45 days after receipt of the SCS request.

(e) If the SHPO concurs in the findings of the professional archeologist, or fails to respond within 45 days, that identified cultural properties are significant and may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, the state conservationist will request an official determination of eligibility from the NPS. Address all requests for determination of eligibility to Director, Office of Archeology and Historic

Preservation, National Park Service, Washington, D.C. 20240.

(f) If the NPS determines that the identified sites are not of significant value to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, the state conservationist will document his files and proceed.

(g) (1) If the NPS determines that the identified cultural property(ies) is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, and may be affected by the proposed action, the SCS will attach the proposed plan (see step (b)) for recovery, protection, and/or preservation, developed by the professional archeologist/historian, to the archeologist's report and forward to the ACHP. A letter of concurrence from the SHPO should be included. The letter should request the ACHP's comments on the undertaking, in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470f. Also, the letter should call attention to the fact that the cultural property(ies) is located on nonfederal land. There will be no change in existing responsibilities of any federal agency under Executive Order 11593 with respect to control or ownership of land. The NPS should be requested to undertake recovery.

(2) Adverse effects generally occur when cultural properties are located within the proposed land disturbance area, including flood pool areas, access roads, borrow pits, and other support areas likely to be disrupted during or after construction. For above ground cultural properties, usually those of historical or architectural significance, adverse effects occur when the project introduces visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property or alter its setting and occur in near proximity to the proposed construction site.

(3) For archeological sites, a determination of no adverse effect may be made when: the property is not a National Historic Landmark of ethnic or social significance; has minimal value as an in situ exhibit; currently available technology permits adequate recovery of data in accordance with NPS standards.

(4) The state conservationist's letter to the ACHP should request a response within 45 days and state that SCS considers implementation of the plan for recovery, etc., constitutes no adverse effects on the cultural property.

(5) The state conservationist will cooperate with the ACHP in the conduct of necessary consultations, inspections, and meetings to further develop recovery plans to avoid or minimize adverse effects of proposed construction activities.

(h) At the same time the request for comments is sent to the ACHP, the state conservationist will request NPS to carry out the proposed plan for a timely recovery of cultural values. The NPS will be provided the proposed plan for recovery, construction schedules, etc., in order to avoid any delays in construction.

(i) The final EIS, if one is required, should reflect the results of each of the steps as appropriate. However, if steps (d–h) have not been completed at the time of preparation of the final EIS, appropriate statements should be included in the Consultation section to indicate that full compliance with SCS procedures for protection of cultural properties will be accomplished prior to construction.

§ 656.7 Steps necessary to determine the effects of planned SCS-assisted actions on archeological and historical properties, occurring on nonfederal land, during the environmental assessment of a project in the operations stage (parts 622.4, 622.5, and 623 of this chapter).

(a) If an environmental assessment is to be made in an operations project and an "Archeological and Historical Review" has not been made, such a review should be made prior to the signing of a project agreement. Findings should be documented and a determination made if further investigation is necessary.

(b) (1) If the SHPO, state archeologist, or appropriate historical or archeological authorities present factual evidence in step (a), that significant cultural properties are likely to be adversely affected by planned construction activities, and that further investigation is necessary; the state conservationist will decide whether to cause an "Archeological and Historical Reconnaissance" to be made. If it is determined that a reconnaissance investigation is necessary, it should be accomplished by contract or cooperative agreement.

(2) The contract or cooperative agreement for this investigation will require the professional archeologist/historian to provide his opinion as to the eligibility of any identified cultural properties for inclusion in the NRHP. If the professional archeologist/historian recommends recovery, protection, and/or preservation of identified cultural properties, the contract or cooperative agreement should be broad enough to allow adequate testing of the sites to develop a proposed plan for such recovery, protection, and/or preservation.

(c) If no cultural properties are identified in step (b) as either listed, or eligible for inclusion, in the NRHP, SCS will document its files and proceed with construction. Findings should be included in the EIS if one is prepared.

(d) If the results of the investigation made in step (b) include an opinion by the professional archeologist and/or historian that identified cultural properties are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, and may be destroyed or adversely affected by construction activities, the state conservationist will request the SHPO to render an opinion on eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP. If, in the opinion of the SHPO, the properties are not of significant value to be included in the NRHP, the state conservationist will document such findings and proceed with the project or measure. The SHPO should be requested to respond within 45 days after receipt of the SCS request.

(e) If the SHPO concurs in the findings of the professional archeologist or fails to respond within 45 days, that identified cultural properties are significant and may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, the state conservationist will request an official determination of eligibility from the NPS. Address all requests for determination of eligibility to Director, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, National Park Service, Washington, D.C. 20240.

(f) If the NPS determines that the identified sites are not of significant value to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, the state conservationist will document his files and proceed.

(g) (1) If the NPS determines that the identified cultural property is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, and may be affected by the proposed action, the SCS will attach the proposed plan (see step (b)) for recovery, protection, and/or preservation, developed by the professional archeologist/historian, to the archeologist's report and forward to the ACHP. A letter of concurrence from the SHPO should be included. The letter should request the ACHP's comments on the undertaking, in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470f. Also, the letter should call attention to the fact that the cultural property(ies) is located on nonfederal land, there will be no change in existing responsibilities of any federal agency under Executive Order 11593 with respect to control or ownership of land, and that the NPS is being requested to undertake recovery.

(2) Adverse effects generally occur when cultural properties are located within the proposed land disturbance area, including flood pool areas, access roads, borrow pits, and other support areas likely to be disrupted during or after construction. For above ground cultural properties, usually those of historical or architectural significance, adverse effects occur when the project introduces visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property or alter its setting and occur in near proximity to the proposed construction site.

(3) For archeological sites, a determination of no adverse effect may be made when: the property is not a National Historic Landmark of ethnic or social significance; has minimal value as an in situ exhibit; currently available technology permits adequate recovery of data in accordance with NPS standards; and funds are available to adequately recover the data.

(4) The state conservationist's letter to the ACHP should request a response within 45 days and state that SCS considers implementation of the plan for recovery, etc., constitutes no adverse effects on the cultural property.

(5) The state conservationist will cooperate with the ACHP in the conduct of necessary consultations, inspections, and meetings to further develop recovery plans to avoid or minimize adverse

effects of proposed construction activities.

(h) At the same time the request for comments is sent to the ACHP, the state conservationist will request NPS to carry out the proposed plan for a timely recovery of cultural values. The NPS will be provided the proposed plan for recovery, construction schedules, etc., in order to avoid any delays in construction.

(i) The final EIS, if one is required, should reflect the results of each of the steps as appropriate. However, if steps (d–h) have not been completed at the time of preparation of the final EIS, appropriate statements should be included in the Consultation section to indicate that full compliance with SCS procedures for protection of cultural properties will be accomplished prior to construction.

§ 656.8 Determination of the course of action when archeological properties are discovered during construction.

If cultural properties are discovered during construction, the state conservationist will immediately consult with the SHPO, and NPS (Atlanta, Denver, or San Francisco, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation), to determine whether there is factual evidence to warrant a decision to undertake detailed survey and recovery. If the evidence is substantive, and at the request of NPS, construction should be stopped to undertake immediate survey and recovery. (See NPS responsibilities, Sec. 4(C) Pub. L. 93–291, 16 U.S.C. 469a–2(c).) If the evidence is inconclusive, construction should continue with caution. In the event that recovery is decided upon, the state conservationist and the sponsors should determine if the landrights are adequate to cover archeological recovery and proceed.

§ 656.9 Determination of the effects of proposed SCS-assisted actions on archeological and historical properties occurring on federal land.

The steps outlined in paragraphs 656.6 and 656.7 of this part are equally applicable for investigations on federal land. However, when significantly important cultural properties are discovered on federal land, the agency having ownership or control of the land must assist in the preparation of plans for recovery, protection, and/or preservation. An appropriate agreement among the land managing agency, SCS, SHPO, NPS, and the ACHP is to be executed prior to implementing the proposed plan for recovery, protection, or preservation.

§ 656.10 Recovery, protection, and/or preservation of significantly important archeological or historical properties which will be adversely affected by construction activities in SCS-assisted actions.

(a) *Nonfederal land.* If it is determined that properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP are likely to be adversely affected by construction in a watershed project or RC&D measure, and occur on nonfederal land, the state conservationist will cause a plan for recovery, protection, and/or preservation (see subparagraph 656.6(b) or 656.7(b) of this part) to be developed and request the comments on the undertaking from the ACHP. (See 656.6(g) or 656.7(g) this part.) Where no comments are received within 45 days after the request, the state conservationist will initiate recovery procedures. Concurrently with the request for comments from the ACHP, the state conservationist will notify the Atlanta, Denver, or San Francisco (as appropriate) Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation of NPS in writing, and request that recovery, protection, and/or preservation of the significant values be undertaken by the Department of the Interior, as specified in 16 U.S.C. 469 a–2.

(b) *Federal land.* If properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP are likely to be affected by construction in a watershed project, or RC&D measure, and such cultural property occurs on federally owned or controlled land, the State conservationist, in consultation with the federal agency managing the property, will prepare a plan for recovery, protection, and/or preservation (see subparagraph 656.6(b) or 656.7(b) of this part) and afford the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking. The SHPO, NPS, SCS, and the federal agency managing the property will enter into an appropriate agreement to insure proper recovery and/or disposition of the property prior to construction. Concurrently with the request for comments from the ACHP, the state conservationist will notify the Atlanta, Denver, or San Francisco (as appropriate) Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation of NPS in writing, and request that recovery, protection, and/or preservation of the significant values be undertaken by the Department of the Interior, as specified in 16 U.S.C. 469 a–2.

(c) *Notification of NPS in accordance with Section 1, Pub. L. 93–291 (16 U.S.C. 469 a).* The state conservationist will notify the NPS (Atlanta, Denver, or San Francisco) as early as possible after project authorization that he intends to assist with the construction of any dam that creates a reservoir of 40 surface-acres or any floodwater-retarding structure providing 5,000 acre-feet or more of detention capacity. Notification will not be made for smaller dams and reservoirs except as required in 16 U.S.C. 469 a.

(d) *Information to be forwarded to NPS when recovery is called for.* Where it is determined that cultural properties are to be recovered, protected, or preserved, the state conservationist will notify the NPS as early as possible before construction starts. The notice will include site location, approximate area to be flooded, approximate area to be disturbed, archeologist's report, such additional data as may be useful. SCS will request that the Secretary of the Interior, undertake the recovery, protection, and preservation of data as needed. Construction should not begin or be continued until the NPS has responded to the notice and request. The state conservationist will request the NPS, in accordance with 16 U.S.C. 469a–2(c) to initiate the survey or recovery effort within 60 days after notification or within such other time as agreed upon. He will request the NPS to keep SCS informed at all times of the survey or recovery effort so there will be as little disruption or delay as possible. The survey and recovery programs will terminate at a time mutually agreed upon by the Director, NPS, and the Administrator, SCS.

(e) *Granting permission to survey and recover on nonfederal lands.* In accordance with 16 U.S.C. 469a–2(d) prior to undertaking surveys and recovery operations on nonfederal lands, the SCS will assist the NPS, and the project sponsors, to obtain the consent of all persons, associations, or public entities having a legal interest in the property involved. The Secretary of the Interior (16 U.S.C. 469a–2(d)) is to compensate any person, association, or public entity damaged as a result of delays in construction or as a result of the temporary loss of the use of private or any nonfederally owned lands. No survey or recovery work will be required which in the determination of the Administrator would impede SCS's activities in connection with any emergency.

[FR Doc.76–16698 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

CHAPTER IX—AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE (MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS; FRUITS, VEGETABLES, NUTS), DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

[Grapefruit Regulation 76, Amendment 7]

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

Amendment of Grade Regulations

Effective June 4, 1976, this amendment lowers the minimum grade requirements applicable to domestic and export shipments of white seedless grapefruit and white and pink seeded grapefruit produced in Florida to U.S. No. 2 Russet. The specification of such lower minimum grade requirements is necessary to satisfy the current and prospective demand for such grapefruit. The amended regulation recognizes the quality of much of the white seedless and white and pink seeded grapefruit remaining for fresh shipment from the production area.

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 requirements applicable to white seedless

grapefruit and white and pink seeded grapefruit, as hereinafter provided, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(2) This amendment reflects the Department's appraisal of the current and prospective demand for Florida white seedless grapefruit and white and pink seeded grapefruit by fresh market outlets. The U.S. No. 2 Russet minimum grade requirement specified for domestic and export shipments of white seedless grapefruit and white and pink seeded grapefruit reflects the seasonal decline in the external appearance of such grapefruit and the prospective demand for such grapefruit by domestic and export outlets. For the season through May 23, 1976, fresh shipments of Florida grapefruit totaled 36,739 carlots.

(3) It is hereby further found that it is impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest to give preliminary notice, engage in public rulemaking procedure, and postpone the effective date of this amendment until 30 days after publication thereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 553) in that 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 lowers requirements applicable to the handling of white seedless grapefruit and white and pink seeded grapefruit grown in Florida.

Order.—The provisions of paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(3) and (b)(1) and (b)(3) of § 905.563 (Grapefruit Regulation 76; 40 F.R. 42317, 49785, 54420, 58446; 41 F.R. 15829, 18673, 19965) are amended to read as follows:

§ 905.563 Grapefruit Regulation 76.

(a) * * *

(1) Any seeded grapefruit, grown in the production area, which do not grade at least U.S. No. 2 Russet;

(2) * * *

(3) Any seedless grapefruit, grown in the production area, which do not grade at least U.S. No. 2 Russet; or * * *

(b) * * *

(1) Any seeded grapefruit, grown in the production area, which do not grade at least U.S. No. 2 Russet;

(2) * * *

(3) Any seedless grapefruit, grown in the production area, which do not grade at least U.S. No. 2 Russet; or * * *

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

Effective date: June 4, 1976.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

CHARLES R. BRADER,
Acting Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc.76-16720 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Peach Regulation 8]

PART 917—FRESH PEARS, PLUMS, AND PEACHES GROWN IN CALIFORNIA

Container, Pack and Container Marking Requirements

This regulation is issued pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 917, as amended (7 CFR Part 917; 41 FR 17528), which regulate the handling of fresh pears, plums, and peaches grown in California. It requires that any package or container of any variety of peaches handled during the period June 9 through August 1, 1976, shall conform to the pack and labeling requirements hereinafter specified. Those requirements are that (1) all peaches packed in closed containers shall meet the requirements of "standard pack" as specified in the United States Standards for Peaches, (2) each container of peaches shall bear the name "peaches" and the name of the variety or the words "unknown variety" if the variety is not known, (3) each container of peaches shall be marked with the size of the peaches therein, (4) the variation in diameter among peaches in each container shall not exceed the limits hereinafter specified, (5) No. 22D and 22E standard lug boxes shall be labeled according to the applicable net weight hereinafter specified, and (6) bulk bin containers of peaches, in addition to above requirements, as applicable, shall contain at least 400 pounds, net weight, and be marked with the name and address of the shipper and specific net weight.

Peach Regulation 8 contains essentially the same requirements as were in effect in 1975 and prior years except for the requirement that the name "peaches" appear on the container in addition to the varietal name and the additional requirements applicable to bulk bin containers of peaches. This regulation supersedes Peach Regulation 5 (§ 917.436; 40 FR 19633, 25435) which has been in effect since May 7, 1975. This regulatory action is necessary to provide standardized packing practices and more informative labeling that will facilitate more orderly marketing of fresh California peaches and contribute to more effective operations under said marketing agreement and order.

Findings.—(1) Pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 917, as amended (7 CFR Part 917; 41 FR 17528), regulating the handling of fresh pears, plums, and peaches grown in 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 of the Peach Commodity Committee, established under the aforesaid marketing agreement and order, and upon other available information, it is hereby found that the regulation of shipments of peaches, as hereinafter provided, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(2) This action reflects the Department's appraisal of the need for regulation in the interest of consumers and the industry. Fresh shipments from the production area are now in progress. The container and pack requirements provided herein are designed to prevent the handling of fresh peaches, grown in the production area, which do not comply with such requirements so as to provide consumers and the trade with clear and conspicuous labeling of all fresh peach containers, which containers shall have been properly packed.

(3) It is hereby further found that it is impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest to give preliminary notice, engage in public rulemaking procedure, and postpone the effective date of this regulation until 30 days after publication thereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 553) in that, as hereinafter set forth, the time intervening between the date when information upon which this regulation is based became available and the date when this regulation must become effective in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act is insufficient; a reasonable time is permitted, under the circumstances, for preparation for such effective date; the containers and pack of fresh California peaches are currently regulated by Peach Regulation 5 (§ 917.436; 40 FR 19633, 25435) and said regulation will continue indefinitely unless sooner terminated, and good cause exists for making the provisions hereof effective on the date hereinafter set forth. Adequate information pertaining thereto was not available to the Peach Commodity Committee until April 29, 1976, on which date an open meeting was held, after giving due notice thereof, to consider the need for, and the extent of, peach container and pack regulation. Interested persons were afforded an opportunity to submit information and views at this meeting; the recommendation and supporting information and regulation during the period specified herein were promptly submitted to the Department after such meeting was held; necessary supplemental information was received on May 24, 1976. Initial shipments of the 1976 crop of such peaches are currently underway; this regulation should be applicable to shipments of peaches during the period hereinafter set forth in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act; the provisions of this regulation are identical with the aforesaid recommendation of the committee; information concerning such provisions and effective time has been disseminated among handlers of such peaches; and compliance with the provisions of this regulation will not require of handlers any preparation therefor which cannot be completed by the effective time hereof.

§ 917.442 Peach Regulation 8.

Order.—(a) Peach Regulation 5 (40 F.R. 19633, 25435) is hereby terminated as of the effective date hereof.

(b) During the period June 9 through August 1, 1976, no handler shall handle any package or container of any variety of peaches except in accordance with the following terms and conditions:

(1) Such peaches, when packed in any closed container, shall conform to the requirements of standard pack.

(2) Each package or container of peaches shall bear, in plain sight and in plain letters on one outside end, the name "peaches" and the name of the variety, if known or, when the variety is not known, the words "unknown variety."

(3) Each package or container of peaches shall bear, on one outside end in plain sight and plain letters, the following count or size description of the peaches as applicable.

(i) The size of peaches packed in molded forms (tray packs) in cartons, lug boxes, No. 12B fruit (peach) boxes, or flats and the size of wrapped peaches packed in rows in No. 12B fruit (peach) boxes shall be indicated in accordance with the number of peaches in the container, such as "80 count," "88 count," etc.

(ii) The size of peaches loose-filled, loose-packed, or tight-filled (not packed in rows) in No. 22D standard lug boxes shall be indicated according to the number of such peaches when packed in molded forms in said boxes in accordance with the requirements of standard pack, such as "88 size," "96 size," etc.

(iii) The size of peaches loose-filled, loose-packed, or tight-filled (not packed in rows) in any container, other than the No. 22D standard lug box, shall be indicated according to the number of such peaches when packed in molded forms in a No. 22D standard lug box in accordance with the requirements of standard pack, such as "80 size," "88 size," etc.

(4) Except as hereinafter provided in subparagraph (5) of this paragraph, the difference in diameter between the smallest and the largest peach in any individual container shall be not greater than

(i) ¼-inch for size 80 or smaller and for the equivalent count of such peaches when packed in molded forms in No. 22D standard lug boxes; or

(ii) ⅜-inch for size 75 or larger and for the equivalent count of such peaches when packed in molded forms in No. 22D standard lug boxes.

(5) Not more than five percent, by count, of the peaches in any individual container may fail to comply with the diameter requirements specified in subparagraph (4) of this paragraph.

(6) Each No. 22D standard lug box of loose-filled or loose-packed peaches (not packed in rows shall bear on one outside end, in plain sight and in plain letters, the words "25 pounds net weight."

(7) Each No. 22E standard lug box of loose-filled or loose-packed peaches (not packed in rows) shall bear on one outside end, in plain sight and in plain letters, the words "35 pounds net weight."

(8) Each bulk bin container of loose-filled or loose-packed peaches shall contain not less than 400 pounds, net weight, and bear on one outside panel, in plain sight and in plain letters, the following information:

(i) The name and address (including zip code) of the shipper.

(ii) The net weight.

(c) As used herein, "standard pack" shall have the same meaning as set forth in the U.S. Standards for Peaches (§ 51.1210–51.1223 of this title); the terms "No. 22D standard lug box," "No. 22E standard lug box," and "No. 12B fruit (peach) box" shall have the same meaning as set forth in § 1387.11 of the "Regulations of the California Department of Food and Agriculture"; and all other terms shall have the same meaning as when used in the marketing agreement and order.

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

Effective June 9, 1976.

Dated June 3, 1976.

CHARLES R. BRADER,
Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc.76–16718 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

[Grapefruit Regulation 16—Amdt. 5]

PART 944—FRUITS; IMPORT REGULATIONS

Minimum Grade Requirements for Imports of White Seedless Grapefruit and White and Pink Seeded Grapefruit

This amendment lowers the minimum grade requirements applicable to imported white seedless grapefruit and white and pink seeded grapefruit to U.S. No. 2 Russet on June 4, 1976. These requirements are the same as those applicable to grapefruit produced in Florida and regulated pursuant to Marketing Order No. 905.

This amendment is consistent with section 8e of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674). This section requires that whenever specified commodities, including grapefruit, are regulated under a federal marketing order, imports of that commodity must meet the same or comparable grade, size, quality or maturity requirements as those in effect for the domestically produced commodity. This amendment fixes the same minimum grade requirements on imported white seedless and white and pink seeded grapefruit as are effective under Marketing Order No. 905, as amended (7 CFR Part 905), regulating the handling of oranges, grapefruit, tangerines, and tangelos grown in Florida.

Order.—In § 944.112 (Grapefruit Regulation 16; 40 FR 42529, 49787; 41 FR 15829, 18674, 19965) the provisions of paragraph (a) are amended to read as follows:

§ 944.112 Grapefruit Regulation 16.

(a) * * *

(1) Seeded grapefruit shall grade at least U.S. No. 2 Russet and be of a size not smaller than 3 1/16 inches in diameter, except that a tolerance for seeded grapefruit smaller than such minimum size shall be permitted as specified in § 51.761 of the United States Standards for Grades of Florida Grapefruit;

(2) Seedless grapefruit shall grade at least U.S. No. 2 Russet and be of a size not smaller than 3⅜16 inches in diameter, except that a tolerance for seedless grapefruit smaller than such minimum size shall be permitted as specified in § 51.761 of the United States Standards for Grades of Florida Grapefruit.

* * * * *

It is hereby found that it is impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest to give preliminary notice, engage in public rulemaking procedure, and postpone the effective time of this amendment beyond that hereinafter specified (5 U.S.C. 553) in that (a) the requirements of this amended import regulation are imposed pursuant to section 8e of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), which makes such regulation mandatory; (b) this amendment fixes the same requirements for imports of white seedless grapefruit and white and pink seeded grapefruit as are applicable under amended Grapefruit Regulation 76 (§ 905.563) to the shipment of white seedless and white and pink seede grapefruit grown in Florida; and (c) this amendment lowers the minimum grade requirements applicable to imported white seedless and white and pink seeded grapefruit.

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

Dated: June 4, 1976.

Effective: June 4, 1976.

CHARLES R. BRADER,
Acting Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc.76–16719 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

CHAPTER XVIII—FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBCHAPTER H—GENERAL

PART 1901—PROGRAM-RELATED INSTRUCTIONS

Environmental Impact Statements

Correction

In FR Doc. 76–15988 appearing on page 22256 in the FEDERAL REGISTER of Wednesday, June 2, 1976 in the third column, the fourth line of paragraph (d) should read, "sumed not to be significant actions under".

Title 16—Commercial Practices

CHAPTER II—CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

PART 1207—SAFETY STANDARD FOR SWIMMING POOL SLIDES

Amendment to Safety Standards

The purpose of this notice is to amend the safety standard for Swimming Pool

Slides (16 CFR Part 1207) to clarify the scope of the standard to ensure that it is in conformance with the provisions of the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA) (15 U.S.C. 2051 et seq.) by specifying that the standard applies only to those swimming pool slides manufactured after the effective date of the standard, July 17, 1976.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission issued the safety standard for Swimming Pool Slides under the CPSA in the FEDERAL REGISTER of Monday, January 19, 1976 (41 FR 2742). The standard establishes requirements for the design, construction, and performance of swimming pool slides manufactured after July 17, 1976. (This date was corrected from July 19 to July 17 by notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER of April 9, 1976 (41 FR 15003)).

Sections 1207.1 and 1207.2 of the standard presently state that the standard applies to all slides "manufactured for sale, offered for sale, distributed in commerce, or imported into the U.S." after the effective date of the standard. However, section 9(d)(1) of the CPSA (15 U.S.C. 2058(d)(1)) specifies that a consumer product safety standard shall be applicable only to consumer products manufactured after the effective date of the standard. Therefore, the Commission amends §§ 1207.1 and 1207.2 to assure that those sections are in conformance with the Act by requiring that only swimming pool slides manufactured after the effective date of the standard comply with the standard.

The Commission finds that this amendment to §§ 1207.1 and 1207.2 of Title 16 is to ensure that the scope of the standard is in conformance with the provisions in section 9(d)(1) of the CPSA which specifies that consumer product safety standards apply only to those products manufactured after the effective date of the standard. Therefore, the Commission finds that the notice and public procedure requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553(b)) are unnecessary in this matter and the provisions of section 9(e) of the CPSA for amending standards need not be followed.

Accordingly, pursuant to section 9 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (sec. 9, Pub. L. 92-573, 86 Stat. 1216; 15 U.S.C. 2058), the Commission amends Part 1207 of Title 16 Chapter 2, subchapter B, as follows:

1. In § 1207.1, paragraph (a) is revised as follows:

§ 1207.1 Scope, purpose, and findings.

(a) *Scope and purpose.* This Part 1207 sets forth the consumer product safety standard issued by the Consumer Product Safety Commission for the manufacture and construction of slides for use in swimming pools. The requirements of this standard are designed to reduce or eliminate the unreasonable risks of death or injury associated with swimming pool slides. This standard also makes certain recommendations regarding the installation, maintenance, and intended use of swimming pool slides that supplement its mandatory requirements. This standard is applicable to all swimming pool slides manufactured after July 17, 1976. Paragraph (b) of this section sets forth the findings which the Commission is required to make by section 9(c) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2058(c)).

2. Section 1207.2 is revised as follows:

§ 1207.2 Effective date.

This Part 1207 shall become effective July 17, 1976. All swimming pool slides manufactured after that date must meet the requirements of this Part 1207.

Effective date. The amendment issued above, 16 CFR 1207.1 and 1207.2, shall take effect July 17, 1976, the effective date of the standard.

(Sec. 9, Pub. L. 92-573, 86 Stat. 1216, 15 U.S.C. 2058)

Dated: June 3, 1976.

SADYE E. DUNN,
Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc.76-16617 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

SUBCHAPTER E—POISON PREVENTION PACKAGING ACT OF 1970 REGULATIONS

PART 1700—POISON PREVENTION PACKAGING

Certain Preparations Containing Iron; Child-Resistant Packaging Standards

Correction

In FR Doc. 76-15935 appearing on page 22261 in the issue of Wednesday, June 2, 1976 make the following changes:

On page 22263, the eighteenth line in the last paragraph should have read: "(ten 5 grain ferrous sulphate tablets)".

On page 22264, the first sentence in paragraph E. in the third column should have read; "E. *Effective date.* Section 9 of the PPPA provides, in part, that no standard issued under the act shall go into effect sooner than 180 days or later than 1 year from the date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER of the final regulation."

On page 22266, the twelfth line of § 1700.14(a)(1)(12) should have read: "0.10 percent or more on a".

Title 24—Housing and Urban Development

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

[Docket No. FI-2016]

PART 1915—IDENTIFICATION AND MAPPING OF SPECIAL HAZARD AREAS

List of Communities With Special Hazard Areas

The purpose of this notice is the identification of communities with areas of special flood or mudslide or erosion hazards in accordance with Part 1915 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations as authorized by the National Flood Insurance Program (42 U.S.C. 4001-4128). The identification of such areas is to provide guidance so that communities may adopt appropriate flood plain management measures to minimize damage caused by flood losses and to guide future construction, where practicable, away from locations which are threatened by flood hazards.

The Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 requires the purchase of flood insurance on and after March 2, 1974, as a condition of receiving any form of Federal or Federally related financial assistance for acquisition or construction purposes in an identified flood plain area having special flood hazards that is located within any community participating in the National Flood Insurance Program.

One year after the identification of the community as flood prone, the requirement applies to all identified special flood hazard areas within the United States, so that, after that date, no such financial assistance can legally be provided for acquisition and construction in these areas unless the community has entered the program. The prohibition, however, does not apply to loans by a Federally regulated, insured, supervised or approved bank prior to March 1, 1976, to finance the acquisition of a previously occupied residential dwelling.

The effective date of identification shall be 30 days after the date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (July 9, 1976), or the date which appears in this notice, whichever is later.

This 30 day period does not supersede the statutory requirement that a community, whether or not participating in the program, be given the opportunity for a period of six months to establish that it is not seriously flood prone or that such flood hazards as may have existed have been corrected by floodworks or other flood control methods. The six months period shall be considered to begin 30 days after the date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (July 9, 1976) or the effective date of the Flood Hazard Boundary Map, whichever is later. Similarly, the one year period a community has to enter the program under Section 201(d) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 shall be considered to begin 30 days after publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER or the effective date of the Flood Hazard Boundary Map, whichever is later.

Where several dates appear in the column set forth below marked Effective Date of Identification, the first date is the date of initial identification, and all other dates represent modification by additions or deletions to identified areas with special hazards.

Accordingly, § 1915.3 is amended by adding in alphabetical sequence a new entry to the table, which entry reads as follows:

§ 1915.3 List of communities with special hazard areas (FHBM's in effect).

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Alabama	Etowah	Gadsden, city of	H 010080A 01 through H 010080A 15	Mayor, Box 267, Gadsden, Ala. 35902	Mar. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Marion	Hamilton, city of	H 010163A 01 through H 010163A 09	Mayor, Box 188, Hamilton, Ala. 35570	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Marion and Fayette.	Winfield, city of	H 010164A 01 through H 010164A 07	Mayor, City of Winfield, P.O. Drawer 579, Winfield, Ala. 35594.	May 10, 194.7 May 28, 1976.
Arizona	Maricopa	El Mirage, town of	H 040041A 01 through H 040041A 04	Mayor, Town Hall, 12205 Well Street, El Mirage, Ariz. 85335.	Feb. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Pinal	Mammoth, town of	H 040086A 01	Town Hall, 716 Clark Street, Mammoth, Ariz. 85618	Dec. 7, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Arkansas	Washington	Fayetteville, city of	H 050216A 01 through H 050216A 19	Mayor, City Hall, Fayetteville, Ark. 72701	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Randolf	Ravenden Springs, town of	H 050281 01	Mayor, Town Hall, Ravender Springs, Ark. 72460	July 23, 1976.
California	Orange	Fountain Valley, city of	H 060218A 01 through H 060218A 05	City Engineer, City Hall, 10200 Slater Ave., Fountain Valley, Calif. 92708.	Mar. 29, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Nevada	Grass Valley, city of	H 060211A 01 through H 060211A 03	Mayor, City Hall, 125 East Main St., Grass Valley, Calif. 95945.	May 17, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo, city of	H 060310A 01 through H 060310A 06	Civil Engineering Assistant, Public Works Department, 990 Palm St., San Luis Obispo, Calif. 93401.	Oct. 26, 1973. May 21, 1976.
Colorado	Weld	La Salle, town of	H 080186A 01	Mayor, Town Hall, 119 Main St., La Salle, Colo. 80645	May 17 1974.
Do	San Juan	Silverton, town of	H 080165A 01	Mayor, Town Hall, 1360 Greene St., Silverton, Colo. 81433	June 14, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Florida	Gadsden	Havana, town of	H 120411 01	Town Hall, P.O. Box 1068, Havana, Fla. 32333	July 23, 1976.
Do	Palm Beach	Haverhill, town of	H 120205A 01	Mayor, 4585 Charlotte St., West Palm Beach, Fla. 33401	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	do	Juno Beach, town of	H 120208A 01	Town Clerk, Town of Juno Beach, 841 Ocean Dr., Juno Beach, Fla. 33408.	Jan. 16, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lafayette	Mayo, town of	H 120132A 01	Town Clerk, Town of Mayo, P.O. Box 56, Mayo, Fla. 32060.	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lake	Minneola, town of	H 120412 01	Town Hall, P.O. Box 678, Minneola, Fla. 32755	July 23, 1976.
Do	Jefferson	Monticello, city of	H 120365 01 through H 120365 02	Monticello City Hall, P.O. Box 533, Monticello, Fla. 32344	Do.
Do	Clay	Orange Park, town of	H 120066A 01 through H 120066A 02	Clerk, Town of Orange Park, P.O. Box 237, Orange Park, Fla. 32073.	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lee	Sanibel, city of	H 120402 01 through H 120402 01	Mayor, P.O. Drawer 436, Sanibel, Fla. 33957.	July 23, 1976.
Do	Bradford	Starke, city of	H 120017A 01 through H 120017A 02	Mayor, City Hall, Starke, Fla. 32091	July 19, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Hernando	Weeki Wachee, city of	H 120413 01	Weeki Wachee City Hall, P.O. Box 97, Weeki Wachee, Fla. 33512.	July 23, 1976.
Do	Sumter	Wildwood, city of	H 120299A 01 through H 120299A 03	Clerk, City of Wildwood, P.O. Box 267, Wildwood, Fla. 32785.	Jan. 23, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Georgia	Gwinnett	Berkeley Lake, city of	H 130450 01	Berkeley Lake, city of	July 23, 1976.
Do	Miller	Colquitt, city of	H 130135 01 through H 130135 04	Colquitt City Hall, 154 East College St., Colquitt, Ga. 31735.	Do.
Do	Seminole	Donalsonville, city of	H 130164 01 through H 130164 02	Donalsonville City Hall, P.O. Box 308, Donalsonville, Ga. 31745.	Do.
Do	Walton	Jersey, town of	H 130412 01	Mayor, Town Hall, Jersey, Ga. 30235	Do.
Do	Stephens	Martin, town of	H 130392A 01 through H 130392A 02	Mayor, Town Hall, Martin, Ga. 30557	Apr. 4, 1975. May 28, 1976.
Idaho	Nez Perce	Lewiston, city of	H 160104A 01 through H 160104A 07	Mayor, City Hall, Lewiston, Idaho 84501	Aug. 16, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Clearwater	Orofino, city of	H 160047A 01 through H 160047A 02	Mayor, City Hall, P.O. Box 312, Orofino, Idaho 83544	Nov. 23, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Illinois	Cook	Evergreen Park, village of	H 170733A 01 through H 170733A 02	Village President, village of Evergreen Park, 9418 South Kedzie Ave., Evergreen Park, Ill. 60642.	Mar. 22, 1974.
Do	Du Page	Glendale Heights, village of	H 170206A 01 through H 170206A 02	Village President, 1611 Bloomingdale, Glendale Heights, Ill. 60137.	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Henry	Green Rock, city of	H 170285A 01	Mayor, City Hall, Green Rock, Ill. 61241	Jan. 16, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Bureau	Manlius, village of	H 170013A 01	Village President, Box 273, Manlius, Ill. 61338	Mar. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Williamson	Marion, city of	H 170719A 01 through H 170719A 04	City Clerk, City of Marion, 100 Public Sq., Marion, Ill. 62959.	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do	Clark	Marshall, city of	H 170040A 01	Mayor, City of Marshall, 708 Archer Ave., Marshall, Ill. 62441.	June 14, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	St. Clair	Mascoutah, city of	H 170630A 01 through H 170630A 02	City Manager, City of Mascoutah, 3 West Main St., Mascoutah, Ill. 62258.	Mar. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Coles	Mattoon, city of	H 170053A 01 through H 170053A 03	Mayor, City of Mattoon, City Hall, Mattoon, Ill. 61938	Mar. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Putnam	McNabb, village of	H 170573A 01	Mayor, Box 287, McNabb, Ill. 61335	Sept. 13, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Kane	Montgomery, village of	H 170328A 01 through H 170328A 02	Mayor, 1300 South Broadway, Montgomery, Ill. 60538	Oct. 26, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lee	Nelson, village of	H 170418 01	Village President, Village Hall, Nelson, Ill. 61058	July 23, 1976.
Do	Jasper	Newton, city of	H 170303A 01 through H 170303A 03	Mayor, 114 North Van Buren, Newton, Ill. 62448	Dec. 17, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Montgomery	Nokomis, city of	H 170515A 01 through H 170515A 02	Mayor, 111 South Pine St., Nokomis, Ill. 62075	Mar. 29, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Crawford	Palestine, village of	H 170179A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Palestine, Ill. 62451	Nov. 23, 1973.
Do	Cook	Phoenix, village of	H 170147A 01	Village Clerk, Village of Phoenix, 15240 Vincennes Rd., Phoenix, Ill. 60426.	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Hancock	Pontoosuc, village of	H 170272A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Pontoosuc, Ill. 62330	Jan. 16, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Ogle	Rochelle, city of	H 170532A 01 through H 170532A 02	City of Rochelle, P.O. Box A, Rochelle, Ill. 61068	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Cook	Rolling Meadows, city of	H 170155A 01 through H 170155A 02	Mayor, 3600 Kirchoff Rd., Rolling, Meadows, Ill. 60008	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	do	South Barrington, village of	H 170161A 01 through H 170161A 03	Village President, Mund Hank Rural Delivery, Route 3, Barrington, Ill. 60010.	Mar. 22, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Knox	Wataga, village of	H 170354A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Wataga, Ill. 61488	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	St. Clair	Summerfield, village of	H 170636A 01	Village President, Box 82, Summerfield, Ill. 62289	May 3, 1974.
Do	Madison	Venice, city of	H 170450A 01	City of Venice, Broadway and Klein Sts., Venice, Ill. 62090.	Feb. 15, 1974.
Do	Cass	Virginia, city of	H 170024A 01	City Clerk, City of Virginia, P.O. Box 49, Virginia, Ill. 62691.	Apr. 5, 1974. May 28, 1974.
Indiana	Hamilton	Arcadia, town of	H 180315A 01	President, Town Board, Town Hall, Arcadia, Ind. 46030	Feb. 1, 1974.
Do	Warrick	Boonville, city of	H 180273A 01 through H 180273A 02	Mayor, 113 South 2d St., Boonville, Ind. 47601	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	St. Joseph	Mishawaka, city of	H 180227A 01 through H 180227A 08	Mayor, City Hall, 204 East 1st St., Mishawaka, Ind. 46544	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Washington	Salem, city of	H 180279A 01	Mayor, City of Salem, City Hall, Salem, Ind. 47167	Nov. 23, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Hancock	Spring Lake Park, town of	H 180346A 01	Town Board President, Rural Delivery No. 9, P.O. Box 68, Greenfield, Ind. 46140.	Feb. 1, 1976.
Do	Kosciusko	Warsaw, city of	H 180123A 01 through H 180123A 04	Mayor, City Hall, Warsaw, Ind. 46480	May 10, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Hamilton	Westfield, town of	H 180083A 01 through	Clerk/Treasurer, P.O. Box 322, Westfield, Ind. 46074	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Boone	Whitestown, town of	H 180015A 01	Town Board President, Town of Whitestown, Town Hall, Whitestown, Ind. 46075.	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Greene	Worthington, town of	H 180079A 01	Town Board President, Town of Worthington, 320 West Main St., Worthington, Ind. 47471.	Nov. 23, 1973.
Iowa	Sac	Lake View, city of	H 190503 01	Mayor, City Hall, Lake View, Iowa 51450	July 23, 1976.
Do	Dallas	Minburn, city of	H 190780 01	Mayor, City Hall, Minburn, Iowa 50167	Do.
Do	Mahaska	Oskaloosa, city of	H 190638 01 through H 190638 02	City Planner, City Hall, Oskaloosa, Iowa 52577	Do.
Do	Dickinson	Spirit Lake, city of	H 190116A 01 through H 190116A 02	Mayor, City Hall, Spirit Lake, Iowa 51360	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Louisiana	Avoyelles Parish	Bunkie, town of	H 220020 01 through H 220020 04	Mayor, Town Hall, Bunkie, La. 71322	July 23, 1976.
Michigan	Ionia	Belding, city of	H 260096A 01 through H 260096A 02	City Manager, 109 South Pleasant St., Belding, Mich. 48809.	Jan. 17, 1975. May 28, 1976.
Do	Menominee	Stephenson, city of	H 260139A 01	Mayor, City of Stephenson, City Hall, Stephenson, Mich. 49887.	May 17, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Clinton	Watertown, township of	H 260291A 01 through H 260291A 02	Township Supervisor, Township Hall, 8101 Park Rd., Grand Ledge, Mich. 48837.	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Minnesota	Wright	Buffalo, city of	H 270535A 01 through H 270535A 03	Clerk/Treasurer, 212 Central Ave., Buffalo, Minn. 55313	May 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	do	Clearwater, city of	H 270536A 01	Clerk/Treasurer, City Hall, Clearwater, Minn. 55320	Aug. 23, 1974.
Do	Hennepin	Corcoran, city of	H 2701551 01 through H 270155A 12	Mayor, 21600 Larkin Rd., Hamel, Minn. 55340	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Pope	Cyrus, city of	H 270369A 01	Mayor, City Hall, Cyrus, Minn. 56323	Aug. 9, 1974.
Do	Jackson	Jackson, city of	H 270213A 01 through H 270213A 03	City Engineer, City of Jackson, City Hall, 504 2d St., Jackson, Minn. 56143.	Oct. 26, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Anoka	Lino Lakes, city of	H 270015A 01 through H 270015A 12	Mayor, 1189 Main St., Lino Lakes, Minn. 55014	Dec. 13, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Ramsey	Little Canada, city of	H 270377 01 through H 270377 02	Mayor, 515 Little Canada Rd., Little Canada, Minn. 55117	July 23, 1976.
Do	Rock	Luverne, city of	H 270411A 01 through H 270411A 02	Administrative Assistant, City of Luverne, City Hall, Luverne, Minn, 56156,	Feb. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Watonwan	Madelia, city of	H 270517A 01	Mayor, City Hall, Madelia, Minn, 56062	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Mahnomen	Mahnomen, city of	H 270266A 01	City Clerk, City of Mahonomen, City Hall, Mahonomen, Minn. 56557,	Apr. 12, 1974.
Do	Steele	Medford, city of	H 270462A 01	City Clerk, City of Medford, 411 3d Ave, SW., Medford, Minn. 55049.	Do
Do	Marshall	Middle River, city of	H 270270A 01	Mayor, City Hall, Middle River, Minn. 56737	July 19, 1974.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do.	Stearns	Richmond, city of	H 270453A 01	Mayor, City Hall, Richmond, Minn. 56368	Mar. 29, 1974.
Do.	Hennepin	St. Bonifacius, city of	H 270183A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 356, St. Bonifacius, Minn. 55375	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Wadena	Sebeka, city of	H 270494B 01 through H 270494B 02	Mayor, City Hall, Sebeka, Minn. 56477	Apr. 12, 1974. July 11, 1975. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Scott	Shakopee, city of	H 270434A 01 through H 270434A 10	Clerk/Administrator, City of Shakopee, 129 East 1st Ave. Shakopee, Minn. 55379.	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Crow Wing	Riverton, city of	H 270100A 01	City Clerk, City of Riverton, Riverton Route, Ironton, Minn. 56455.	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Itasca	Taconite, city of	H 270209 01 through H 270209 02	Mayor, City Hall, Taconite, Minn. 55786	July 23, 1976.
Do.	Cottonwood	Windom, city of	H 270090A 01 through H 270090A 02	Building Administrator, City of Windom, 4444 9th St., Windom, Minn. 56101.	Nov. 9, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Mississippi	Humphreys	Belzoni, city of	H 280080A 01	City Clerk, City of Belzoni, P.O. Box 674, Belzoni, Miss. 39038.	Feb. 1, 1974.
Do.	DeSoto	Horn Lake, town of	H 280051A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 37, Horn Lake, Miss. 38637	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Humphreys	Isola, town of	H 280190A 01	Town Clerk, Town of Isola, Box 203, Isola, Miss. 38754	June 21, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Missouri	Taney	Branson, city of	H 290436A 01 through H 290436A 02	Mayor, City Hall, Branson, Mo. 65616	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Clay	Excelsior Springs, city of	H 290090A 01 through H 290090A 04	Mayor, City Hall, Excelsior Springs, Mo. 64024	Apr. 5, 1974. May 28, 1976.
New Hampshire	Grafton	Bath, town of	H 330043A 01 through H 330043A 13	Chairwoman, Planning Board, R.F.D. No. 2, Woodsville, N.H. 03785.	Mar. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Belknap	Meredith, town of	H 330006A 01 through H 330006A 19	Town Engineer, Town of Meredith, P.O. Box 709, Meredith, N.H. 03253.	June 14, 1974. May 28, 1976.
New Jersey	Burlington	Bordentown, city of	H 340087A 01	City Clerk, City of Bordentown, 324 Farnsworth Ave., Bordentown, N.J. 08503.	Dec. 20, 0974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Bergen	Franklin Lakes, borough of	H 340026A 01 through H 340026A 05	Boswell Engineering, 78-80 Mount Vernon St., Ridgefield Park, N.J. 17660.	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Hunterdon	High Bridge, borough of	H 340508A 01	Borough Secretary, Borough of High Bridge, 71 Main St., High Bridge, N.J. 08829.	June 21, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Salem	Lower Alloways Creek, township of.	H 340416A 01 through H 340416A 17	Mayor, Township Bldg., Hancocks Bridge, N.J. 08038	Sept. 13, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Mercer	Princeton, township of	H 340252A 01 through H 340252A 05	Mayor, State and Valley Rds., Princeton, N.J. 08540	June 15, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Burlington	Springfield, township of	H 340116A 01 through H 340116A 10	Mayor, Municipal Bldg., Jobstown, N.J. 08041	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Gloucester	Swedesboro, borough of	H 340519A 01	Borough Clerk, Borough of Swedesboro, Borough Hall, Kings Highway, Swedesboro, N.J. 08050.	Nov. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Passaic	West Milford, township of	H 340411A 01 through H 340411A 24	Township Manager, 1480 Union Valley Rd., West Milford, N.J. 07480.	July 19, 1974. May 28, 1976.
New Mexico	Taos	Taos, town of	H 350080A 01	Mayor, Town Hall, P.O. Drawer M, Taos. N. Mex. 87571	May 17, 1974. May 28, 1976.
New York	Chenango	Afton, village of	H 360979 01	Clerk/Treasurer, Maple St., Afton, N.Y. 13730	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Allegany	Alma, town of	H 360980A 01 through H 360980A 10	Supervisor, Rural Delivery No. 4, Wellsville, N.Y. 14895	Dec. 13, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Wyoming	Arcade, town of	H 360939A 01 through H 360939A 06	Supervisor, Town of Arcade, Town Hall, Arcade, N.Y. 14009.	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Livingston	Avon, village of	H 360379A 01 through H 360379A 04	Village Clerk/Treasurer, Village Office, 102 Genesee St., Avon, N.Y. 14414.	May 10, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Ontario	Canadice, town of	H 361297A 01 through H 361297A 03	Supervisor, Bald Hill Road, Rural Delivery No. 1, Hemlock, N.Y. 14466.	Nov. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Chautauqua	Carroll, town of	H 360994A 01 through H 360994A 04	Town Supervisor, 107 West Main St., Falconer, N.Y. 14733,	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Oswego	Central Sq., village of	H 360647A 01	Mayor, 111 North Main St., Central Sq., N.Y. 13036	May 17, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Nassau	Centre Island, village of	H 360461A 01	Mayor, Centre Island, Oyster Bay, N.Y. 11771	Aug. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Montgomery	Charleston, town of	H 360444A 01 through H 360444A 06	Supervisor, Rural Delivery No. 1, Esperance, N.Y. 12066	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Chautauqua	Charlotte, town of	H 361070A 01 through H 361070A 05	Supervisor, Town of Charlotte, Rural Delivery No. 2, Casanega, N.Y. 14718.	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Erie	Cheektowaga, town of	H 360231A 01 through H 360231A 06	Town Clerk, Town of Cheektowaga, Town Hall, Cheektowaga, N.Y. 14227.	Sept. 7, 1973. May 28, 1976.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do	Otsego	Cherry Valley, village of	H 361449A 01	Clerk/Treasurer, Village of Cherry Valley, Village Hall, Main St., Cherry Valley, N.Y. 13320.	Nov. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Oneida	Clinton, village of	H 360525A 01	Mayor, Village of Clinton, P.O. Box 242, Clinton, N.Y. 13323.	Feb. 15, 1974.
Do	Steuben	Cohocton, town of	H 360771A 01 through H 360771A 15	Town Clerk, Town of Cohocton, Town Hall, 15 South Main St., Cohocton, N.Y. 14572.	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Chenango	Columbus, town of	H 361086A 01 through H 361086A 05	Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, Town of Columbus, Chenango County Bldg., Norwich, N.Y. 13815.	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Erie	Collins, town of	H 360234A 01 through H 360234A 04	Supervisor, Town Collins, 14093 Mill St., Collins, N.Y. 14034.	Aug. 2, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lewis	Constableville, village of	H 360360A 01	Mayor, Constableville, N.Y. 13325	Aug. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Oswego	Constantia, town of	H 360648A 01 through H 360648A 07	Supervisor, Town of Constantia, Town Hall, Constantia, N.Y. 13028.	Apr. 5, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Saratoga	Corinth, village of	H 360714A 01	Town Clerk, Village of Corinth, 6 Sherman Ave., Corinth, N.Y. 12822.	Aug. 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Orange	Cornwall, town of	H 360611A 01 through H 360611A 08	Supervisor, Town of Cornwall, 183 Main St., Cornwall, N.Y. 12518.	Mar. 29, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Greene	Coxsackie, village of	H 360288A 01 through H 360288A 02	Mayor, Village of Coxsackie, 38 Manison St., Coxsackie, N.Y. 12051.	Mar. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lewis	Croghan, village of	H 361068A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Croghan, N.Y. 13327	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Allegany	Cuba, village of	H 360029A 01	Mayor, Village of Cuba, Box 12, Cuba, N.Y. 14727	May 17, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Oneida	Deerfield, town of	H 360526A 01 through H 360526A 04	Supervisor, 656 Hewey St., Utica, N.Y. 13502	Aug 2, 197 . May 28, 1976.
Do	Orange	Deerpark, town of	H 360612A 01 through H 360612A 06	Town Supervisor, Drawer A, Huguenot, N.Y. 12746	May 17, 1974. May 28, 19 6.
Do	Delaware	Delhi, village of	H 360193A 01 through H 360193A 02	Mayor, P.O. Box 328, Delhi, N.Y. 13753	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lewis	Denmark, town of	H 360363A 01 through H 360363A 05	Town Supervisor, Box 84, Deer River, N.Y. 13627	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Tompkins	Dryden, village of	H 360847A 01 through H 360847A 04	Clerk/Treasurer, Village Hall, Dryden, N.Y. 13053.	Jnue 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Wyoming	Eagle, town of	H 360943A 01 through H 360943A 05	Supervisor, De Witt Rd., Bliss, N.Y. 14024	Sept. 13, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Chenango and Madison.	Earlville, village of	H 360397A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Earlville, N.Y. 13332	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Cattaraugus	East Otto, town of	H 360067A 01 through H 360067A 11	Chairman of Planning Board, East Flats Rd., East Otto, N.Y. 14729.	June 21, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Erie	Eden, town of	H 360238A 01 through H 360238A 10	Town Supervisor, 2795 East Church St., Eden, N.Y. 14057.	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Onondaga	Elbridge, town of	H 360575A 01 through H 360575A 15	Town Clerk, Grimes Rd., Jordan, N.Y. 13080	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Westchester	Elmsford, village of	H 360910A 01	Mayor, 15 South Stone Ave., Elmsford, N.Y. 10523	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Chautauqua	Falconer, village of	H 360138A 01	Mayor, 101 West Main St., Falconer, N.Y. 14733	Feb. 22, 1974.
Do	Madison	Fenner, town of	H 360399A 01 through H 360399A 02	Supervisor, Rural Delivery No. 1, Cazenovia, N.Y. 13035	Sept. 13, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Delaware	Fleischmanns, village of	H 360197A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Fleischmanns, N.Y. 12430	Dec. 6, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Montgomery	Fort Plain, village of	H 360448A 01	Clerk/Treasurer, 168 Canal St., Fort Plain, N.Y. 13339	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Herkimer	Frankfort, town of	H 360303A 01 through H 360303A 03	Town Clerk, Town Hall, Frankfort, N.Y. 13340	Mar. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	do	Frankfort, village of	H 360304A 01	Village Clerk, 107 West Main St., Frankfort, N.Y. 13340	Mar. 22, 1974.
Do	Chautauqua	Fredonia, village of	H 360139A 01 through H 360139A 03	Village Administrator, Village Hall, Fredonia, N.Y. 14063	May 3, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Allegany	Friendship, village of	H 360031A 01	Village Clerk, Village Hall, Friendship, N.Y. 14739	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Madison	Georgetown, town of	H 360400A 01	Supervisor, Town Hall, Earlville, N.Y. 13332	Aug. 2, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Orange	Goshen, town of	H 360614A 01 through H 360614A 04	Town Supervisor, P.O. Box 217, Goshen, N.Y. 10924	Mar. 22, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	St. Lawrence	Gouverneur, village of	H 360699A 01	Village Clerk, 33 Clinton St., Gouverneur, N.Y. 13642	Mar. 24, 1975.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do	Rockland	Grand View-On-Hudson, village of	H 360680A 01 through H 360680A 02	Clerk, 89 River Rd., Grand View-On-Hudson, N.Y. 10960.	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Nassau	Great Neck, village of	H 361519A 01 through H 361519A 02	Village Clerk, 61 Baker Hill Rd., Great Neck, N.Y. 11203.	July 26, 1974.
Do	Tompkins	Groton, village of	H 360849A 01	Village Clerk, 108 Cortland St., Groton, N.Y. 13073	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Oswego	Hannibal, village of	H 360652A 01	Village Clerk, Rural Delivery No. 1, Hannibal, N.Y. 13074.	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Cortland	Harford, town of	H 360180A 01 through H 360180A 03	Town Clerk, Box 43, Hartford Mills, N.Y. 13785	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lewis	Harrisville, village of	H 361451A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Harrisville, N.Y. 13648	Nov. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Herkimer	Herkimer, town of	H 360306A 01 through H 360306A 03	Supervisor, 118 Green St., Herkimer, N.Y. 13350	Mar. 8, 1974.
Do	do	Herkimer, village of	H 360307A 01 through H 360307A 02	Village Engineer, 120 Green St., Herkimer, N.Y. 13350	May 10, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	St, Lawrence	Heuvelton, village of	H 360701A 01	Village Clerk, Village Hall, Heuvelton, N.Y. 13654	May 24, 1974.
Do	Nassau	Hewlett Bay Park, village of	H 360408A 01	Mayor, 30 Piermont Ave., Hewlett, N.Y. 11557	June 28, 1974.
Do	Columbia	Hudson, city of	H 361512A 01 through H 361512A 03	Mayor, 520 Warren St., Hudson, N.Y. 12534	Nov. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Ulster	Hurley, town of	H 360857A 01 through H 360857A 04	Town Supervisor, P.O. Box 10, Hurley, N.Y. 12443	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Chautauqua	Kiantone, town of	H 361075A 01 through H 361075A 05	Supervisor, Rural Delivery No. 5, South Main St. Extension, Kiantone, N.Y. 14701.	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Washington	Kingsbury, town of	H 361235A 01 through H 3611235A 10	Town Supervisor, 210 Main St., Hudson Falls, N.Y. 12839.	Nov. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Seneca	Lodi, town of	H 360753A 01 through H 360753A 04	Town Supervisor, Town Hall, Lodi, N.Y. 14860	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lewis	Lyons Falls, village of	H 361065A 01	Mayor, Center St., Lyons Falls, N.Y. 13368	Nov. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Dutchess	Milan, town of	H 361339A 01 through H 361339A 06	Supervisor, Salisbury Rd., Red Hook, N.Y. 12571	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Onondaga	Minoa, village of	H 361017A 01	Village Clerk, 238 North Main St., Minoa, N.Y. 13116	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Saratoga	Moreau, town of	H 360723A 01 through H 360723A 13	Town Supervisor, Moreau Town Hall, 61 Hudson St., South Glens Falls, N.Y. 12801.	Aug. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Otsego	Morris, village of	H 361353A 01	Mayor, Morris, N.Y. 13808	Nov. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Oneida	New Hartford, village of	H 360536A 01	Mayor, Butler Memorial Hall, New Hartfor, N.Y. 13413	Feb. 22, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Nassau	North Hempstead, town of	H 360482A 01 through H 360482A 10	Town Engineer, 200 Plandome Rd., Manhasset, N.Y. 11030.	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Madison	Oneida, city of	H 360408A 01 through H 360408A 02	City Engineer, 109 North Main St., Oneida, N.Y. 13421	Mar. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	St. Lawrence	Oswegatchie, town of	H 360708A 01 through H 360708A 05	Town Clerk, Town Clerks Office, Oswegatchie, N.Y. 13670.	Sept. 13, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Oswego	Oswego, city of	H 360656A 01 through H 360656A 06	Mayor, City Hall, Oswego, N.Y. 13126	May 10, 1974.
Do	Seneca	Romulus, town of	H 360755A 01 through H 360755A 06	Town Supervisor, Rural Delivery 1, Romulus, N.Y. 14541.	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Cayuga	Scipio, town of	H 360122A 01 through H 360122A 05	Supervisor, Town Hall, Aurora, N.Y. 13026	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Oneida	Sherrill, city of	H 360544A 01	City Clerk, City Hall, 601 Sherrill Rd., Sherrill, N.Y. 13461.	Mar. 8, 1974.
Do	Ulster	Ulster, town of	H 360866A 01 through H 360866A 04	Town Supervisor, Town Hall, Lake Katrine, N.Y. 12449.	May 3, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Wayne	Walworth, town of	H 361228B 01 through H 361228B 09	Deputy Supervisor, Town Hall, Walworth, N.Y. 14568	Dec. 13, 1974. Oct. 10, 1975. May 28, 1976.
North Carolina	Beaufort	Aurora, town of	H 370014A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 86, Aurora, N.C. 27806.	May 3, 1974.
Do	Yadkin	Jonesville, town of	H 370260A 01 through H 370260A 02	Mayor, 136 West Main St., Jonesville, N.C. 28642	Mar. 4, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Buncombe	Weaverville, town of	H 370269A 01	Mayor, Box 338, Weaverville, N.C. 28787	Nov. 29, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Ohio	Jefferson	Adena, village of	H 390295 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Adena, Ohio 43901	July 23, 1976.
Do	do	Amsterdam, village of	H 390296 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 455, Amsterdam, Ohio 43903	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Harrison	Bowerston, village	H 390257A 01 through H 390257A 02	Mayor, Box 2, Bowerston, Ohio 44695	Aug. 9, 1974.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do	Jefferson	Brilliant, village of	H 390297A 01	Mayor, 400 Prospect St., Brilliant, Ohio 43913	Jan. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Medina	Brunswick, city of	H 390380A 01 through H 390380A 05	City Manager, 4095 Centre Rd., Brunswick, Ohio 44212	Nov. 2, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Harrison	Cadiz, village of	H 390258A 01	Mayor, 128 Court St., Cadiz, Ohio 43907	May 31, 1974.
Do	Mahoning	Campbell, city of	H 390368A 01 through H 390368A 03	Mayor, 351 Tinney Ave., Campbell, Ohio 44505	Mar. 1, 1974.
Do	Stark	Canton, city of	H 390512A 01 through H 390512A 08	Mayor, 218 Cleveland Ave., S.W., Canyon, Ohio 44702	Dec. 17, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Hamilton	Cheviot, city of	H 390209A 01	Mayor, 3814 Harrison, Cheviot, Ohio 45211	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Ross	Chillicothe, city of	H 390482 01 through H 390482 04	Mayor, 26 South Paint St., Chillicothe, Ohio 45601	June 28, 1974.
Do	Clermont	Chilo, village of	H 390067 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 13, Chilo, Ohio 45112	July 23, 1976.
Do	Champaign	Christiansburg, village of	H 390056A 01	Mayor, Wilson and 2d Sts., Christiansburg, Ohio 45389	Aug. 9, 1974.
Do	Hamilton	Cleves, village of	H 390211 01 through H 390211 02	Mayor, 101 North Miami Ave., Cleves, Ohio 45002	July 23, 1976.
Do	Wayne	Creston, village of	H 390575A 01 through H 390575A 04	Mayor, Garden St., Creston, Ohio 44217	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Tuscarawas	Dennison, village of	H 390542A 01 through H 390542A 02	Mayor, P.O. Box 147, Dennison, Ohio 44621	Mar. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Henry	Deshler, village of	H 390262 01	Mayor, Town Hall, Deshler, Ohio 43516	July 23, 1976.
Do	Lake	Eastlake, city of	H 390313A 01 through H 390313A 04	Mayor, 35150 Lake Shore Blvd., Eastlake, Ohio 44094	November 20, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	do	Fairport Harbor, village of	H 390314A 01	Mayor, 220 3d St., Fairport, Harbor Ohio 44077	July 23, 1976.
Do	Knox	Gambier, village of	H 390310 01 through H 390310 02	Mayor, P.O. Box 222, Gambier, Ohio 43022	Do.
Do	Cuyahoga	Gates Mills, village of	H 390593A 01 H 390593A 04	Mayor, River Rd., Gates Mills, Ohio 44040	Nov. 9, 1973. May 28, 1976
Do	Montgomery	Germantown, village of	H 390411A 01 through H 390411A 02	Mayor, Municipal Bldg., Walnuto and Center Sts., Germantown, Ohio 45327.	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Licking	Granville, village of	H 390330A 01 through H 390330A 02	Village Administrator, 118 South Main St., Granville, Ohio 43023.	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Darke	Greenville, city of	H 390139A 01 through H 390139A 03	Mayor, Municipal Bldg., Public Sq., Greenville, Ohio 45331.	Feb. 15, 1975. May 28, 1976.
Do	Hardin	Kenton, city of	H 390253A 01 through H 390253A 02	Mayor, 224 West Columbus St., City Bldg., Kenton, Ohio 43326.	Jan. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Guernsey	Kimbolton, village of	H 390201A 01	President of Council, Kimbolton, Ohio 43749	Dec. 6, 1974.
Do	Summit	Lakemore, village of	H 390527A 01	Mayor, 1400 Main St., Lakemore, Ohio 44250	Feb. 8, 1974.
Do	Marion	La Rue, village of	H 390375A 01	Mayor, 86 South High St., La Rue, Ohio 43332	Nov. 23, 1973. May 28, 1973.
Do	Medina	Lodi, village of	H 390382A 01	Mayor, 110 Ainsworth St., Lodi, Ohio 44254	Mar. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Clermont	Loveland, city of	H 390068A 01 through H 390068A 02	Mayor, 120 West Loveland Ave., Loveland, Ohio 45140	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Hardin	McGuffey, village of	H 390254A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, McGuffey, Ohio 45859	May 10, 1974.
Do	Mercer	Mendon, village of	H 390671A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Mendon, Ohio 45862	June 14, 1974.
Do	Stark	Minerva, village of	H 390518 01	Mayor, 209 North Market St., Minerva, Ohio 44657	July 23, 1976.
Do	Mercer	Montezuma, village of	H 390396A 01	Mayor, Box 35, Montezuma, Ohio 45866	Aug. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Hancock	Mount Cory, village of	H 390249A 01	Mayor, Route 1, Mount Cory, Ohio 45868	Sept. 20, 1974.
Do	Knox	Mount Vernon, city of	H 390311A 01 through H 390311A 04	Mayor, 40 Public Sq., Mount Vernon, Ohio 43050	May 3, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Hamilton	Newtown, village of	H 390230A 01 through H 390230A 02	Mayor, 3536 Church St., Cincinnati, Ohio 45244	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Wood	North Baltimore, village of	H 390587A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 174, North Baltimore, Ohio 45872	Feb. 8, 1974.
Do	Clark	North Ridgeville, city of	H 390352A 01 through H 390352A 06	Mayor, 7307 Avon Belden Rd., North Ridgeville, Ohio 44039.	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Tuscarawas	Port Washington, village of	H 390664A 01	Mayor, 109 West Main St., Port Washington, Ohio 43837	Apr. 5, 1974.
Do	Marion	Prospect, village of	H 390377A 01	Village President, P.O. Box 67, Prospect, Ohio 43342	Nov. 23, 1973.
Do	Jefferson	Rayland, village of	H 390801A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 152, Rayland, Ohio 43943	Mar. 22, 1974.
Do	Union	Richwood, village of	H 390549A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Richwood, Ohio 43344	May 17, 1974.
Do	Mercer	Rockford, village of	H 390397A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Rockford, Ohio 45882	Apr. 12, 1974.
Do	Wood	Rossford, city of	H 390589A 01 through H 390589A 02	Mayor, 133 Osborn St., Rossford, Ohio 43460	Mar. 1, 1974.
Do	Hamilton	Sharonville, city of	H 390236A 01 through H 390236A 04	Mayor, 10000 Reading Rd., Sharonville, Ohio 45241	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Champaign	Urbana, city of	H 390060A 01 through H 390060A 04	Mayor, South Main St., City Bldg., Urbana, Ohio 43078	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Preble	Verona, village of	H 390464A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 676, Verona, Ohio 45378	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Huron	Wakeman, village of	H 390288A 01	Mayor, 60 Pleasant St., Wakeman, Ohio 44889	Nov. 9, 1973.
Do	Auglaize	Wapakoneta, city of	H 390023A 01 through H 390023A 02	Mayor, 102 Perr St., Wapakoneta, Ohio 45895	Feb. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Pike	Waverly, city of	H 390452A 01 through H 390452A 02	Mayor, 202 South Market St., Waverly, Ohio 45690	June 21, 1974.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do	Lorain	Wellington, village of	H 390358A 01	Mayor, Village Hall, Wellington, Ohio 44090	Jan. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Trumbull and Mahoning.	Youngstown, city of	H 390373A 01 through H 390373A 10	Mayor, 1st Floor, City Hall, Youngstown, Ohio 44503	Apr. 5, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Oklahoma	Muskogee	Fort Gibson, town of	H 400123 01 through H 400123 02	President, City Hall, Fort Gibson, Okla. 74434	July 23, 1976.
Do	Tulsa	Glenpool, town of	H 400208A 01 through H 400208A 08	City Engineer, Spradling & Associates, 5157 East 51st St., Tulsa, Okla. 74135.	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Pittsburg	McAlester, city of	H 400170A 01 through H 400170A 03	Mayor, P.O. Box 578, Municipal Bldg., McAlester, Okla. 74501.	Feb. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Ottowa	Picher, city of	H 400159 01	Mayor, City Hall, P.O. Box 247, Picher, Okla. 74360	July 23, 1976.
Do	Craig	Vinita, city of	H 400050A 01	Mayor, 104 East Illinois, Drawer D, City Hall, Vinita, Okla. 74301.	May 24, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Woodward	Woodward, city of	H 400232A 01 through H 400232A 03	Mayor, City Hall, 1221 8th, Woodward, Okla. 73801	June 14, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Oregon	Umatilla	Milton-Freewater, city of	H 410210A 01 through H 410210A 02	Mayor, City Hall, Milton-Freewater, Oreg. 97862	Nov. 16, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Douglas	Myrtle Creek, city of	H 410064A 01 through H 410064A 04	Mayor, City Hall, Myrtle Creek, Oreg. 97457	Oct. 12, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Pennsylvania	Montgomery	Abington, township of	H 420695A 01 through H 420695A 04	President, Township Commission, 1176 Old York Rd., Abington, Pa. 19001.	Mar. 2, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Berks	Albany, township of	H 421046A 01 through H 421046A 11	Chairman, Rural Delivery No. 2, Kempton, Pa. 19529	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Beaver	Aliquippa, borough of	H 420101A 01 through H 420101A 04	Mayor, 300 Franklin Ave., Aliquippa, Pa. 15001	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Washington	Allenport, borough of	H 420845A 01 through H 420845A 05	mayor, Borough Bldg., Allenport, Pa. 15412	June 21, 1974.
Do	Beaver	Ambridge, borough of	H 420102A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 220, Ambridge, Pa. 15003	Feb. 22, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Franklin	Antrim, township of	H 421233A 01 through H 421233A 06	Chairman, Township Supervisors, Box 130, Greencastle, Pa. 17225.	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Beaver	Baden, borough of	H 420103A 01 through H 420103A 04	Mayor, 369 State St., Baden, Pa. 15005	Mar. 22, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Cambria	Barr, township of	H 421434A 01 through H 421434A 10	Supervisor, Township Bldg., Nicktown, Pa. 15762	Jan. 17, 1975. May 28, 1976.
Do	Berks	Bethel, township of	H 421052A 01 through H 421052A 12	Chairman, Rural Delivery 1, Bethel, Pa. 19507	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lebanon	do	H 420967A 01 through H 420967A 11	Chairman, Rural Delivery 1, Fredericksburg, Pa. 17026	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Crawford	Bloomfield, township of	H 421563A 01 through H 421563A 05	Board of Township Supervisors, Rural Delivery No. 3, Union City, Pa. 16438.	Jan. 31, 1975. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lycoming	Cascade, township of	H 421837A 01 through H 421837A 06	Chairman, Township Board, Proctor Star Route, Williamsport, Pa. 17701.	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976
Do	Allegheny	Castle Shannon, borough of	H 420020A 01	Mayor, 3600 Willow Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15234	June 28, 1974.
Do	Blair	Catherine, township of	H 420962A 01 through H 420962A 06	Chairman, Rural Delivery No. 1, Williamsburg, Pa. 16693	Jan. 23, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lancaster	Colerain, township of	H 421765A 01 through H 421765A 10	Chairman, Rural Delivery No. 1, Kirkwood, Pa. 17536	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Beaver	Conway, borough of	H 420107A 01 through H 420107A 03	Mayor, 1208 3rd Ave., Conway, Pa. 15027	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Clinton	Crawford, township of	H 421535A 01 through H 421535A 08	Chairman, Rural Delivery No. 2, Jersey Shore, Pa. 17740	Dec. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Armstrong	Dayton, borough of	H 421211A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 25, Dayton, Pa. 16222	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Monroe	Delaware Water Gap, borough of.	H 420690A 01 through H 420690A 04	Mayor, Delaware Water Gap, Pa. 18327	June 21, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Washington	Donora, borough of	H 420851A 01 through H 420851A 04	Mayor, Box 501, Donora, Pa. 15033	Jan. 23, 1974.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do.	Union	East Buffalo, township of	H 421011A 01 through H 421011A 05	Chairman, Rural Delivery No. 1, Box 610, Lewisburg, Pa. 17837.	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Chester	East Caln, township of	H 421477A 01 through H 421477A 02	Chairman, P.O. Box 232, Downingtown, Pa. 19335	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Allegheny	Edgeworth, borough of	H 420032A 01	Mayor, 301 Beaver Rd., Sewickley, Pa. 15143	Mar. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Beaver	Fallston, borough of	H 420110A 01	Mayor, 147 Beaver St., New Brighton, Pa. 15066	Feb. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Venango	Franklin, city of	H 420836B 01 through H 420836B 03	Mayor, 430 13th St., Franklin, Pa. 16323	Sept. 14, 1973. May 31, 1976.
Do.	Allegheny	Hampton, township of	H 420978A 01 through H 420978A 06	Chairman, 3101 McCully Rd., Allison Park, Pa. 15101	Mar. 15, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Susquehanna	Harford, township of	H 422081A 01 through H 422081A 03	Chairman, Rural Delivery No. 1, New Milford, Pa. 18834	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Beaver	Harmony, township of	H 421038A 01 through H 421038A 04	President of Comm., Woodland Rd., Ambridge, Pa. 15003	Mar. 22, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Montgomery	Hatboro, borough of	H 420697A 01 through H 420697A 02	Mayor, 120 East Montgomery, Hatboro, Pa. 19040	Aug. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Westmoreland	Irwin, borough of	H 420881A 01	Mayor, 424 Main St., Irwin, Pa. 15642	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Luzerne	Kingston, township of	H 420613A 01 through H 420613A 04	Chairman, 11 Carverton Rd., Trucksville, Pa. 18708	July 19, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	do	Larksville, borough of	H 420614A 01 through H 420614A 02	Mayor, Town Hall, Larksville, Pa. 18651	July 6, 1973.
Do.	Allegheny	Leet, township of	H 421075A 01	President, Commissioners, 14 Ambridge Ave., Fair Oaks, Pa. 15003.	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Clinton	Leidy, township of	H 421540A 01 through H 421540A 07	Chairman, Star Route, Revono, Pa. 17764	Dec. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Susquehanna	Little Meadows, borough of	H 420814A 01 through H 420814A 02	Mayor, Rural Delivery 1, Box 72, Little Meadows, Pa. 18830.	Nov. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Montgomery	Lower Merion, township of	H 420701A 01 through H 420701A 08	President, Commissioners, 75 East Lancaster Ave., Ardmore, Pa. 19002.	June 21, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Allegheny	McKeesport, city of	H 420051A 01 through H 420051A 05	Mayor, 201 Lysle Blvd., McKeesport, Pa. 15132	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Delaware	Middletown, township of	H 420422A 01 through H 420422A 09	Chairman, P.O. Box 157, Lima, Pa. 19060	Apr. 12, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Beaver	Monaca, borough of	H 420114A 01 through H 420114A 04	Mayor, 928 Pennsylvania Ave., Monaca, Pa. 15061	Mar. 29, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Allegheny	Monroeville, borough of	H 420054A 01 through H 420054A 07	Mayor, 2700 Monroeville Blvd., Monroeville, Pa. 15146	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Northampton	Nazareth, borough of	H 420725A 01	Mayor, 30 Belvedere, Nazareth, Pa. 18064	Jan. 9, 1974.
Do.	Cumberland	North Middleton, township of.	H 420367A 01 through H 420367A 02	Chairman, Rural Delivery 3, P.O. Box 303, Carlisle, Pa. 17013.	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Lehigh	North Whitehall, township of.	H 421813A 01 through H 421813A 03	Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Rural Delivery 1, Schnecksville, Pa. 18078.	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Allegheny	Oakmont, borough of	H 420060A 01 through H 420060A 02	Mayor, 661 7th St., Oakmont, Pa. 15139	Mar. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Montgomery	Perkiomen, township of	H 421915A 01 through H 421915A 05	Chairman, Board of Supervisors, 258 Bridge St., Schwenksville, Pa. 19473.	Oct. 25, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Franklin	Peters, township of	H 421654A 01 through H 421654A 08	Chairman, Rural Delivery 2, Mercersburg, Pa. 17236	Sept. 13, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Schuylkill	Pine Grove, township of	H 420782A 01 through H 420782A 06	Chairman, Rural Delivery 1, Pine Grove Pa. 17963	Aug. 2, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Allegheny	Richland, township of	H 421199A 01 through H 421199A 04	Chairman of Board, 4011 Dickey Rd. Gibsonia, Pa. 15044.	Aug. 2, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Beaver	Rochester, borough of	H 420116A 01	Mayor, 426 Adams St., Rochester, Pa. 15074	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Bradford	Rome, borough of	H 420174A 01	Mayor, Rural Delivery 1, Rome, Pa. 18837	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Washington	Roscoe, borough of	H 420858A 01	Mayor, Box 193, Roscoe, Pa. 15477	June 7, 1974.
Do.	Delaware	Rutledge, borough of	H 420432A 01	Mayor, 117 Linden Ave., Rutledge, Pa. 19070	July 19, 1974.
Do.	Elk	St. Marys, borough of	H 420446A 01 through H 420446A 03	Borough Manager, Municipal Bldg., St. Marys, Pa. 15857	June 14, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Somerset	Salisbury, borough of	H 420801A 01	Mayor, Borough Hall, Salisbury, Pa. 15558	July 19, 1974.
Do.	Lackawanna	Scranton, city of	H 420538A 01 through H 420538A 08	Mayor, 430 North Washington Ave., Scranton, Pa. 18503	Jan. 23, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do.	Allegheny	Sewickley, borough of	H 420070A 01	Mayor, 230 Thorn St., Sewickley, Pa. 15143	Jan. 9, 1974.
Do.	Northumberland	Shamokin, city of	H 420741A 01 through H 420741A 02	Mayor, City Hall, Shamokin, Pa. 17872	May 10, 1974.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do	Schuylkill	Shenandoah, borough of	H 420788A 01 through H 420788A 03	Mayor, 15 West Washington, Shenandoah, Pa. 17976	July 26, 1976. May 28, 1976.
Do	McKean	Smethport, borough of	H 420672A 01	Mayor, 410 Main St., Smethport, Pa. 16749	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Somerset	Somerset, borough of	H 420803A 01 through H 420803A 08	Mayor, 340 West Union St., Somerset, Pa. 15501	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Cambria	South Fork, borough of	H 420238A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 171, South Fork, Pa. 15956	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Centre	South Philipsburg, borough of.	H 420271A 01	Mayor, 228 Walnut St., P.O. Box 532, Philipsburg, Pa. 16866.	Aug. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Chester	Spring City, borough of	H 420289A 01	Mayor, Hall and Church Sts., Spring City, Pa. 19475	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Northampton	Stockertown, borough of	H 420730A 01	Mayor, Borough Bldg., Stockertown, Pa. 18083	Aug. 2, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Warren	Sugar Grove, borough of	H 420842A 01 through H 420842A 02	Mayor, Sugar Grove, Pa. 16350	May 31, 1974.
Do	Centre	Taylor, township of	H 421469A 01 through H 421469A 08	Chairman, Rural Delivery No. 1, Port Matilda, Pa. 16870	Dec. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Berks	Tilden, township of	H 421112 A 10 through H 421112A 05	Supervisor, Rural Delery 1, Hamburg, Pa. 19526	July 26, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Allegheny	Turtle Creek, borough of	H 420079A 01 through H 420079A 02	Mayor, 125 Monroeville Ave., Turtle Creek, Pa. 15145	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Bradford	Tuscarora, township of	H 421116A 01 through H 421116A 09	Chairman, Rural Delivery 1, Box 30, Laceyville, Pa. 17982	Oct. 18, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Delaware	Upper Chichester, township of.	H 420439A 01 through H 420439A 03	President of Commissioners, P.O. Box 2136, Boothwyn, Pa. 19061.	Jan. 23, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Montgomery	Upper Moreland, township of.	H 421909A 01 through H 421909A 06	President of Commissioners, 117 Park Ave., Willow Grove, Pa.	Dec. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Bucks	Upper Southampton, township of.	H 420989A 01	Chairman, Board of Supervisors, 939 St. Rd., Southampton, Pa. 18966.	Jan. 16, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Venango	Utica, borough of	H 420841A 01 through H 420841A 04	Mayor, Rural Delivery No. 1, Utica, Pa. 16362	Aug. 16, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Chester	Uwchlan, township of	H 421492A 01 through H 421492A 03	Chairman, P.O. Box 255, Lionville, Pa. 19353	Sept. 6, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Allegheny	Versailles, borough of	H 420081A 01	Mayor, 5100 Walnut St., Versailles, Pa. 15132	Mar. 29, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Westmoreland	Washington, township of	H 422196A 01 through H 422196A 06	Chairman, Township Supervisors, Rural Delivery No. 1, Appollo, Pa. 15613.	Sept. 6, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Erie	Waterford, borough of	H 420454A 01 through H 420454A 02	Mayor, Box 124, Waterford, Pa. 16441	May 10, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Tioga	Westfield, borough of	H 422093A 01 through H 422093A 02	Mayor, 364 East Main St., Westfield, Pa. 16950	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Berks	Womelsdorf, borough of	H 420157A 01	Mayor, 16 North Front, Womelsdorf, Pa. 19567	May 24, 1974.
Do	Bradford	Wyalusing, township of	H 421126A 01 through H 421126A 04	Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Rural Delivery 1, Wyalusing, Pa. 18853.	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Jefferson	Young, township of	H 421737A 01 through H 421737A 05	Chairman, Township Bldg., Delancey, Pa. 15733	Aug. 30, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Westmoreland	Youngstown, borough of	H 420907A 01	Mayor, Box 56, Youngstown, Pa. 15696	Aug. 9, 1974.
S. Carolina	Greenville	Fountain Inn, town of	H 450209 01 through H 450209 02	Mayor, P.O. Box 336, Fountain Inn, S.C. 29644	July 23, 1976.
Do	Spartanburg	Pacolet Mills, town of	H 450180A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 428, Pacolet Mills, S.C. 29273	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Sumter	Pinewood, town of	H 450183A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 236, Pinewood, S.C. 29125	June 21, 1974.
Do	Florence	Scranton, town of	H 450083A 01	Mayor, Town Hall, Scranton, S.C. 29591	May 24, 1.74. May 28, 1976.
Do	Dorchester	St. George, town of	H 450072 01	Mayor, Town Hall, St. George, S.C. 29477	July 23, 1976.
S. Dakota	Day	Waubay, city of	H 460226 01	Mayor, City Hall, Waubay, S. Dak. 57273	Do.
Texas	Parker, Tarrant, and Wise.	Briar, city of	H 480588 01 through H 480588 05	Mayor, City Hall, Briar, Tex. 76020	Do.
Do	Hunt	Celeste, city of	H 480365A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 398, City Hall, Celeste, Tex. 75423	June 21, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Morris	Daingerfield, town of	H 480493A 01	Mayor, 103 Jefferson, Daingerfield, Tex. 75638	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Williamson	Georgetown, city of	H 480668A 01 through H 480668A 08	Mayor, 9th and Main, P.O. Box 409, City Hall, Georgetown Tex. 78626.	Mar. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Burnet	Marble Falls, city of	H 480093A 01 through H 480093A 07	Mayor, City Hall, 200 Main St., P.O. Drawer F, Marble Falls, Tex. 78654.	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Collin	McKinney, city of	H 480135A 01 through H 480135A 07	Mayor, City Hall, 130 South Chestnut, McKinney, Tex. 75069.	May 24, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Franklin	Mount Vernon, town of	H 480821 01 through H 480821 02	Mayor, City Hall, P.O. Drawer 597, Mount Vernon, Tex. 75457.	July 23, 1976.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do	Gray	Pampa, city of	H 480258A 01 through H 480258A 02	Mayor, City Hall, West Foster and Russell Sts., Pampa, Tex. 79065.	May 10, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Camp	Pittsburg, city of	H 480116A 01 through H 480116A 02	Mayor, City Hall, 132 Jefferson St., Pittsburg, Tex. 75686	Jan. 23, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Edwards	Rocksprings, town of	H 481118 01 through H 481118 02	Mayor, Town Hall, Rocksprings, Tex. 78880	July 23 1976.
Do	Austin	Sealy, city of	H 480017A 01 through H 480017A 02	Mayor, City Hall, 415 Main St., Sealy, Tex. 77474	Dec. 17, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Coleman	Talpa, town of	H 480753 01 through H 480753 02	Mayor, Town Hall, Talpa, Tex. 76882	July 23, 1976.
Do	Taylor	Trent, town of	H 481130 01	Mayor, Town Hall, Trent, Tex. 79561	Do.
Vermont	Orange	Strafford, town of	H 500240A 01 through H 500240A 15	Chairman, Board of Selectmen, Town of Strafford, Strafford, Vt. 05072.	Mar. 28, 1975. May 28, 1976.
Virginia	Tazewell	Bluefield, town of	H 510161A 01 through H 510162A 06	Mayor, Box 770, Bluefield, Va. 24605	Aug. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Franklin	Boones Mill, town of	H 510062A 01	Mayor, Box 66, Boones Mill, Va. 24065	Aug. 16, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Rockingham	Bridgewater, town of	H510134 A 01 through H 510134A 02	Mayor, Box 72, Bridgewater, Va. 22812	June 28, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Botetourt	Buchanan, town of	H 510019A 01 through H 510019A 02	Mayor, Box 205, Buchanan, Va. 24066	Feb. 1, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Augusta	Craigsville, town of	H 510014A 01 through H 510014A 02	Mayor, Box 426, Craigsville, Va. 24430	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do		Emporia, city of	H 510047 01	Mayor, 211 North Main St., Emporia, Va. 23847	July 23, 1976.
Do	Frederick	Unincorporated areas	H 510063A 01 through H 510063A 29	Chairman, Board of Commissioners, 9 Ct. Sq., Winchester, Va. 22601.	Nov. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Giles	Glen Lyn, town of	H 510289 01	Mayor, Glen Lyn, Va. 24093	July 23, 1976.
Do	Rockbridge	Goshen, town of	H 510217A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 32, Goshen Va. 24439	Sept. 6, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Accomack	Hallwood, town of	H 510218A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 204, Hallwood, Va. 23359	Aug. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Page	Shenandoah, town of	H 510248A 01	Mayor, Town Office, Shenandoah, Va. 22849	Nov. 1, 1974.
Do	Accomack	Wachapreague, town of	H 510005A 01	Mayor, Town Hall, Wachapreague, Va. 23888	Aug. 30, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Washington	Franklin	Pasco, city of	H 530046 01 through H 530046 04	Acting Director, Community Development, P.O. Box 293, Pasco, Wash. 99301.	July 23, 1976.
Do	Snohomish	Snohomish, city of	H 530171A 01 through H 530171A 02	Mayor, City Hall, 1009 1st St., Snohomish, Wash. 98290	Mar. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.
West Virginia	Marion	Fairmont, city of	H 540099 01 through H 540099 03	Mayor, P.O. Box 1428, Fairmont, W. Va. 26554	July 23, 1976.
Do	Wayne	Fort Gay, town of	H 540202A 01	Mayor, Town Hall, Fort Gay, W. Va. 52214	Sept. 13, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	do	Kenova, city of	H 540221A 01 tarough H 540221A 03	Mayor, P.O. Box 268, Kenova, W. Va. 25530	May 3, 1974.
Do	McDowell	Northfork, town of	H 540121A 01	Mayor, Northfork, W. Va. 24868	May 24, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Jackson	Ripley, city of	H 540064A 01 through H 540064A 03	Mayor, City Hall, Ripley, W. Va. 25271	May 17, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Marion	Rivesville, town of	H 540105A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 45, Rivesville, W. Va. 26588	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Wisconsin	Waupaca	Big Falls, village of	H 550493A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Big Falls, Wis. 54926	Aug. 30, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Grant	Bloomington, village of	H 550146A 01	Mayor, Box 441, Bloomington, Wis. 53804	June 28, 1974.
Do	Shawano	Bowler, village	H 550415A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Bowler, Wis. 54416	Nov. 30, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Rusk	Bruce, village of	H 550370A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Bruce, Wis. 54819	May 24, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Barron	Cameron, village of	H 550011A 01	Village President, Box Q, Cameron, Wis. 54822	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Manitowoc	Cleveland, village of	H 550237A 01 through H 550237A 03	Village President, Village Hall, Cleveland, Wis. 53015	June 7, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Marinette	Coleman, village of	H 550260A 01	Village President, Coleman, Wis. 54112	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Sawyer	Couderay, village of	H 550408A 01	Village President, Box 76, Couderay, Wis. 54828	Aug. 23, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lafayette	Darlington, city of	H 550228A 01	Clerk, 135 East Ann St., Darlington, Wis. 53530	Oct. 26, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Dodge	Iron Ridge, village of	H 550100 01	Village President, P.O. Box 142, Iron Ridge, Wis. 53035	July 23, 1976.
Do	Grant	Livingston, village of	H 550151A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Livingston, Wis. 53554	May 17, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Waupaca	Manawa, city of	H 550198A 01	Mayor, 820 Depot St., Manawa, Wis. 54949	Nov. 30, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Dane	Marshall, village of	H 550084A 01	Village President, P.O. Box 45, Marshall, Wis. 53559	Dec. 17, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Monroe	Melvina, village of	H 550288A 01	Village President, Route No. 1, Cashton, Wis. 54619	Aug. 30, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Winnebago	Menasha, city of	H 550510A 01 through H 550510A 03	Clerk, P.O. Box 350, Menasha, Wis. 54502	Nov. 16, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Jackson	Merrillan, village of	H 550189A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Merrillan, Wis. 54754	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Green	Monroe, city of	H 550162A 01 through H 550162A 02	City Clerk, P.O. Box 200, Monroe, Wis. 53566	May 31, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Marquette	Montello, city of	H 550266A 01	Mayor, 20 Underwood Ave., Montello, Wis. 53949	Dec. 28, 1973.
Do	Iron	Montreal, city of	H 550184A 01	Mayor, City Hall, Montreal, Wis. 54550	May 10, 1974.

State	County	Location	Map No.	Local map repository	Effective date of identification of areas which have special flood hazard
Do	Waukesha	Mukwonago, village of	H 550485A 01 through H 550485A 02	Village President, P.O. Box 96, Mukwonago, Wis. 53149	Dec. 17, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Juneau	Necedah, village of	H 550205A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Necedah, Wis. 54646	Jan. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Clark	Neillsville, city of	H 550053A 01	Clerk, 118 West 5th St., Neillsville, Wis. 54456	Jan. 16, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Marquette	Neshkoro, village of	H 550267A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Neshkoro, Wis. 54960	Aug. 26, 1974.
Do	St. Croix	New Richmond, city of	H 550384A 01 through H 550384A 02	City Attorney, 156 East 1st St., New Richmond, Wis. 54017.	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Fond Du Lac	North Fond Du Lac, village of.	H 550138A 01	Clerk, 16 Garfield St., North Fond Du Lac, Wis. 54935	Jan. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Oconto	Oconto Falls, city of	H 550298A 01	Mayor, P.O. Box 7D, Oconto Falls, Wis. 54154	Jan. 9, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Waupaca	Ogdensburg, village of	H 550500A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Ogdensburg, Wis. 54967	Aug. 23, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	La Crosse	Onalaska, city of	H 550221A 01 through H 550221A 02	City Clerk, 415 Main St., Onalaska, Wis. 54650	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Vernon	Ontario, village of	H 550457A 01	Village President, Box 22, Ontario, Wis. 54651	Jan. 9, 1974.
Do	Marquette	Oxford, village of	H 550268A 01	Village Clerk, Village Hall, Oxford, Wis. 53952	Sept. 6, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Wood	Pittsville, city of	H 550517A 01	City Clerk, Municipal Bldg., Pittsville, Wis. 54466	Dec. 17, 1973.
Do	Grant	Platteville, city of	H 550154A 01	City Manager, Box 252, Platteville, Wis. 53818	July 19, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	do	Potosi, village of	H 550155A 01 through H 550155A 02	Village President, Box 45, Potosi, Wis. 53820	Dec. 28, 1973.
Do	Columbia	Poynette, village of	H 550064A 01	Village President, 305 Main St., Poynette, Wis. 53955	May 3, 1974.
Do	Sauk	Prairie Du Sac, village of	H 550401A 01	Village President, 560 Park Ave., Prairie Du Sac, Wis. 53578.	Dec. 7, 1973.
Do	Barron	Prairie Farm, village of	H 550015A 01	Village President, Box 45, Prairie Farm, Wis. 54762	Do.
Do	Price	Prentice, village of	H 550346A 01	Village President, Box 262, Prentice, Wis. 54556	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Brown	Pulaski, village of	H 550024A 01	Village President, P.O. Box 310, Pulaski, Wis. 54162	May 24, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Waushara	Redgranite, village of	H 550508A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Redgranite, Wis. 54970	May 17, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Sauk	Reedsburg, city of	H 550402A 01 through H 550402A 02	Mayor, 134 South Locust St., Reedsburg, Wis. 53959	Dec. 17, 1973.
Do	Taylor	Rib Lake, village of	H 550436A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Rib Lake, Wis. 54470	May 24, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Iowa	Ridgeway, village of	H 550181A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Ridgeway, Wis. 53582	Sept. 20, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Fond Du Lac	Ripon, city of	H 550140A 01 through H 550140A 02	Mayor, 100 Jackson St., Ripon, Wis. 54971	May 24, 1974.
Do	Milwaukee	River Hills, village of	H 550280A 01 through H 550280A 02	Village President, 7650 North Pheasant Lane, Milwaukee Wis. 53217.	Dec. 17, 1973. May 28 1976.
Do	Rusk	Sheldon, village of	H 550376A 01	Village President, Box 45, Sheldon, Wis. 54766	Aug. 2, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	Lafayette	Shullsburg, city of	H 550230A 01	Mayor, City Offices, Shullsburg, Wis. 53586	May 17, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	do	South Wayne, village of	H 550231A 01	Village President, 101 South Varuim, South Wayne, Wis. 53587.	Dec. 7, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Washburn	Spooner, city of	H 550470A 01	Mayor, City Hall 322-26 Walnut St., Spooner, Wis. 54801	Dec. 21, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Chippewa	Stanley, city of	H 550047A 01	Mayor, 116 3rd Ave., Stanley, Wis. 54768	May 3, 1974. May 28, 1976.
Do	St. Croix	Star Prairie, village of	H 550387A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Star Prairie, Wis. 54026	Dec. 28, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Taylor	Stetsonville, village of	H 550437A 01	Village President, Village Hall, Stetsonville, Wis. 54480	May 17, 1974.
Do	Dane	Stoughton, city of	H 550091A 01	Mayor, City Hall, P.O. Box 247, Stoughton, Wis. 53589	Dec. 17, 1973. May 28, 1976.
Do	Waukesha	Waukesha, city of	H 550491A 01 through H 550491A 07	Mayor, 201 Delafield St., Waukesha, Wis. 53186	Feb. 8, 1974. May 28, 1976.

(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 28, 1976.

HOWARD B. CLARK,
Acting Federal Insurance Administrator.

[FR Doc.76-16415 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

Title 28—Judicial Administration

CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[Tax Division Directive No. 27]

PART 0—ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Appendix to Subpart Y—Redelegation of Authority To Compromise, Settle, and Close Claims

By virtue of the authority vested in me by Part 0 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, particularly §§ 0.70, 0.160, 0.162, 0.164, 0.166, and 0.168, it is ordered as follows:

SEC. 1. The Chiefs of the Civil Trial Sections, the Court of Claims Section, and the Appellate Section are authorized to reject offers in compromise, regardless of amount, without reference to the Review Section, provided that such action is not opposed by the agency or agencies involved.

SEC. 2. Subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in Section 6 hereof, the Chiefs of the Civil Trial Sections and Court of Claims Section are authorized to accept offers in compromise in all cases in which the amount of the Government's concession, exclusive of statutory interest, does not exceed $35,000, provided that such action is not opposed by the agency or agencies involved.

SEC. 3. Subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in Section 6 hereof, the Chief of the Review Section shall have authority to—

(A) Accept offers in compromise in all cases in which the amount of the Gov-

ernment's concession, exclusive of statutory interest does not exceed $75,000;

(B) Approve administrative settlements not exceeding $75,000;

(C) Approve concessions (other than by compromise) of civil claims asserted by the Government in all cases in which the gross amount of the original claim does not exceed $75,000, and

(D) Reject offers in compromise, or disapprove administrative settlements or concessions, regardless of amounts,

provided that the action is not opposed by the agency or agencies involved or the chief of the section to which the case is assigned.

SEC. 4. Subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in Section 6 hereof, the Director, Civil Litigation, shall have authority to—

(A) Accept offers in compromise in all cases in which the amount of the Government's concession, exclusive of statutory interest, does not exceed $250,000,

(B) Approve administrative settlements not exceeding $250,000,

(C) Approve concessions (other than by compromise) of civil claims asserted by the Government in all cases in which the gross amount of the original claim does not exceed $250,000, and

(D) Reject offers in compromise, or disapprove administrative settlements or concessions, regardless of amount,

provided that the action is not opposed by the agency or agencies involved, the Chief of the Review Section, or the chief of the section to which the case is assigned, and provided further that the limiting amount in (A), (B), and (C) shall be $100,000 if the case is subject to reference to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

SEC. 5. Subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in Section 6 hereof, the Deputy Assistant Attorneys General each shall have authority to—

(A) Accept offers in compromise in all cases in which the amount of the Government's concession, exclusive of statutory interest, does not exceed $250,000,

(B) Approve administrative settlements not exceeding $250,000,

(C) Approve concessions (other than by compromise) of civil claims asserted by the Government in all cases in which the gross amount of the original claim does not exceed $250,000, and

(D) Reject offers in compromise, or disapprove administrative settlements or concessions, regardless of amount,

provided that the limiting amount of (A), (B), and (C) shall be $100,000, if the proposed disposition of the claim is opposed by the agency or agencies involved or if the case is subject to reference to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

SEC. 6. The authority redelegated herein shall be subject to the following conditions and limitations:

(A) When, for any reason, the compromise or administrative settlement or concession of a particular claim, as a practical matter, will control or adversely influence the disposition of other claims totaling more than the respective amounts designated in Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5, the case shall be forwarded for review at the appropriate level.

(B) When, because of the importance of a question of law or policy presented, the position taken by the agency or agencies or by the United States Attorney involved, or any other considerations, the person otherwise authorized herein to take final action is of the opinion that the proposed disposition should be reviewed at a higher level, he shall forward the case for such review.

(C) Nothing in this Directive shall be construed as altering any provision of Subpart Y of Part O of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations requiring the submission of certain cases to the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, or the Solicitor General.

(D) Authority to approve recommendations that the Government confess error, or make administrative settlements, in cases on appeal, is excepted from the foregoing redelegations.

(E) The Assistant Attorney General, at any time, may withdraw any authority delegated by this Directive as it relates to any particular case or category of cases, or to any part thereof.

SEC. 7. This Directive supersedes Tax Division Directive No. 19, approved November 27, 1973.

SEC. 8. This Directive shall become effective June 9, 1976.

SCOTT P. CRAMPTON,
Assistant Attorney General.

Approved:
H. R. TYLER, Jr.,
Deputy Attorney General.

MAY 31, 1976.

[FR Doc.76-16716 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

Title 30—Mineral Resources

CHAPTER I—MINING ENFORCEMENT AND SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PART 75—MANDATORY SAFETY STANDARDS—UNDERGROUND COAL MINES

Extension of Time Periods for Installation of Canopies or Cabs on Self-Propelled Electric Face Equipment for Mining Heights of Less Than 30 Inches

In accordance with the provisions of section 317(j) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 and pursuant to the authority under section 101 of the Act, there was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER for October 3, 1972 (37 FR 20689) mandatory safety standards contained in 30 CFR 75.1710-1 pertaining to the installation of canopies or cabs on self-propelled electric face equipment. These mandatory standards were made effective on January 1, 1973. Time periods for operators to design and install substantially constructed canopies or cabs based upon the mining height of the particular mine were prescribed in §§ 75.1710-1(a)(1) through 75.1710-1(a)(6) as follows:

(1) On and after January 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 72 inches or more;

(2) On and after July 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 60 inches or more, but less than 72 inches;

(3) On and after January 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 48 inches or more, but less than 60 inches;

(4) On and after July 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 36 inches or more, but less than 48 inches;

(5) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 36 inches, and

(6) On and after July 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of less than 24 inches.

As required by section 101(g) of the Act, the Secretary of the Interior made findings of fact which were also published on October 3, 1972. The need for canopies or cabs was reflected in findings of fact numbers (1) and (2):

(1) Roof falls have been the prime cause of fatalities in underground bituminous coal mines, having accounted for an average of over 50 percent of such fatalities.

(2) Fatalities to operators of self-propelled electric face equipment due to falls of roof, face, and rib will be significantly reduced by the installation and use of substantially constructed canopies or cabs on such equipment. Equipment-operator fatalities caused by operators being pinned, squeezed, or crushed against the roof, rib, or other equipment will also be significantly reduced by the installation and use of substantially constructed canopies or cabs on self-propelled electric face equipment.

Analysis of accident data performed by MESA shows that since January 1, 1973 fatalities and injuries to operators of self-propelled electric face equipment, while actually at the operating controls of such equipment, due to falls of roof, face, and rib have decreased. Although the standards have not been in effect long enough to develop definitive conclusions as to their relationship to this decrease, MESA is aware of 60 instances where equipment operators have been saved from death or serious injury because a canopy or cab protected them from falls of roof, face, and rib.

In addition to finding that there was a need for canopies and cabs it was also recognized that human engineering problems remained in mining heights less than 72 inches and that these problems might affect the timetables for canopy or cab installation. Finding of fact number (6) stated:

(6) Although practical technology is available to design and construct a substantial canopy or cab for installation on self-propelled electric-face equipment of sufficient strength to protect the equipment operator from a nonmassive roof fall, it has been shown that in mining heights less than 72 inches, additional research and study is necessary to solve human engineering problems such as reduction of visibility and cramping of the equipment operator. Such research and study is currently being undertaken on behalf of the Bureau of Mines and results will be available in calendar year 1973. Depending upon the results of such research and study, as well as experience gained in the course of enforcement of the

Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 and other pertinent statutes, the timetables, based on mining heights, for the installation of canopies or cabs on self-propelled electric-face equipment, contained in § 75.1710–1(a) (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6), may be shortened or lengthened. (emphasis added)

Since October 3, 1972, considerable research and study has been performed by the Bureau of Mines, MESA, operators and manufacturers. The results of these efforts, as well as experience gained in the course of MESA enforcement, indicate that practical technology is available to design and construct a substantial canopy or cab for all mining heights.

However, in lower mining heights, particularly those below 30 inches, certain human engineering problems have not been fully solved. While these problems vary depending upon the particular mining equipment, they include impaired operator vision, and operator cramping and fatigue. Because of these unsolved engineering problems the Secretary has determined that certain dates should be extended on and after which coal mines having specific mining heights must install canopies or cabs. This action is considered necessary in order to permit development of additional technology on canopy or cab design, in conjunction with accomplishing equipment design changes to adapt canopies or cabs.

In view of the above circumstances, it is determined that good cause exists for omitting the rulemaking procedure. Therefore, §75.1710–1 is amended as set forth below, effective June 9, 1976.

§ 75.1710–1 [Amended]

1. Paragraph (a) (5) is revised to read as follows:

(a) * * *

(5) (i) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 30 inches or more, but less than 36 inches,

(ii) On and after July 1, 1977, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 30 inches, and * * *

2. In paragraph (a) (6), the date reading "July 1, 1976" is changed to read "July 1, 1978".

(Secs. 101(a), 317(j) Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, as amended, Pub. L. 91–173, 83 Stat. 745, 789, 30 U.S.C. 811(a), 877(j))

Dated: June 3, 1976.

RAYMOND A. PECK, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

[FR Doc.76–16636 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

Title 40—Protection of Environment

CHAPTER I—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 557–7]

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Idaho SO_2 Control Strategy

The purpose of this rulemaking is to (1) disapprove Regulation R of the "Rules and Regulations for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho;" (2) promulgate substitute regulations which will provide for the control of SO_2 at The J. R. Simplot Company facility near Pocatello, Idaho; (3) approve a State-issued Consent Order for the control of SO_2 at the Beker Industries facility at Conda, Idaho; (4) revoke the federally promulgated compliance schedule for sulfuric acid plants located in the State of Idaho; and (5) extend the attainment date for meeting national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards for sulfur oxides (sulfur dioxide) in the Eastern Idaho Intrastate Air Quality Control Region to July 31, 1976. The preamble which follows contains the background for these actions, a summary of public comments, the Administrator's findings and a description of the promulgated regulations.

BACKGROUND

The Eastern Idaho Intrastate Air Quality Control Region (AQCR) is classified Priority IA for sulfur oxides (SO_x) due to emissions from the production of sulfuric acid by The J. R. Simplot Company's Minerals and Chemical Division located near Pocatello, Idaho. On May 31, 1972 (37 FR 10842), under Section 110 of the Clean Air Act, the Administrator approved, with specific exceptions, the State of Idaho Air Quality Implementation Plan (SIP) for the attainment and maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Specifically, the Administrator disapproved the SO_x control strategy and compliance schedule sections of the Idaho SIP for the Eastern Idaho Intrastate AQCR because the Plan did not contain a regulation for the attainment and maintenance of the SO_x NAAQS in the Eastern Idaho Intrastate AQCR. Subsequently, on October 24, 1972, the State of Idaho adopted Regulation R, "Regulation for Control of Sulfur Oxides Emissions from Sulfuric Acid Plants," as the basis for an SO_x control strategy for the Eastern Idaho Intrastate AQCR. Regulation R restricts SO_x emissions to 28 pounds per ton of 100 percent sulfuric acid produced. The two existing facilities subject to the regulation were The J. R. Simplot Company and the Beker Industries facility.

The Administrator, in the May 14, 1973 FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 12702), approved Regulation R as the SO_x control strategy for the Eastern Idaho Intrastate AQCR. In the August 23, 1973 FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 22735), EPA promulgated a compliance schedule for the two sources subject to Regulation R. On September 21, 1973 Simplot filed a Petition for Review of EPA's approval of Regulation R and promulgation of the compliance schedule. Simplot's Petition was, in large part, based on the contention that Regulation R was more restrictive than necessary for the attainment and maintenance of the SO_x NAAQS.

Soon after, on October 24, 1973, the Idaho Board of Environmental and Community Services (now the Board of Health and Welfare) adopted a Consent Order for Beker Industries which replaces Regulation R as the regulation applicable to the facility. The Consent Order establishes SO_2 and particulate emissions from the facility, in addition to requiring performance tests and continuous monitoring. Reports on the tests and continuous monitoring are submitted to the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare on a regular basis. The Consent Order was submitted for EPA's approval as a SIP revision on July 28, 1975. The Order was proposed and public comment invited in the November 6, 1975 FEDERAL REGISTER (40 FR 51655). No comments were received during the 30-day public comment period ending December 8, 1975.

In the meantime, from October 1973 through May 1974, EPA gathered and analysed relevant information pertaining to the technical merit of The J. R. Simplot Company's Petition for Review. During this review, EPA worked closely with the State of Idaho and The J. R. Simplot Company.

On May 29, 1974 The J. R. Simplot Company proposed to EPA a method of SO_x emission control based on a revised sulfuric acid plant configuration. The J. R. Simplot Company requested an EPA technical review and approval of their approach. The May 29 Simplot proposal was evaluated in detail using the results of diffusion modeling in conjunction with analysis of measured ambient SO_2 concentrations. On July 22, 1974 EPA transmitted to Simplot its final report, "Analysis of Technical Contentions Contained in The J. R. Simplot Company Petition for Review." Briefly, the report concludes that Regulation R is inadequate to provide for attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. Further, the report concludes that Simplot's proposal was inadequate in that a more restrictive (1700 lbs/hr) emission limit would be required for the #300 acid plant.

On September 16, 1974, under the authority of section 110(c) of the Clean Air Act, EPA officially advised the State of Idaho that Regulation R was inadequate to provide for attainment and maintenance of SO_2 NAAQS. The State was given 60 days to revise their SIP.

On October 22, 1974 the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare indicated that due to their heavy involvement with other issues and the pending nature of the Simplot Petition for Review, EPA should proceed with the matter of promulgating the required emission control and compliance schedule for Simplot. Therefore, in the August 20, 1975 FEDERAL REGISTER (40 FR 36385), EPA proposed: (1) disapproval of Regulation R; (2) a substitute emission limiting regulation to apply to The J. R. Simplot Company facility; (3) rescission of the compliance schedule for sulfuric acid plants, 40 CFR 52.677(d), as it applies to Simplot and (4) extension of the attainment date for primary and secondary SO_x NAAQS in the Eastern Idaho Intrastate AQCR to March 31, 1976.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A public hearing on the proposed federal regulation for The J. R. Simplot

Company was held in Pocatello, Idaho on September 25, 1975. The proposed EPA regulation and EPA's proposal to disapprove Regulation R elicited limited public comment. The testimonies and submittals to the public hearing record are summarized as follows:

Four individuals presented testimony on behalf of The J. R. Simplot Company. The first representative related the measures taken by Simplot to date to comply with the SO_x NAAQS, including the currently ongoing installation of an ammonia liquor scrubber which will serve both #100 and #200 sulfuric acid plants. Simplot also stated that they believe that limiting emissions of SO_2 from the #300 sulfuric acid plant to 1700 pounds per hour, as EPA proposed, will reduce effective plant capacity by at least 50 tons of sulfuric acid production per day, thereby potentially decreasing the amount of diammonium phosphate fertilizer produced.

A second representative presented a summary of a study recently prepared for the Company predicting the impact of Simplot's future operations on NAAQS. The study concludes that Simplot could operate the #300 acid plant at an effluent rate of 2190 pounds of SO_2 per hour and the #100 and #200 plants at 200 pounds per hour (equivalent to 2 kg per metric ton or 4 pounds per ton of sulfuric acid produced) without violating the SO_2 NAAQS. A summary of the technical background for the proposal was presented including methods used in the calculations and a summary of the findings.

Simplot also objected to several requirements of the proposed regulation relating to monitoring of emissions because the requirements are inconsistent with the regulations for new sulfuric acid plants as promulgated or, in some cases, proposed by EPA in 40 CFR Part 60, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources.

The last representative for the Simplot Company related additional measures the Company is prepared to take should EPA determine that the proposed emission rate of 2190 pounds of SO_2 per hour for #300 plant is not adequate to assure attainment and maintenance of NAAQS. These measures include (1) placing a meteorological station south of the Simplot facility to continuously monitor relevant weather conditions, (2) installing a system to continuously deliver data from the meteorological station to a control room in the plant, and (3) reducing to predetermined levels the production rates under certain weather and operating conditions to assure that no violations of the SO_x NAAQS will occur.

Simplot also requested that the date for final compliance with the emission limitations be changed to July 31, 1976, rather than the proposed date of March 31, 1976, because the installation of the ammonia liquor scrubber for the #100 and #200 acid plants cannot be completed until that date. Simplot provided written evidence indicating that the delay is due to a delay of delivery of equipment and material.

In addition, six representatives of the public presented testimony at the hearing. In general, their testimony related concern about the problem of SO_2 in the Pocatello area and support for stringent regulations to control emissions from the Simplot facility. Three letters were entered into the record at the hearing which also supported stringent regulations to control SO_2.

During the three week period that the public hearing record remained open to accept comments, two more letters were received from representatives of the general public who testified at the hearing reiterating statements made in support of stringent controls on Simplot.

In response to a question asked by EPA at the hearing, Simplot submitted information relating to a review of the #300 acid plant by a third consultant. This consultant made a number of recommendations to Simplot regarding the operation of the plant to improve its performance. In general, the consultant concluded that by changing some of the operating procedures currently utilized, the plant should be able to meet an SO_2 emissions rate even lower than the 1700 pounds per hour proposed by EPA. This is in agreement with testimony given at the hearing by an EPA technical advisor who indicated that a rate of 1280 pounds SO_2 per hour has been achieved by other similar sulfuric acid plants. Simplot responded that although essentially all of the consultant's recommendations have been completed, the emissions rate achieved by the #300 plant is higher than that projected by the consultant. The #300 acid plant is currently achieving a rate of approximately 2190 pounds SO_2 per hour.

Findings

In the period since the public hearing, the Administrator has carefully reviewed and evaluated all testimony and other submitted materials relating to the proposed federal regulation for the J. R. Simplot Company. The Administrator, the State of Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, and the Simplot Company have agreed that Regulation R is inadequate to prevent violations of the SO_2 NAAQS in the Eastern Idaho Intrastate AQCR. In addition, it is agreed that the proposed SO_2 emission rate of 2 kg per metric ton (4 pounds per ton) of sulfuric acid produced for the combined #100 and #200 sulfuric acid plant can be regarded as the maximum achievable technology and will assure that the #100 and #200 plants alone will not cause a violation of the SO_2 NAAQS.

In regard to Simplot's request that the date for final compliance with the emission limitations be extended to July 31, 1976, the Administrator finds that the delay is beyond the control of Simplot, and since the Company is making a good faith effort to complete installation of the scrubber, the Administrator is granting the request. The Administrator is also extending the attainment date for meeting SO_2 NAAQS in the Eastern Idaho Intrastate AQCR to July 31, 1976. In addition, because of the length of time that has passed prior to the promulgation of these regulations, the Administrator is allowing Simplot until September 30, 1976 to meet the requirements for the installation of the continuous emission and ambient monitoring equipment.

The only remaining principal area of disagreement between EPA and Simplot is the SO_2 emissions rate from the #300 sulfuric acid plant. Both EPA and Simplot submitted detailed technical documents to the record outlining a basis for determining the appropriate SO_2 emissions rate from the #300 plant. Simplot contends that a rate of 2190 pounds SO_2 per hour will assure that no violations of the SO_2 NAAQS will occur. EPA has calculated that a rate of 1700 pounds SO_2 per hour is necessary to assure that no violations occur. Each proposal is based on analytical diffusion techniques and, to a large extent, considers the same data. The Administrator has carefully reviewed and evaluated both documents and has found that some technical weaknesses can be found in each due to the insufficient data upon which both are based. The Administrator has therefore concluded that it would be futile to attempt to do further analysis on the proper emission rate at this time in view of: (1) the lack of adequate technical background data, and (2) the changes that have been made recently in the plant's configuration. The Administrator has determined that the more appropriate action is to base the emissions rate on an analysis of actual measured ambient air quality, meteorological and emissions data.

Therefore, the Administrator is today promulgating an emissions limitation of 2190 pounds of SO_2 per hour for the #300 sulfuric acid plant. Also, in order to determine whether a more restrictive emission limit is required, the Administrator is requiring that Simplot install and operate an expanded ambient monitoring network until such time as the Administrator declares that an adequate data base has been generated which shall be no earlier than at least one year. Within 90 days of the Administrator's declaration of an adequate data base, Simplot will submit for EPA's review a technical analysis indicating the degree of permanent emissions control required on the #300 acid plant to ensure attainment and maintenance of NAAQS.

Regulations

The Administrator is today disapproving Regulation R because it does not ensure the attainment and maintenance of NAAQS for SO_2.

The Administrator is also approving the Consent Order issued by the Idaho Board of Health and Welfare on October 24, 1973, as the applicable regulation for the Beker Industries Corporation, located at Conda, Idaho. The Consent Order has been reviewed by EPA and found to meet the requirements of 40 CFR Part 51. Any future changes to the Order made by the State must be submitted to EPA as an Implementation Plan revision in accordance with 40 CFR 51.6.

The Administrator is promulgating a regulation applicable to The J. R. Simplot Company as follows:

1. The combined SO_2 emissions from the designated #100 and #200 sulfuric acid plants shall not exceed 2 kg per metric ton (4 pounds per ton) of 100 percent sulfuric acid produced.

2. The SO_2 emissions from the designated #300 sulfuric acid plant shall not exceed 994 kg (2190 pounds) per hour.

3. Simplot must utilize best engineering techniques in the operation of their plant to prevent fugitive SO_2 losses.

4. The #100 and #200 sulfuric acid plants, which share a common stack, and the #300 sulfuric acid plant, are subject to performance testing and continuous emission monitoring requirements.

The regulation establishes certain SO_2 emission limitations which the facility must meet by July 31, 1976. The regulation also establishes test methods and procedures to be followed in determining compliance with the promulgated emission limitations.

5. Simplot is required to install, operate and report data from an expanded ambient air monitoring network of sufficient size to fully assess the impact of SO_2 emissions on ambient air quality in the principal downwind directions from the plant. Such a network shall consist of a minimum of four ambient SO_2 monitoring instruments and one meterological station capable of monitoring wind speed and wind direction. All site locations shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator. Simplot shall certify to EPA that the data generated from these instruments is accurate to the manufacturer's suggested specification.

The Administrator is also today extending the attainment date for the SO_2 NAAQS in the Eastern Idaho Intrastate AQCR to July 31, 1976.

Should the State of Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, following promulgation of the regulations for The J. R. Simplot Company, adopt and submit regulations equivalent to the regulations promulgated below, the Administrator will make an appropriate modification to his determination regarding the approvability of the affected portion of the State's Implementation Plan and will rescind these regulations.

The record of EPA's disapproval of Regulation R, and the record of public comment on the proposed federal regulations are available for review at the following locations:

Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Statehouse, Boise, Idaho 83720.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region X, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.

Environmental Protection Agency, Public Information Reference Unit, Room 2922 (EPA Library), 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20460.

The regulations promulgated herein are effective July 9, 1976.

This Notice of Final Rulemaking is issued under the authority of Section 110 (a) and 110(c) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857c-5(a) and 1857c-5(c)).

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JOHN QUARLES,
Acting Administrator.

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

Subpart N—Idaho

1. In § 52.670, paragraph (c) is amended by adding subparagraph (15) as follows:

§ 52.670 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) The plan revisions listed below were submitted on the dates specified.

* * * * *

(15) Consent Order for Beker Industries submitted on July 28, 1975 by the Governor.

2. Section 52.672 is amended by adding paragraph (c) as follows:

§ 52.672 Extensions.

* * * * *

(c) The Administrator hereby extends to July 31, 1976, the attainment date for the primary and secondary standards for sulfur oxides in the Eastern Idaho Intrastate Air Quality Control Region.

3. Section 52.675 is added as follows:

§ 52.675 Control Strategy: Sulfur oxides—Eastern Idaho Intrastate Air Quality Control Region.

(a) Regulation R of the Rules and Regulations for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho, which is part of the sulfur dioxide (SO_2) control strategy, is disapproved since it is inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of § 51.13. These requirements are not met by Regulation R in that the SO_2 control strategy contained therein is not adequate for the attainment and maintenance of SO_2 national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).

(b) *Regulation for control of sulfur dioxide (SO_2) emissions: Sulfuric Acid Plants.*

(1) The provisions of this paragraph shall apply to the owner(s) and operator(s) of The J.R. Simplot Company's Minerals and Chemical Division, located in Power County, Idaho, in the Eastern Idaho Intrastate Air Quality Control Region.

(2) The owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company facility shall utilize best engineering techniques in the operation of their plant to prevent fugitive SO losses. Such techniques shall include but are not limited to:

(i) Operating and maintaining all conducts, flues, and stacks in a leakfree condition.

(ii) Operating and maintaining all process equipment and gas collection systems in such a fashion that leakage of SO_2 gases will be prevented to the maximum extent possible.

(3) The owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company facility shall limit SO_2 emissions from their sulfuric acid plants per the following:

(i) The combined SO_2 emissions from the designated #100 and #200 sulfuric acid plants shall not exceed 2 kilograms (kg) per metric ton (4 pounds per ton) of 100 percent sulfuric acid produced.

(ii) The SO_2 emissions from the designated #300 sulfuric acid plant and stack shall not exceed 994 kg per hour (2190 pounds per hour).

(4) (i) The owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company shall achieve compliance with the requirements specified in paragraphs (b) (2) and (b) (3) of this section in accordance with the following schedule:

(A) Advise EPA as to status of contract(s) and construction schedules for pollution abatement projects within 30 days of the effective date of this regulation.

(B) Attain final compliance by July 31, 1976.

(ii) A performance test of the #300 acid plant shall be necessary to determine whether compliance has been achieved with the requirements of paragraph (b) (3) of this section. Such test must be completed within 15 days of the final compliance date specified in paragraph (b) (4) (i) of this section. Notice must be given to the Administrator at least 10 days prior to such a test to afford him an opportunity to have an observer present.

(iii) Within 60 days after achieving the maximum production rate at which the #100 and #200 acid plant will be operated, but not later than 180 days after initial start-up of these plants and at such other times as may be required by the Administrator under Section 114 of the Clean Air Act, the owner(s) and operator(s) of the facility shall conduct performance test(s) in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 60.8.

(iv) If the owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company facility are presently in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (b) (2) and (b) (3) of this section or in compliance with a portion of these requirements, such compliance shall be certified to the Administrator within 15 days following the date of the publication of these requirements as a final regulation in the FEDERAL REGISTER. If the owner(s) or operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company achieve compliance prior to July 31, 1976, such compliance shall be certified to the Administrator within 15 days of the date of achieving compliance. The Administrator may request whatever supporting information he considers necessary to determine the validity of the certification.

(5) (i) By no later than September 30, 1976, the owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company facility shall install, calibrate, maintain and operate measurement system(s) for:

(A) Continuously monitoring and recording SO_2 concentration rates in each sulfuric acid plant discharge stack per the requirements of 40 CFR 60.13 and 60.84.

(B) Continuously monitoring and recording gas volumetric flow rates in the exhaust stack of the designated #300 sulfuric acid plant.

(ii) By no later than October 30, 1976, and at such other times following that date as the Administrator may specify, the SO_2 concentration measurement system(s) and stack gas volumetric flow rate system(s) installed and used pursuant to this paragraph shall be demonstrated to meet the measurement system performance specifications prescribed in 40 CFR 60.13 and Appendix E to this part, respectively. The Administrator shall be notified at least 10 days prior to the start of this field test period to afford the Administrator the opportunity to have an observer present.

(iii) The sampling point for monitoring the concentration of SO_2 emissions shall be in the duct at the centroid of the cross section of the discharge stack if the cross sectional area is less than 4.65 m^2 (50 ft^2) or at a point no closer to the wall than 0.91 m (3 ft) if the cross sectional area is 4.65 m^2 (50 ft^2) or more. The monitor sample point shall be representative of the average concentration in the duct.

(iv) The measurement system(s) shall be maintained, operated and calibrated in accordance with the methods prescribed by the manufacturers. Records of maintenance and/or calibration shall be kept and submitted to the Administrator upon request. These records shall clearly show instrument readings before and after such calibration and/or maintenance.

(v) The owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company facility shall maintain a daily record of three hour average emission rate measurements for each sulfuric acid plant. Three hour average emission rates shall be calculated for each day beginning at midnight. For the #100 and #200 acid plants, the calculations shall be in conformance with 40 CFR 60.84. For the #300 acid plant, average SO_2 emission rates expressed in kg SO_2 per hour shall be calculated. The results of these calculations for each month shall be submitted to the Administrator within 15 days following the end of each month. Such submission shall identify each period of excess emissions that occurred and the nature and cause of any malfunction (if known), the corrective action taken or preventative measures adopted. The records of such measurements including strip charts and other appropriate raw data shall be retained for a minimum of two years following the date of such measurements.

(vi) The continuous monitoring and recordkeeping requirements of paragraph (b)(5) of this section shall become applicable September 30, 1976.

(6)(i) Compliance with the requirements set forth in paragraph (b)(3) of this section shall be determined using the emission rates measured by the continuous measurement system(s) installed, calibrated, maintained and operated in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (b)(5) of this section.

(ii) At the Administrator's discretion, compliance may also be determined using the manual source test methods per 40 CFR 60.85 and Appendix A to Part 60 of this Title. Emission rates for each stack shall be expressed in units consistent with those in paragraph (b)(3) of this section.

(iii) A violation of the requirements of paragraph (b)(3) of this section shall occur whenever the SO_2 emission rates determined according to paragraph (b)(6)(i) or (b)(6)(ii) of this section exceed the corresponding SO_2 emission rates specified in paragraph (b)(3) of this section.

(7) The owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company facility shall by September 30, 1976, install, calibrate, maintain and operate a network for continuously monitoring ground level ambient SO_2 concentrations and wind speed and direction.

(i) The monitoring network shall consist of at least four ambient SO_2 monitoring stations and one meteorological station placed at locations approved by the Administrator.

(ii) The SO_2 monitoring network shall be consistent with automated equivalent methods for measurement of ambient concentrations of SO_2 as defined in Part 53 of this chapter.

(iii) The monitoring network installed and used pursuant to this subparagraph shall be maintained, operated and calibrated in accordance with the methods prescribed by the manufacturers. Records of maintenance and/or calibration shall be kept and submitted to the Administrator upon request. These records shall clearly show instrument readings before and after such calibration and/or maintenance.

(iv) The owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company facility shall maintain a daily record of all measurements required by this subparagraph. Strip charts and other raw data from the monitoring network shall be retained for a minimum of two years following the date of such measurement.

(v) The owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company shall calculate hourly average ambient SO_2 concentrations, wind speed, and wind direction from each monitoring station and submit such values to the Administrator within 15 days following the end of each month.

(vi) The continuous monitoring and recordkeeping requirements of paragraph (b)(7) of this section shall become applicable September 30, 1976 and shall remain applicable until such time as the Administrator declares that an adequate ambient air data base has been established, which shall be no earlier than at least one calendar year.

(vii) Within 90 days of the Administrator's declaration of an adequate data base, Simplot shall submit to the Administrator a technical analysis of the degree of permanent control required on the #300 acid plant to ensure attainment and maintenance of NAAQS.

(8) Nothing in paragraph (b) of this section shall be construed to relieve the owner(s) and operator(s) of The J. R. Simplot Company to comply with any applicable requirements of Part 60 of this Title. In the event of conflicting requirements or interpretations between Part 60 of this Title and this paragraph, the more restrictive interpretation or requirement shall apply.

(9) In the event that measurement systems cannot be installed and operational by the date specified in this section, The J. R. Simplot Company shall propose the earliest possible date by which such requirements can be met. Such proposal shall include adequate justification and supporting documentation.

§ 52.677 [Amended]

4. Section 52.677 is amended by revoking paragraph (d)(3) and (d)(4) as follows:

* * * * *

(d) *Federal compliance schedules.*

* * * * *

(3) [Reserved]

(4) [Reserved]

§ 52.680 [Amended]

5. In § 52.680, the letter "a" indicating the date for attainment of the national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards for sulfur oxides in the Eastern Idaho Intrastate Air Quality Control Region is amended to read "*f*", and footnote "*f*" is added beneath the table to read as follows:

* * * * *

f: July 31, 1976.

[FR Doc.76-16746 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

Title 41—Public Contracts and Property Management

CHAPTER 101—FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

[FPMR Amendment E-188]

PART 101-32—GOVERNMENT-WIDE AUTOMATED DATA MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Validation of Cobol Compilers; Substitute to Standard Terminology

FPMR Amendment E-174 (40 FR 53012), requiring the validation of COBOL compilers, was published on November 14, 1975. FPMR Amendment E-174 requires that all COBOL compilers brought into the Federal inventory must be validated to determine their conformance with Federal Information Processing Standard Publication (FIPS PUB) 21-1, Federal Standard COBOL.

Vendors are unable to comply with certain requirements of the new regulation because their development of compilers based on FIPS PUB 21-1 is in various stages of completion. FIPS PUB 21-1 provides for an interim period (December 1, 1975 to June 1, 1977) to allow vendors to make the transition from the FIPS PUB 21 standard.

This regulation provides a substitute paragraph with special terminology for solicitation documents that will be used by agencies during this transition period.

Subpart 101–32.13—Implementation of Federal Information Processing Standards Publications (FIPS PUBS) Into Solicitation Documents

The following note is added after paragraph (h) of § 101–32.1305–1a.

§ 101–32.1305–1a Validation of COBOL compilers.

* * * * *

NOTE.—The following paragraph shall be used to replace paragraph (h) of this section during the interim period of implementation of Federal Standard COBOL (December 1, 1975 to June 1, 1977). The language below is applicable to FIPS PUB 21–1 only. Provisions of § 101–32.1305–1a fully apply to compilers that are based on FIPS PUB 21, offered as a substitute for FIPS PUB 21–1 compilers during the interim period as prescribed in paragraph 11.2 of FIPS PUB 21–1.

VALIDATION OF COBOL COMPILERS

(FIPS PUB 21–1, substitute for paragraph (h))

In addition to the specified mandatory COBAL compiler requirements stated in the specification portion of this solicitation, all COBOL compilers brought into the Federal inventory as a result of this solicitation, which have not been tested, must be tested using the official COBOL Compiler Validation System (CCVS). Validation shall be in accordance with Federal Property Management Regulation (FPMR) 101–32.1305–1a. The results of the validation shall be used to confirm that the compiler meets the specified requirements of the designated level of FIPS PUB 21–1 Federal Standard COBOL. To be considered responsive the vendor shall:

i. Certify in the proposal that all COBOL compilers offered in response to this solicitation based upon FIPS PUB 21–1 shall be submitted for validation as set forth in FPMR 101–32.1305–1a no later than June 1, 1977.

ii. Agree to correct all deviations from the standard reflected in the Validation Summary Report (VSR) not previously covered by a waiver. Corrections shall be made within 12 months of receipt of the VSR by the contractor or June 1, 1978, whichever is later unless a shorter period is specified elsewhere in this solicitation. If an interpretation of the standard is required that will invoke the procedures set forth in FIPS PUB 29, such requests for interpretation will be made within 30 calendar days after receipt of the VSR by the contractor.

Any corrections that are required as a result of decisions made under the procedures of FIPS PUB 29 will be completed within 12 months of the date of formal notification of the interpretation to the contractor. Failure to make required corrections within the time provisions set forth above shall be deemed a failure to deliver required software. The liquidated damages as specified for failure to deliver either operating systems or other software shall apply. In addition, such failure falls within the purview of the default clause. If the required corrections are not made within the time provisions specified above, subsequent proposals submitted to the Government offering the deficient COBOL compilers or subsequent uncorrected versions thereto shall be considered non-responsive.

(Sec. 205(c), 63 Stat. 390; 40 U.S.C. 486(c))

Effective date: This regulation is effective June 9, 1976.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JACK ECKERD,
Administrator of General Services.

[FR Doc.76–16703 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

Title 50—Wildlife and Fisheries

CHAPTER I—UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PART 33—SPORT FISHING

Sport Fishing on Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge, Minnesota

On May 13, 1976, there was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 19783) a notice of proposed rulemaking adding Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge, Minnesota to the list of refuge areas which are open for sport fishing. This is published at 50 CFR 33.4.

Pursuant to the authority of 16 U.S.C. § 668dd(d), as redelegated to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service at D.M. 242.1.1, the Director has determined that allowing sport fishing on Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge would not be contrary to the provisions of law applicable to the area, would be in the public interest, and that such activity is not detrimental to the objectives for which the area was established.

The public was provided an abbreviated comment period and was advised that an environmental assessment had been prepared on the proposal and was available for public inspection. No comments were received on the proposed rulemaking.

Based on the preceding and an evaluation of the environmental assessment, it has been determined that sport fishing on the Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge is not a major federal action which would significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C)). The preparation of an environmental impact statement on the proposed action is, therefore, not required.

Because of the time limitations involved in coordinating State and Federal fishing regulations, with the State-wide season already open, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has concluded that "good cause" exists within the meaning of section 553(d)(3) of the Administrative Procedures Act to expedite the implementation of this rulemaking. Therefore, this rulemaking will become effective June 9, 1976.

Accordingly, the proposed rulemaking is hereby adopted without change and 33.4 amended as set forth below:

§ 33.4 List of open areas; sport fishing.

* * * * *

MINNESOTA

Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge

* * * * *

Dated: June 4, 1976.

JAMES W. PULLIAM, Jr.,
Acting Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc.76–16648 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

PART 33—SPORT FISHING

Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge, Minnesota

The following special regulation is issued and is effective on June 9, 1976.

§ 33.5 Special Regulation; sport fishing; for individual wildlife refuge areas.

MINNESOTA

BIG STONE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Sport fishing on the Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge, Ortonville, Minnesota, is permitted on areas as described under special conditions below, and as delineated on maps available at refuge headquarters and from the Office of the Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Building, Fort Snelling, Twin Cities, Minnesota 55111. Sport fishing shall be in accordance with all applicable State regulations subject to the following special conditions:

(1) Sport fishing is permitted from May 15 to September 30 only.

(2) The Minnesota and Yellow Bank Rivers are open to fishing during daylight hours only for their entire lengths through the refuge.

(3) Canoes (no motors) are allowed only on the Minnesota River channel canoe trail.

(4) Boats, canoes or other floating devices will not be permitted in the pool areas or open marshes. All fishing in these areas shall be from the shoreline only.

(5) Vehicles are restricted to public roads and parking areas. The provisions of this special regulation supplement the regulations which govern fishing on wildlife refuge areas generally which are set forth in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 33, and are effective through December 31, 1976.

JACK E. HEMPHILL,
Regional Director.

MAY 24, 1976.

[FR Doc.76–16647 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

CHAPTER II—NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE, NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PART 216—REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE TAKING AND IMPORTING OF MARINE MAMMALS

On May 28, 1976, the National Marine Fisheries Service published a notice in

the Federal Register, 41 FR 21782, which implemented an Order issued by Federal District Court Judge Charles R. Richey in the cases of *Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc.* v. *Elliot L. Richardson, et al.* (C.A. No. 74–1465, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia) and *Fund for Animals, et al.* v. *Elliot L. Richardson, et al.* (C.A. No. 75–0227, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia).

Generally, the purpose of the notice of May 28, 1976, was to implement Judge Richey's Order by (a) informing the appropriate general permit and certificate holders of the status of their general permit and certificates of inclusion as of May 31, 1976, (the effective date of the Judge's Order) and (b) amending the regulations in Part 216 of Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to conform to the Court's Order. On May 28, 1976, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit stayed Judge Richey's Order until 5:00 P.M. June 1, 1976. On June 1, 1976, the stay was extended until further ordered by the Court.

Accordingly, the purpose of this notice is to implement the Court of Appeals' Order Staying Judge Richey's Order by (a) informing the American Tunaboat Association that the general permit issued to it on December 20, 1975, for Category 2, encircling gear, yellowfin tuna purse seining and holders of certificates of inclusion issued under this permit that the general permit and the certificates of inclusion are valid until December 31, 1976, unless otherwise ordered by the Court of Appeals and (b) rescinding that portion of the notice of May 28, 1976, which amended Part 216 of the Code of Federal Regulations Title 50.

Further, certificate holders are advised that National Marine Fisheries Service scientific observers and gear technicians are to continue activities in accordance with prior plans aboard their vessels until further notice. Log sheets required by 50 CFR 216.24(d)(2)(i)(B)(iii) will continue to be maintained.

These changes are effective immediately.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

ROBERT W. SCHONING,
Director, National Marine Fisheries Service.

§ 216.24 [Amended]

Accordingly, so much of the rulemaking as set forth in the notice of May 28, 1976, which amended Part 216 by revoking paragraphs (b)(1)(ii), (c)(6)(i)(B), (c)(6)(ii)(B), (d)(2) and (f) is rescinded. In addition, the amendment to § 216.24e)(3)(v) is also rescinded. The provisions of § 216.24, in effect on January 1, 1976, are in effect until amended by this agency or otherwise modified by order of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

[FR Doc.76–16717 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

proposed rules

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of the Attorney General

[28 CFR Part 16]

[Order No. 652–76]

THE PRIVACY ACT

Proposed Exemption of a Criminal Division System of Records

The Department of Justice proposes to issue regulations exempting a system of records maintained by the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice from provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), for the reasons set forth in the proposed exemption notice.

Persons wishing to comment on the proposed exemption may address their comments in writing to the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530. All comments must be received by July 9, 1976.

Dated: June 3, 1976.

EDWARD H. LEVI,
Attorney General.

The Department of Justice proposes to issue regulations exempting a system of records maintained by the Criminal Division known as JUSTICE/CRM–024, Freedom of Information/Privacy Act Records, from the provisions of subsections (c) (3) and (4), (d), (e), (1), (2) and (3), (e), (4) (G), (H), and (I), (e) (5) and (8), (f) and (g) of 5 U.S.C. 552a. The principal function of the Criminal Division pertains to the enforcement of criminal laws. The purpose of these exemptions is to maintain the confidentiality and security of information compiled for purposes of criminal investigation or civil or regulatory law enforcement or reports compiled at any stage of the process of enforcement of the criminal laws, to maintain the confidentiality and security of the identity of witnesses, informants, and others protected in witness security programs, and to maintain the confidentiality and security of information that is specifically authorized to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or foreign policy. Some records contained in this system of records may not be subject to exemptions. A determination will be made as to the exemption of a specific record at the time a request for notification or access is made.

Written comments on the proposed exemptions should be clearly labeled "Privacy Act Exemption Comments" and sent to:

Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, 10th & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530.

All comments must be received no later than July 9, 1976. No oral hearings are contemplated.

By virtue of the authority vested in me by 5 U.S.C. 552a (j) and (k), and as Attorney General of the United States, § 16.91 of Subpart E of Part 16 of Chapter I of Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended by adding the following new paragraphs (s) and (t):

§ 16.91 Exemption of Criminal Division Systems—Limited access, as indicated.

* * * * *

(s) The following system of records is exempted pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2) from subsections (c) (3) and (4), (d), (e) (1), (2) and (3), (e)(4) (G), (H) and (I), (e) (5) and (8), (f), and (g) of 5 U.S.C. 552a; in addition, the following system of records is exempted pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a (k)(1) and (k)(2) from subsections (c)(3), (d), (e)(1), (e)(4) (G), (H) and (I), and (f) of 5 U.S.C. 552a:

Freedom of Information/Privacy Act Records (JUSTICE/CRM–024).

These exemptions apply only to the extent that the records contained in this system have been obtained from other systems of records maintained by the Criminal Division for which exemptions from one or more of the foregoing provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974 have been promulgated. The exemption claimed for this system of records applies only to records obtained from such other Criminal Division systems and only to the same extent as the records contained in such other systems have been exempted.

(t) The system of records listed under paragraph (s) of this section is exempted for the following reasons:

(1) In the course of processing requests for records pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) or for access or correction of records pursuant to the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a), it is frequently necessary to search for records in systems of records for which exemptions have been claimed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a (j) or (k). When records are located in said systems, it is frequently necessary to prepare copies for the purpose of consulting with agency personnel or with other agencies, either with regard to determining whether or to what extent the records should be disclosed, or access provided, or correction made or denied, or for review in the event of administrative appeal or judicial review.

(2) If records otherwise exempt pursuant to published rules should lose their exempt character when taken from such exempt systems for the purpose of compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act in reviewing such records and making determination with regard to disclosure, access, and the Department of Justice in claiming correction, the purpose of the Privacy Act in providing such exemptions, and of such exemptions would be defeated and nullified. The proper, efficient, and timely processing of citizens' requests pursuant to said Acts would be hindered and impeded.

[FR Doc.76–16651 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[43 CFR Parts 3520 and 9230]

Amendments

MINERAL LEASING REGULATIONS

This proposed rulemaking would amend three sections of 43 CFR Parts 3520 and 9230 to clearly state that leasable minerals cannot be mined in commercial quantities prior to the issuance of a lease for that purpose.

43 CFR 3510.1–2, in describing the rights conferred under a prospecting permits, states that only such material may be removed from the land as is necessary for experimental work or the demonstration of quantity. Two sections of Part 3520 and one section of Part 9230 now imply that right to remove materials in commercial quantities before a lease has been issued. The Solicitor has determined that there is no authority to permit commercial mining under a prospecting permit or prior to the issuance of a lease. The following proposed amendments clarify the regulations by making Part 3520 consistent with Part 3510 and with the Solicitor's interpretation of the statute.

1. Section 3520.2–2 is changed to eliminate the implication that the removal of commercial quantities of material is allowed prior to the issuance of a lease.

2. Section 3521.4–1 is restated to make mining activity on a permit area, after the prospecting permit has expired and a lease application rejected, an act of trespass.

3. Section 9239.5–3(b) is changed to make mining without a lease an act of trespass.

In summary, the proposed amendments clarify the reguations and make them consistent with the Solicitor's interpretation of the statute. The clarification will help the Agency in managing other resources associated with the mineral resources and protect the rights and privileges of resource users.

In accordance with the Department's policy on public participation in rulemaking (36 Fed. Reg. 8336), interested parties may submit written comments, suggestions, or objections with respect to the proposed rules to the Director (210), Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C. on or before July 9, 1976.

It is hereby determined that the publication of this proposed rulemaking is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quaity of the human environment and that no detailed statement pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) is required.

Copies of comments, suggestions, or objections made pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in the Division of Legislation and Regulatory Management (Room 5554), Interior Building, Washington, D.C., during regular business hours (7:45 a.m.–4:15 p.m.).

These amendments are proposed under the authority of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 181–287) and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351–359).

It is proposed to amend 43 CFR Parts 3520 and 9230 as follows:

1. Section 3520.2–2(a) is revised to read as follows:

§ 3520.2–2 Dating of Leases.

(a) Leases will be dated the first day of the month following the date signed by the lessor, except that upon receipt of a prior written request, a lease may be dated the first day of the month in which it is signed.

* * * * *

2. Section 3521.4–1 is revised to read as follows:

§ 3521.4–1 Preference right lease.

Mining operations carried on prior to the effective date of a lease shall constitute an act of trespass.

3. Section 9239.5–3(b) is amended to read as follows:

§ 9239.5–3 Coal.

* * * * *

(b) *Coal mined when there is no lease in effect.* Any mining of coal which is not pursuant to a coal lease in effect at the time of the mining shall constitute a trespass, and the coal so mined must be paid for on a trespass basis.

CHRIS FARRAND,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

JUNE 2, 1976.

[FR Doc.76–16706 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

[7 CFR Part 916]

NECTARINES GROWN IN CALIFORNIA

Proposed Handling Regulation

This notice invites written comment relative to a proposed amendment that would continue Nectarine Regulation 7 (§ 916.349; 41 FR 20545) through May 31, 1977. Said regulation will expire on July 21, 1976, unless extended. The regulation prescribes that shipments of California nectarines grade U.S. No. 1 except that (1) a slightly smaller area of the surface of each fruit may be affected by fairly light colored, fairly smooth scars, and (2) an additional tolerance is provided for individual fruit not well formed but not badly misshapen. The regulation also prescribes minimum sizes for 45 named varieties. The proposed extension of the effective period of Nectarine Regulation 7 is designed to maintain orderly marketing conditions and provide consumers with an ample supply of acceptable-quality fruit. Fresh shipments of California nectarines are expected to total 9,957,000 packages in 1976 compared to actual shipment of 9,595,000 packages last season. The proposed amendment is consistent with the quality and size composition of the estimated crop of California nectarines.

The proposed amendment was submitted by the Nectarine Administrative Committee, established pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 916, as amended (7 CFR Part 916), which regulates the handling of nectarines grown in California. This is a regulatory program effective under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674).

All persons who desire to submit written data, views, or arguments for consideration in connection with Nectarine Regulation 7, as published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on May 19, 1976 (41 FR 20545), or the proposed amendment published herein shall file the same, in quadruplicate, with the Hearing Clerk, United States Department of Agriculture, Room 112, Administration Building, Washington, D.C. 20250 not later than June 30, 1976.

The proposal is to amend § 916.349 by changing the date from "July 20, 1976" to "May 31, 1977" where it appears in § 916.349(a) preceding subparagraph (1). As amended said § 916.349 would read as follows:

§ 916.349 Nectarine regulation 7.

(a) During the period June 1, 1976, through May 31, 1977, no handler shall handle:

* * * * *

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

Dated: June 3, 1976.

CHARLES R. BRADER,
Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc.76–16643 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Federal Insurance Administration

[24 CFR Part 1917]

[Docket No. FI–2017]

APPEALS FROM FLOOD ELEVATION DETERMINATION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

Proposed Flood Elevation Determination for the City of Farmers Branch, Dallas County, Texas

The Federal Insurance Administrator, in accordance with Section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (Pub. L. 93–234), 87 Stat. 980, which added Section 1363 to the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (Title XIII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, Pub. L. 90–448), 42 U.S.C. 4001–4128, and 24 CFR Part 1917 (§ 1917.4(a)) hereby gives notice of his proposed determinations of flood elevations for the City of Farmers Branch, Dallas County, Texas.

Under these Acts, the Administrator, to whom the Secretary has delegated the statutory authority, must develop criteria for flood plain management in identified flood hazard areas. In order to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program, the City must adopt flood plain management measures that are consistent with the flood elevations determined by the Secretary.

Proposed flood elevations (100-year flood) are listed below for selected locations. Maps and other information showing the detailed outlines of the flood-prone areas and the proposed flood elevations are available for review at the Department of Public Works, City Hall, 13000 William Dodson Parkway, Farmers Branch.

Any person having knowledge, information, or wishing to make a comment on these determinations should immediately notify George G. Grimmer, Mayor, P.O. Box 34435, Farmers Branch, Texas 75234. The period for comment will be ninety days following the second publication of this notice in a newspaper of local circulation in the above-named community.

The proposed 100-year Flood Elevations are:

Source of flooding	Location	Elevation in feet above mean sea level	Width in feet from bank of stream to 100-yr flood boundary facing downstream	
			Left	Right
Elm Fork of the Trinity River.	South corporate limit (Royal Lane)	430	2,500	(1)
	Farmers Branch Creek confluence	431	600	(1)
	Keenan Bridge Rd	434	3,250	(1)
	Valley View Lane	435	3,470	(1)
Cooks Branch	West corporate limit	435	810	(1)
	Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific RR	444	50	90
	Interstate Highway 35E	455	1,150	300
	Denton Rd	461	550	380
	Missouri-Kansas-Texas RR	461	610	470
	Bee St	463	170	300
	Valwood Parkway	478	220	200
	Josey Lane	479	340	250
	Hollandale Lane	493	90	40
	North corporate limit	505	120	20
Farmers Branch	Luna Rd	432	65	5,060
	Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific RR	442	110	150
	Denton Rd	462	(1)	120
	Missouri-Kansas-Texas RR	463	(1)	170
	Ford Rd	467	440	160
	Josey Lane	482	165	210
	Veronica Rd	491	210	125
	Webb Chapel Rd	501	250	190
	Lost Valley Lane	509	25	200
	Valley View Lane	520	780	190
	Marsh Lane	544	450	260
	North corporate limit	522	320	320
	West corporate limit	561	75	120
	North corporate limit	576	35	200
Rawhide Creek	Missouri-Kansas-Texas RR	562	50	10
	Demetra Dr. (extended)	466	260	280
	Dixiana St. (extended)	471	75	125
	Valley View Lane	475	65	180
	Tom Field Rd	481	210	150
	Josey Lane	488	85	200
	Longmeade Dr	500	150	230
	Webb Chapel Rd	505	75	530
	Brookhaven Club Dr	518	375	285
	Pebble Beach Dr	537	220	450
	Garden Brook Dr	552	85	395
	West corporate limits (Marsh Lane)	567	180	260

(1) Outside corporate limits.

(National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (Title XIII of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968), effective January 28, 1969 (33 FR 17804, November 28, 1968), as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4001–4128; and Secretary's delegation of authority to Federal Insurance Administrator 34 FR 2680, February 27, 1969, as amended by 39 FR 2787, January 24, 1974.)

Issued: May 24, 1976.

J. ROBERT HUNTER,
Acting Federal
Insurance Administrator.

[FR Doc.76-16754 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[40 CFR Part 52]

[FRL 557-3]

STATE OF DELAWARE

Proposed Revision to Delaware State Implementation Plan

On September 3, 1975, the State of Delaware submitted to EPA Region III amendments to section V of eac!. portion of the Delaware State Implementation Plan for the attainment and maintenance of ambient air quality standards. The State requested that the modified section V be incorporated as a supplement to the Federally-approved Delaware State Implementation Plan.

The amendments consist of a revised section V—*Surveillance*, for both the State of Delaware and the New Castle County SIP for attainment and maintenance of standards for pa. 'culate matter and sulfur dioxide. The changes to section V consist of the following:

1. *General Narrative.*—The modifications listed below have been made:

a. Changes are included to eliminate the requirement to monitor nitrogen dioxide. Monitoring of this pollutant is no longer required in the New Castle County portion of the Metropolitan Philadelphia Interstate AQCR, because this county has been redesignated Priority III (38 FR 16346).

The State has indicated that nitrogen oxides are still being monitored at sites P–1 and P–2, to provide an on-going assessment of its concentration level. The narrative also specifies that carbon monoxide and photochemical oxidants are being monitored at sites P–1 and P–2.

b. A description of a special sampling program for special air pollutants and odors has been added.

c. Changes are included to reflect availability of manually processed data for hourly periods only, rather than for both 15 minute and one hour periods.

2. *Tables and Figures.*—The following modifications listed below have been made:

Table V–1.—The Jacobs-Hochheiser Method for nitrogen dioxide, as well as footnotes c and d, has been deleted.

Table V–2.—This table replaces former Table V–3; former Table V–2 has been deleted.

Table V–3.—Former Tables V–4 and V–5 have been combined and restructured so that the sampling frequency parameter is a function of the air pollutant.

Table V–4.—Former Tables V–6 and V–7 have been combined. Changes made as of January 1, 1973 are reflected.

Table V–5.—This table replaces former Table V–9, and has been restructured in format similar to Table V–3.

Figures V–1 and V–2 are amended to indicate changes in the location of monitoring sites.

3. *Changes to Monitoring Systems.*

a. *Deletion of Narrative.*

The narrative describing proposed additions to the state's monitoring network has been deleted. The amendments being considered for EPA approval incorporate the updated changes to the network.

b. *Primary System.*

i. The types of data listed below are still being generated, but either by using different reference methods or by monitoring only at specific sites:

(a) *Carbon Monoxide.*—The same monitoring technique applies, but this information is being generated only at stations P–1 and P–2.

(b) *Photochemical Oxidents.*—The same monitoring technique applies, but this information is being generated only at Stations P–1 and P–2.

(c) *Nitrogen Oxides.*—Information is being generated only at stations P–1 and P–2.

(d) *Soiling Index.*—Coefficient of Haze Units have replaced reference units and are being monitored at station P–2 only.

ii. Data Reduction.—The 15 minute and 6 hour averages have been deleted; one hour averages are now being reduced manually, and running 24 hour and annual averages are now being generated through computer processing.

iii. Changes in monitoring site.—Monitor P–2 has been relocated in downtown Wilmington and monitor P–1 has been moved to the Woods Haven-Kruse in Claymont.

c. *Secondary System.*

i. The following types of data are still being generated but are either using different reference methods or being monitored only at specific sites:

(a) *Soiling Index.*—the Coefficient of Haze Units, RAC, Continuous (stand-by basis) is replacing the A.I.S.I. Tape Sampler.

(b) *Sulfur Dioxide*—The conductivity method, ½ hour averages is being replaced with the West-Gaeke method (continuous) at all New Castle County Stations. In addition, the bubbler method is being used at stations S–11 and S–12.

ii. The following monitoring sites have been added:

S–11 City Police Station, Dover.

S–12 City Water Tower, Seaford.

S–13 Danneker School, Milford, (Stand-by basis).

iii. The following monitoring sites have been changed in status to standby basis:

S–4 Lombardy School, Faulk Road.

S–6 Ferris School, Centre Road.

S–7 Delaware SPCA, Greater Wilmington Airport.

S–10 County Route 413, East of Mt. Pleasant.

d. *Teritary System.* — (Telephone Poles)—The entire system has been deleted.

e. *Mobile Unit System.*—A mobile unit system has been added.

f. *Federal System.*—The following monitoring sites have been deleted or relocated:

i. P–1, Silverside School, Claymont (deleted)

ii. P–2 Downtown Wilmington (relocated)

All four primary stations and the seven remaining secondary stations located throughout the State will continue full operation. The State has determined that the lack of resources prevents adequate data handling and analysis, and that reallocation of the availble resources to the remining stations would improve the overall efficiency of the network. The State has also indicated that once a fully automatic telemetry network is installed in the four primary stations and additional resources become available, the standby stations will resume operations.

The revised system meets population, instrumentation and emergency episode requirements as well as collection reporting techniques as specified by the Administrator (36 FR 8186 and 38 FR 20832.

This notice is to announce receipt of the amendments to section V of the Delaware and New Castle County portion of the State Implementation Plan, and to request public comment.

All comments received on or before July 9, 1976 will be accepted. The Administrator's decision to approve or disapprove these amendments as a revision to the Federally approved Delaware SIP will be based on whether the amendments meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2) of the Clean Air Act and 40 CFR Part 51, requirements for preparation, adoption and submittal of Implementation Plans.

Copies of the amended regulations are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, Curtis Building, Second Floor, Sixth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106, Attn: Mr. Glenn Hanson.

Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control, Tatnall Building, Lackerman Street and Legislative Avenue, Dover Delaware 19901, Attn: Mr. Robert French.

Public Information Reference Unit, Room 2922, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

All comments should be addressed to:

Mr. Howard Heim, Chief, Air Programs Branch, Division of Air and Hazardous Materials, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, Curtis Building, Sixth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106, Attn: AHOO4DE.

(42 USC 1857–5)

Dated: May 28, 1976.

A. R. MORRIS,
Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc.76–16743 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[47 CFR Part 73]

[Docket No. 20830; RM–2630]

OOLOGAH, OKLAHOMA

Proposed Amendment of FM Table of Assignments

By the Chief, Broadcast Bureau:

In the Matter of Amendment of § 73.-202(b), Table of Assignments, FM Broadcast Stations, Oologah, Oklahoma.

1. *Petitioner, Proposal, and Comments:* (a) Notice of Proposed Rule Making is given concerning amendment of the FM Table of Assignments (Section 73.202(b) of the Commission's Rules and Regulations) as concerns Oologah, Oklahoma.

(b) A "Petition for Rule Making"[1] was filed on behalf of William L. Wright seeking the assignment of Channel 291 as a first FM assignment to Oologah. The petitioner has also submitted a supplemental engineering report.

2. *Community Data:* (a) *Location:* Oologah is located approximately 30 miles north of Tulsa, Oklahoma, and 120 miles southeast of Wichita, Kansas.

(b) *Population:* Oologah—458; Rodgers County—28,425.[2]

(c) *Local Broadcast Service:* None.

(d) *Economy:* Little information is provided with regard to the economy of Oologah or its ability to support a broadcast facility.

3. *Preclusion Studies:* The preclusion studies supplied by the petitioner indicate that seven communities with populations greater than 1,000 are located in the areas of preclusion created by the proposed assignment. Petitioner should submit showings as to whether or not alternate channels are available for assignment to these communities.

4. *Additional Considerations:* (a) The petitioner's Roanoke Rapids showings indicate that a station operating as proposed[3] would provide a first FM service to 4,271 persons in an area of 175 square miles and a second FM service to 31,204 persons in an area of 1,015 square miles. It would also provide a second aural service to 6,570 persons in an area of 205 square miles. Further, a staff engineering analysis confirms, as Wright alleged, that Channel 291 is the only FM Channel that can be assigned to Oologah without making other changes in the FM Table of Assignments. This factor plus the knowledge that a significant first and second FM service would be provided by such an assignment persuade us that the assignment should be proposed despite the fact that, in the usual instance, we would not assign a Class C channel to a community the size of Oologah.

[1] Public Notice of the filing of the petition was issued on January 14, 1976 (Rpt. No. 960).

[2] 1970 U.S. Census.

[3] Wright proposes a station on Channel 291 at 400 feet HAAT with an effective radiated power output of 100 kW.

5. *Proposed Amendment to the FM Table of Assignments:* (a) Accordingly for the purpose of eliciting comments on whether or not such an action would benefit the public interest, the Commission proposes to amend the FM Table of Assignments (Section 73.202(b) of the Commission Rules and Regulations) with regard to the community of Oologah, Oklahoma, as follows:

City	Channel No.	
	Present	Proposed
Oologah, Okla.		291

6. *Authority:* The Commission's authority to institute rule making proceedings, showings required, cut-off procedures, and filing requirements are contained in the attached Appendix and are incorporated by reference herein.

7. *Comments and Replies:* Interested parties may file comments on or before July 12, 1976, and reply comments on or before August 2, 1976.

Adopted: May 27, 1976.

Released: June 3, 1976.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
WALLACE E. JOHNSON,
Chief, Broadcast Bureau.

APPENDIX

1. Pursuant to authority found in Sections 4(1), 5(d)(1), 303 (g) and (r), and 307(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Section 0.281(b)(6) of the Commission's Rules, it is proposed to amend the FM Table of Assignments, Section 73.202 (b) of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, as set forth in the Notice of Proposed Rule Making to which this Appendix is attached.

2. *Showings required.* Comments are invited on the proposal(s) discussed in the Notice of Proposed Rule Making to which this Appendix is attached. Proponent(s) will be expected to answer whatever questions are presented in initial comments. The proponent of a proposed assignment is also expected to file comments even if it only resubmits or incorporates by reference its former pleadings. It should also restate its present intention to apply for the channel if it is assigned, and, if authorized, to build the station promptly. Failure to file may lead to denial of the request.

3. *Cut-off procedures.* The following procedures will govern the consideration of filings in this proceeding.

(a) Counterproposals advanced in this proceeding itself will be considered, if advanced in initial comments, so that parties may comment on them in reply comments. They will not be considered if advanced in reply comments. (See § 1.420(d) of Commission Rules.)

(b) With respet to petitions for rule making which conflict with the proposal(s) in this Notice, they will be considered as comments in the proceeding, and Public Notice to this effect will be given as long as they are filed before the date for filing initial comments herein. If filed later than that, they will not be considered in connection with the decision in this docket.

4. *Comments and reply comments; service.* Pursuant to applicable procedures set out in Sections 1.415 and 1.420 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, interested parties may file comments and reply comments on or before the dates set forth in the Notice of

Proposed Rule Making to which this Appendix is attached. All submissions by parties to this proceeding or persons acting on behalf of such parties must be made in written comments, reply comments, or other appropriate pleadings. Comments shall be served on the petitioner by the person filing the comments. Reply comments shall be served on the person(s) who filed comments to which the reply is directed. Such comments and reply comments shall be accompanied by a certificate of service. (See § 1.420 (a), (b) and (c) of the Commision Rules.)

5. *Number of copies.* In accordance with the provisions of Section 1.420 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, an original and four copies of all comments, reply comments, pleadings, briefs, or other documents shall be furnished the Commission.

6. *Public inspection of filings.* All filings made in this proceeding will be available for examination by interested parties during regular business hours in the Commission's Public Reference Room at its headquarters, 1919 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

[FR Doc.76-16640 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[47 CFR Parts 76 and 78]

[Docket No. 20621; RM-2499]

LIMITATION ON ALIEN OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF CABLE TELEVISION SYSTEMS

Report and Order; Proceeding Terminated

In the Matter of: Amendment of Parts 76 and 78 of the Commission Rules to Adopt General Citizenship Requirements for Operation of Cable Television Systems and for Grant of Station Licenses in the Cable Television Relay Service.

By the Commisison: Commissioner Washburn concurring and issuing a statement.

1. On October 15, 1975, the Commission released its Notice of Proposed Rule-r aking in Docket 20621, FCC 75-1141, 56 FCC 2d 159 (1975), in which it proposed to add a new § 76.503 to its rules restricting alien ownership of cable television systems. In addition to comments on the proposed citizenship restrictions, the Notice requested comments as to the need for similar restrictions in the Cable Television Relay Service and as to the advisability of requiring divestiture of existing foreign interests in cable television. Comments have been received from domestic and alien owners of cable television systems, trade associations, two public interest groups and a State public utilities agency.

2. The proposed new rule is designed to limit alien ownership and control of cable television systems. If adopted it would prohibit aliens, foreign governments and "foreign" corporations from owning or operating a cable system. Corporations controlled by "foreign" corporations also would be excluded where the "Commission finds that such ownership or control would not be consistent with the public interest." [1] The proposal is similar to section 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. Sect. 310), which imposes citizenship restrictions on ownership and control of certain Commission broadcast licensees.[2]

3. Federal citizenship restrictions in the field of communications were first imposed in 1912 when Congress acted to limit the issuance of radio licenses so,

That such license shall be issued only to citizens of the United States or Puerto Rico, or to a company incorporated under the laws of some State or Territory of the United States or Puerto Rico * * * [3]

The inflexible nature of this statute, however, created a problem during World War I when it was determined that no discretion existed to deny a license to a domestic corporation purportedly owned by German interests. After the war another effort was made to impose workable citizenship limitations on Commission licensees culminating in the Radio Act of 1927. Section 12 of the Act prohibited aliens, foreign governments and foreign corporations from ownership. Also prohibited were certain corporations controlled by aliens. This marked the first time terms were set forth upon which foreign interests could participate in domestic corporations holding radio licenses. Finally, the Communications Act of 1934 was adopted, section 310 of which made the last major change in citizenship restrictions by granting the Commission discretion to allow ownership of licenses by foreign holding companies.

4. The ensuing years have produced only relatively minor changes in Section 310, except that in 1974 Congress acted to exclude certain licensees from the prohibition. That change, in part prompted this rule making proceeding. Previously most cable operators were subject to the prohibitions of section 310 by virtue of their use of microwave radio stations in the Cable Television Relay Service (CARS).[4] In 1974 Congress amended section 310 to exclude from the ownership restrictions certain services apparently including CARS. The legislative history of this change indicates that the intention was to permit the grant of radio licenses in the safety and special and experimental radio services directly to aliens, representatives of aliens and foreign corporations.[5] Therefore, it appears, alien ownership of cable television systems no longer is restricted.

5. Other factors affecting the nature and timing of the rule making are cable television's capacity to originate programming, and the relatively slight foreign influence in the industry today. Cable is a unique communication medium, for in addition to its ability to relay programming and information supplied by others, it also can originate its own material. This serves to distinguish the cable operator from a broadcaster who, for instance, is able to exercise control of the programming broadcast by his

---

[1] The new Section 76.503 would read as follows:

§ 76.503 General Citizenship Restrictions.

(a) No cable television system shall be owned or operated by:

(1) Any alien or the representative of any alien;

(2) Any foreign government or a representative thereof;

(3) Any corporation organized under the laws of any foreign government;

(4) Any corporation of which any officer or director is an alien;

(5) Any corporation of which more than one-fifth of the capital stock is owned of record or voted by aliens or their representatives or by a foreign government or the representative thereof, or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign country;

(6) Any corporation directly or indirectly controlled by any other corporation of which any officer or more than one-fourth of the directors are aliens, if the Commission finds that such ownership or control would not be consistent with the public interest; or

(7) Any corporation directly or indirectly controlled by any other corporation of which more than one-fourth of the capital stock is owned of record or voted by aliens, their representatives, or by a foreign government or the representative thereof, or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign country, if the Commission finds that such ownership or control would not be consistent with the public interest.

(b) Corporations seeking Commission approval of existing or proposed interests as described in subparagraphs (a) (6) and (7) of this section shall file with the Commission no later than ten days following the creation of any such interests, a notification clearly stating the extent and nature of such interests, and shall include therewith a copy of the ownership section of FCC Form 325 "Annual Report of Cable Television Systems," supplying the information requested, as if the alien interest were already in existence. The notice shall be filed in accordance with the procedural requirements of Section 76.7 of the Commission's Rules.

[2] Section 310, to the extent here pertinent, states:

(a) The station license required under this Act shall not be granted to or held by any foreign government or the representative thereof.

(b) No broadcast or common carrier or aeronautical en route or aeronautical fixed radio station license shall be granted to or held by—

(1) Any alien or the representative of any alien;

(2) Any corporation organized under the laws of any foreign government;

(3) Any corporation of which any officer or director is an alien or of which more than one-fifth of the capital stock is owned of record or voted by aliens or their representatives or by a foreign government or representative thereof or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign country;

(4) Any corporation directly or indirectly controlled by any other corporation of which any officer or more than one-fourth of the directors are aliens, or of which more than one-fourth of the capital stock is owned of record or voted by aliens, their representatives, or by a foreign government or representative thereof, or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign country, if the Commission finds that the public interest will be served by the refusal or revocation of such license.

[3] 37 Stat. 302, Sect. 2 (1912).

[4] While cable television systems are not licensed, stations in the Cable Television Relay Service are authorized by license.

[5] After adoption of the amendment this section's alien ownership prohibitions applied only to "broadcast or common carrier or aeronautical en route or aeronautical fixed station" licenses. See Commission *Order*, —— FCC 2d ——, 40 F.R. 5565 (1975).

station, and from the common carrier who exercises very little control. Thus, cable television cannot be categorized arbitrarily with the other media. Rather, it must be examined separately so that any imposition of ownership restrictions will be in response to needs as they specifically relate to cable. Empirical evidence regarding the effects of foreign ownership is scarce. Although some argue that no action should be taken until a data base is developed demonstrating a need for restrictions, the Commission believes that prudence requires an examination while the industry remains relatively free of foreign influence.

6. Comments in support of the proposed rule were received from Time, Inc., and Viacom International, Inc., two cable television systems operators, and jointly from two public interest groups, Citizens for Cable Awareness in Pennsylvania, and the Philadelphia Community Cable Coalition. First, they argue that alien ownership of cable systems would be contrary to the best interests of the United States. They analogize to section 310 of the Act which prohibits alien ownership of certain licenses issued by the Commission, and assert that similar restrictions are required for those who own and control cable television systems. Cable is described as an industry capable of "profoundly influencing the lives and actions of United States citizens" whose mass takeover by aliens "clearly" would be contrary to the best interests of the American people. Viacom states that this "strategic national industry" supplies many Americans with their only knowledge of the daily news, and argues that it therefore, should not be controlled by those with views contrary to the interests of the United States. Proponents also argue that foreign owners will be unable to identify, evaluate and respond to the needs of the local community with which they are unfamiliar. Finally, Time, Inc., states that the Commission's failure to restrict alien ownership now may in fact encourage increased foreign participation due to the industry's present financial plight.

7. Comments urging rejection of the proposed restrictions were submitted by four multiple system cable operators, three of which are aliens, two foreign CARS operators, one State and two national associations of cable operators, and the New Jersey Department of Public Utilities. They submit that foreign ownership poses no threat to this country's security, that foreign ownership to the extent it exists today has proved beneficial, and that restrictions, if imposed, may prove harmful to the development of cable television in the United States. They suggest that the local nature of cable, and the operator's limited ability to control programming, negate any threat to the national secuity. The National Cable Television Association notes that cable differs from broadcasting and should not be subject to the same restrictions. Suburban Cablevision and McLean-Hunter Cable TV, Canadian companies with cable interests in the United States, characterize Section 310 as "anachronistic" vis-a-vis cable television because it is unlikely ownership of cable systems could be used against the National interest. Suburban operates several cable systems in the State of New Jersey and plans to expand its services in the future. Also, it is noted that the New Jersey Department of Public Utilities, that body which approves each cable franchisee within the State, opposes adoption of the proposed rule and cites the contributions to cable made by aliens. Other opponents argue that the proposed restrictions will have an adverse economic impact on the cable industry by restricting the availability of money and technology controlled by those who are not United States citizens. Lastly, the Commission's asserted authority to impose restrictions on ownership is questioned because, it is argued, the limitations exceed the "reasonable ancillary" test set forth by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Midwest Video Corp.*, 405 U.S. 649 (1972), and *United States* v. *Southwestern Cable Co.*, 392 U.S. 157 (1968).

8. Having reviewed the comments in this proceeding and given some additional consideration to the policy matters involved, we have come to the conclusion that while it was timley to raise the question of alien cable ownership restrictions in this proceeding it would be premature at this time to adopt the rule proposed. We have determined instead, without adopting additional rules, to review annually, or more often if necessary, alien ownership trends based on the annual ownership information filed with us (Form 325) and on the information filed with us in connection with Certificate of Compliance applications.[6]

9. As the comments indicate, there is at this time only a very limited amount of foreign investment in cable television in the United States and most of this is by Canadian corporations. We see in this no threat to the security of the United States or to the development of the cable television industry. Unlike broadcast licensees subject to the restriction of section 310, cable television system operators, as a practical matter, have program content control over only a minor portion of the programming they distribute. Most programming viewed by cable subscribers is supplied by those broadcast stations which the cable system "may" or "must" carry. The cable operator has no control over this programming except to the extent he may select stations for carriage (within the bounds established by the Rules).[7] Neither can the operator exercise control over program content on any of the access channels made available to subscribers.[8] And, even the newly developing area of subscription cable operations generally provides programming obtained from producers independent of the cable operation. While the cable operator is free to originate his own programming, is encouraged to do so, and may in fact produce programming of considerable interest in the local community, it is nevertheless clear that the totality of a cable operator's program content control does not approach that required of a broadcaster. Allen ownership restrictions do not apply to comwire news services, non-license radio and television networks, film and television producers, cable system networks and channel leasees, and it is not clear that they should apply to a system operator solely because of his potential ability to influence, through his program origination efforts, the ideas and attitudes of cable subscribers. Likewise foreign ownership of cable appears to present little threat to the national security of the United States at this time. Thousands of different systems are operated across the United States, most diverse in their operations and each individually responsible to the communities that have selected and franchised their operations.[9] It is these local jurisdictions that are initially in the best position to determine whether or not an individual operator's nationality will prevent him from satisfying his "public interest" obligations.

10. The Commission further believes that citizenship prohibitions may in some measure deter the development of cable television in the United States. Although it is hoped that the industry will continue to find sources of domestic capital to fund its growth, it remains at this time relatively undeveloped and in need of new sources of capital and technology to continue its development. Foreign interests, if permitted, could contribute to this development. The Commission, we believe, ought not deny these resources to cable without overriding reasons of national importance. In the absence of a demonstrable harm and where benefits may result, the Commission is inclined to allow free market forces to determine the direction of capital flow within the industry. The proposed resrictions have been termed, in the comments, a "cure for which there is no disease." The slight evidence accumulated regarding cable systems owned by aliens seems to bear this out, for now.

11. In declining to adopt restrictions at this time we do not set aside lightly the possibility that the nature of the cable industry and the services it provides and the amount and type of for-

[6] A similar policy of "watchful waiting" has been adopted in connection with cross-ownership between local newspaper and cable television and the reasons for the two policies are somewhat similar. See First Report in Docket 18891, FCC 75-303, 52 FCC 2d 170 (1975).

[7] Subpart D of the Rules sets forth the requirements relating to carriage of television broadcast signals.

[8] Section 76.251(a)(9) of the Rules states, in part, that "each such system shall exercise no control over program content on any of the channels described * * *"

[9] Current figures indicate that there are approximately 3400 cable systems serving 7,720 communities in the United States.

eign investment in it may change rapidly and in ways that would suggest a clear need for ownership restrictions of the type proposed. Because of this possibility we believe it important to attempt, on some systematic basis, to follow trends in foreign investment in United States cable television so that any undesirable consequences of such ownership may be known at an early date. Although information of this type has been available in the past through cable system annual reports it has been difficult to make any systematic use of it because of the time required to process the information manually. In the near future, and in years to come, this information will be sorted and processed with the aid of the Commission's automated data processing facility. We plan to use this capability to monitor developments in this area and to determine if future trends warrant action in this area.

12. There are those who asserted that the Commission would be overstepping its jurisdictional bounds if it were to adopt the proposed rule, and their comments present a thorough discussion of this issue. Although the decision has been made not to adopt the ownership restrictions, this in no way represents a concession that the Commission lacks jurisdiction.[10] The decision to permit alien ownership simply moots the question for this proceeding.

13. In the Notice, comments were requested with respect to two other related issues: alien ownership of CARS stations and "groundfathering" of existing alien interests in cable. Comments urging citizenship restrictions on CARS licensees were received from those who also favored the prohibition on cable owners. They seek a total ban on alien ownership and argue that restricted CARS ownership will reinforce that policy. Similarly, those opposed to restrictions on cable ownership also opposed restrictions in the CARS service. CARS stations are said to be an internal and passive part of cable television service, usually owned by the cable operator. Thus, restricting their ownership would be anomalous if no constraints are imposed on cable systems themselves. As previously noted, Comment Ltd. argues that it will be providing a needed service benefiting the public interest. Absent a more definitive statement by Congress, the Commission has found no compelling reason to impose citizenship restrictions on the ownership of cable systems, and likewise believes that none should be imposed on CARS licensees. CARS stations serve as the links between a cable system and its program sources. To prohibit their ownership by aliens would be inconsistent with, if not destructive of, the decision to permit alien ownership of cable systems. Finally, the question of "grandfathering" is rendered moot by our decision not to impose restrictions on alien ownership of cable television systems or their CARS networks.

In view of the foregoing, The Commission finds that it would not be in the public interest at this time to adopt § 76.503 as proposed.

Accordingly, it is ordered, That this proceeding is terminated.

Adopted: May 19, 1976.

Released: May 28, 1976.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
VINCENT J. MULLINS,
Secretary.

Statement filed as part of the original document.

[FR Doc.76-16641 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[10] As the Commission stated in the Notice: Even in the absence of a specific Congressional directive on this matter, the Commission has general statutory responsibilities in the granting of radio authorizations and regulatory authority over cable television which we believe mandate consideration of whether restrictions on foreign ownership of cable television systems should be adopted.

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

[10 CFR Part 700]

ENERGY CONSERVATION CONTINGENCY PLANS AND RATIONING CONTINGENCY PLAN

Change in Hearing Location in San Francisco

On May 25, 1976, the Federal Energy Administration issued for public comment five energy conservation contingency plans (41 FR 21908, May 28, 1976) and a rationing contingency (41 FR 21928, May 28, 1976). Regional hearings are scheduled for June 21 and 22, 1976, respectively, on these proposals. However, the location for the regional hearings in San Francisco has been changed from the site specified in the May 25, 1976 notices. The San Francisco hearings will now be held in the Ceremonial Courtroom, Federal Building, 19th Floor, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California.

Dated: June 3, 1976.

MICHAEL F. BUTLER,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc.76-16611 Filed 6-4-76;9:00 am]

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

[29 CFR Part 2602]

PREMIUM PAYMENT AND DECLARATION [1]

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

On December 10, 1975, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (hereinafter "the PBGC") published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (40 FR 57457) a revision of Part 2602, Chapter XXVI, of Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, which imposes the premiums to be paid for basic benefits guaranteed under section 4022(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

As set forth below, the PBGC proposes to amend that regulation to impose the specific premium payment obligation applicable to plan years beginning on or after September 2, 1976, and to incorporate certain additional modifications. The purpose of these proposed modifications is to simplify the premium payment process.

The current premium rate of one dollar or fifty cents per participant is proposed to be retained, but to be based hereafter on the number of participants on the last day of the preceding plan year rather than "at any time during the plan year." If this participant count is not available prior to the premium payment and filing due date, the premium payment would be based on the participant count as last filed with the PBGC for the preceding plan year. The actual count would be due no later than the last date prescribed for the payment of the following year's premiums. The premiums for new plans would be based on the number of participants in the plan on the plan's effective date.

The definition of the term "participant" also would be amended to no longer include in the premium count, for plan years beginning on or after September 2, 1976, and for the reconciliation of the preceding plan year, those retired and other former participants who have received all of their benefits or for whom all benefits are fully guaranteed by a private insurance company annuity contract (immediate or deferred). If under any circumstances, through cancellation of a group policy or otherwise, the insurance company can be relieved of liability to pay the annuity, the retired or former participants must be included as participants. It also should be noted that a non-vested individual with a break in service of not less than one year should not be counted for premium purposes.

Under the proposal, the PBGC will bill plans for any underpayments, i.e., the amount of premiums necessary to reconcile the premiums paid with the actual premiums due. This billing will apply to all plan years in progress on or beginning on or after September 2, 1974. The PBGC will not bill plans filing timely reconciliations for any interest or late payment penalties on any underpayment if the underpayment amount is paid no later than 30 days after it is billed by the PBGC. Because, under the revised premium regulation, interest and late payment penalties no longer will be imposed on such underpayment amounts, it no longer will be necessary for plans to file revisions to their existing premium declaration forms. Accordingly, Form PBGC-1R no longer will be prescribed.

Copies of the revised premium form have been filed with and are available for inspection at the Office of the Federal Register and additional copies are available upon request from the PBGC.

[1] Form PBGC-1 is filed as part of the original document. Copies of Form PBGC-1 may be obtained at the PBGC's Office of Communications, Suite 7100, 2020 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

This proposed regulation was prepared by the staff of the PBGC. With the understanding that this is a staff document without the Board's endorsement of the policies underlying it, the Board of Directors of the PBGC authorized publication of this proposed regulation in the FEDERAL REGISTER to invite public comments and suggestions that will assist the Board in its consideration of the regulation to be finally adopted.

Interested persons may participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting written data, views or arguments to the Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Suite 7200, 2020 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. Each person submitting comments should include his name and address, identify this notice, and give reasons for any recommendations. Comments should be submitted not later than July 6, 1976. Copies of written comments will be available for examination by interested persons in the Office of Communications, PBGC, Suite 7100, 2020 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. The proposal may be changed in light of comments received.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is proposed to amend Part 2602, Chapter XXVI of Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, as set forth below:

PART 2602—DECLARATION AND PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS

Sec.

2602.1 Purpose and scope.
2602.2 Definitions.
2602.3 Filing requirement.
2602.4 Coverage for guaranteed basic benefits.
2602.5 Premium rate.
2602.6 Form.
2602.7 Late payment interest charges.
2602.8 Late payment penalty charges.
2602.9 Waivers.
2602.10 Date of filing.
2602.11 Computation of time.
2602.12 Mailing address.

AUTHORITY: Sections 4002, 4006, 4007; 88 Stat. 1004, 1010, 1013; 29 U.S.C. 1302, 1306, 1307.

§ 2602.1 Purpose and scope.

(a) The purpose of this part is to impose the premiums applicable to plan years in progress on and beginning on or after September 2, 1974.

(b) This part applies to all covered plans, as provided by § 4021 of the Act.

§ 2602.2 Definitions.

As used in this part:

"Act" means the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

"Multiemployer Plan" means a plan defined in § 4001(a)(3) of the Act.

"Participant" means: (a) an individual currently accruing benefits or retaining or earning credited service under the terms of the plan (but does not include a non-vested former employee who has incurred a break in service of not less than one year); (b) a former employee with vested rights to immediate or deferred benefits; (c) a retiree who is receiving or is eligible to receive benefits from the plan; (d) a deceased participant whose survivors are receiving or are eligible to receive benefits from the plan; (e) any other individual who is defined as a participant under the terms of the plan; and, (f) for plan years beginning before September 2, 1975, a retiree or former employee for whom a fully paid-up immediate or deferred annuity has been purchased if such individual retains a legal claim against the plan for benefits or if the plan retains a participating interest in the annuity policy.

"PBGC" means the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

"Plan Year" means the calendar, policy or fiscal year on which the records of the plan are kept.

§ 2602.3 Filing requirement.

(a) No later than October 2, 1974, the plan administrator of each covered plan shall file in accordance with the instructions contained therein the premium declaration form prescribed by this part and any estimated premium payments due for any plan year beginning before and in progress on September 2, 1974.

(b) No later than 30 days after the beginning of any plan year beginning on or after September 2, 1974, the plan administrator of each covered plan shall file in accordance with the instructions contained therein the premium declaration form prescribed by this part and any premium payments due for such plan year.

(c) No later than 2 years and 30 days after the beginning of any plan year beginning before September 2, 1976, the plan administrator of each covered plan shall file in accordance with the instructions contained therein the premium declaration form prescribed by this part to enable the PBGC to reconcile premium payments paid, with the actual premium payment due, for such plan year.

(d) No later than the last date prescribed for the payment of premiums for any plan year beginning on or after September 2, 1977, the plan administrator of each covered plan shall file in accordance with the instructions contained therein the premium declaration form prescribed by this part to enable the PBGC to reconcile the premium payments paid, with the actual premium payment due, for any plan year beginning on or after September 2, 1976.

(e) The date prescribed for payment of premiums for plans not previously covered by § 4021 of the Act is 30 days after the later of the date of the plan's adoption or the date of the plan's effectiveness.

(f) Any premium declaration not filed in accordance with this part, not filed in accordance with the instructions contained in the form, not accompanied by the required premium payment or otherwise incomplete may, in the discretion of the PBGC, be returned in whole or in part to the plan administrator and treated as not having been filed.

§ 2602.4 Coverage for guaranteed basic benefits.

(a) The failure by a plan administrator to pay the premiums due under this part will not result in that plan's loss of coverage for basic benefits guaranteed under § 4022(a) of the Act.

(b) The payment of the premiums imposed by this part will not result in coverage for basic benefits guaranteed under § 4022(a) of the Act for plans not covered under § 4021 of the Act.

§ 2602.5 Premium rate.

(a) For plan years beginning before September 2, 1976, the premium rate for basic benefits guaranteed under § 4022(a) of the Act shall be as follows:

(1) Plans which are not multiemployer plans shall pay a premium of one dollar for each individual who is a participant in such plan at any time during the plan year;

(2) Multiemployer plans shall pay a premium of fifty cents for each individual who is a participant in such plan at any time during the plan year.

(b) For plan years beginning on or after September 2, 1976, the premium rate for basic benefits guaranteed under § 4022(a) of the Act shall be as follows:

(1) Plans which are not multiemployer plans shall pay a premium of one dollar for each individual who is a participant in such plan on the last date of the preceding plan year;

(2) Multiemployer plans shall pay a premium of fifty cents for each individual who is a participant in such plan on the last date of the preceding plan year.

(3) For plans not previously covered by § 4021 of the Act, the premium rate shall be one dollar for each participant or fifty cents for each participant, as is appropriate in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of § 2602.5(b), in such plan on such plan's effective date.

§ 2602.6 Form.

The form prescribed by this part for the declaration, payment and reconciliation of premiums is Form PBGC-1 (Rev. 1976).

§ 2602.7 Late payment interest charges.

(a) If any premium payment due under this part is not paid by the last date prescribed for payment in § 2602.3, an interest charge shall be imposed on the unpaid amount at the rate of 6 percent per annum through June 30, 1975, 9 percent per annum through January 31, 1976 and 7 percent per annum thereafter, for the period from the date payment is due to the date the payment is made.

(b) PBGC bills for interest assessed by § 2602.7 will be deemed paid in full if paid no later than 30 days after the date of such bills.

(c) PBGC bills for premium payments necessary to reconcile the premiums paid with the actual premium due, will be deemed paid when due if paid no later than 30 days after the date of such bills.

§ 2602.8 Late payment penalty charges.

If any premium payment due under this part is not paid by the last date

prescribed for payment in § 2602.3, a late payment charge shall be assessed on the unpaid amount at the rate provided in the following tables.

LATE PAYMENT PENALTY CHARGES

PREMIUM DUE DATE PRIOR TO OCTOBER 2, 1975

Days late from due date:	*Late payment charge (percent)*
1 to 60	0
61 to 90	25
91 to 120	50
121 to 180	75
More than 180	100

PREMIUM DUE DATE ON OR AFTER OCTOBER 2, 1975

Days late from due date:	*Late payment charge (percent)*
1 to 30	5
31 to 60	10
61 to 90	20
91 to 120	40
121 to 150	60
151 to 180	80
More than 180	100

§ 2602.9 Waivers.

The late payment penalty charges imposed by § 2602.8 will not be assessed in whole or in part:

(a) With respect to any premium payment made within 60 days after the last date prescribed for payment in § 2602.3 if, before such last date, the PBGC grants a waiver upon:

(1) A showing of substantial hardship arising from the timely payment of the premium and a showing that the premiums will be paid within such 60 day period; or,

(2) Any other demonstration of good cause;

(b) If the PBGC, on its own motion, waives the application of § 2602.8, or

(c) With respect to any PBGC bills for such charges or PBGC bills for the premium payments necessary to reconcile the premiums paid with the actual premium due, if such bills are paid not later than 30 days after the date of such bills.

§ 2602.10 Date of filing.

(a) Any form required to be filed under the provisions of this part and any payment required to be made under the provisions of this part shall be deemed to have been filed or made on the date on which it is mailed.

(b) A form or payment shall be presumed to have been mailed on the date on which it is postmarked by the United States Postal Service or three days prior to the date on which it is received by the PBGC if not postmarked by the United States Postal Service.

§ 2602.11 Computation of time.

In computing any period of time prescribed by this part, the first day shall not be included and the last day shall be included.

§ 2602.12 Mailing address.

The mailing address of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is P.O. Box 7119, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 7th day of June 1976.

KENNETH L. HOUCK,
Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

Issued on the date set forth above, pursuant to a resolution of the Board of Directors approving the publication of these proposed regulations and authorizing its Executive Director to issue same.

HENRY ROSE,
Secretary,
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

[FR Doc.76-16803 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

notices

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Fiscal Service

[Dept. Circ. 570, 1975 Rev., Supp. No. 21]

FARMLAND MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

Surety Companies Acceptable on Federal Bonds; Change of Name

Farmers Elevator Mutual Insurance Company, an Iowa corporation, has formally changed its name to Farmland Mutual Insurance Company, effective March 25, 1976. Documents evidencing the change of name are on file in the Treasury.

A new Certificate of Authority as an acceptable surety on Federal bonds dated March 25, 1976, has been issued by the Secretary of the Treasury to Farmland Mutual Insurance Company, under Sections 6 to 13 of Title 6 of the United States Code, to replace the certificate issued July 1, 1975 (40 FR 29250, July 10, 1975) to the company under its former name, Farmers Elevator Mutual Insurance Company. The underwriting limitation of $754,000 previously established for the company remains unchanged.

The change in name of Farmers Elevator Mutual Insurance Company does not affect its status or liability with respect to any obligation in favor of the United States or in which the United States has an interest, which it may have undertaken pursuant to the Certificate of Authority issued by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Certificates of Authority expire on June 30 each year, unless sooner revoked, and new certificates are issued on July 1, so long as the companies remain qualified (31 CFR Part 223). A list of qualified companies is published annually as of July 1, in Department Circular 570, with details as to underwriting limitations, areas in which licensed to transact surety business and other information. Copies of the circular, when issued, may be obtained from the Audit Staff, Bureau of Government Financial Operations, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C. 20226.

Dated: May 24, 1976.

DAVID MOSSE,
Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 76-16644 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

Office of the Secretary

[Department Circular; Public Debt Series No. 14-76]

TREASURY NOTES OF SERIES D-1980

Interest Rate

JUNE 4, 1976.

The Secretary of the Treasury announced on June 3, 1976, that the interest rate on the notes described in Department Circular—Public Debt Series—No. 14-76 dated May 19, 1976, will be 7⅝ percent per annum. Accordingly, the notes are hereby redesignated 7⅝ percent Treasury Notes of Series D-1980. Interest on the notes will be payable at the rate of 7⅝ percent per annum.

DAVID MOSSO,
Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16657 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

NAVAL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. I), notice is given that the Naval Research Advisory Committee will hold a closed meeting on July 8 and 9, 1976 at the Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, California. The topic of the meeting will be "Recent Issues in Naval Research", with emphasis on Arctic Research. Presentations will be made on several sensitive topics: recent Naval operations in the Arctic; plans for future Naval Arctic operations and related requirements for supporting research; classified Naval communications and surveillance requirements for space and ionospheric research; and on recent findings of research in Naval ship acquisition. All sessions will address classified matters required to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense. The Secretary of the Navy has therefore determined in writing that the public interest requires the meeting to be closed to the public because it will be concerned with matters listed in section 552(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

LARRY G. PARKS,
Captain, JAGC, U.S. Navy, Assistant Judge Advocate General (Civil Law).

JUNE 2, 1976.

[FR Doc.76-16702 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[Order No. 651-76]

Office of the Attorney General

PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

System of Records

Attached hereto is a notice of a proposed system of records maintained by the Department of Justice and required to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER and in annual compilation form pursuant to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-579.

The following system of records will be maintained by the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice and is a new system of records for which no public notice consistent with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(4) has been published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. The system, JUSTICE/CRM-024, Freedom of Information/Privacy Act Records, will come into existence thirty days after publication of this notice.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(11) interested persons are invited to submit written comments on those portions of the notice which describe the routine uses of the system of records listed. Comments may be submitted in writing to the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530. All comments must be received by July 9, 1976. No oral hearings are contemplated.

Dated: June 3, 1976.

EDWARD H. LEVI,
Attorney General.

JUSTICE/CRM-024

System name: Freedom of Information/Privacy Act Records.

System location: U.S. Department of Justice, Criminal Division, 10th & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530.

Categories of individuals covered by the system: Persons who request disclosure of records pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act; persons who request access to or correction of records pertaining to themselves contained in Criminal Division systems of records pursuant to the Privacy Act; and, where applicable, persons about whom records have been requested or about whom information is contained in requested records.

Categories of records in the system: The system contains copies of all correspondence and internal memorandums related to Freedom of Information and Privacy Act requests, and related records necessary to the processing of such requests received on or after January 1, 1975.

Authority for maintenance of the system: This system is established and maintained pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3101 and is maintained to implement the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552 and 552a and the provisions of 28 CFR 16.1 et seq. and 28 CFR 16.40 et seq.

Routine uses of records maintained in the system, including categories of users and the purposes of such uses: A record maintained in this system may be disseminated as a routine use of such record as follows: (1) a record may be disseminated to a Federal agency which furnished the record for the purpose of per-

mitting a decision as to access or correction to be made by that agency, or for the purpose of consulting with that agency as to the propriety of access or correction; (2) a record may be disseminated to any appropriate Federal, State, local, or foreign agency for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of information submitted by an individual who has requested amendment or correction of records contained in systems of records maintained by the Criminal Division.

Policies and practices for storing, retrieving, accessing, retainnig, and disposing of records in the system:

Storage: A record contained in this system is stored manually in alphabetical order in file cabinets.

Retrievability: A record is retrieved by the name of the individual or person making a request for access or correction of records.

Safeguards: Access to physical records is limited to personnel of the Freedom of Information/Privacy Act Unit of the Criminal Division and known Department of Justice personnel who have a need for the record in the performance of their duties. The records are safeguarded and protected in accordance with applicable Departmental rules.

Retention and Disposal: Currently there are no provisions for disposal of records contained in this system.

System manager and address: Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 10th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530.

Notification procedures: A part of this system is exempted from this requirement under 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), (k)(1), or (k)(2). Inquiry concerning this system should be directed to the system manager listed above.

Record access procedures: A part of this system is exempted from this requirement under 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), (k)(1), or (k)(2), to the extent that this system of records is not subject to exemption, it is subject to access and contest. A determination as to exemption shall be made at the time a request for access is received. A request for access to a record contained in this system shall be made at the time a request for access is received. A request for access to a record contained in this system shall be made in writing, with the envelope and the letter clearly marked "Privacy Access Request". Include in the request the name of the individual involved, his birth date and place, or any other identifying number or information which may be of assistance in locating the record, the name of the case or matter involved, if known, and the name of the judicial district involved, if known. The requester shall also provide a return address for transmitting the information. Access requests shall be directed to the system manager listed above.

Contesting record procedures: Individuals desiring to contest or amend information maintained in the system should direct their request to the system manager listed above, stating clearly and concisely what information is being contested, the reasons for contesting it, and the proposed amendment to the information sought.

Record source categories: Sources of information contained in this system are the individuals and persons making requests, the systems of records searched in the process of responding to requests, and other agencies referring requests for access to or correction of records originating in the Criminal Division.

Systems exempted from certain provisions of the Act: Records secured from other systems of records have been exempted from the provisions of the Privacy Act to the same extent as the systems of records from which they were obtained. Rules have been promulgated in accordance with the requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(c), and (e) and have been published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

[FR Doc.76-16650 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE STANDARDS AND GOALS

Meeting

This is to provide notice of meeting of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Task Force of the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Task Force will be meeting at the Airport Park Holel, 600 Avenue of Champions, Inglewood, California on Saturday, June 26, 1976 from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. The meeting will be open to the public.

The agenda includes the following items:

Consideration of Minutes of the June 4–5, 1976 Task Force meeting.
Report of the NAC June 16–19, 1976 meeting.
Action by the Task Force of NAC requested changes of the Juvenile Justice Standards.
Final Task Force Approval of the Revised Juvenile Justice and Deliquency Prevention Standards and Goals Volume.

For further information, contact Richard Van Duizend, General-Attorney, National Institute of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

JAY A. BROZOST,
Attorney-Advisory,
Office of General Counsel.

[FR Doc.76-16626 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE STANDARDS AND GOALS

Change of Meeting

This is to provide notice of change of meeting for the Organized Crime Task Force of the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. This notice cancels previous meeting dates of June 23–24, 1976.

The Organized Crime Task Force will meet on July 7–9, 1976. The meeting will be held at the Ramada Inn, 1900 N. Ft. Myer Drive, Board Room, Arlington, Virginia. The meeting will be open to the public.

Discussion will focus on the recommendations made by the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals and the review of the entire Report of the Organized Crime Task Force.

Meeting Times: July 7 and 8—9 a.m.–9 p.m.; July 9—9 a.m.–Noon.

For further information, contact William T. Archey, Director, Policy Analysis Division, Office of Planning and Management, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

JAY A. BROZOST,
Attorney-Advisor,
Office of General Counsel.

[FR Doc.76-16715 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[M 34240]

MONTANA

Application

JUNE 1, 1976.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 185), as amended by the Act of November 16, 1973 (87 Stat. 576), Montana-Dakota Utilities Company has applied for a natural gas pipeline right of way for 6-inch and 12-inch lines across the following lands:

PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, MONTANA

T. 26 N., R. 58 E.,
Sec. 18 SE¼NW¼; and
Sec. 31, NW¼NE¼.

This pipeline will convey natural gas across 0.54 miles of national resource lands in Richland County, Montana.

The purpose of this notice is to inform the public that the Bureau will be proceeding with consideration of whether the applications should be approved and, if so, under what terms and conditions.

Interested persons desiring to express their views should promptly send their names and address to the District Manager, Bureau of Land Management, P.O. Box 940, Miles City, MT 59301.

ROLAND F. LEE,
Chief, Branch of Lands and Minerals Operations.

[FR Doc.76-16705 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

Office of Hearings and Appeals

[Docket No. M 76-177]

EDD POTTER COAL CO.

Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and

Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. § 861(c) (1970), Edd Potter Coal Co. has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.1710 to its No. 2 Mine, Woodman, Kentucky.

30 CFR 75.1710 provides:

An authorized representative of the Secretary may require in any coal mine where the height of the coalbed permits that electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, be provided with substantially constructed canopies, or cabs, to protect the miners operating such equipment from roof falls and from rib and face rolls.

To be read in conjunction with Section 75.1710 is 30 CFR 75.1710–1 which in pertinent part provides:

* * * Except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, all self-propelled electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, which is employed in the active workings of each underground coal mine on and after January 1, 1973, shall, in accordance with the schedule of time specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of this paragraph (a), be equipped with substantially constructed canopies or cabs, located and installed in such a manner that when the operator is at the operating controls of such equipment he shall be protected from falls of roof, face, or rib, or from rib and face rolls. The requirements of this paragraph (a) shall be met as follows:

(1) On and after January 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 72 inches or more;

(2) On and after July 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 60 inches or more, but less than 72 inches;

(3) On and after January 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 48 inches or more, but less than 60 inches;

(4) On and after July 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 36 inches or more, but less than 48 inches;

(5) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 36 inches; and

(6) On and after July 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of less than 24 inches. * * *

The substance of Petitioner's statement is as follows:

1. The petition applies to the following equipment in Petitioner's mine:

Quantity	*Type*
1	Miner.
7	Motors.
2	Roof bolters.

2. The equipment described above is operated in a coal seam between 36 and 39 inches. The condition of the roof in the subject mine is good and a roof control plan approved by MESA is in effect.

3. Petitioner believes that the installation of cabs or canopies on the foregoing equipment will substantially reduce the machine operator's vision and mobility thereby endangering the lives of the operators and other miners in the area.

REQUEST FOR HEARING OR COMMENTS

Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before July 9, 1976. Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc.76–16708 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. M 76–92]

GRAYS KNOB COAL CO.

Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. § 861(c) (1970), Grays Knob Coal Company has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.1710 to its Nos. 1, 5, and 7 Mines, Harlan County, Kentucky.

30 CFR 75.1710 provides:

An authorized representative of the Secretary may require in any coal mine where the height of the coalbed permits that electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, be provided with substantially constructed canopies, or cabs, to protect the miners operating such equipment from roof falls and from rib and face rolls.

To be read in conjunction with Section 75.1710 is 30 CFR 75.1710–1 which in pertinent part provides:

* * * Except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, all self-propelled electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, which is employed in the active workings of each underground coal mine on and after January 1, 1973, shall, in accordance with the schedule of time specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of this paragraph (a), be equipped with substantially constructed canopies or cabs, located and installed in such a manner that when the operator is at the operating controls of such equipment he shall be protected from falls of roof, face, or rib, or from rib and face rolls. The requirements of this paragrarph (a) shall be met as follows:

(1) On and after January 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 72 inches or more;

(2) On and after July 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 60 inches or more, but less than 72 inches;

(3) On and after January 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 48 inches or more, but less than 60 inches;

(4) On and after July 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 36 inches or more, but less than 48 inches;

(5) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 36 inches; and

(6) On and after July 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of less than 24 inches. * * *

The substance of Petitioner's statement is as follows:

The seams of coal being mined in Harlan County, Kentucky, by Grays Knob Coal Company vary in height from 28 to 46 inches. The face equipment used in these mines is as follows: 12 RB Cutting Machine, 14 BU Joy Loader, CD81 Joy Coal Drill, 100L, 265 Lee Norse Miners, 21 SC Joy Shuttle Cars and Model 300 Galis Roof Bolter. The coal seams are generally level but have some local undulations or dips and rises in the top and bottom.

If cabs and canopies were required to be installed on the face equipment in these mines this method will result in a diminution of safety to the miners in these mines.

Petitioner offers the following in support of the above statement:

1. Cabs or canopies on this equipment would obstruct the field of vision of the operator of the equipment possibly causing him to run into the rib, machinery or other miners.

2. The post supporting the cabs or canopies would cause shadows to be thrown by the operator's cap lamp. These shadows would increase the chances of over or under steering around corners causing the equipment to run into or sideswipe the ribs or other equipment. This could throw the operator from the equipment or injure or kill him.

3. Installation of cabs or canopies on equipment in these mines would cause the operator to lean out of the operator's compartment in order to see where he is going or in the case of a continuous miner whether or not he is cutting in the top or bottom. If he leans out to the side of the equipment to get an unobstructed view of his surroundings or roadway his chances of falling from the equipment is increased or he may sideswipe the rib, a corner, other equipment or some other projecting obstruction and be dragged from or under the equipment and be injured or killed.

4. Installation of cabs or canopies on equipment in these mines would cause the operator to ride on and operate the equipment from a cramped position which may slow reaction time when steering or applying the brakes which may cause him to injure or kill himself or another miner.

5. A majority of the miners who work at these mines have stated that the installation of canopies on equipment would cause death or injury and that they would refuse to operate equipment with canopies on it.

6. Because of cramped quarters in the operator's compartment of this equipment if cabs or canopies are installed the operator would have to get outside of the operator's compartment to turn in the direction of travel. This required movement could cause the operator to be injured or killed or cause harm to come to another miner. It is true that the operator should shut off the power to the equipment and lock the brake but, regardless of prior warning and training, he may not do this. Unmindful of what he does, he should not be penalized with his life when the removal of the canopy would vastly decrease his chances of injury.

REQUEST FOR HEARING OR COMMENTS

Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before July 9, 1976.

Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc.76-16709 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. M 76-93]

HARLAN CENTRAL COAL CO.

Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. § 861(c) (1970), Harlan Central Coal Company has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.1710 to its No. D-1 Mine, Harlan County, Kentucky.

30 CFR 75.1710 provides:

An authorized representative of the Secretary may require in any coal mine where the height of the coalbed permits that electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, be provided with substantially constructed canopies, or cabs, to protect the miners operating such equipment from roof falls and from rib and face rolls.

To be read in conjunction with Section 75.1710 is 30 CFR 75.1710-1 which in pertinent part provides:

* * * Except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, all self-propelled electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, which is employed in the active workings of each underground coal mine on and after January 1, 1973, shall, in accordance with the schedule of time specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of this paragraph (a), be equipped with substantially constructed canopies or cabs, located and installed in such a manner that when the operator is at the operating controls of such equipment he shall be protected from falls of roof, face, or rib, or from rib and face rolls. The requirements of this paragraph (a) shall be met as follows:

(1) On and after January 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 72 inches or more;

(2) On and after July 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 60 inches or more, but less than 72 inches;

(3) On and after January 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 48 inches or more, but less than 60 inches;

(4) On and after July 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 36 inches or more, but less than 48 inches:

(5) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 36 inches; and

(6) On and after July 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of less than 24 inches. * * *

The substance of Petitioner's statement is as follows:

The seam of coal being mined in Harlan County, Kentucky, by Harlan Central Coal Company varies in height from 28 to 32 inches. The face equipment used in this mine is as follows: 101 Jeffrey continuous miner and Model 300 Galis Roof Bolter. The coal seam is generally even but has some local undulations or dips and rises in the top and bottom.

If cabs and canopies were required to be installed on the face equipment in these mines this method will result in a diminution of safety to the miners in these mines.

Petitioner offers the following in support of the above statement:

1. Cabs or canopies on this equipment would obstruct the field of vision of the operator of the equipment possibly causing him to run into the rib, machinery or other miners.

2. The post supporting the cabs or canopies would cause shadows to be thrown by the operator's cap lamp. These shadows would increase the chances of over or under steering around corners causing the equipment to run into or sideswipe the ribs or other equipment. This could throw the operator from the equipment or injure or kill him.

3. Installation of cabs or canopies on equipment in these mines would cause the operator to lean out of the operator's compartment in order to see where he is going or in the case of a continuous miner whether or not he is cutting in the top or bottom. If he leans out to the side of the equipment to get an unobstructed view of his surroundings or roadway his chances of falling from the equipment is increased or he may sideswipe the rib, a corner, other equipment or some other projecting obstruction and be dragged from or under the equipment and be injured or killed.

4. Installation of cabs or canopies on equipment in these mines would cause the operator to ride on and operate the equipment from a cramped position which may slow reaction time when steering or applying the brakes which may cause him to injure or kill himself or another miner.

5. A majority of the miners who work at these mines have stated that the installation of canopies on equipment would cause death or injury and that they would refuse to operate equipment with canopies on it.

6. Because of cramped quarters in the operator's compartment of this equipment if cabs or canopies are installed the operator would have to get outside of the operator's compartment to turn in the direction of travel. This required movement could cause the operator to be injured or killed or cause harm to come to another miner. It is true that the operator should shut off the power to the equipment and lock the brake but, regardless of prior warning and training, he may not do this. Unmindful of what he does, he should not be penalized with his life when the removal of the canopy would vastly decrease his chances of injury.

REQUEST FOR HEARING OR COMMENTS

Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before July 7, 1976. Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc.76-16710 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. M 76-94]

HARLAN-CUMBERLAND COAL CO.

Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. § 861(c) (1970), Harlan-Cumberland Coal Company has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.1710 to its No. H-1 Mine, Harlan County, Kentucky.

30 CFR 75.1710 provides:

An authorized representative of the Secretary may require in any coal mine where the height of the coalbed permits that electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, be provided with substantially constructed canopies, or cabs, to protect the miners operating such equipment from roof falls and from rib and face rolls.

To be read in conjunction with Section 75.1710 is 30 CFR 75.1710-1 which in pertinent part provides:

* * * Except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, all self-propelled electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, which is employed in the active workings of each underground coal mine on and after January 1, 1973, shall, in accordance with the schedule of time specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of this paragraph (a), be equipped with substantially constructed canopies or cabs, located and installed in such a manner that when the operator is at the operating controls of such equipment he shall be protected from falls of roof, face, or rib, or from rib and face rolls. The requirements of this paragraph (a) shall be met as follows:

(1) On and after January 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 72 inches or more;

(2) On and after July 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 60 inches or more, but less than 72 inches;

(3) On and after January 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 48 inches or more, but less than 60 inches;

(4) On and after July 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 36 inches or more, but less than 48 inches;

(5) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 36 inches; and

(6) On and after July 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of less than 24 inches. * * *

The substance of Petitioner's statement is as follows:

The seams of coal being mined in Harlan County, Kentucky, by Harlan Cumberland Coal Company vary in

height from 33 to 46 inches. The face equipment used in these mines is as follows: 265 Lee Norse continuous miner, 21SC Joy Shuttle Car and Model 300 Galis Roof Bolter. The coal seams are generally level but have some local undulations or dips and rises in the top and bottom.

If cabs and canopies were required to be installed on the face equipment in these mines this method will result in a diminution of safety to the miners in these mines.

Petitioner offers the following in support of the above statement:

1. Cabs or canopies on this equipment would obstruct the field of vision of the operator of the equipment possibly causing him to run into the rib, machinery or other miners.

2. The post supporting the cabs or canopies would cause shadows to be thrown by the operator's cap lamp. These shadows would increase the chances of over or under steering around corners causing the equipment to run into or sideswipe the ribs or other equipment. This could throw the operator from the equipment or injure or kill him.

3. Installation of cabs or canopies on equipment in these mines would cause the operator to lean out of the operator's compartment in order to see where he is going or in the case of a continuous miner whether or not he is cutting in the top or bottom. If he leans out to the side of the equipment to get an unobstructed view of his surroundings or roadway his chances of falling from the equipment is increased or he may sideswipe the rib, a corner, other equipment or some other projecting obstruction and be dragged from under the equipment and be injured or killed.

4. Installation of cabs or canopies on equipment in these mines would cause the operator to ride on and operate the equipment from a cramped position which may slow reaction time when steering or applying the brakes which may cause him to injure or kill himself or another miner.

5. A majority of the miners who work at these mines have stated that the installation of canopies on equipment would cause death or injury and that they would refuse to operate equipment with canopies on it.

6. Because of cramped quarters in the operator's compartment of this equipment if cabs or canopies are installed the operator would have to get outside of the operator's compartment to turn in the direction of travel. This required movement could cause the operator to be injured or killed or cause harm to come to another miner. It is true that the operator should shut off the power to the equipment and lock the brake but, regardless of prior warning and training, he may not do this. Unmindful of what he does, he should not be penalized with his life when the removal of the canopy would vastly decrease his chances of injury.

REQUEST FOR HEARING OR COMMENTS

Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before July 7, 1976. Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc. 76-16711 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. M 76-233]

HONEY CAMP COAL CO.

Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. § 861(c) (1970), Honey Camp Coal Company has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.1710 to its No. 12 Mine, Trammel, Virginia.

30 CFR 75.1710 provides:

An authorized representative of the Secretary may require in any coal mine where the height of the coalbed permits that electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, be provided with substantially constructed canopies, or cabs, to protect the miners operating such equipment from roof falls and from rib and face rolls.

To be read in conjunction with Section 75.1710 is 30 CFR 75.1710–1 which in pertinent part provides:

* * * Except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, all self-propelled electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, which is employed in the active workings of each underground coal mine on and after January 1, 1973, shall, in accordance with the schedule of time specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of this paragraph (a), be equipped with substantially constructed canopies or cabs, located and installed in such a manner that when the operator is at the operating controls of such equipment he shall be protected from falls of roof, face, or rib, or from rib and face rolls. The requirements of this paragraph (a) shall be met as follows:

(1) On and after January 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 72 inches or more;

(2) On and after July 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 60 inches or more, but less than 72 inches;

(3) On and after January 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 48 inches or more, but less than 60 inches;

(4) On and after July 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 36 inches or more, but less than 48 inches;

(5) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 36 inches; and

(6) On and after July 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of less than 24 inches. * * *

The substance of Petitioner's statement is as follows:

1. The petition applies to the following equipment in Petitioner's mine:

Quantity	Name	Height	Length	Width
		Inches	*Feet*	*Feet*
1	Lee Norse Mine, Model HH 265	32	32½	10½
2	Long-Airdox Roof, Bolters Model CRB 15	28	17¾	6
2	Joy Shuttle Cars, Model 85C	28	27	11

2. The equipment described above is operated in a coal seam of 38 inches. The condition of the roof in the subject mine is good and a roof control plan approved by MESA is in effect.

3. Petitioner believes that the installation of cabs or canopies on the foregoing equipment will substantially reduce the machine operator's vision and mobility thereby endangering the lives of the operators and other miners in the area.

REQUEST FOR HEARING OR COMMENTS

Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before July 7, 1976. Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc.76-16707 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. M 76-137]

ROYAL COAL CO.

Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. § 861(c) (1970), Royal Coal Company has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.1710 to its Royal No. 7 Mine, Beckley, West Virginia.

30 CFR 75.1710 provides:

An authorized representative of the Secretary may require in any coal mine where the height of the coalbed permits that electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, be provided with substantially constructed canopies, or cabs, to protect the miners operating such equipment from roof falls and from rib and face rolls.

To be read in conjunction with Section 75.1710 is 30 CFR 75.1710–1 which in pertinent part provides:

* * * Except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, all self-propelled electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, which is employed in the active workings of each underground coal mine on and after January 1, 1973, shall, in accordance with the schedule of time specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of this paragraph (a), be equipped with substantially constructed canopies or cabs, located and installed in such a manner that when the operator is at the operating controls of such equipment he shall be protected from falls

of roof, face, or rib, or from rib and face rolls. The requirements of this paragraph (a) shall be met as follows:

(1) On and after January 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 72 inches or more;

(2) On and after July 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 60 inches or more, but less than 72 inches;

(3) On and after January 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 48 inches or more, but less than 60 inches;

(4) On and after July 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 36 inches or more, but less than 48 inches;

(5) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 36 inches; and

(6) On and after July 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of less than 24 inches. * * *

The substance of Petitioner's statement is as follows:

The Royal No. 7 Mine has an average mining height of 32 inches. Due to the limited clearance between equipment and roof support in a seam of this height, the operator must, necessarily, operate under conditions of reduced visibility. The addition of a cab or canopy reduces existing visibility to the point that three hazards are created:

(1) Collisions with Roof Support.

(a) In order to allow an operator even minimal visibility across the top of his machine, a canopy must add several inches of height to a piece of equipment. In a mining height of less than 48 inches, the dimensions of roof support used to supplement the regular bolting plan become very critical; thus, the strength of supplemental roof support must be limited in lower areas in order to accommodate the enlarged equipment.

(b) A canopy obscures an operator's view of overhead roof support; this, along with the accompanying increase in equipment height, substantially increases the probability of roof support being dislodged through an error in judgment by the operator. While a roof fall is not normally the immediate result of such an occurrence, the roof is weakened each time its support is disturbed.

(2) Injury to the operator.

(a) In mining heights under 48 inches, equipment operators use variations in seam height to great advantage. Whenever possible, switching and maneuvering operations are performed where seam height allows the best visibility. In order for a piece of equipment to be used on a given section, its canopy must be lowered to allow clearance under the lowest conditions on that section. Thus, the advantage of using higher areas for difficult maneuvering and safety is lost. The operator is forced to negotiate the entire section under the limiting conditions of only a part of it.

(b) Due to the severely reduced visibility caused by a cab or canopy in mining heights below 48 inches, an operator often must extend his head beyond the side support of the canopy in order to see ahead of his machine. Extending himself to the side of the equipment results in an unnatural operating position for the driver and, thus, reduces his ability to control the equipment. In this position, the operator is vulnerable to injury due to collision with the rib or other obstacles in tight-clearance situations.

(3) Injury to other persons.

When an operator's vision is restricted by the addition of a cab or canopy, the increased hazard to persons working near the moving equipment is obvious. This hazard is made worse when side clearances are reduced due to the installation of a cab, thereby creating a "pinch-point" for persons who happen to be beside a machine while it is in motion.

At present, technology is not available to allow us to install cabs or canopies on the equipment in use at the Royal No. 7 Mine without creating serious safety hazards.

REQUEST FOR HEARING OR COMMENTS

Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before July 7, 1976. Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc.76-16712 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. M 76-138]

ROYAL COAL CO.

Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. § (c) (1970), Royal Coal Company has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.-1710 to its Royal No. 2 Mine, Beckley, West Virginia.

30 CFR 75.1710 provides:

An authorized representative of the Secretary may require in any coal mine where the height of the coalbed permits that electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, be provided with substantially constructed canopies, or cabs, to protect the miners operating such equipment from roof falls and from rib and face rolls.

To be read in conjunction with Section 75.1710 is 30 CFR 75.1710-1 which in pertinent part provides:

* * * Except as provided in paraargph (f) of this section, all self-propelled electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, which is employed in the active workings of each underground coal mine on and after January 1, 1973, shall in accordance with the schedule of time specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of this paragraph (a), be equipped with substantially constructed canopies or cabs, located and installed in such a manner that when the operator is at the operating controls of such equipment he shall be protected from falls of roof, face, or rib, or from rib and face rolls. The requirements of this paragraph (a) shall be met as follows:

(1) On and after January 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 72 inches or more;

(2) On and after July 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 60 inches or more, but less than 72 inches;

(3) On and after January 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 48 inches or more, but less than 60 inches;

(4) On and after July 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 36 inches or more, but less than 48 inches;

(5) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 36 inches; and

(6) On and after July 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of less than 24 inches. * * *

The substance of Petitioner's statement is as follows:

The Royal No. 2 Mine has an average mining height of 34 inches. Due to the limited clearance between equipment and roof support in a seam of this height, the operator must, necessarily, operate under conditions of reduced visibility. The addition of a cab or canopy reduces existing visibility to the point that three hazards are created:

(1) Collisions with Roof Support.

(a) In order to allow an operator even minimal visibility across the top of his machine, a canopy must add several inches of height to a piece of equipment. In a mining height of less than 48 inches, the dimensions of roof support used to supplement the regular bolting plan become very critical; thus, the strength of supplemental roof support must be limited in lower areas in order to accommodate the enlarged equipment.

(b) A canopy obscures an operator's view of overhead roof support; this, along with the accompanying increase in equipment height, substantially increases the probability of roof support being dislodged through an error in judgment by the operator. While a roof fall is not normally the immediate result of such an occurrence, the roof is weakened each time its support is disturbed.

(2) Injury to the operator.

(a) In mining heights under 48 inches, equipment operators use variations in seam height to great advantage. Whenever possible, switching and maneuvering operations are performed where seam height allows the best visibility. In order for a piece of equipment to be used on a given section, its canopy must be lowered to allow clearance under the lowest conditions on that section. Thus, the advantage of using higher areas for difficult maneuvering and safety is lost. The operator is forced to negotiate the entire section under the limiting conditions of only a part of it.

(b) Due to the severely reduced visibility caused by a cab or canopy in mining heights below 48 inches, an operator often must extend his head beyond the side support of the canopy in order to see ahead of his machine. Extending himself to the side of the equipment results in an unnatural operating position for the driver and, thus, reduces his ability to control the equipment. In this posi-

tion, the operator is vulnerable to injury due to collision with the rib or other obstacles in tight-clearance situations.

(3) Injury to other persons.

When an operator's vision is restricted by the addition of a cab or canopy, the increased hazard to persons working near the moving equipment is obvious. This hazard is made worse when side clearances are reduced due to the installation of a cab, thereby creating a "pinch-point" for persons who happen to be beside a machine while it is in motion.

At present, technology is not available to allow us to install cabs or canopies on the equipment in use at the Royal No. 2 Mine without creating serious safety hazards.

REQUEST FOR HEARING OR COMMENTS

Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before July 7, 1976. Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc.76-16713 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. M 76-136]

ROYAL COAL CO.

Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. § 861(c) 1970), Royal Coal Company has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.1710 to its Royal No. 5 Mine, Beckley, West Virginia.

30 CFR 75.1710 provides:

An authorized representative of the Secretary may require in any coal mine where the height of the coalbed permits that electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, be provided with substantially constructed canopies, or cabs, to protect the miners operating such equipment from roof falls and from rib and face rolls.

To be read in conjunction with Section 75.1710 is 30 CFR 75.1710-1 which in pertinent part provides:

* * * Except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, all self-propelled electric face equipment, including shuttle cars, which is employed in the active workings of each underground coal mine on and after January 1, 1973, shall in accordance with the schedule of time specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of this paragraph (a), be equipped with substantially constructed canopies or cabs, located and installed in such a manner that when the operator is at the operating controls of such equipment he shall be protected from falls of roof, face, or rib, or from rib and face rolls. The requirements of this paragraph (a) shall be met as follows:

(1) On and after January 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 72 inches or more;

(2) On and after July 1, 1974, in coal mines having mining heights of 60 inches or more, but less than 72 inches;

(3) On and after January 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 48 inches or more, but less than 60 inches;

(4) On and after July 1, 1975, in coal mines having mining heights of 36 inches or more, but less than 48 inches;

(5) On and after January 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of 24 inches or more, but less than 36 inches; and

(6) On and after July 1, 1976, in coal mines having mining heights of less than 24 inches. * * *

The substance of Petitioner's statement is as follows:

The Royal No. 5 Mine has an average mining height of 38 inches. Due to the limited clearance between equipment and roof support in a seam of this height, the operator must, necessarily, operate under conditions of reduced visibility. The addition of a cab or canopy reduces existing visibility to the point that three hazards are created:

(1) Collisions with Roof Support.

(a) In order to allow an operator even minimal visibility across the top of his machine, a canopy must add several inches of height to a piece of equipment. In a mining height of less than 48 inches, the dimensions of roof support used to supplement the regular bolting plan become very critical; thus, the strength of supplemental roof support must be limited in lower areas in order to accommodate the enlarged equipment.

(b) A canopy obscures an operator's view of overhead roof support; this, along with the accompanying increase in equipment height, substantially increases the probability of roof support being dislodged through an error in judgment by the operator. While a roof fall is not normally the immediate result of such an occurrence, the roof is weakened each time its support is disturbed.

(2) Injury to the operator.

(a) In mining heights under 48 inches, equipment operators use variations in seam height to great advantage. Whenever possible, switching and maneuvering operations are performed where seam height allows the best visibility. In order for a piece of equipment to be used on a given section, its canopy must be lowered to allow clearance under the lowest conditions on that section. Thus, the advantage of using higher areas for difficult maneuvering and safety is lost. The operator is forced to negotiate the entire section under the limiting conditions of only a part of it.

(b) Due to the severely reduced visibility caused by a cab or canopy in mining heights below 48 inches, an operator often must extend his head beyond the side support of the canopy in order to see ahead of his machine. Extending himself to the side of the equipment results in an unnatural operating position for the driver and, thus, reduces his ability to control the equipment. In this position, the operator is vulnerable to injury due to collision with the rib or other obstacles in tight-clearance situations.

(3) Injury to other persons.

When an operator's vision is restricted by the addition of a cab or canopy, the increased hazard to persons working near the moving equipment is obvious. This hazard is made worse when side clearances are reduced due to the installation of a cab, thereby creating a "pinch-point" for persons who happen to be beside a machine while it is in motion.

At present, technology is not available to allow us to install cabs or canopies on the equipment in use at the Royal No. 5 Mine without creating serious safety hazards.

REQUEST FOR HEARING OR COMMENTS

Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before July 7, 1976. Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc.76-16714 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Soil Conservation Service

CANE CREEK IMPROVEMENT AREA RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT (RC&D) MEASURE, TENNESSEE

Availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement

Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; Part 1500 of the Council on Environmental Quality Guidelines (38 FR 20550, August 1, 1973); and Part 650 of the Soil Conservation Service Guidelines (39 FR 19650, June 3, 1974); the Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, has prepared a final environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Cane Creek Improvement Area RC&D Measure, Putnam County, Tennessee, USDA-SCS-EIS-RCD-(ADM)-76-1(F)TN.

The EIS concerns a measure for watershed protection, flood prevention, and public water-based recreation on Cane Creek, Putnam County, Tennessee. The planned works of improvement provide for construction of a multiple-purpose structure with associated recreation development.

The final EIS has been filed with the Council on Environmental Quality.

A limited supply is available to fill single copy requests at the following location:

Soil Conservation Service, USDA, 561 U.S. Courthouse, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

"(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 10.901, National Archives Reference Services.)

Dated: June 1, 1976.

NEIL F. BOGNER,
Acting Deputy Administrator for Field Services, Soil Conservation Service.

[FR Doc.76-16699 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

MUDDY CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT MISSISSIPPI AND TENNESSEE

Availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement

Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; Part 1500 of the Council on Environmental Quality Guidelines (38 FR 20550, August 1, 1973); and Part 650 of the Soil Conservation Service Guidelines (39 FR 19650, June 3, 1974); the Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, has prepared a final environmental impact statement for the Muddy Creek Watershed Project, Tippah County, Mississippi and Hardeman County, Tennessee.

The environmental impact statement concerns the channel portion of a plan for watershed protection, flood prevention, and recreation. The planned works of improvement include conservation land treatment, supplemented by channel work. The channel work will involve clearing and debris removal on 8.2 miles of existing channels and enlargement of 23.2 miles of existing channels. The entire 31.4 miles of channel work will be accomplished on previously modified channels. The lower one-third of main Muddy Creek (about 8.0 miles) is perennial with the upper two-thirds of main Muddy Creek and the tributaries being intermittent. Most of the planned land treatment measures, 17 floodwater retarding structures, one multiple-purpose structure, and 28 sediment control structures have been installed or covered under a negative declaration.

The final EIS has been filed with the Council on Environmental Quality.

A limited supply is available at the following location to fill single copy requests:

Soil Conservation Service, USDA, P.O. Box 610, Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Dated: June 2, 1976.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 10.904, National Archives Reference Services.)

JOSEPH W. HAAS,
Deputy Administrator for Water Resources, Soil Conservation Service.

[FR Doc. 76-16613 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census

CENSUS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS

Public Meeting Changes

On May 10, 1976, a Notice was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 19147) of a meeting of the Census Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics to be held on June 15, 1976 at 9:00 p.m. at the Marriott Inn, Clarksville, Indiana; that meeting has been cancelled. The Federal Register Notice also scheduled a meeting of the Committee for 8:00 a.m. on June 16, 1976 in the Bureau of the Census, Jeffersonville, Indiana; that meeting will now be held at 9:00 a.m. in Room 2424, Federal Building 3 at the Bureau of the Census in Suitland, Maryland.

There are no substantive changes to the agenda as published for the June 16 meeting.

Persons planning to attend and wishing additional information concerning this meeting should contact the Committee Control Officer, Mr. Orvin L. Wilhite, Chief, Agriculture Division, Bureau of the Census, Room 3015, Federal Building 4, Suitland, Maryland. (Mail address: Washington, D.C. 20233). Telephone (301) 763-5230.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

VINCENT P. BARABBA,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

[FR Doc.76-16642 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix I), announcement is made of the following National Advisory body scheduled to assemble during the month of June 1976:

MINORITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE, ADAMHA

June 28-29; 9 a.m.
June 28, Conference Room F, June 29, Conference Room A, Parklawn Building, Rockville, Maryland.

OPEN MEETING

Contact Ernest F. Hurst, Parklawn Building, Room 13C-15, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852, 301-443-3838.

Purpose: The Minority Advisory Committee, ADAMHA, advises the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Administrator, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, on needs, programs, and activities regarding minority alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health matters, and makes recommendations for possible solutions which meet the needs and concerns of minority groups throughout the United States. The Committee functions in an advisory capacity to the Administrator, ADAMHA, on these matters which relate to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institute on Drug Abuse, and the National Institute of Mental Health.

Agenda: This meeting will be open to the public. The agenda will include reports by committee members on FY 1976-1977 priority issues and on liaison with national organizations, a review and discussion of the committee's findings and recommendations with the Administrator, ADAMHA, and with the Institute Directors, a meeting with the community representatives and staffs of Metropolitan Area Alcoholism, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Programs, as well as staff reports on health planning systems, community mental health legislation (status of regulations and impact of legislation on minority groups). Agenda items are subject to change as priorities dictate. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

Substantive program information may be obtained from the contact person listed above.

Mr. James C. Helsing, Deputy Director, Office of Public Affairs, ADAMHA, will furnish, on request, summaries of the meeting and a roster of the committee members. Mr. Helsing is located in Room 16-95, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852, 301-443-3783.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

CAROLYN T. EVANS,
Committee Management Officer, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration

[FR Doc.76-16649 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

NATIONAL PANEL ON ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting

In accordance with Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix I), announcement is made of the following National Advisory body scheduled to assemble during the month of June 1976:

NATIONAL PANEL ON ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH

June 30; 9:30 a.m.
Conference Room 14-105, Parklawn Building, Rockville, Maryland.

OPEN MEETING

Contact Mr. Robert W. Brown, Parklawn Building, Room 13C-26, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20851, 301-443-3706.

Purpose: The National Panel on Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health advises and makes recommendations to the Secretary concerning the activities to be carried out through the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration. By law, the Panel is composed of three members, one each from the public members of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Advisory Council on Drug Abuse, and the National Advisory Mental Health Council.

Agenda: This meeting will be open to the public. Agenda items will include a discussion of the report of the President's Panel on Biomedical Research, State-level organization of Alcohol, Drug Abuse, Mental Health, and State Advisory Councils, and reports by each Panel member on the activities of each Institute's National Advisory Council which cut across the program activities of other Institutes. Agenda items are subject to change as priorities dictate. Public attendance will be limited to space available.

Substantive program information and summaries of meetings may be obtained,

upon request, from the contact person listed above.

Dated: June 3, 1976.

CAROLYN T. EVANS,
Committee Management Officer, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration.

[FR Doc.76-16614 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. 76F-0186]

3M CO.

Filing of Petition for Food Additive

Pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 409 (b)(5), 72 Stat. 1786 (21 U.S.C. 348(b)(5))), notice is given that a petition (FAP 6B3129) has been filed by the 3M Co., 3M Center, St. Paul, MN 55101, proposing that § 121.2622 Styrene block polymers (21 CFR 121.2622) be amended to provide for safe use of styrene block polymers with 1,3-butadiene as a component of pressure-sensitive adhesive intended to contact nonfatty food.

The environmental impact analysis report and other relevant material have been reviewed, and it has been determined that the proposed use of the additive will not have a significant environmental impact. Copies of the environmental impact analysis report may be seen in the office of the Assistant Commissioner for Public Affairs, Rm. 15B-42 or the office of the Hearing Clerk, Food and Drug Administration, Rm. 4-65, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20852, during working hours, Monday through Friday.

Dated: June 1, 1976.

DONALD W. RIESTER,
Acting Director, Bureau of Foods.

[FR Doc.76-16615 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

NATIONAL ADVISORY FOOD AND DRUG COMMITTEE

Meeting

This notice announces the forthcoming meetings of a public advisory committee of the Food and Drug Administration and is issued under section 10(a)(1) and (2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 86 Stat. 770-776 (5 U.S.C. App. I)):

Committee name	Date, time, and place	Type of meeting and contact person
National Advisory Food and Drug Committee.	June 29 and 30, 9 a.m., Conference Room F, Parklawn Bldg., 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Md.	Open committee discussion June 29, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.; open public hearing June 30, 9 to 10 a.m.; open committee discussion June 30, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.; William V. Whitehorn, M.D. (HFG-1), 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Md. 20852, 301-443-1547.

General function of the committee. Reviews and evaluates agency programs and advises on policy matters of national significance as they relate to the statutory mission of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the areas of foods, drugs, cosmetics, medical devices, biological products, and electronic products. Reviews and makes recommendations on applications for grants-in-aid for research projects relevant to the mission of FDA, as required by law.

Agenda—Open public hearing. Any interested person may present information, data, or views, orally or in writing, on issues pending before the committee.

Open committee discussion. State of agency; status reports on the blending issue and of the Subcommittee on Antibiotics in Animal Feeds; review of agency reforms—(a) report of Subcommittee on FDA reorganization and (b) FDA legislative package; priority planning update; public policy regarding risk; and concerns of the members.

Agenda items are subject to change as priorities dictate.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

WILLIAM F. RANDOLPH,
Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.

[FR Doc.76-16628 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

PANEL ON REVIEW OF GENERAL AND PLASTIC SURGERY DEVICES

Agenda Change

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of October 6, 1972 (Pub. L. 92-463, 86 Stat. 770-776 (5 U.S.C. App. I), the Food and Drug Administration announced, in a notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of May 19, 1976 (41 FR 20606), public advisory committee meetings and other required information in accordance with provisions set forth in section 10(a)(1) and (2) of the act.

Notice is hereby given that the agenda items listed in the above-mentioned notice of meetings for the Panel on Review of General and Plastic Surgery Devices meeting of June 24 will be superseded by the following agenda items:

Open public hearing. (8 a.m. to 10 a.m.) Presentations will be made by the following: Charles T. Patrick and Alan G. Furler (NDM Corp.)—"Patient Return Electrode Requirements for Electrosurgery"; Dr. Leon Goldman (Director—Laser Laboratory, Medical Center, University of Cincinnati)—"Safety and Efficacy of Surgical Lasers."

Interested parties are encouraged to present information to the panel pertinent to the classification of devices listed at the end of this announcement. Submission of data relative to the panel's tentative classification findings is also invited. Those persons desiring to make formal presentations should notify Mark Parish (HFK-470), 8758 Georgia Ave., Silver Spring, MD 20910, 301-427-7238, before the meeting.

Open committee discussion. (10 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.) The general and plastic surgery panel preliminarily classified electrosurgical units and accessories and surgical lasers into the Class II regulatory category—Standards.

Following this preliminary recommendation, a priority ranking of Class II devices by all of the classification panels resulted in the placement of electrosurgical devices within the group of devices most urgently requiring the development of standards. Surgical lasers were ranked immediately below electrosurgical devices.

The panel will discuss these devices, specifically addressing (1) any potential for hazard in their use, and their effectiveness and (2) whether the development of standards for surgical lasers will be an effective and appropriate method to reduce potential hazards and ensure effectiveness.

The panel will also discuss and formulate its recommendations for the content of performance standards for these devices.

The panel will also review its previous classification results for the following devices according to the statutory requirements of the Medical Device Amendments of 1976 (Pub. L. 94-295): Catheters—balloon type, biliary, cardiovascular, cholangiography, continuous irrigation, eustachian, irrigation; electrosurgical cutting and coagulation devices and accessories; fiberoptic endoscopes; gauze—absorbable, nonabsorbable (medicated, nonmedicated, X-ray detectable); laser—surgical; mesh-metallic, polymeric; prosthesis kit and accessories; prostheses—arterial grafts (biological and synthetic), chin, ear, larynx, mamary; suction device—high vacuum; tubing—disposable and reusable.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

WILLIAM F. RANDOLPH,
Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.

[FR Doc.76-16629 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. 76F-0187]

PHELPS DODGE MAGNET WIRE CO.

Filing of Petition for Food Additive

Pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 409 (b)(5), 72 Stat. 1786 (21 U.S.C. 348(b)(5))), notice is given that a petition (FAP 6B3201) has been filed by the Phelps Dodge Magnet Wire Co., P.O. Box 600, Ft. Wayne, IN 46801, proposing that § 121.2628 Polyamide-imide resins (21 CFR 121.2628) be amended to provide for a specification change in the minimum solution viscosity of the resin from the currently permitted 1.550 to a revised minimum viscosity of 1.200 (as determined by a method available from the Commissioner of Food and Drugs).

The environmental impact analysis report and other relevant material have been reviewed, and it has been determined that the proposed use of the additive will not have a significant environmental impact. Copies of the environmental impact analysis report may be seen in the office of the Assistant Commissioner for Public Affairs, Rm. 15B-42 or the office of the Hearing Clerk, Food and Drug Administration, Rm. 4-65, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20852, dur-

ing working hours, Monday through Friday.

Dated: June 1, 1976.

DONALD W. RIESTER,
Acting Director,
Bureau of Foods.

[FR Doc.76-16616 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. D-76-435]

CAMDEN AREA OFFICE, REGION II, NEW YORK

Designation and Delegation of Authority

SECTION A. *Designation of Acting Area Director.* Each of the officials appointed to the following position is designated to serve as Acting Area Director during the absence of, or vacancy in the position of, the Area Director, with all the powers, functions, and duties redelegated or assigned to the Area Directors; Provided, That no official is authorized to serve as Acting Area Director unless all officials listed before him in this designation are unavailable to act by reason of absence or vacancy in the position:

1. The Deputy Area Director
2. The Area Counsel
3. The Director, Housing Production and Mortgage Credit
4. The Equal Opportunity Officer
5. The Director, Community Planning and Development
6. The Director, Housing Management

Effective Date: This designation and delegation shall be effective June 9, 1976.

S. WILLIAM GREEN,
Regional Administrator,
New York Regional Office.

[FR Doc.76-16749 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. D-76-436]

NEWARK AREA OFFICE, REGION II, NEW YORK

Designation and Delegation of Authority

SECTION A. *Designation of Acting Area Director.* Each of the officials appointed to the following position is designated to serve as Acting Area Director during the absence of, or vacancy in the position of, the Area Director, with all the powers, functions, and duties redelegated or assigned to the Area Directors; Provided, That no official is authorized to serve as Acting Area Director unless all officials listed before him in this designation are unavailable to act by reason of absence or vacancy in the position:

1. The Deputy Area Director
2. The Director, Housing Management
3. The Director, Housing Production Mortgage Credit
4. The Director, Community Planning and Development
5. The Director, Equal Opportunity
6. The Area Counsel

Effective Date: This designation and delegation shall be effective June 9, 1976.

S. WILLIAM GREEN,
Regional Administrator,
New York Regional Office.

[FR Doc.76-16748 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Docket No. 29278]

STAFF TASK FORCE REPORT ON SERVICE TO SMALL COMMUNITIES

Comment Period Extension

JUNE 4, 1976.

On May 18, 1976, the Civil Aeronautics Board announced that public comment on the Staff Task Force Report on Service to Small Communities should be received at the Board on or before June 18, 1976. The date for the submission of public comments on the report is hereby extended until July 19, 1976.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board.

PHYLLIS T. KAYLOR,
Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16701 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket 27914]

TOURIST ENTERPRISES CORPORATION "ORBIS"

Prehearing Conference

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, that a further prehearing conference in the above-entitled matter is assigned to be held on July 15, 1976, at 10:00 a.m. (local time), in Room 1003, Hearing Room B, Universal North Building, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

Dated at Washington, D.C., June 1, 1976.

RONNIE A. YODER,
Administrative Law Judge.

[FR Doc.76-16700 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS ADVISORY PANEL

Meeting

JUNE 7, 1976.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel (HEPAP) will meet June 29 through July 1, 1976. The meeting will be held at Argonne National Laboratory; Argonne, Illinois, in the Zero Gradient Synchrotron (ZGS) Building 362. The portion of the meeting which will be open to the public will convene from 10:30 a.m. to approximately 6 p.m. on June 29, reconvene from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on June 30, and will resume at 9 a.m. to end at aproximately 11:30 a.m. on July 1.

A major component of the meeting will be to review and discuss the research program and facility development at the ZGS. The Panel will examine the current status of budget requests for the High Energy Physics Program; discuss proton-proton colliding beam facilities; discuss approaches toward a study of manpower projections and analyses; discuss initiation of a study of high energy physics computer needs and policies at national laboratories; and hear a report on recent results of an ongoing study to investigate potential problems that might arise in any future collaborative effort by the U.S., USSR, European nations, and Japan to build a very big high energy accelerator.

In addition to the public sessions, two (2) executive sessions of the Panel are scheduled. The first executive session will occur at approximately 9 a.m. prior to the open sesstion on June 29; the second will begin at approximately 1 p.m. on July 1 and continue throughout the end of the meeting at approximately 4:30 p.m. Topics to be discussed at these executive sessions are the future allocation of resources for operations, priorities among proposed future construction projects and other similar matters.

I have determined, in accordance with subsection 10(d) of Pub. L. 92-463 that these executive sessions will consist of an exchange of opinions and formulation of recommendations, the discussion of which, if written would fall within exemption (5) of 5 U.S.C. 552(b).

It is essential to close these portions of the meeting to protect the free interchange of internal views to avoid undue interference with Agency or Committee operation.

The Chairman is empowered to conduct the meeting in a manner that in his judgment will facilitate the orderly conduct of business.

With respect to public participation in the meeting, the following requirements shall apply:

(a) Persons wishing to submit written statements on the topics for discussion may do so by mailing 25 copies thereof, postmarked, if possible no later than June 14, 1976, to the Executive Secretary, High Energy Physics Advisory Panel, Dr. Ernest Coleman, Division of Physical Research, U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration, Washington, DC 20545. Minutes of the meeting will be kept open for 30 days for receipt of written statements for the record.

(b) Those persons submitting a written statement in accordance with paragraph (a) above may request an opportunity to make oral statements concerning the written statement, and shall set forth reasons justifying the need for such oral statements and their usefulness to the Panel. To the extent that the time available for the meeting permits, the Panel will receive oral statements during a period of not more than 30 minutes at an appropriate time, chosen by the Chairman.

(c) Requests for the opportunity to make oral statements shall be ruled on by the Chairman of the Panel, who is empowered to apportion the time available among those selected by him to make oral statements.

(d) Information as to the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements, and the time allotted, can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call on June 16, 1976, to the office of the Executive Secretary of the Panel on (301) 353-3624 between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

(e) Questions at the meeting may be asked only by members of the Advisory Panel.

(f) Seating for the public will be made available on a first-come first-served basis.

(g) Copies of minutes of public sessions will be made available for copying, following their certification by the Chairman, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, at the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration's Public Document Room, 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, upon payment of all charges required by law.

HARRY L. PEEBLES,
Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc.76-16794 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 557-4]

AMBIENT AIR MONITORING REFERENCE AND EQUIVALENT METHODS

Receipt of Application for Reference or Equivalent Method Determination

Notice is hereby given that on May 7, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency received an application from ASARCO Incorporated to determine if its Model 500 Sulfur Dioxide anayzer should be designated by the Administrator of the EPA as an equivalent method under 40 CFR Part 53, promulgated February 18, 1975 (40 FR 7044). If, after appropriate technical study, the Administrator determines that this method should be so designated, notice thereof will be given in a subsequent issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Dated: June 3, 1976.

WILSON K. TALLEY,
Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc.76-16742 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[FRL 557-8; OTS-01-76]

CHLORALKYLENE FLUIDS

Opinion Regarding Use as Dielectric Fluids

On May 14, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency received a request from the Prodelec Company for the Agency's opinion regarding the environmental risk involved in using chloralkylene fluids as a substitute for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's) as dielectric fluids. The Agency responded to this request with the following correspondence:

PRODELEC Specialites Rhone-Progil, Ugine-Kuhlmann, Pour L'Industrie Electrique, 21, Rue Jean Goujon, 75008 Paris Tel.: 256-40-00; Telex: Rhone x 640100 F; Telegr.: Rhodia-Paris 086.

E.P.A., OFFICE OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES, 401 M Street, S.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. (U.S.A.)

Subject: Chloralkylene/substitute dielectric fluid.

Paris, 10th May 1976.

ATTENTION: Russell Train.

DEAR MR. TRAIN: We wish to thank Mr. Schweitzer and his group for the informal meeting at which we discussed the environmental impact study and the other aspects of our proposed replacement for the polychlorobiphenyls used in the American capacitor industry.

We would like to propose our product as the best temporary solution to this problem and we would very much appreciate learning the reaction of the EPA to our request for Chloralkylene to be accepted on a temporary basis until such time a more suitable product can be found completely acceptable for both the environment and for use in the capacitor industry.

Our Chloralkylene is based on mono and dichloro biphenyl which have not been found in the environment (although dichlorobiphenyl amount to 20% in commercial PCB's). The tests carried out on Chloralkylene which could be completed by some additional studies as suggested during our meeting with Mr. Schweitzer, indicate in particular that this product is farly easily metabolized in different biotas and does not offer the risks of persistency and accumulation which in the case of PCB's are of so much concern to the ecologist.

However, we do not think our product cannot be proved to be completely safe for the environment but at this time it is clear that it fulfills all the requirements of the capacitor industry and could be considered as a biodegradable replacement for PCB's and a comparatively non toxic substitute.

Therefore, we would appreciate your information at this time concerning, whether or not we should continue our studies and whether the EPA is willing to consider Chloralkylene as a suitable temporary replacement.

Yours faithfully,

G. PAINDAVOINE.
B. REY COQUAIS

Mr. GERARD PAINDAVOINE,
Directeur,
Mr. BRUNO REY-COQUAIS, *Ingenieur* I.C.P.I.
Societe Prodelec, 21, rue Jean-Goujon, 75360 Paris, Cedex 08, France.

GENTLEMEN: We have received your letter of May 10, 1976, requesting our views on the environmental acceptability of Chloralkylene, a mixture containing polychlorinated biphenyl compounds and alkylchlorobiphenyl isomers, in electrical capacitors with a potential production level for such application of several tens of millions of pounds annually. Our preliminary conclusions concerning the environmental aspects of this proposed replacement fluid for Aroclor 1016, based on your technical briefing and your supporting documentation, are set forth below.

The data that have been developed on Chloralkylene are inadequate to assess the environmental acceptability of a product with a chemical structure so closely related to other polychlorinated biphenyls which have caused considerable environmental damage. For example, not a single lifetime animal feeding study has been conducted on Chloralkylene nor is one planned. Also, there are serious unresolved questions concerning the persistence of Chloralkylene. Its effects on aquatic organisms are not well understood. We also are concerned that your studies apparently show that metabolites of Chloralkylene may include the hydroxylated biphenyl, which could be of even greater concern than the starting material.

In the absence of more definitive data demonstrating the likelihood that Chloralkylene will not present environmental problems, we must recommend against the introduction of Chloralkylene for use in capacitors.

We are aware that some specialists believe that the less highly chlorinated biphenyls may present less of an environmental hazard than the more highly chlorinated ones. In the absence of more persuasive documentation than is currently available, however, we do not share the view that the degree of chlorination is the only determining factor in considering the environmental acceptability of this class of chemicals. Furthermore, even if some polychlorinated biphenyls are somewhat less toxic, less bioaccumulative, and less persistent than others, we consider that the properties of all members of the class are sufficiently undesirable to warrant major environmental concerns.

Sincerely,

GLENN E. SCHWEITZER,
Director,
Office of Toxic Substances.

The Agency would like to receive any additional information available on this issue. Members of the public or other Federal agencies are invited to submit written comments and other information relevant to this issue or to the correspondence contained in this notice to Dr. I. E. Wallen (WSME 711), Office of Toxic Substances (WH-557), Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460. All written comments filed pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in the above office from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. during normal working days.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

A. W. BREIDENBACH,
Assistant Administrator for Water and Hazardous Materials.

[FR Doc.76-16744 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[FRL 558-1; OTS-02-76]

POLYDIMETHYLSILOXANE

Opinion Regarding Use as Coolants for Use in Transformers

On May 5, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency received a request from the Dow Corning Corporation for the Agency's opinion regarding the environmental risk involved in using polydimethylsiloxane fluids as a substitute for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) as coolants for electrical transformers. The Agency responded to this request with the following correspondence:

DOW CORNING

APRIL 30, 1976.

DR. I. E. WALLEN,
Office of Toxic Substances, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460.

DEAR DR. WALLEN: Enclosed is a copy of our answers to the questions that were raised during our informal technical meeting on March 23. We also have enclosed a number of supporting documents pertinent to these answers.

As you know, we are currently actively carrying out further research into environmental transport and decomposition routes of polydimethylsiloxane. As our information in this area grows, we are designing new experiments to investigate any potential toxicity of decomposition products. It is our in-

tention to keep you advised of our progress and to rapidly make you aware of significant results, particularly if they are contrary to the general trends we have reported to date.

We request your office to provide us with a statement stating your opinion as to the environmental risk involved in using polydimethylsiloxane fluids as coolants for electrical transformers.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. RYAN, PH. D.,
Manager Fluids Research,
Dow Corning Corporation.

DR. JOHN W. RYAN,
Manager, Fluids Research, Dow Corning Corporation, Midland, Michigan 48640.

DEAR DR. RYAN: We have received your letter of April 30, 1976, requesting our views on the environmental acceptability of polydimethylsiloxane fluids to be used in electrical transformers. The potential production level of this type of chemical for such application would be several tens of millions of pounds annually. Our preliminary conclusions concerning the environmental aspects of this fluid as a potential replacement for one of the major uses of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), based on your technical briefing and your supporting documentation, are set forth below. However, we have not attempted to assess the performance, flammability, or economic aspects of the use of these fluids in transformers.

We are unaware of any incidents of adverse health or ecological effects associated with the production, use, or disposal of polydimethylsiloxane fluids, which have been produced in the United States at an estimated level of about 340 million pounds for a variety of applications, including applications which result in substantial environmental discharges. Similarly, available laboratory test data do not suggest the likelihood of environmental problems. At the same time, however, we are unaware of any systematic epidemiological or other field efforts to search for adverse effects, and we would like to see more data on chronic health effects and effects in aquatic systems.

Despite the incompleteness of our knowledge concerning the environmental effects of polydimethylsiloxane fluids, we believe that the available information indicates that these fluids are far preferable to PCBs for use in transformers from the environmental viewpoint. Further, we have no basis for suspecting that this closed-system application will result in serious environmental problems.

Given the widespread use of polydimethylsiloxane fluids in open systems, as well as their potential use in transformers, we would encourage expanded efforts to acquire more definitive data as to the health and ecological aspects of these fluids, in addition to your current efforts directed to environmental transport and decomposition. Given the long history of usage of these fluids, epidemiological investigations of workers and users who have been exposed to them for long periods of time at relatively high concentrations should not be too difficult to organize and carry out. The single chronic toxicity animal study conducted in the 1940s was not performed at today's standards for control nor length of study. Additional animal studies of the chronic effects, particularly on the circulatory and respiratory systems, are in order. Finally, we would suggest further investigations of the likely impact of spills of polydimethylsiloxane fluids into confined aquatic areas on aquatic life, including surface dwelling insects. Since previous testing was all done with static bioassay, we would recommend, as a minimum, flow-through-bioassay with fathead minnow, sheepshead minnow, and/or Daphnia.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN E. SCHWEITZER,
Director,
Office of Toxic Substances.

The Agency would like to receive any additional information available on this issue. Members of the public or other Federal agencies are invited to submit written comments and other information relevant to this issue or to the correspondence contained in this notice to Dr. I. E. Wallen (WSME 711), Office of Toxic Substances (WH-557), Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460. All written comments filed pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in the above office from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. during normal working days.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

A. W. BREIDENBACH,
Assistant Administrator for Water and Hazardous Materials.

[FR Doc.76-16745 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

VINYL CHLORIDE

Recommended Procedures for Disposal of Aerosol Cans

Background. On January 22, 1975, the Environmental Protection Agency in the FEDERAL REGISTER canceled certain indoor aerosol pesticide products which contain vinyl chloride as a propellant (40 FR 3494). Following that action, the Office of Solid Waste Management Programs (OSWMP) of EPA developed internal guidance for the use of its Regional Offices should they be requested to provide disposal advice to affected parties.

On September 5, 1975, and again on February 6, 1976, the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) reaffirmed in the FEDERAL REGISTER its regulation declaring *any* self-pressurized products intended or suitable for household use that contain vinyl chloride monomer as an ingredient or in the propellant to be "banned hazardous substances". That action included certain repurchase requirements for manufacturers and had obvious disposal implications. In fact, CPSC in the September 5, 1975, FEDERAL REGISTER notice requested appropriate industry officials to conduct their repurchase and disposal actions in accordance with EPA guidelines (40 FR 41170). It was also noted "* * * that many States and municipalities have adopted codes for the disposal of hazardous wastes * * * [which, in many instances] are in conformity with EPA guidelines and will insure the proper disposal of the products involved." No seizure actions have been initiated to date, but the CPSC, if necessary, "will recommend to the Courts disposal methods consistent with EPA guidelines."

Purpose. Pursuant to section 204(b)(1) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, the Administrator may issue guidance and recommendations to State and local government, industry, organizations, and individuals, related to the disposal of waste materials.

The purpose of this publication is to provide guidance for the disposal of vinyl chloride-containing aerosol cans. This guidance is addressed primarily to holders[1] of large quantities of vinyl chloride-containing aerosol cans, although the recommended procedures are appropriate to disposal of any such wastes. These recommended procedures represent the best information available on preferable disposal options for vinyl chloride-containing aerosol cans.

When the problem of disposal surfaced, little was known about the chemical interactions of vinyl chloride monomer (VCM) with the environment. While the chemical and physical properties of VCM as they generally relate to its manufacture and use are known, there is limited information on how VCM reacts in a land disposal site environment. However, comparison of the known properties of VCM to those of other gases has been attempted in order to provide a base for recommended procedures for the disposal of VCM-containing aerosols. The following recommendations acknowledge recommended procedures for pesticide disposal as well as procedures for disposal of heavy-metal containing materials.

Technical background. Vinyl chloride monomer (VCM) is a chlorinated alkene hydrocarbon with a density of twice that of air. Since VCM boils at −13.37 C, it is a gas at normal atmospheric temperature and pressure. Vinyl chloride is highly flammable having a flash point of −78 C. The explosive limits are from 4 to 22 percent VCM in air by volume.

VCM is soluble in organic solvents, but not very soluble in water. The quantity of VCM that dissolves in water depends on the partial pressure of the gas above the solution. If the partial pressure of the gas above the water is reduced, VCM will escape into the gas phase and be released to the ambient air. Chemical reactions, which can occur because of water impurities, might tend to inhibit escape of vinyl chloride. Certain salts have the ability to combine with VCM; for example, soluble silver and copper salts increase the solubility of VCM in water by forming complex dissolved salts.

VCM makes up about 20 percent by volume (equivalent to about 16 percent of the net weight) of the propellant in most of the canceled pesticide aerosols. The pesticides involved are mainly pyrethrins, lindane, and malathion. In hair sprays, deodorants, paints, etc., however, VCM may constitute as much as 40 to 45 percent by volume of the contents. Other propellants are chlorofluorocarbons 11

[1] The CPSC estimated in its September 5, 1975, *Federal Register* notice that an estimated 3.3 million cans of vinyl chloride aerosols were in existence. Of these, approximately one million were in the hands of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. The remaining 2.3 million cans were in the possession of the consumer.

and 12 (e.g., Freon). Although EPA has no data on the ingredients of non-pesticide aerosols, hairsprays, for example, would be expected to consist mainly of organics, while paints may contain heavy metals such as cadmium, lead, chromium, or mercury.

Disposal of VCM-containing aerosol cans. Final disposal of VCM-containing aerosol cans should be undertaken using methods listed in order of preferred priority:

1. High temperature incineration (except for products containing heavy metals)
2. Burial in a State-approved chemical (or hazardous) waste landfill
3. Burial in a separate area of a State-approved sanitary landfill.

It should be noted that chemical treatment to recover the active materials may be technically feasible, but would require special handling techniques to remove the contents from the cans. Since this process is very costly, its feasibility depends largely upon the value of the recovered materials.

Incineration. Incineration should be used when possible for final destruction of the materials. This method is limited to heavy duty rotary-kiln or other incinerators that (1) can handle aerosol cans without damage, (2) operate at a temperature of 1000 C with two seconds dwell time, and (3) are equipped with appropriate pollution controls to meet State or local air pollution control requirements. Incinceration should not be used where the product contains more than trace quantities of heavy metals such as lead, mercury, cadmium and chromium.

High temperature incineration of pesticides, VCM, and the other propellants and solvents or carriers found in aerosol units can effectively be carried out at 1000 C with a dwell time in the combustion zone of two seconds. Although VCM probably is destroyed at a lower temperature (one source indicated 7000 C was sufficient), preparations containing pesticides may not be completely combusted. Additionally, the hair sprays, deodorants, etc. contain unknown resins which may require higher temperatures for complete destruction.

Since the cans explode and produce shrapnel at high temperatures, only heavy duty rotary-kiln or equivalent units should be considered if more than about 12 cans are to be disposed of at one time. Incinerator feed mechanisms should be adjusted to prevent injury or damage from blow-back which may occur when several aerosol units (such as one case) are introduced simultaneously.

A pollution control system will be required to remove potential air contaminants. Most of these aerosols contain chlorofluorocarbon propellants as well as VCM, and, therefore, generate both hydrogen chloride (HCl) and hydrogen fluoride (HF).

EPA publication, Hazardous Waste Management Facilities (EPA/530/SW-146.2),[2] provides information on some incineration facilities. Use of these facilities for incineration of VCM-containing aerosol cans should be checked with EPA Regional and State representatives to assure that the facility has adequate environmental controls to meet Federal/State/local regulations.

Chemical Waste Landfills. In some areas there are public or commercial landfills that have been approved by State agencies to accept industrial hazardous wastes. Such sites are located, engineered, or constructed to avoid hydraulic continuity with either surface or ground water. Disposal of VCM aerosols in these facilities does, however, require extraordinary care above that given to other toxic or hazardous wastes (such as sludges), because the gases that could be released upon rupture of the unit are highly volatile and flammable as well as toxic.

Further details on the recommended site criteria and operating procedures for landfilling are given in the following section. Specifically, however, in the case of VCM disposal in a chemical waste landfill, special bottom liners would not be needed, although all other criteria and procedures should be followed.

State-approved Sanitary Landfills. Sanitary landfills for disposal of aerosols containing VC, should only be considered if an adequate incinerator or chemical waste landfill is not available. Even then, special conditions should be observed to assure proper disposal. Such a landfill should be located and operated in an appropriate manner and be inspected and approved by State and local agencies.

The following procedures discuss the landfilling aspects of disposal of aerosols containing VCM and are only concerned with the propellant. The active ingredients in the aerosol can could dictate more stringent disposal requirements due to their potential hazard to the environment. However, the quantities of active ingredient contained are usually small (1 percent of the net weight or less). Most of the pesticide chemicals involved are insoluble in water and biodegradable. Thus, they may not move from the burial site in ground water or percolating water, but would be biodegraded to their basic constituents in place. Other products, however, may contain soluble materials capable of polluting groundwaters. Procedures discussed in the next section will limit groundwater degradation potential.

Little is known of the soil degradation of VCM gas. However, the polar molecules suggest that the gas will be loosely held in place by soil organic matter, and by the clay fraction of the soil. Soil moisture also impedes the dispersion of gases in soils; however, the best medium to contain gases would have a moisture content approaching 50 percent of field capacity. Such soils also normally contain a large, varied population of microorganisms including several species that might attack the organic compounds found in aerosols.

Recommended Procedures for Landfilling. State-approved sanitary landfills that are located, designed, and operated in accordance with EPA's "Guidelines for the Land Disposal of Solid Wastes" (40 CFR Part 241) published August 14, 1974, in the *Federal Register* (39 FR 29328) are acceptable, provided that the following special criteria and procedures are utilized:

(1) Advance notice is given to the appropriate State agency;

(2) A facility is chosen which has groundwater monitoring facilities or such facilities are provided prior to disposal of the cans. Quarterly monitoring for heavy metals or other potential pollutants should be carried out;

(3) The burial site is specifically recorded in the property records;

(4) A separate, clearly marked area is set aside so that the bottom of the trench (in which the aerosol cans are to be placed) is at least one foot above the 50-year high water table;

(5) A trench with minimum depth of 10 feet is dug;

(6) A high-density polyethylene film (20 to 30 mil) (or equivalent material) is properly installed at the bottom of the trench;

(7) One foot of topsoil covers the film (see note);

(8) A single layer of cases, or randomly distributed cans do not exceed 12 inches in depth and 3 feet in width;

(9) One foot of topsoil covers the cans (see note);

(10) Six feet of cover material is compacted over the topsoil (see note);

(11) A high-density polyethylene film liner (20 to 30 mil) is laid over the compacted cover;

(12) One foot of final cover is compacted; and

(13) The following safety precautions are observed during disposal:

No smoking or open flames, since VCM is a flammable gas,

No direct compaction of cans is undertaken since rupture will expose workers to hazardous or toxic vapors,

Each day's accumulation is covered with at least one foot of topsoil and 6 feet of cover and compacted.

NOTE.—Organic matter, clay, and moisture contents of soils will provide additional protection by interfering with the movement of chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides and VCM to the surface or to the water table. The topsoil and cover material should contain less than the optimum moisture content for compaction, in order to provide more pore space for the absorption of gases. The final cover should be mounded to approximately six inches above grade in the center to promote runoff and reduce infiltration.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

ROGER STRELOW,
Assistant Administrator for Air and Waste Management.

[FR Doc.76-16747 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[2] Referenced document may be obtained from Solid Waste Information, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, Ohio 45268.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

FARMERS BANK OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE, DOVER, DELAWARE

Suspension of Trading

It appearing to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation that an extension of the suspension of trading in the common stock of Farmers Bank of the State of Delaware being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange, ordered by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation on March 8, 1976, is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

Therefore, pursuant to Sections 12(i) and 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the suspension of trading in such securities otherwise than on a national securities exchange is extended for the period beginning at 9:00 a.m. (d.s.t.) on June 6, 1976 through June 15, 1976.

By order of the Board of Directors, June 3, 1976.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION,
ALAN R. MILLER,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16639 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

[No. 76-31]

SOUTH AMERICAN SHOE CORP. V. THE ZIM ISRAEL NAVIGATION COMPANY, LTD.

Filing of Complaint

JUNE 3, 1976.

Notice is hereby given that a complaint filed by South American Shoe Corp. against Zim Israel Navigation Company, Ltd. was served June 3, 1976. The complaint alleges that respondent has violated sections 16, 17, and 18(b)(5) by virtue of applying an outbound freight rate on shoes from New York to Greece significantly in excess of the rate applied inbound from Greece on the same commodity.

Hearing in this matter shall commence on or before December 3, 1976.

JOSEPH C. POLKING,
Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16724 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. 76-26]

TRANSCONEX INC.—PROPOSED GENERAL RATE INCREASE IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DOMESTIC OFFSHORE TRADE

Order Vacating Suspension of Rates

By Order of Investigation and Suspension served on May 11, 1976, the Commission initiated this proceeding. At issue is a 12 percent general rate increase of Transconex, Inc., an NVOCC, in the Virgin Islands trade. The suspension of the rate increase was based on an analysis of the financial data submitted by Transconex to support the increase.

Subsequent to the Commission's Order, Transconex petitioned via telex for reconsideration of the suspension and supplied additional financial data. The analysis of the additional data indicates that the suspension is no longer warranted.

Therefore, it is ordered, That the suspension of the subject tariff matter, identified in Appendix A, is hereby vacated, but that the investigation portion of the proceeding be continued;

It is further ordered, That pursuant to the provisions of the Commission's Tariff Circular No. 3 (46 CFR 531.20(f)), Transconex may file with the Commission the tariff matter necessary to vacate and set aside the suspension of said rates, such tariff matter to become effective on not less than one day's notice;

It is further ordered, That a copy of this Order shall be filed with Transconex's Tariff FMC-F No. 1, shall be served upon all parties to this proceeding and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Commission.

JOSEPH C. POLKING,
Assistant Secretary.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCONEX, INC.

FMC-F NO. 1

14th Revised Page 15
9th Revised Page 24
12th Revised Page 25
10th Revised Page 26
11th Revised Page 25
11th Revised Page 27
11th Revised Page 37
12th Revised Page 38
13th Revised Page 38
12th Revised Page 39
12th Revised Page 40

[FR Doc.76-16723 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Project No. 2376]

APPALACHIAN POWER CO.

Application for Approval of Revised Exhibits J and K and Exhibit R

JUNE 2, 1976.

Public notice is hereby given that an application was filed on February 6, 1976, under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 791a-825r) by Appalachian Power Company (Correspondence to: Mr. Herbert B. Cohn, Vice President, Appalachian Power Company, P.O. Box 18, Bowling Green Station; New York, New York 10004) for approval of revised Exhibits J and K and Exhibit R for the constructed Reusens Project No. 2376, located on the James River in Amherst, Bedford, and Campbell Counties, Virginia. Applicant also filed a revised Exhibit F to reflect current land ownership at the project. The proposed change in exhibits would only affect lands in Amherst County, Virginia.

Applicant seeks Commission approval of revised Exhibits J and K and Exhibit R that were filed in accordance with Article 30 of the license for the project. The Exhibit R describes existing recreation facilities for picnicking and boat launching on the 9.35-acre Monacan Recreation Area purchased by Applicant in 1968. No further recreational development is planned. The proposed revision to the Exhibits J and K is to illustrate the inclusion of the above-mentioned tract of land within the project boundary.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before July 19, 1976, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. § 1.8 or § 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules. The application is on file with the Commission and is available for public inspection.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by Sections 308 and 309 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. § 825g, § 825h) and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, specifically Section 1.32(b) (18 C.F.R. § 1.32(b)), as amended by Order No. 518, a hearing may be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no issue of substance is raised by any request to be heard, protest or petition filed subsequent to this notice within the time required herein and if Applicant requests that the shortened procedure of § 1.32(b) be used. If an issue of substance is so raised or Applicant fails to request the shortened procedure, further notice of hearing will be given.

Under the shortened procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing before the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16682 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-713]

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE CO.

Tender of Rate Supplement

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that, on May 28, 1976, Arizona Public Service Company (APS) tendered for filing Supplement No. 1 to Service Schedule E of the Power Coordination Agreement between APS and Tucson Gas and Electric Company, Rate Schedule FPC No. 32. APS states that this supplement establishes additional delivery and redelivery points and also provides for a change in the manner for computation of transmission lines.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal

Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 21, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16692 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. RP74-61(PGA76-3); and RP76-10(PGA76-3)]

ARKANSAS LOUISIANA GAS CO.

Filing of Revised Tariff Sheets

JUNE 1, 1976.

Take notice that on May 25, 1976, Arkansas Louisiana Gas Company (Arkla) tendered for filing Eighth Revised Sheet No. 4 in its Rate Schedule G-2, FPC Gas Tariff, First Revised Volume No. 1 and Fifth Revised Sheet No. 185 in its Rate Schedule X-26, FPC Gas Tariff Original Volume No. 3. Arkla requests an effective date of July 1, 1976.

The company states that copies of the revised tariff sheets and supporting data are being mailed to Arkla's jurisdictional customers and other interested parties.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a Petition to Intervene or Protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 10, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a Petition to Intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16669 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. RP71-122; Docket No. RP74-94-1]

ARKANSAS LOUISIANA GAS CO. AND ARKANSAS GAS CO.; ARKANSAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORP.

Order Affirming in Part, and Modifying in Part, the Initial Decision, and Establishing Procedures

JUNE 2, 1976.

Before Commissioners: Richard L. Dunham, Chairman; John H. Holloman III, and James G. Watt.

This is the latest in a series of opinions and orders dealing with our attempts to devise and implement a plan for required curtailment of gas deliveries on the system of Arkansas Louisiana Gas Company (Arkla). These proceedings were initiated on May 18, 1971, when Arkla filed a proposed curtailment plan which, in the course of time, we ordered Arkla to modify in various respects. In Opinion No. 643,[1] we found, based on the record, the initial decision, and the briefs there before us, that Arkla should be required to institute a plan which incorporated the priorities of service established in Order No. 467,[2] which we issued the same day. Arkla was directed to file revised tariff tsheets reflecting these mandated adjustments. Arkla complied by filing a remodelled plan on or about March 7, 1973. In the interim, however, several of Arkla's customers had sought rehearing of portions of Opinion No. 643. Accordingly, on April 10, 1973, we issued Opinion No. 643-A,[3] wherein we confirmed Opinion No. 643 in all significant respects, but modified slightly the priority of service categories to be observed by Arkla, in conformity with Order No. 467-B,[4] which had been issued the month before. Additionally, we defined certain key terms as used in Opinion No. 643, et seq., including "firm service" and "interruptible service".[5]

---

[1] 49 F.P.C. (1973).

[2] Order No. 467 entitled "Statement of Policy", Utilization and Conservation of Natural Resources—Natural Gas Act, Docket No. R-469 (issued January 8, 1973), as amended by Order Nos. 467-A, 467-B, and 467-C, issued January 15, 1973, March 2, 1973, April 4, 1974, respectively. Order No. 467, as supplemented, modified Section 2.78 of the Commissions Regulations under the Natural Gas Act, 18 CFR 2.78(a).

[3] 49 F.P.C. 907 (1973).

[4] Order No. 467 was designated "Statement of Policy", and, as such, is not to be considered binding in any given case but, instead, must be supported by substantial evidence of record in each case. *Pacific Gas & Electric Company* v. *F.P.C., et al.*, 506 F. 2d 33 (D.C. Cir. 1974); *Consolidated Edison of New York, Inc.* v. *F.P.C.*, 512 F. 2d 1332 (D.C. Cir. 1974). As we indicated in Opinion No. 643-A, our decision in Opinion No. 643 to require adherence to the schedule contemporaneously established in Order No. 467 was based upon our consideration of the record, the initial decision, and briefs thereon, and a finding of substantial evidence in support of such a schedule, 49 F.P.C. 907 at 910. Our decision in Opinion No. 643-A to impose further changes was similarly founded.

[5] *Firm Service:* Service from schedules or contracts under which seller is expressly obligated to deliver specific volumes within a given time period and which anticipates no interruptions, but which may permit unexpected interruption in case the supply to higher priority customers is threatened.

Interruptible Service: Service from schedules or contracts under which seller is not expressly obligated to deliver specific volumes within a given time period, and which anticipates and permits interruption on short notice, or service under schedules or contracts which expressly or impliedly require installation of alternate fuel capability.

Finally, we provided Arkla 30 days within which to file further revised tariff sheets. Arkla itself applied for rehearing of Opinion No. 643-A. In our Opinion No. 643-B[6] issued on June 8, 1973, we denied Arkla's application but granted Arkla an extension of time for filing tariff revisions in compliance with Opinion No. 643-A. On July 6, 1973, Arkla tendered for filing a series of tariff sheets which purported to comply with Opinion Nos. 643, 643-A and 643-B. Finding the priorities of service which Arkla therein proposed to deviate from those set out in Opinion No. 643-A, we rejected Arkla's filing on January 22, 1974. Arkla responded on February 5, 1974, by filing further revised sheets in which it had remedied all deficiencies. We accepted these sheets on March 7, 1974, and allowed them to become effective as of February 20, 1974.

The current round of litigation was opened by Mississippi River Transmission Corporation (MRT) and Cities Service Gas Company (Cities), historically two of Arkla's primary sale-for-resale customers, who, on January 4, 1974, and February 21, 1974, respectively, filed motions in Docket No. RP71-122 in which they alleged that Arkla, in attempting to construct its curtailment plan, had persistently refused to properly categorize their requirements in accordance with the schedule developed in Opinion No. 643, as amended. MRT sought to have the Commission order outright reclassification of its requirements; Cities renewed its requests of September 17, 1973, and December 18, 1973, for a hearing on the matter. By order of March 27, 1974, we ordered such a hearing:

> * * * [to] be confined to the issues contemplated by Ordering Paragraph (C) of Opinion No. 643, namely, implementation and classification questions resulting from Arkla's currently effective plan. In addition, the hearing will not be limited to cognizance of the motions of MRT and Cities but will be held to determine the proper implementation of Arkla's deliveries to Cities, MRT, and any other Arkla customer who has intervened in the present docket or who is granted intervention following notice hereof. *Id.* at *Mimeo* page 1.[7]

Ordering Paragraph (D) of the March 27, 1974, order permitted the intervention of the Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation (Cooperative). On the following day, March 28, 1974, Cooperative filed in Docket No. RP71-122 a petition for individualized treatment in which it requested that Arkla be ordered

---

[6] 49 F.P.C. 1316 (1973).

[7] Ordering Paragraph (C) of Opinion No. 643 states:

(C) This docket shall remain open for the purpose of determining the specific volumes to which Arkla's customers both direct and resale, are entitled in times of curtailment based upon end-use in accordance with this opinion and order, and for the purpose of determining the necessity for individualized treatment of the gas needs of any customer because of particular environmental problems or other reasons.

to assign its new McClellan Power Plant a base daily allowance of gas so as to bring it into parity with other plants whose entitlements were established according to gas takes over a three year historical period. By order of May 24, 1974, we directed that Cooperative's petition be consolidated for hearing and decision with the aforementioned motions of MRT and Cities.[8]

Hearings were held in three sessions, on June 11, June 13, and June 14, 1974, before Administrative Law Judge Samuel Kanell. His initial decision was issued August 26, 1974. Briefs on Exceptions thereto were filed by MRT, Cities, General Motors Corporation (GM), and the Staff. Briefs Opposing Exceptions were submitted by Arkla, Cooperative, Cities, the Staff, and the State of Louisiana.

CITIES

Cities has played an active role in the proceedings at Docket No. RP71–122 from the outset. In Opinion No. 643 we remarked on the impropriety of relegating customers having residential and other high priority needs to the interruptible categories on the basis of contract, and provided that, to the extent that it is entitled to relief from the 467–B priorities thereafter prescribed for Arkla, Cities should pursue its case for individualized treatment in accordance with paragraph 49 of that Opinion. 49 FPC 53 at 61. Cities' motion of February 21, 1974, does not purport to invoke the provisions of Paragraph 49 or any other rule or regulation regarding special relief, but instead reflects dissatisfaction with the way in which Arkla has chosen to implement the new plan itself. As grounds for its motion Cities alleges "despite the Commission's determination in Opinion No. 643 that the same curtailment percentages should be applied to Cities' market categories as Arkla applies to its own customers," [9] Arkla has discriminatorily categorized Cities' industrial customers as interruptible while categorizing its own industrial customers having similar purposes as firm. Additionally, Cities requests that Arkla be ordered to apply curtailment to the specific quantity of gas called for by Cities on any given day, rather than to the fixed volume of 100,000 Mcf per day, as Arkla proposes.[10] Cities states that this caveat will permit maximum protection of fluctuating high priority needs on peak winter days. Finally, Cities contends that one hundred percent of its systemwide operational requirements should be included in priority one under the Arkla curtailment plan.

In his initial decision, the Presiding Judge refers to language in Paragraph 15 of our Opinion No. 643–A, wherein is discussed the reasoning behind the caveat concerning "alternate fuel capabilities" found in priorities six through nine. He concludes that:

> The criteria (sic) for determining whether a specific customer should be classified as firm or interruptible * * * is whether an alternate fuel could have been utilized by the specific end-use customer. . . .

Finding insufficient evidence to make the alternate fuel capability determination for Cities' end-use customers, the Judge orders Cities to compile data on this point and submit it to Arkla for use in correcting any improper classifications. He rejects use of the sliding scale entitlement as potentially discriminatory to Arkla's other curtailed customers on peak winter days. Finally, he rejects Cities' proposal regarding classification of operational requirements, adopting instead Staff's suggestion to limit the volume of priority one gas for this purpose to an amount equal to X in the equation:

$$\frac{X}{\text{Cities total operational requirements}} = \frac{\text{Total Mcf received by Cities from Arkla}}{\text{Total Mcf received by Cities from all sources}}$$

THE FIRM INTERRUPTIBLE DISTINCTION

Cities agrees with the finding of the Presiding Judge that the criterion for determining whether a customer should be classified as firm or interruptible is whether or not alternate fuel could have been used by that customer. In contrast, Staff believes that the Judge's reliance on alternate fuel capability is misplaced. Staff asserts that the language of the contract under which gas service is provided determines whether that service is firm or interruptible, and that alternate fuel capability is only relevant to a determination of whether or not an interruptible customer should be placed in priorities six through nine or in priority three. Staff contends that the evidence presented is sufficient to enable us to find that the industrial sales made by Cities and Gas Service Company, (Gas Service), a distributor customer of Cities, have been properly classified as interruptible by Arkla. Staff's appraisal is correct. Alternate fuel capabilty is relevant to a determinaton of interruptibility only insofar as the terms of a particular contract may advise a buyer that he is responsible for maintaining such a capablity because he cannot rely on the continuity of his service. Whether or not he heeds such notice does not change the nature of the service for which he has contracted. Cities' industrial resale contracts require the buyer to discontinue use of gas in times of interruption by "use of standby fuel to be kept in sufficient quantities by buyer at all times", or by shutting down operations (Exhibit No. 74–21, paragraph 7(b)). Gas Service Company requires unequivocally that its customers "keep sufficient quantity of other fuels in stock at all times and * * * maintain proper facilities for using same * * * in case of interruption of gas deliveries" (Exhibit No. 74–12, paragraph 6). From our definition of interruptibility, supra note 5, we find that sales made under either contract are prima facie interruptible.

In its brief on exceptions GM does not dispute the conclusion that the sales which Cities and Gas Service make to their respective industrial customers are interruptible as that term is defined in Opinion No. 643–A, supra note 5. GM does, however, pursue Cities' original position in the instant proceeding by arguing that Cities' affected industrial loads should not be disposed of on that basis alone. According to GM, the firm-interruptible distinction is indefensible insofar as Cities is concerned because vis-a-vis Arkla that distinction fails to accurately reflect the relative intensity of a purchaser's need for gas as required by our Opinion No. 697,[11] with the result that, as between Cities and Arkla, use of the firm-interruptible distinction should be found to be unduly discriminatory (and thus violative of Sections 4 and 5 of the Natural Gas Act). GM therefore concludes that Cities should be granted individualized treatment and classified equally with Arkla's direct customers in priorities 1–5 of Arkla's curtailment plan.

These arguments are similar to those which GM raised before the Court of Appeals in petitioning for review of Opinion No. 643 et seq., arguments which prompted that Court to find that the reasons given by the Commission in Opinion No. 643 in support of the firm-interruptible distinction were not supported by substantial evidence.[12] As identified by the Court, the Commission's two primary reasons for the distinction were that (1) interruptible gas is generally used for inferior purposes, and (2) interruptible customers can be expected to have alternate fuel facilities already operational.[13] Yet, according to the Court, the record there suggested that (1) interruptible gas is in some cases sold to hospitals, schools, and churches, all human needs clustomers, and (2) as echoed above by GM, buyers of interruptible gas did not contemplate lengthly curtailment and thus many did not make provision for adequate standby

---

which provides for delivery of an annual average of 100,000 Mcf per day at 14.65 psia, a daily minimum of 75,000 Mcf, and a daily maximum of 133,000 Mcf.

[8] In our order of May 24, 1974, we also granted Cooperative's motion of March 22, 1974, in Docket No. RP74–94–1, wherein Cooperative requested Commission authorization to transfer to the McClellan Plant volumes of gas which it was then scheduled to receive from Arkla at two of its other power plants. The authorized transfer was ordered to expire no later than October 30, 1974.

[9] This is an erroneous interpretation of the language of Opinion No. 643 and one which Cities has not actively pursued in this proceeding. It is apparently based on Cities construction of our Opinion No. 527, Cities Service Gas Co., et al., 38 F.P.C. 364, 390 (1967), wherein we stated merely that Cities should not be given a service preference over Arkla's other customers with respect to Arkla gas reserves located outside of the dedicated acreage there in question. Curtailment priorities were not an issue.

[10] Filed as Arkla's Rate Schedule X–26, the contract for Cities is a firm service contract

[11] Opinion No. 697, El Paso Natural Gas Company, 51 FPC 2053 (1974).

[12] *Arkansas Power & Light Company, et al.* v. *F.P.C., et al.*, 517 F. 2d 1223 (D.C. Cir. 1975).

[13] As the court correctly observes, price considerations were ultimately ignored in defense of the firm interruptible distinction. 517 F. 2d at 1233, no. 27.

fuel. Further, the Court expressed concern that interruptible industrial sales for process, feedstock, and plant protection purposes, for which no alternate fuel capacity exists, would be assigned only so high as priority 3 under the Arkla plan, whereas firm gas used for similar purposes enjoys the added protection of Priority 2 classification. In order to resolve the questions left open by these evidentiary deficiencies, the Court has remanded the proceeding to the Commission with instructions to take additional evidence relating, inter alia, to the firm-interruptible distinction. In the interim, the Court has permitted Arkla's 467-B type curtailment plan to remain in effect "for a reasonable period."

From the record in the instant follow-up proceeding, it appears that, insofar as Cities is concerned, the question of how human needs customers purchasing gas on an interruptible basis should be classified under the Arkla plan has not been reintroduced. This suggests that in the revised plan which we accepted on March 7, 1974, Arkla properly relied upon the residential or commercial nature of the end uses of such gas as controlling over the respective contract label.[14] To the extent that our supposition here is erroneous, Arkla is directed to rehabilitate its classifications accordingly.

The validity of the firm-interruptible distinction as used in the Arkla curtailment plan is thus in question only where industrial customers are concerned. The question is whether that distinction accurately reflects differences in end use or alternate fuel capability. There is no record evidence or argument for the proposition, which we have never advanced, that industrial end uses of "interruptible" customers on the Cities system are qualitatively inferior to similar end uses of Arkla's "firm" direct sale customers. Our reliance upon the firm-interruptible distinction is therefore placed squarely on the alternate fuel capability rationale. As observed in Opinion No. 643, the installation of alternate fuel capability was thought to be a natural consequence of an interruptible buyer's apparent willingness to absorb interruptions in service, thus leaving that buyer significantly better equipped to handle the initial brunt of modern curtailment. Based on the aggregate record compiled in Docket No. RP71-122, however, we have reached the conclusion that our reasoning in Opinion No. 643 was erroneous.

The record contains clear and convincing evidence that many of Cities' industrial customers whom Arkla had classified interruptible were historically ill-prepared to absorb curtailment except as required of "firm service" customers, supra note 5. Cities' witness Finch testified that the standby fuel provisions referenced above had been included in the Cities and Gas Service industrial contracts since long before the onset of modern curtailment (Tr. 431-432). Such provisions were assertedly drafted with the objective of protecting those sellers against suits for damages arising out of short term interruptions in service (Tr. 433). As observed by counsel for Arkla, the interruptions to which these provisions originally related were peak day interruptions, and reflected insufficient system capacity rather than a shortfall in available gas supplies (Tr. 439-440). As a result, it appears that many of the customers whom Arkla had classified as interruptible never anticipated having to undertake the major conversion efforts necessary in order to maintain continuous operations during prolonged periods of curtailment, as currently required, and, by virtue of being classified within priorities 6 through 9, were faced with the alternatives of shutting down operations indefinitely or engaging in long-term rebuilding efforts which could force a shutdown of operations for a limited period (Tr. 381-383).

The fact that many of these interruptible contracts gave the buyer the express option of installing alternate fuel or shutting down (Exhibit No. 74-21) corroborates the view that these interruptibility provisions were not directed to long term curtailments. We find it inconceivable that a buyer would knowingly agree to take delivery under conditions which might require the layoff of several thousand employees (Tr. 434) over a sustained period of time.

At the time the standby fuel provisions of the Cities and Gas Service contracts were written, "alternate fuel" included propane. Witness Finch testifies at Tr. 379-380 that approximately 7 percent of Cities' interruptible load relies upon propane or LP gas for plant protection and process requirements. In view of our exclusion of propane or other gaseous fuel as an alternate fuel,[15] there would appear to be no valid reason for classifying those customers in priority 3 while firm customers with similar end uses are placed within priority 2.[16]

Cities' allegations stand virtually uncontroverted on the record. Arkla's classification of approximately 42,000 Mcf per day of Cities' load in priorities 6-9 (Exhibit 74-1, Part 1, Schedule 1) is not shown to be reflective of actual, installed alternate fuel capability. It need not be under the definition of that term adopted in Opinion No. 643-A.

There is evidence that Arkla too has historically sold gas to industrial customers under contracts which were technically interruptible but which gave the buyer insufficient notice to prepare it for the degree of curtailment which might be required thereunder. The record shows that Arkla provides service to two Oklahoma industrial customers under contracts which require these customers to maintain standby fuel sufficient to meet 75 percent of maximum peak day requirements for a period of 10 days (Tr. 82). Apparently in order to avoid the consequences of this caveat, Arkla classifies sales under these contracts as firm (Exhibit No. 74-1. Part 1. Schedule 1). In its Brief Opposing Exceptions, Arkla takes the position that, if determined by the Commission to be interruptible, these contracts should be downgraded; Arkla understandably finds this preferential to a unilateral upgrading of the Cities' contracts to "firm."

The weight of the evidence compels us to find, as we did in Opinion No. 697, supra note 11, that, as between industrial end users on the Arkla system, the firm-interruptible distinction is inaccurate as a reflection of the intensity of a purchaser's need for gas. Whatever validity the firm-interruptible distinction may have for pricing purposes, it can no longer be relied upon for curtailment purposes. Rather than direct a study aimed at retaining the firm-interruptible distinction on a customer-by-customer basis, we find the more prudent course to be elimination in toto of that distinction insofar as it pertains to contracts between ultimate sellers and ultimate purchasers of gas,[17] as a criterion for classifying requirements under the Arkla curtailment plan.[18] We emphasize that our decision here is ad hoc, and does not signal outright abrogation of our 467-B Statement of Policy and the priorities of service described therein.[19] Procedures for the transition shall be outlined elsewhere in this order.

We believe one final point of clarification to be in order here. In connection with its reliance upon our Opinion No. 697, GM asserts that differences between Arkla's and Cities' Industrial contracts, insofar as the firm-interruptible distinction is concerned, are, inter alia, the result of Arkansas' state regulatory policies. This is not the case. In Opinion No. 697, we found that the State of California, through its action in requiring

[14] In accordance with the definitions promulgated in Order No. 643-A and 493-A, 50 FPC 1316 (1973).

[15] Order No. 493-A, 50 FPC 1316, 1320 (1973).

[16] We have permitted priorities 2 and 3 to merge in this respect in other cases. Cf. Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, Docket No. RP72-99 (order issued November 28, 1975) slip op. at 22.

[17] As distinguished from the situation of MRT, treated infra.

[18] We acknowledge our statements in the Order of March 27, 1974 initiating those proceedings to the effect that, because the filed motions do not relate to the form of the plan but rather to its implementation, the scope of the hearing would be confined to implementation and classification questions. Our instant decision to dismantle the firm-interruptible distinction, however, is in response to the mandate of the court in Arkansas Power and Light and is based on evidence in the record of the main curtailment case as well as the follow-up proceedings. Because the issue was raised and fully litigated in connection with the curtailment case, we see no reason to defer our decision herein to another evidentiary proceeding. See *Louisiana Power and Light Company, et al.* v. *F.P.C.*, 526 F.2d 898, 904 (5th Cir. 1976). Our decision here effectively moots Cities' case for individualized treatment as such.

[19] The Arkansas Power and Light Court expressly avoided a finding that the firm-interruptible concepts are so vague as to be unuseable, explaining that remand of that issue was necessary only because of the absence of record evidence in support of the Commission's reasoning. 517 F.2d at 1233.

all industrial sales in excess of 200 Mcf per day in that state to be made on an interruptible basis, had caused the firm-interruptible distinction to become unrepresentative of relative need, such that its reflection in El Paso's 467-B type curtailment plan constituted undue discrimination in violation of the Natural Gas Act. In the instant case, by contrast, although the State of Arkansas directed that Arkla's Arkansas customers be given the opportunity to modify their contracts, there is no evidence that the Arkansas Commission required any unilateral change in contract or tariff within the State of Arkansas which caused contracts which were formerly firm to become interruptible, or vice versa. Findings of the Arkansas Public Service Commission indicate that, prior to 1971, most of the industrial contracts between Arkla and its customers contained interruptibility provisions similar to the following:

> This service is interruptible to the extent necessary to supply *human needs* domestic and commercial consumption and such small industrials as cannot practically be interrupted without interrupting a parity, insofar as parity can practically be obtained, with service to Seller's other industrial purchasers of Buyer's class served under substantially similar terms and conditions.[20] (Emphasis added.)

This provision is essentially the same as that contained in Exhibit No. 74-8 as an example of the currently effective interruptibility provision in Arkla's Arkansas industrial contracts. Although reported by Arkla as "interruptible" in its 1970 FPC Form 2, as noted by GM, sales under these contracts then, as now, clearly fall within the purview of firm service as defined in Opinion No. 643-A, supra note 5.

The Swing Provision of Arkla's Rate Schedule X-26.

As discussed previously, this is the provision whereby Cities is contractually entitled to call for as much as 133,000 Mcf or as little as 75,000 on any given day, with average annual deliveries of 100,000 Mcf per day. In its Brief on Exceptions, Cities points out that this provision is designed primarily for the benefit of its residential and small commercial market in the Joplin-Springfield, Missouri area on cold winter days. Cities argues that without the swing it will be necessary to construct new facilities in order to bring in sufficient volumes of gas from areas to the west. Yet, Cities notes that one of the principal advantages of the Arkla-to-Cities sale in the first place was the fact that Arkla gas was to be delivered directly into the lateral out of Joplin, where peak day volumes were badly needed. See 38 F.P.C. at 455. Cities discounts administrative difficulty for discarding use of the swing and contends that the record fails to suggest the use of the swing would discriminate against Arkla's other customers. On the contrary, Cities alleges that the Presiding Judge's decision on this point will permit Arkla to supply gas to its industrial customers while Cities' residential customers suffer.

Sections 4(b) and 5(a) of the Natural Gas Act prohibit the fixing of rates or charges which are unduly preferential or discriminatory as between localities or classes of customers. In Opinion No. 643, we found "basically correct" Staff's position with respect to Cities which consisted, inter alia, of the argument that Arkla should not be permitted to treat Cities preferentially vis-a-vis other customers during peak day curtailments. 49 FPC at 61. We reaffirm that finding here. It is true, as Cities advises, that from a strict end use standpoint the customers who will be protected under the swing are "superior" to those whose service will have to be commensurately curtailed. In this regard reflection of the swing in Arkla's curtailment plan promotes the primary objective of that plan: to maximize protection of high priority temperature-sensitive loads. Yet pursuit of that objective cannot be the sole standard by which to measure the efficiency of a particular provision of a curtailment plan. Entitlement ratios under priorities of service should be fixed; they are established according to actual historical takes. This enables the supplier (Arkla) to gauge the relative needs of its system against its anticipated supply; conversely, it enables the customers who will be most likely affected by imminent curtailment to acquire alternate fuel sources accordingly. The presence of a swing which may involve as much as 58,000 (133,000—75,000) Mcf per day significantly impairs the ability of such customers to efficiently prepare for the winter and thus frustrates a major purpose of the curtailment plan. Balancing the equities, we believe Cities' argument must fail. Cities is fully capable of remedying the supply deficiency which may be caused by discarding the swing,[21] whereas the loss of reliability which preservation of the swing would cause elsewhere on the Arkla system cannot, it would appear,[22] be satisfactorily restored.

Classification of Cities' Operational Gas Requirements

Cities argues that, because its system is integrated, all of its systemwide operational requirements should be included in priority one under Arkla's curtailment plan. Arkla takes the contrary position that, because all of the gas which it delivers to Cities is received and consumed in the Joplin-Springfield area, Arkla's curtailment plan should be charged with the operational requirements for that area alone. Arkla appears to support the formula, page 6 supra, suggested by Staff and adopted by the Presiding Judge as a fair method of determining the amount to be allocated to operational requirements.

In light of our certification of Transmission facilities in Docket No. CP 75-345, we do not expect Arkla's position to remain that it should be charged with the operational requirements for all operations in Cities' Springfield area. The practicability and equitability of the Presiding Judge's formula are not impaired by this development, however, and, since the record is silent as to how much of the Arkla gas is actually devoted to compressor fuel, is lost or unaccounted for, or is free gas connected to storage lease operations, we find the Judge's solution to be the appropriate one.

Arkla's witness Henderson testified on the record that Arkla's deliveries to Cities during the past annual period represent 3.5 percent of Cities total gas supply during that period (Tr. 175). By contrast, Cities' witness Finch, using the 100,000 Mcfd contract entitlement to compute Arkla's share of Cities total annual input, arrives at a figure of 6.7 percent (Tr. 419). At page 9 of its brief opposing exceptions, Arkla states that in the revised classification of Cities' volumes which it has attached as Appendix A to its brief and which is based on Cities June 28, 1974, revisions to Exhibit No. 74-5, Arkla has assigned 10 percent of Cities' systemwide operational requirements to priority one under its curtailment plan. From a Form 16 comparison of Arkla's actual deliveries to Cities during the reported period ending in August 1975, with the actual deliveries to Cities from all sources during the same period, we find that Arkla's 10 percent assignment is justified under the formula heretofore described. Cities' exception is denied.

MRT

The interruptible requirements of Cities and MRT together comprise the vast majority of what Arkla classifies as the interruptible load on its system, and, like Cities, MRT has been highly visible throughout the proceedings in Docket No. RP71-122. Whereas, in Opinion No. 643 our disposition of MRT turned largely on our interpretation of the "firm-interruptible" distinction and how that distinction applies to the gas purchase agreement between Arkla and

---

[20] In the Matter of Industrial Contracts of Arkansas Louisiana Gas Company, Docket No. U-2307 (opinion and order issued August 9, 1971) at Section D, p. 2. Orders of the Arkansas PSC are matters of public record, 18 CFR § 1.26(c)(2)(ii), of which we take administrative notice.

[21] In this connection, we reference our certification of 2.9 million dollars worth of facilities which Cities proposed to construct in order to provide adequate gas service to its Joplin-Springfield market. Cities Service Gas Company, Docket No. CP75-345 (order issued November 26, 1975). As recited in its original May 21, 1975, application in Docket No. CP 75-345, and unmodified in either of the supplements thereto filed on August 21, and September 8, 1975, Cities intended to have these facilities operational for use during the 1975-76 winter season.

[22] Arkla's Witness Henderson testified at Tr. 515-16 that Arkla had not been able to devise a workable method of integrating the swing provision into its currently effective curtailment plan.

MRT,[23] in the instant proceeding the dispute involves differing interpretations of Opinion No. 643 itself. MRT asserts that, in Opinion No. 643, as amended, the Commission manifested its intent to require Arkla to classify each of MRT's customers on the basis of MRT's overall end use profile, such that 23,000 Mcf of its 25,000 Mcf per day should be classified within priorities one through three. Arkla disagrees, stating that the Commission in Opinion No. 643 et seq. did not in fact prescribe the method by which deliveries to MRT would be categorized but merely provided that, in appropriate circumstances, the nature of the Arkla-MRT contract could be disregarded.[24] In classifying all of MRT's requirements within priority 9, Arkla demonstrates its belief that such circumstances have not been shown.

The Presiding Judge denies relief to MRT. His decision is based upon an interpretation of Paragraph 29 of Opinion No. 643 (49 F.P.C. 53 at 62). The Judge construes our language there as according to MRT no absolute right to any Arkla gas but instead providing only that MRT might be able to procure some Arkla volumes, provided it could satisfy the requisites for individualized consideration outlined in Paragraph 49 of Opinion No. 643 (49 F.P.C. 53 at 67–68). Finding that MRT has failed to demonstrate on the record that it has encountered any significant difficulty in serving its customers as a result of Arkla's curtailment of gas service to MRT, the Judge holds that MRT has not met its burden of proving a genuine need for gas to protect health or property on its system. He therefore views MRT's motion as a petition for individualized consideration which should be denied.

To begin with, we find it necessary to comment upon the distinction which we precieve between "interruptible service" as reflected in the contracts by which Cities and Gas Service resell gas to industrial customers, and "interruptibility" as it pertains to the contract between Arkla and MRT. As discussed above, the Cities and Gas Service contracts were found to be interruptible primarily due to the presence of language requiring the maintenance of alternate fuel capability. This is interruptibility as it was defined in Opinion No. 643–A and Order Nos. 467–B and 493.[25] It pertains principally, if not exclusively, to contracts between sellers and *ultimate* purchasers. In calling the validity of the firm-interruptible distinction into question, the Arkansas Power court, as heretofore noted, expressed concern as to the actual understanding of end-use customers who had chosen to purchase on an interruptible as opposed to a firm basis. 517 F. 2d at 1233–1234.

The MRT contract with Arkla, by contrast, is a contract between two pipeline companies. It is essentially a contract whereby Arkla, if it so desires, can sell to MRT any surplus gas which it may have after servicing its contract demand requirements. Accordingly, in the proposed curtailment plan which Arkla filed with the Commission on May 18, 1971 pursuant to Order No. 431,[26] Arkla categorized MRT as wholly within Category I, sales which are subject to interruption at seller's discretion under contracts or tariffs which provide in effect for the sale of such gas as seller may be agreeable to selling and buyer may be agreeable to buying. Category I was to be curtailed first under that plan. In reviewing the efficacy of so treating MRT, we found that "MRT receives gas under different conditions than Cities * * * [t]hus, * * * MRT may properly be treated differently than Cities." 49 F.P.C. at 62. The very need for curtailment plans, beginning in 1971, reflected the realization that the natural gas shortage had progressed to the point where contract demand could not be assured of supply throughout the year. Surplus, or "dump", gas would naturally be the first category to come off the line. The Arkansas Power court apparently recognized this when it observed

> * * * the Arkla-MRT contract provides for what might be considered the most interruptible type of service, since under other types of interruptible contracts there is an explicit commitment to sell gas when it is available. 517 F.2d at 1230, n. 21.

"Interruptibility", as applied to the service arrangement between Arkla and MRT, is not defined in terms of alternate fuel capabilities and it is not a product of negotiation between ultimate customers and their immediate sellers. Consequently, the potential infirmities which the Arkansas Power court identified in the firm-interruptible dichotomy as applied to Cities are not in evidence with respect to MRT. We are therefore of the opinion that the Arkansas Power court's remand of Opinion Nos. 643 et seq. in that respect has no material bearing on our resolution of the Arkla-MRT dispute. Interruptibility in the case of pipeline-to-pipeline sales of surplus gas should not be confused with interruptible service at the end of the line.

We acknowledge the Arkansas Power court's reference (517 F.2d at 1233, n. 29) to the same pages of the transcript which we had cited in Opinion No. 643, wherein MRT asserted that it used Arkla gas to service human needs customers. We had trouble in Opinion No. 643, as we do now, in understanding why MRT, as a gas company purchasing certain volumes of gas, the delivery of which is at the sole discretion of one seller, would earmark those volumes for use by ultimate customers whose reliance upon service from MRT is critical. Nevertheless, we determined in Opinion No. 643 that MRT should not be denied the opportunity to show good cause why it should be granted an exception, in the form of "individualized consideration," from the normal operation of the Arkla plan. MRT, like Cities, was therefore directed to paragrah 49 [27] of Opinion No. 643, where necessary, 49 FPC 53, 62 and 66, footnote 13. Although the Arkansas Power court, perhaps through a misunderstanding of the breadth of paragraph 49,[28] found recourse to that emergency provision to be unacceptable as a substitute for the "evidentiary shortcomings" of Opinion No. 643, it is again clear that the subject "shortcomings" were those relating to resale contracts of the type used by Cities. We do not perceive this language as constituting any barrier to our power to limit MRT's avenue of redress to that prescribed in paragraph 49 of Opinion No. 643.

From the record in the instant proceeding it is readily apparent that MRT did not avail itself of the opportunity to present evidence on behalf of its human needs customers who allegedly relied upon Arkla volumes for continuity of service. Nor do we find the presence of any petitions for extraordinary relief pursuant to Order No. 467–C, supra note 2.

Certainly, from the overall supply data available to us in this proceeding, it is difficult to perceive exactly how discontinuation of deliveries by Arkla can jeopardize high priority service on the MRT system to a relatively greater extent that forced continuation of such deliveries will jeopardize such service on Arkla's own system. Exhibit No. 74–4 indicates that, for the period from April 1973 through March 1974, Arkla experienced curtailments amounting to 30.3 percent of total (firm and interruptible) requirements, while for MRT's system the corresponding figure was 13.4 percent. According to Arkla's September 30, 1975 Form 16 projections, curtailment of firm service requirements for the period from September 1975 through August 1976 will be 31.73 percent. By comparison MRT projects firm service curtailments of but .16 percent. From the

---

[23] Filed as Arkla's Rate Schedule XFS–25, MRT's contract with Arkla calls for a delivery of up to 25,000 Mcf per day of excess gas, if and when available, during the heating season from October 15 through April 15. Because of curtailment, Arkla has delivered no gas to MRT since Arkla's interim curtailment plan became effective in the fall of 1971.

[24] Interestingly, Arkla appealed Opinion No. 643 et seq. on the question of whether the Commission had authority to circumvent the contract label and direct delivery of gas to MRT under any circumstances. In Arkansas Power & Light, the Court ruled that the Commission does indeed have such authority under Sections 4 and 5 of the Natural Gas Act. See *American Smelting & Refining Co.* v. *F.P.C.*, 494 F. 2d 925, 934–5, *cert. denied*, 419 U.S. 882 (1974).

[25] 50 F.P.C. 831, 835 (1973).

[26] 45 F.P.C. 570 (1971).

[27] Paragraph 49 (49 F.P.C. at 67–68) is here set forth in its entirety:

> 49. Any customer which seeks individualized consideration of its allocated percentage may assume the burden of establishing its need for an exception from Arkla's classification or proposed curtailment percentage, and of establishing the volume of gas needed for service; such presentation shall be made in this docket and determined herein.

[28] As evidenced in the foregoing note, individualized consideration is couched in terms of need rather than danger to life or property. The standards for individualized consideration should be distinguished from the more stringent standards which must be met for a grant of extraordinary or special relief from curtailment under Order No. 467–C, supra note 2.

status reported submitted to us by Administrative Law Judge Sherman P. Kimball on August 18, 1975, pursuant to our omnibus order of June 11, 1975, in Docket Nos. RP74–42, et al. (including Docket No. RP71–122), it appears that required curtailment on the Arkla system was expected to invade Priority 2 on several peak days this past winter. Although we have no such assessment of MRT's curtailment posture, we believe ourselves to be clearly justified in concluding that MRT's gas supply situation for high priority end-users was more optimistic than was Arkla's. Taken together, the dearth of record evidence as to the specific needs of MRT's allegedly dependent high priority customers and the reported severity of Arkla's curtailment outlook when contrasted with MRT's effectively rebut MRT's case for individualized consideration.

It is instructive to contrast our treatment of MRT with our treatment in Opinions Nos. 747 and 747–B [29] of the distributor-customers, notably Carolina Pipeline Company, who traditionally purchase gas from Southern Natural Gas Company under the authorized overrun provisions of Southern's tariff. In each case the subject volumes are excluded from contract demand requirements under the respective pipeline-supplier's effective curtailment plan. Historically, these volumes were supplied out of the pipeline's surplus after contract demand had been met. Accordingly, as we stated above, these volumes would naturally be the first to be taken off the line in time of curtailment, unless a showing of special circumstances could be made to demonstrate why a different result should obtain. In the instant proceeding, MRT failed to make the requisite showing of need to justify a grant of "individualized consideration." In the Southern proceeding, by contrast, the record was found to contain substantial evidence demonstrating a significant degree of dependence which Carolina, among others, had come to attach to the authorized overrun volumes. It was there shown that (1) customers receiving such gas were obligated upon receipt thereof to pay the full fixed costs of such service, as opposed to merely paying the effective commodity rate for such gas; (2) Carolina, and perhaps Southern itself, had been engaged in recent years in system redesign efforts which reflected the expectation that the A–O deliveries would continue; (3) although high priority end-use on the Carolina system could theoretically be supplied despite discontinuation of deliveries from Southern, such a development would cause so significant an impairment in other service as to endanger the financial integrity of that distributor and thus jeopardize service to high priority customers in the long run. Under the circumstances, we concluded that Carolina and others similarly-situated on the Southern system should be accorded what amounts to a grant of "individualized consideration" to permit their A–O service from Southern to be viewed as contract demand under the Southern curtailment plan.

In sum, we find (1) that the evidentiary shortcomings of Opinion Nos. 643 et seq., as identified by the court in Arkansas Power & Light, *supra* note 11, are wholly immaterial to the Arkla-MRT dispute, (2) that, as indicated in Opinion Nos. 643 et seq., MRT's proper avenue of relief is through petition for individualized consideration, and MRT's January 4, 1974 motion should be so treated, and (3) that MRT has failed to make a satisfactory record showing of need as would justify any inclusion of MRT's requirements within the Arkla curtailment plan. As we have noted above, surplus gas deliveries should be discontinued completely before contract service is curtailed unless special circumstances indicate otherwise. Arkla's inclusion of MRT within priority 9 is therefore unwarranted, and MRT will not be affected by the reclassification of priorities which we hereinafter order in connection with the dissolution of the firm-interruptible distinction.

COOPERATIVE

Cooperative is a non-profit organization, formed and owned by sixteen electric distribution parties who receive wholesale power from the Cooperative's plants. It is a member of the Southwest Power Pool, which provides power to areas within six southwestern states, including Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kansas. Cooperative owns three electric steam generating stations, located at Ozark, Augusta, and Camden, Arkansas. The plants at Ozark and Augusta are assigned priority five under the Arkla curtailment plan. Pursuant to Opinion No. 643, their respective base volumes for curtailment were established according to the volumes of gas they each received during the three-year period ending September 30, 1971. The newer McClellan plant at Camden, on the other hand, was not completed until 1972, although work had begun in the pre-curtailment years, 1966–7. Therefore, it has virtually no base volume for curtailment. In addition to natural gas, the boilers in the plants at Ozark and Augusta are also equipped to burn No. 6 fuel oil. However, because use of fuel oil had never been actually required at those two plants, Cooperative chose to design the McClellan plant without such a capability. With the onset of curtailment, Cooperative attempted the use of No. 2 fuel oil to operate the McCellan plant's boilers, but resulting inefficiency caused Cooperative to undertake a program of conversion to No. 6 fuel oil, which program was scheduled for completion by the end of 1974.

Citing the public need for adequate electric power generating capacity, Cooperative requested the Commission to assign the McClellan plant a revised base volume for curtailment periods. Cooperative suggested 16,650 Mcf daily, a figure to which no party to these proceedings excepts.

The Presiding Judge, balancing equities, granted Cooperative's request for individualized consideration, and assigned the McClellan plant a base volume of 16,650 Mcf per day. The Judge relied on the innocence of Cooperative's poor timing, adding that no undue adverse effect would be sustained by any of Arkla's higher-priority gas patrons. The McClellan plant is classified in priority 5.

GM and Staff have filed exceptions to the Administrative Law Judge's decision to grant relief to Cooperative, each alleging that Cooperative has failed to meet the burden of proof required for a grant of individualized consideration. Staff contends that individualized consideration is synonomous with extraordinary relief, and that such relief should issue only upon proof by a customer of his inability to operate his facility in the absence of the requested deliveries of natural gas. Because Cooperative, according to testimony of its own witness, expected completion of the conversion to No. 6 fuel oil [30] by the end of December, 1974, at the latest (Tr. 226–7), Staff sees no reason to continue the Commission's relief beyond that time. Staff adds that the economic detriment [31] which a shutdown of gas supply will cause Cooperative is insufficient reason to permit the McCellan plant to continue to consume gas. GM, in its brief on exceptions, agrees with Staff that Cooperative's planned alternate fuel capability should be the primary reason for denying Cooperative the relief which it seeks in its petition for individualized consideration. GM concludes by stating that, as a matter of policy, the Commission should encourage conversion to alternate fuels whenever possible, especially where new facilities are concerned.

Cooperative takes issue with Staff's characterization of the petition as one seeking "extraordinary relief." Cooperative concedes that the ability of a customer to use alternate fuel would be justification for denying extraordinary relief. Where only "individualized treatment" is sought, however, Cooperative maintains that relief may be appropriate, despite the existence of alternate fuel capability, in circumstances where denial of such relief would result in a basic inequity. Reiterating its position at the hearing, Cooperative points out that its situation is unique, that the McClellan plant's lack of a base daily allowable resulted from forces beyond Cooperative's control, and that Cooperative seeks no new classification for the McClellan plant, thus avoiding any threat to higher priority users. Cooperative argues that its alternate fuel capability should not

[29] Southern Natural Gas Company, Docket Nos. RP74–6 and RP72–74 (opinions issued November 20, 1975 and May 21, 1976, respectively).

[30] At the hearing, Cooperative's witness Fish stated that Cooperative anticipated no difficulty in obtaining sufficient No. 6 fuel oil to fuel the McClellan plant's boilers (Tr. 233).

[31] Cooperative estimates that it can save as much as a million dollars per year if as little as ten percent of the fuel used at the McClellan Plant consists of gas. (Tr. 228.)

be reason for denying it relief, since all other priority five users by definition have such capability, and they each enjoy base daily allowables. Finally, Cooperative rebuts the applicability of GM's policy argument by pointing out that such policy should apply only to parties who have ignored the current realities of the gas supply situation by building facilities in reliance upon a fuel which is known to be dwindling rapidly. Having had no incentive to avoid such reliance at the time construction on the McClellan plant was begun, Cooperative concludes that it should be exempted from such policy consideration.

We find that the exceptions here should be sustained. In so finding, we resolve the apparent inconsistency between the Presiding Judge's treatment of Cooperative's petition for individualized treatment and his treatment of MRT, discussed above. The Judge's denial of MRT's petition was based largely on his finding that MRT had managed to serve its customers in the absence of any gas from Arkla, thus disproving MRT's actual "need" for Arkla gas. The evidence here indicates that the McClellan plant should have been able to serve Cooperative's customers as of January 1, 1975 in the absence of Arkla gas to fuel its boilers. Yet the Presiding Judge granted individualized consideration to Cooperative, such relief to extend indefinitely. Although he did require Cooperative, as a condition for relief, to use diligence in completing its conversion program and to file a progress report thereon with the Commission by January 1, 1975, nowhere in his decision does he state that relief will be terminated on January 1, 1975, or upon completion of the conversion program. In order to make relief fully commensurate with actual need, however, we find that such should have been the case. As we can locate no conversion progress report in the files of this proceeding, we are compelled to conclude that conversion was completed on schedule and that, accordingly there is no present "need" for Arkla gas as boiler fuel.[32] While we are mindful of the fact that it will be significantly more expensive for the McClellan plant to burn fuel oil than gas, we do not find in the record any evidence to suggest that the resultant economic hardship will be so severe as to threaten the continued functioning of the plant and thereby endanger the public through loss of electric service and unemployment. The costs of conversion to, and procurement of fuel oil are sufferable costs which must be justifiably borne in order to insure, insofar as possible, the protection of service to the highest priority end users of gas.[33] The record contains no evidence to show that the McClellan plant relies upon Arkla gas for uses for which no alternate fuel can be substituted. Cooperative is not precluded, however, from filing a petition pursuant to Order No. 467–C seeking relief from curtailment to the extent that such reliance may in fact exist.

Compliance with Arkansas Power & Light

Based on the record as certified to it by the Commission, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia found our Opinion Nos. 643, 643–A and 643–B lacking in three respects and, accordingly, remanded the proceedings to the Commission with instructions to file an environmental impact statement and to take additional evidence relating to the distinction between firm and interruptible service, discussed above, and the proper classification of storage gas under the Arkla curtailment plan. We here manifest our compliance with these directives.

Dismantling of the Firm Interruptible Distinction

Based on evidence adduced in this docket, we find the presently-effective Arkla curtailment plan to be unjust, unreasonable and discriminatory under Sections 4(b) and 5(a) of the Natural Gas Act[34] to the extent that said plan incorporates the firm-interruptible distinction as a criterion for classifying requirements thereunder. When revised to reflect the following priorities of service, by contrast, the Arkla curtailment plan becomes a just and reasonable interim (pending proper classification of storage gas and final compliance with NEPA) mechanism for achieving the purposes for which it was intended. The revised plan shall consist of six priorities:

Priority 1: Residential and small commercial requirements of less than 50 Mcf per peak day.

Priority 2: Commercial requirements of more than 50 Mcf per peak day, industrial requirements for plant protection, feedstock, and process needs, and other industrial requirements of up to 300 Mcf per day,[35] and pipeline customer storage injection requirements.[36]

Priority 3: Industrial requirements in excess of 300 Mcf per day for other than plant protection, fedestock, process, or boiler fuel uses.

Priority 4: Industrial requirements for boiler fuel use of more than 300 Mcf per day but not more than 1,500 Mcf per day.

Priority 5: Industrial requirements for boiler fuel use of more than 1,500 but not more than 3,000 Mcf per day.

Priority 6: Industrial requirements for boiler fuel use of more than 3,000 Mcf per day.

Definitions and guidelines set forth in Opinion Nos. 643, et seq., and Order Nos. 493, et seq., shall govern in all pertinent respects. Aside from the elimination of the firm-interruptible distinction, the only modification of the presently effective plan is the disbursement of boiler fuel loads presently classified in priorities 3 through 9 throughout the last four priorities of the revised plan. This is not truly a material modification of the presently effective plan but is rather designed to reconcile the slight volumetric discrepancies between industrial boiler loads formerly classified as firm and those classified as interruptible.

We are aware that a certain length of time will be required before this plan can be implemented. Accordingly, we shall give Arkla ninety days within which to revise its index of requirements and make effective the changes which we have prescribed herein. It shall be incumbent upon Arkla with the help of its customers, to develop procedures whereby this objective may be achieved.

Finally, due in part to reliance upon the priorities of service established in Opinion Nos. 643, et seq., it may be that certain industrial customers are presently without adequate alternate fuel facilities or sufficient alternate fuel supply to enable them to absorb the level of curtailment which the revised plan and Arkla's system supply projections indicate may be expected next winter. We shall therefore allow a one year grace period from the date of issuance of this order for conversion efforts to be completed. It will be the responsibility of the customer to advise Arkla of its needs in this respect prior to implementation of the revised plan. Absent a grant of extraordinary relief from the Commission, Arkla shall classify such customers in priority 3, but only to the extent that installed alternate fuel facilities and available supplies will not afford complete protection from anticipated curtailment.

Storage Gas

In Opinion No. 643–A, we amended category 2 of Arkla's curtailment plan to include "pipeline customer storage requirements." 49 FPC at 914. Arkla objected to this change, arguing that it might enable pipeline customers to use storage gas to serve their own industrial customers or, alternatively, might result in Arkla supplying these customers' high priority requirements twice over. We dismissed these fears as unfounded in Opinion No. 643–B. 49 FPC at 1320. Nevertheless, Arkla took this issue before the appellate court, contending that our insertion of the storage gas component

[32] In this connection, we note from the Presiding Judge's August 18, 1975, Status Report that Arkla expected to curtail priority five approximately 86 percent on an average daily system-wide basis in November 1975, and 100 percent during the months of December 1975 through March 1976.

[33] Cf. Opinion No. 716, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, Docket No. RP74–39–3 (issued December 16, 1974), Mimeo at p. 10.

[34] See *State of Louisiana* v. *F.P.C.*, 503 F. 2d 844 (5th Cir. 1974).

[35] We retain the caveat which appears in Paragraph M, 1st Revised Sheet No. 3D, Arkla FPC Gas Tariff First Revised Volume No. 1 to the effect that, should Arkla be forced at any time to curtail sales in Priority 2, then industrial requirements for feedstock and process needs in excess of 3000 Mcf per day will be curtailed on a pro rata basis before other Priority 2 loads are curtailed. Similarly, we specifically incorporate into Priority 2 of the Revised Plan the caveat reflected in Paragraph L thereof, involving industrial loads of less than 300 Mcf per day.

[36] See the treatment of storage in the next section of this Order.

into category 2 was not based evidence of record. The court agreed, finding that,

> * * * there is no evidence concerning the needs of Arkla's pipeline customers, the importance of storage with respect to serving the needs of high priority users, or the ultimate disposition of gas withdrawn from storage by Arkla's pipeline customers. 517 F.2d at 1235.

As we indicated earlier, the case was remanded in part for "the taking of further evidence on this aspect of the plan". Id. at 1236.

The proper method of classifying storage gas under a 467–B type curtailment plan is an issue which, since the issuance of Opinion Nos. 643 et seq., we have addressed on an ad hoc basis in other proceedings and upon which we have reached divergent results. On the El Paso system we have found that the projected level of supply and the magnitude of customer storage warrants use of a mechanism which, by means of netting and averaging, insures that priority 2 storage injections will be used for priority 1 and priority 2 requirements only.[37] On the Panhandle system, by contrast, the current year round curtailment in priority 2 effectively moots the need to alter the priority 2 classification of storage injection, and, conversely, enhances the need to encourage the development of additional storage where it can be shown that such facilities will afford better protection of priority 1 and priority 2 loads during periods of critical shortage.[38]

In order to comply with the insructions of the Arkansas Power & Light court, we shall hereinafter order that a hearing be held pursuant to Sections 4 and 5 of the Natural Gas Act for the purpose of taking evidence in support of the method or methods which Arkla and/or its customers deem appropriate for the classification of storage injections, revised tariff sheets to be submitted as necessary.[39] As with the remainder of the Arkla curtailment plan, the protection of high priority temperature-sensitive loads shall be the primary objective of the provisions dealing with storage. It shall be incumbent upon Arkla, in going forward with its evidence, to weigh short term factors (correlation of injection priority with actual end use) against long term factors (incentive toward expanding storage to augment dwindling flowing supplies during future winters), taking into consideration the nature of the storage operations for which it supplies gas and its expected deliverability over time.

[37] Opinion Nos. 697 and 697–A, El Paso Natural Gas Company, Docket No. RP72–6, (issued June 14 and December 19, 1974, respectively.)

[38] See Opinion No. 754, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company, Docket No. RP71–119 (issued February 27, 1976).

[39] We note that service to MRT under Arkla's XFS–25 Rate Schedule provides for service, if any, only during the period October 15 to April 16, effectively mooting the storage classification issue with respect to MRT's storage operations.

NEPA

As noted by the Arkansas Power & Light Court, no party to the original proceedings in Docket No. RP71–122 raised the issue of compliance with NEPA until after the case had left the Commission's jurisdiction and come before the Court. Nevertheless, the court held that, as the Arkla curtailment plan was designed and implemented as a permanent plan, the Commission is required to file an environmental impact statement (EIS) in connection therewith.

Anticipating such a decision on the basis of other relatively recent court discussions and applications of the requirements set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(c) (1970),[40] we directed our Staff to undertake preparation of an EIS some time ago, with the result that a final EIS bearing date of February 20, 1976 has been circulated and made public in accordance with relevant guidelines.[41] However, in view of Staff's need to gauge the environmental consequences of our elimination of the firm-interruptible distinction and our approval of any proposed change in the method of classifying storage injections under the Arkla curtailment plan, we find that no valid purpose would be served in making this document a part of the record in Docket No. RP71–122 at present.

The Commission finds:

(1) The Initial Decision should be affirmed insofar as it treats MRT's January 4, 1974 motion as a petition for individualized consideration and denies said petition.

(2) The Initial Decision should be affirmed insofar as it denies Cities' request that Cities' entitlements under the Arkla curtailment plan be determined according to a daily base which may vary at Cities' discretion.

(3) The Initial Decision should be affirmed insofar as it delimits the volume of Cities' operational requirements which Arkla shall include in priority one under its curtailment plan.

(4) The Initial Decision should be modified insofar as it permits individual consideration for Cooperative to extend beyond January 1, 1975.

(5) The Arkla curtailment plan should be revised to eliminate any reference to "firm service" or "interruptible service", future curtailment to be administered in accordance with the 6-priority schedule set forth in the body of this order.

(6) Arkla should be required to reevaluate its tariff treatment of storage gas and present evidence supporting any proposed revision or maintenance of the status quo, as discussed more fully in the body of this order.

(7) Introduction into the record in Docket No. RP71–122 of the final environmental impact statement should be deferred pending further order of the Commission.

The Commission, pursuant to its authority under provisions of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, particularly Sections 4(b) and 5(a) thereof, and in compliance with instructions of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, orders:

(A) Except as hereinafter modified, the initial decision issued on August 26, 1974, in these proceedings is affirmed and adopted as the decision of the Commission, effective as of the date of issuance of this order.

(B) The Arkla curtailment plan shall be modified to consist of six priorities of service, as set forth more fully within the body of this order.

(C) To the Presiding Judge's grant of individualized consideration to the Arkansas Electric Cooperative Company is attached the condition that the relief granted shall terminate as of January 1, 1975, although no payback shall be required for volumes taken after that date and prior to the date of issuance of this order.

(D) Exceptions not granted are denied.

(E) Arkla shall file revised tariff sheets in accordance with Ordering Paragraph (B), above, to be effective 90 days from the date of issuance of this order, together with a supporting study showing the effective redistribution of system gas supply which those changes will involve.

(F) A Presiding Administrative Law Judge to be designated by the Chief Administrative Law Judge shall preside at a conference to be held on July 13, 1976, at 10:00 a.m. in a hearing room of the Federal Power Commission, 825 N. Capitol St., N.E., Washington, D.C. for the purpose of prescribing hearing procedures whereby evidence may be presented as to the appropriate method for classifying storage injections under the Arkla curtailment plan.

(G) Due to the probable need of Staff to revise or supplement its final environmental impact statement so as to take into consideration the environmental consequences of the modifications discussed in Ordering Paragraphs (E) and (F), above, that document will be withheld from the record pending further order of the Commission.

(H) Nothing in this order shall prevent Arkla and any other parties to these proceedings from engaging in informal negotiations in order to facilitate compliance with Ordering Paragraphs (E) and (F), above.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76–16676 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

[40] *American Smelting and Refining Company* v. *F.P.C.*, 494 F. 2d 925 (D.C. Cir. 1974), *cert. denied, sub nom. Southern California Gas Company, et al* v. *F.P.C.*, 419 U.S. 882 (1974); *State of Louisiana* v. *F.P.C.*, 503 F. 2d 844 (5th Cir. 1974).

[41] See the Council on Environmental Quality's Guidelines at 40 C.F.R. § 1500.10 (1973).

[Docket No. ER76-110]

ARKANSAS POWER AND LIGHT CO.

Settlement Conference

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that on June 15, 1976, a conference of all parties to this proceeding and Commission Staff will be held in the Commission's Conference Room No. 3200 (North Building), at 941 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m.

Customers and other interested persons will be permitted to attend, but if such persons have not previously been permitted to intervene by order of the Commission, attendance at the conference will not be deemed to authorize intervention as a party in the proceeding.

All parties will be expected to come fully prepared to discuss the merits of all issues concerning the lawfulness of the proposed rate increase and any procedural matters preparatory to a full evidentiary hearing or to make commitments with respect to such issues and any offers of settlement or stipulations discussed at the conference.

Letters concerning this conference are being mailed this date to all parties to the proceeding, all of the jurisdictional customers, and all affected state commissions.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16688 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Project No. 2245]

CITY OF VANCEBURG, KENTUCKY

Order Granting Rehearing for the Purpose of Further Consideration

MAY 27, 1976.

On April 27, 1976, the City of Vanceburg, Kentucky (Vanceburg) filed a timely petition for rehearing of our Order of March 29, 1976, in which we issued a license to Vanceburg to construct, operate, and maintain the Cannelton Project No. 2245. On May 14, 1976, Vanceburg filed a document entitled "Motion of the City of Vanceburg, Kentucky to Supplement its Petition for Rehearing".

The Commission finds: It is appropriate and in the public interest to grant rehearing for the purpose of further consideration in connection with the above noted documents filed by Vanceburg.

The Commission orders: Rehearing is hereby granted for the purpose of further consideration in connection with the above noted documents filed by Vanceburg.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16660 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

CITY OF VANCEBURG, KENTUCKY

Order Granting Rehearing for the Purpose of Further Consideration

[Project No. 2614]

MAY 27, 1976.

On April 27, 1976, the City of Vanceburg, Kentucky (Vanceburg) filed a timely petition for rehearing of our Order of March 29, 1976, in which we issued a license to Vanceburg to construct, operate, and maintain the Greenup Project No. 2614. On May 14, 1976, Vanceburg filed a document entitled "Motion of the City of Vanceburg, Kentucky to Supplement its Petition for Rehearing".

The Commission finds: It is appropriate and in the public interest to grant rehearing for the purpose of further consideration in connection with the above noted documents filed by Vanceburg.

The Commission orders: Rehearing is hereby granted for the purpose of further consideration in connection with the above noted documents filed by Vanceburg.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16661 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. CP75-359]

COLUMBIA GULF TRANSMISSION CO. AND NORTHERN NATURAL GAS CO.

Amendment to Application

JUNE 2, 1976.

Take notice that on May 24, 1976, Columbia Gulf Transmission Company (Columbia Gulf), P.O. Box 683, Houston, Texas 77001, and Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern), 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68102, filed in Docket No. CP75-359, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act, an amendment to Columbia Gulf's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity filed June 5, 1975, as amended October 14, 1975, in the instant docket to reflect Northern as a joint applicant and to reflect certain changes in lateral facilities in order to connect additional gas reserves offshore Louisiana, all as more fully set forth in the amendment which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

It is stated that by the first amended application, Columbia Gulf proposed to construct a 30-inch pipeline between Block 601 and a producer platform in Block 616, West Cameron Area, to connect to the 30-inch pipeline proposed by Columbia Gulf and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, a Division of Tenneco Inc. (Tennessee), in their joint application pending in Docket No. CP75-262. Additionally it was proposed to construct 5.7 miles of 16-inch lateral line connecting from the 30-inch pipeline to a producer platform at Block 595, West Cameron Area.

Applicants now jointly delete the request for authorization for the 5.7 miles of 16-inch pipeline lateral connecting to Block 595 and add a request for authorization for construction and operation of 6.9 miles of 16-inch pipeline lateral from a producer platform at Blocks 593/594 connecting to the 30-inch pipeline in Block 617. Applicants also propose to construct a 0.6-mile 16-inch pipeline lateral connecting a producer platform in Block 617 to the 30-inch pipeline. The amendment indicates that the instant proposals are estimated to cost $4,108,896 less in the aggregate than the first amended proposal costs of $28,-305,137 in the aggreagte.

Applicants state that the construction, ownership and operation of the proposed facilities will be as provided in an agreement between Applicants which is being negotiated and will be filed shortly as Exhibit M to the instant amendment. Further, it is stated that in such agreement Columbia Gulf would be named as operator of the facilities.

It is indicated that Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia Transmission) has the preferential right to purchase 25 percent of the gas reserves of Exxon Company, U.S.A. (Exxon), in Blocks 616 and 630, West Cameron Area, and that Block 616 gas is expected to become available in December 1976 at an initial deliverability of 136,000 Mcf per day for a 25 percent interest to Columbia Transmission of 34,000 Mcf per day. The Block 630 gas is projected by Exxon to be available by early 1978. Further, it is said that Columbia Transmission has preferential right to purchase 100 percent of the gas reserves of Union Oil Company of California, et al. (Union), in Block 594.

Further, it is indicated that Northern has the preferential right to purchase 30 percent of Exxon's Block 630 gas reserves and is in final stages of negotiation for Mobil's 33⅓ percent of Blocks 617 and 609 West Cameron Area, gas reserves. It is asserted that Columbia Transmission has the preferential right to purchase 50 percent of Amoco Production Company's (Amoco) 33⅓ percent of Blocks 617 and 609 gas reserves through a joint Columbia Transmission-Tennessee advance agreement with Amoco.

Applicants state that reservoir data and dedicated remaining recoverable salable reserves for Blocks 616, 630, 609, and 617 were submitted on March 29, 1976, in a supplement to pending amended applications in Docket Nos. CP75-262 and CP75-359. The instant amendment shows total proven and probable reserves estimated for Blocks 593/594 are 130,000,000 Mcf, 65,000,000 Mcf of which Columbia Transmission has a preferential right to acquire.

Applicants propose to transport through the proposed 30-inch pipeline all of the gas to be produced from Block

617, Columbia Transmission's share of the gas from Block 616, and all of the gas produced from Blocks 593/594. It is indicated that the gas supply from Block 617 comprises a ⅓ interest committed equally to Columbia Transmission and Tennessee, a ⅓ interest being negotiated for by Northern and a ⅓ interest committed to United Gas Pipe Line Company (United) and Southern Natural Gas Company (Southern) and/or Sea Robin Pipeline Company (Sea Robin). It is stated that the gas supply from Blocks 593/594 would be produced from a single platform. It is indicated that Columbia Transmission has 100 percent interest in the Block 594 reserves and Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (Texas Eastern) has an interest in the Block 593 reserves, with the remaining interest in Block 593 not as yet having been sold by the producer.

It is asserted that by letter of understanding, dated May 21, 1976, Northern agrees to become a joint applicant in this amendment and would become a joint owner with Columbia Gulf in the 30-inch pipeline and the lateral to Block 617 and that Columbia Gulf agrees to provide transportation through the jointly owned facilities of Columbia Gulf and Tennessee proposed in Docket No. CP75–262 and to shore through the Blue Water Project.

It is stated that by memorandum of understanding, dated February 25, 1976, United, Southern, and Sea Robin collectively agree to provide transportation for and onshore exchange of gas with Columbia Gulf from East Cameron Block 335, Eugene Island Block 313 South Marsh Island Blocks 142 and 143, Offshore Louisiana, and that Columbia Gulf agrees to provide transportation for and onshore exchange of gas with United, Southern and/or Sea Robin from Blocks 609 and 617.

Applicants state that in Docket No. CP76–237 Tennessee and Columbia Gulf have filed for authorization to transport and/or exchange Columbia Transmission's Ship Shoal Block 271 gas through Tennessee's Project 349 and for Columbia Gulf to transport and/or exchange Tennessee's West Cameron gas through facilities proposed herein. It is stated that in Docket No. CP76–332 Trunkline has applied for authorization to transport for Columbia Transmission on a short-term basis, subject to interruption arising out of curtailment of Trunkline's customers, up to 27,000 Mcf per day through the Stingway system with onshore delivery. Further, it is asserted that Trunkline and Columbia Gulf have agreed that when Applicants' facilities are completed, an exchange of Block 543/544 gas and Block 616 gas would commence, thereby providing a way to balance these deliveries.

The instant amendment indicates that it is proposed that in 1977 Applicants intend to install lateral facilities to connect to producer platforms in Blocks 609 and 630 and to install additional horsepower on an offshore platform at Vermilion Block 245 to transport the anticipated additional gas deliveries from these blocks.

Applicants state that the facilities applied for herein and those planned for in 1977 when completed would have the capability of handling all of the production from Blocks 609, 617, 630, and 593/594 as well as Columbia Transmission's share from Block 616 and would provide the most efficient utilization of existing offshore facilities, with the gas reserves from the blocks indicated becoming available in 1976–1977. Applicants further indicate that the proposed pipeline is so located as to pass near other blocks which either are committed to the Applicants or are believed to contain reserves expected to become available in 1977 and 1978 and that Applicants have considered those anticipated gas reserves which might be added in 1977 by additional laterals so as to provide the most efficient utilization of said facilities.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said amendment should on or before June 15, 1976, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76–16658 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76–320]

THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER CO.

Intention To Act

JUNE 3, 1976.

On May 5, 1976 the Conecticut Municipal Group filed a Motion to Reject to proposed rate increase tendered by The Connecticut Light and Power Company (CL&P) on December 2, 1975 in the above-captioned proceeding. The Motion alleges that the percentage increase in actual bills is substantially higher than that asked for by CL&P in its filing and, therefore, the filing should be rejected. The Town of Bozrah filed a similar motion on May 7, 1975, alleging that its bills for March and April were substantially higher or a percentage basis than what was filed for by CL&P and requesting a change in the suspension period to five months. CL&P filed an Answer to the Motion to Reject on May 20, 1976 in which it claimed the actual bills were lower than those estimated in the filing and alleged that the comparisons made by the Connecticut Municipal Group are invalid.

Unless acted upon within 30 days of their filing, the motions of the Connecticut Municipal Group and Bozrah would be deemed to be denied under Section 1.12(e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Because of the complex issues raised by these motions and the Commission's desire to allow pleadings to be received by all parties before acting, the Commission believes that further consideration is necessary before action is taken on these motions.

Notice is hereby given of the Commission's intention to act upon these motions subsequent to the time prescribed by Section 1.12(e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

By Direction of the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76–16689 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

[Docket Nos. RP72–104 and RP72–157]

CONSOLIDATED GAS SUPPLY CORP.

Order Approving Settlement Agreement and Terminating Docket [1]

JUNE 2, 1976.

Pipeline rates: settlement, termination of docket.

Before Commissioners: Richard L. Dunham, Chairman; Don S. Smith, John H. Holloman III, and James G. Watt.

On February 2, 1976, Consolidated Gas Supply Corporation (Consolidated) filed a motion requesting the Commission to approve a settlement agreement in the above-referenced dockets and to terminate the proceedings. The Commission herein accepts and approves the settlement agreement as an appropriate resolution of the issues raised in the proceedings.

These proceedings involve rates filed by Consolidated on January 31, 1972 in Docket No. RP72–104. The rates were suspended by the Commission for five months and became effective August 17, 1972. The rates remained in effect until December 1, 1973 when they were superseded by the rates filed by Consolidated in Docket No. RP73–107. The proceedings in Docket No. RP72–157 concern certain provisions in Consolidated's tariff concerning purchased gas adjustments.

The settlement agreement would terminate the proceedings in Docket No. RP72–104 without a refund obligation based on the finding that Consolidated did not collect excess revenues from its jurisdictional customers during the period the rates were in effect. The agreement would also sever Docket No. RP72–157 and consolidate it for purposes of hearing and decision with Consolidated's recent general rate increase filing in Docket No. RP75–91.

Notice of Consolidated's filing was issued February 17, 1976. Comments were filed by Public Service Commission of the State of New York (PSCNY), Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation,

[1] See Appendices A, B, and C to Consolidated's motion for approval of the settlement agreement.

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (Rochester), and by the Commission Staff (Staff). No objections to the settlement agreement were filed. However PSCNY, Rochester, and Niagara Mohawk point out that their agreement does not indicate any approval with respect to any ratemaking principles set forth, specifically the zone and allocation issues. Their willingness to settle the case is based on the revenues derived by Consolidated and not on the form of the rates as filed. These parties also emphasize that the cost allocation and rate design issues are being fully litigated in other Consolidated dockets and that they do not wish to be prejudiced in any way by their lack of opposition to the instant agrement.

Examination of the record in this case reveals a revenue deficiency for Consolidated during the periods that the rates were in effect. Thus despite the wide differences between the parties on matters of principle, there is agreement that no refunds should be required. In addition, the Commission notes that the rates involved have been superseded by several additional Consolidated filings in which the parties have had and will have the opportunity to reexamine those issues which divide them. Accordingly, it is reasonable and appropriate to "close the books" on Docket No. RP72-104 by termination of that docket. The Commission draws the parties' attention to Article III of the agreement and Ordering Paragraph (C), infra, which states that the termination of this docket does not establish any ratemaking principles nor prejudice positions taken by the parties in other proceedings.

The issues raised in Docket No. RP72-157 remain unresolved. Accordingly, the Commission shall sever Docket Nos. RP72-104 and RP72-157 and consolidate RP72-157 with Docket No. RP75-91 for purposes of hearing and decision.

The Commission finds: Good cause exists to accept, approve, and implement the settlement agreement filed in this proceeding.

The Commission orders: (A) The settlement filed in these dockets by Consolidated is hereby accepted and approved.

(B) Docket No. RP72-157 is hereby severed from the proceedings herein and consolidated with Docket No. RP75-91 for purposes of hearing and decision.

(C) Docket No. RP72-104 is hereby terminated.

(D) This order is without prejudice to any findings or orders which have been made or which hereafter may be made by the Commission, and is without prejudice to any claims or contentions which may be made by the Commission, its Staff, Consolidated, or any other party or person affected by this order in any proceeding now pending or hereinafter instituted by or against Consolidated or any other person or party.

(E) The Secretary shall cause prompt publication of this order in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16677 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-45]

CONSUMERS POWER CO.

Conference

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that on June 30, 1976, Staff is convening a conference of all interested persons for the purpose of discussing the issues in the above-captioned docket with a view toward settling this proceeding in Room 5200 at the offices of the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426 at 10:00 a.m.

Customers and other interested persons will be permitted to attend, but if such persons have not previously been permitted to intervene by order of the Commission, attendance will not be deemed to authorize intervention as a party in the proceedings.

All parties will be expected to come fully prepared to discuss the merits of all issues concerning the lawfulness of the proposed rate increase and any procedural matters preparatory to a full evidentiary hearing or to make commitments with respect to such issues and any offers of settlement or stipulations discussed at the conference.

Letters concerning this conference are being mailed to all parties to this proceeding, the jurisdictional customers subject to the proposed rate changes, and the interested state commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16686 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Project No. 2232]

DUKE POWER CO.

Order Authorizing Easement Over Project Lands

JUNE 1, 1976.

Before Commissioners: Richard L. Dunham, Chairman; Don S. Smith, John H. Holloman III, and James G. Watt.

Application was filed on June 25, 1975, and supplemented on November 10, 1975, by Duke Power Company (Licensee) for Commission authorization to grant an easement to the Town of Great Falls, South Carolina, for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a sewer line and outfall into Cedar Creek Reservoir, part of the Rocky Creek—Cedar Creek Development of Licensee's Catawba-Wateree Project—No. 2232. The proposed sewer line and outfall would serve a sewage treatment plant located outside the project boundary, and would discharge treated effluent into project waters.

The affected project lands are located on the Catawba River in the Town of Great Falls, Chester County, South Caroline, about 1,700 feet downstream from the Great Falls—Dearborn Hydroelectric Plant of Project No. 2232. The subject easement would cover a right-of-way 50 feet wide during the construction of the line, and 20 feet wide thereafter. The buried sewer line would extend 18 feet from an existing manhole to the edge of Cedar Creek Reservoir, and thence an additional 18 feet into the project waters. This outfall line would rest on the bottom of the river channel at a depth that would vary from four to eight feet according to the slope of the bottom. The last eight feet of the line would be perforated at one-foot intervals to facilitate the diffusion of effluent.

Operation of the new treatment plant, which is currently under construction, would result in elimination of three existing discharges of untreated sewage into waters of the Catawba River basin. Two of these discharges are into Rocky Creek, a tributary to Cedar Creek Reservoir, and the third is directly into the Catawba River below the upstream Fishing Creek Reservoir of Project No. 2232. The volume of the present raw sewage discharges is approximately 0.9 mgd (million gallons per day), of which 0.7 mgd is from industrial sources[1] and 0.2 mgd is from domestic sources in the vicinity of Great Falls. The new treatment plant and sewer line would provide for a maximum discharge of 1.4 mgd. One mgd of this capacity would be reserved for industrial waste, and 0.4 mgd would be reserved for municipal waste. Inasmuch as the ultimate capacity of the plant exceeds present discharges, it is apparent that further development in Great Falls and its environs is contemplated.

Consolidated into the new facilities, the existing waste loads would receive secondary treatment, resulting in removal of 83 percent of the BOD_5 and suspended solids in the sewage. The nutrient level of the effluent would also be reduced, with removal of some nitrogen and phosphorous.[2] Cedar Creek Reservoir is classified by the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control as a Class B body of water, denoting uses for domestic water supply (after treatment), propagation of fish, industrial and agricultural purposes, and other purposes requiring water of lesser quality. There is no indication that this classification will change as a result of the proposed sewage treatment.

---

[1] At present, the sole source of industrial waste in the system is the textile manufacturing operation of J. P. Stevens Company.

[2] A preliminary review of available data compiled by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's National Eutrophication Survey and published in November, 1974, shows Fishing Creek Reservoir (above the proposed discharge) and Lake Wateree (below the proposed discharge) to be potentially eutrophic. Cedar Creek Reservoir itself was apparently not sampled.

Due to a paucity of data concerning the flows at the Great Falls—Dearborn Development immediately upstream from the proposed discharge, it is not possible to determine accurately the extent to which the effluent would be diluted. Article 32 of the license for Project No. 2232 specifies a minimum average daily flow of 444 cfs (cubic feet per second) for the Great Falls—Dearborn Development.[3] With such a flow, and with the sewage treatment plant loaded to full capacity, the dilution factor for the effluent would be 215:1. Dilution with the average flow would of course be somewhat greater. Although the actual average flows for the Great Falls—Dearborn Development are not available, we may assume that some discharges from the treatment plant would be made during periods when the powerhouses at that development were not operating. During such non-generating periods, the flow in the reach of the river affected by the effluent discharge would be limited to that created by leakage and spill, if any, and by any continuous low flows that might be provided. Thus, the concentration of the effluent in the receiving water would be expected to fluctuate according to the operational status of the upstream hydroelectric plant.

Effective December 26, 1974, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. SC0021211 for the proposed effluent discharge to the Town of Great Falls pursuant to Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, 33 U.S.C. § 1342. Great Falls has also obtained Construction Permits Nos. 2630 and 2631 dated September 10, 1973, from the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control for the construction and operation of the treatment plant and effluent line. The Town anticipates that a portion of the construction cost will be financed with EPA funds.

The agreement by which the subject easement would be granted provides that in the construction, operation, maintenance, use, and/or removal of the sewer line, the Town of Great Falls will comply with all applicable local, State, and Federal laws as well as all ordinances, rules, regulations, and sanctions of any regulatory body or governmental agency having jurisdiction in the premises. The agreement further contains a covenant in accordance with paragraph (C) of Commission Order No. 313[4] to the effect that use of the sewer line will not endanger health, create a nuisance, or otherwise be incompatible with the overall recreational use of the project. Licensee would receive a nominal three dollars for the easement.

The license for Project No. 2232 does not include a recreational use plan (Exhibit (R). However, licensee has reported on the recreational use of project lands and waters in the Form No. 80 filed biennially pursuant to Section 8.11 of our Regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 8.11 (1975). Construction, operation, and maintenance of the sewer line would not interfere with current recreational use at the project. Moreover, we find that replacement of existing raw sewage discharges with a system providing secondary waste treatment, with an attendant improvement in both water quality and the aesthetics of the project area, is a development that comports with the public interest.

Construction of the sewer line and outfall would entail only minor and short-term disturbances to the environment of the project area, and operation of the facilities would result in an improvement in water quality without affecting project operations. We conclude that our authorization of the subject easement would not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and thus would not require preparation of a detailed impact statement pursuant to the provisions of Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 43 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C).

Public notice of the application was issued on August 14, 1975, with September 24, 1975, as the last day for filing of protests or petitions to intervene. Notice of the application was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on August 25, 1975, 40 Fed. Reg. 37090. No protests, notices of intervention, or petitions to intervene were received. By letter dated June 23, 1975, Licensee requested use of the shortened procedures provided for under Section 1.32(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 1.32(b) (1975).

At a hearing held on May 26, 1976, the Commission on its own motion received and made a part of the record in this proceeding all pleadings, submittals, and other evidence filed in regard to the application here at issue, and upon consideration of the record,

The Commission finds: (1) The subject application conforms to the Commission's Rules and Regulations.

(2) Authorization of the grant by Duke Power Company to the Town of Great Falls, South Carolina, of the easement discussed in this order would not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

(3) Construction, operation, and maintenance of the sewer line and outfall discussed in this order would not be inconsistent with recreational use at the project.

(4) It is appropriate for the purposes of the Federal Power Act and in the public interest that Duke Power Company be authorized to grant the subject easement to the Town of Great Falls, South Carolina.

The Commission orders: (A) Duke Power Company is hereby authorized to grant the easement discussed in this order to the Town of Great Falls, South Carolina, subject to the terms and conditions contained in the agreement by which the easement is to be granted.

(B) Duke Power Company shall file with the Commission a copy of the executed agreement within 60 days of its execution.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16673 Filed 6-7-76;8:45 am]

[3] See Order Issuing License (Major), Duke Power Co., Project No. 2232, 20 F.P.C. 360, 372 (1958).

[4] 34 F.P.C. 1546, 1549-50 (1965).

[Docket Nos. ER76-648 and E-9453]

DUKE POWER CO.

Order Accepting for Filing and Suspending Supplemental Agreement, Consolidating Proceedings, and Denying Motion for Waiver

MAY 27, 1976.

Before Commissioners: Richard L. Dunham, Chairman; Don S. Smith, John H. Holloman III, and James G. Watt.

On April 28, 1976, Duke Power Company (Duke) tendered for filing a revised service schedule[1] to its Interconnection Agreement with Yadkin, Inc. For the reasons stated herein, we shall accept for filing and suspend the proposed rate increase and consolidate this proceeding with the proceeding pending in Docket No. E-9453.

The proposed Service Schedule F would provide for an increase of approximately $600,774, representing a 19.7% increase, in the Supplementary Power and Energy rate to Yadkin, Inc., (Yadkin) for the year following the requested effective date of May 1, 1976. The proposed schedule would make applicable to Yadkin the same rates filed in Duke's general rate case, Docket No. E-9453, now pending before the Commission. That proceeding involves a revision of Duke's Schedule No. 10,[2] which is applicable to municipal and other public utilities. Duke contends that its service to Yadkin is so similar to its service to these municipals as to warrant the application of identical cost of service determinations for both Yadkin and the municipals. It should be noted that Yadkin has executed the proposed Service Schedule F in this proceeding.

Duke's proposed Service Schedule F consists of energy charges applied to blocks of kWh usage. The kWh usage blocks are computed by applying Yadkin's contract demand of 30,000 kW to Duke's present Schedule 10, which is based on hours use of billing demand per month. The minimum monthly bill in the present and proposed schedule is $.75/kW of contract demand (30,000 kW) or $22,500. The proposed charges are subject to a fuel adjustment clause which conforms to Commission Order No. 517.

Public notice of this filing was issued on May 6, 1976, with comments due on or before May 21, 1976. The Commission's review of this filing indicates that the

[1] Service Schedule F, Supplement No. 8 to Rate Schedule FPC No. 11, superseding Supplement No. 7 to Rate Schedule FPC No. 11.

[2] Schedule No. 10, Resale Service for Municipals and Public Utility Companies was approved by the Commission on March 23, 1973, in Docket No. E-7994. A revised Service Schedule No. 10 is now pending before the Commission in Docket No. E-9453.

proposed rate increase to Yadkin has not been shown to be just and reasonable and may be unjust, unduly discriminatory, preferential, or otherwise unlawful. Accordingly, we shall suspend the proposed service schedule for one day, subject to refund. Because the rates proposed herein to be applied to Yadkin are equivalent to those rates currently pending before the Commission in Docket No. E–9453, we shall consolidate Docket Nos. E–9453 and ER76–648 for purposes of hearing and decision. The consolidated proceedings shall be governed by the procedures established in Docket No. E–9453.

Duke has requested a waiver of the Commission's notice requirements so as to permit its proposed service schedule to become effective on May 1, 1976. We will deny Duke's request and permit an effective date of May 30, 1976, one day after the expiration of the 30-day notice period.

The Commission finds: (1) Good cause exists to accept for filing the proposed service schedule as designated in footnote 1 and to suspend the use thereof for one day until May 30, 1976, when it may become effective subject to refund, as hereinafter ordered and conditioned.

(2) It is necessary and proper in the public interest and to aid in the enforcement of the provisions of the Federal Power Act that the Commission consolidate, for purposes of hearing and decision, the present providings with the proceedings in Docket No. E–9453.

(3) Good cause exists to deny Duke's request for waiver of the Commission's notice requirements.

The Commission orders: (A) Duke's filing of April 28, 1976, is hereby accepted for filing, suspended for one day, and permitted to become effective on May 30, 1976, subject to refund.

(B) Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Power Act and the Commission's Rules and Regulations, the present filing is hereby consolidated, for purposes of hearing and decision, with the proceedings in Docket No. E–9453.

(C) Duke shall file monthly with the Commission the report on billing determinants and revenues collected under the presently effective rates and the proposed increased rates filed herein, as required by Section 35.19a of the Commission's Regulations, 18 CFR Section 35.-19a.

(D) Duke's request for waiver of the Commission's notice requirements is hereby denied.

(E) The Secretary shall cause prompt publication of this order in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76–16659 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

[Docket Nos. CP73–47, et al.; Docket Nos. CP73–132, et al.]

EASCOGAS LNG, INC., ET AL. AND DISTRIGAS CORP., ET AL.

Extension of Time

JUNE 1, 1976.

On May 14, 1976, Eascogas, Inc., filed a motion for an extension of time to respond to the motion filed May 10, 1976, by the Public Advocate of New Jersey, et al., to hold the proceedings in abeyance pending results of proposed rulemaking. The motion states that there were no objections to the extension by Staff Counsel, the Public Advocate of New Jersey, et al., nor by other counsel.

Upon consideration, notice is hereby given that the time is extended to and including June 14, 1976, within which to respond to the above motion.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76–16674 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. RP72–134; PGA76–16A]

EASTERN SHORE NATURAL GAS CO.

Purchased Gas Cost Adjustment to Rates and Charges

JUNE 1, 1976.

Take notice that Eastern Shore Natural Gas Company (Eastern Shore) on May 17, 1976, tendered for filing Substitute Twenty-Ninth Revised Sheet No. 3A and Substitute Twenty-Ninth Revised PGA–1 to its FPC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1. These revised tariff sheets, to be effective May 2, 1976, decrease the commodity or delivery charges of Eastern Shore's Rate Schedules CD–1, CD–E, E–1, I–1 and PS–1 by .001¢ per Mcf to reflect corresponding changes in Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation's rate schedules by its filing of May 7, 1976.

Pursuant to Section 154.51 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act, Eastern Shore respectfully requests waiver of the notice requirements of Section 154.22 of those Regulations and of Section 20.2 of the General Terms and Conditions of its Tariff, to the extent necessary, to permit the tariff sheets submitted to become effective as of May 2, 1976, to coincide with the effective date of Transco's rate changes. In support thereof, Eastern Shore states that Transco's May 7 filing of its revised tariff sheets prohibited Eastern Shore from fulfilling the prescribed notice requirements under the General Terms and Conditions of its Tariff.

Eastern Shore states that copies of the filing have been mailed to each of the Company's jurisdictional customers and to interested State Commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (10 C.F.R. 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 16, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76–16670 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. RP72–134; PGA76–14A]

EASTERN SHORE NATURAL GAS CO.

Purchased Gas Cost Adjustment to Rates and Charges

JUNE 1, 1976.

Take notice that Eastern Shore Natural Gas Company (Eastern Shore) on May 17, 1976, tendered for filing Substitute Twenty-Seventh Revised Sheet No. 3A and Substitute Twenty-Seventh Revised PGA–1 to its FPC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1. These revised tariff sheets, effective April 1, 1976, decrease the commodity or delivery charges in Eastern Shore's Rate Schedules CD–1, CD–E, E–1, PS–1 and I–1 by .019¢ per Mcf to reflect corresponding decreases in Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation's rate schedules by its filing of May 7, 1976.

Pursuant to Section 154.51 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act, Eastern Shore respectfully requests waiver of the notice requirements of Section 154.22 of those Regulations and of Section 20.2 of the General Terms and Conditions of its Tariff, to the extent necessary, to permit the tariff sheets submitted to become effective as of April 1, 1976, to coincide with the effective date of Transco's rate changes. In support thereof, Eastern Shore states that Transco's May 7 filing of its revised tariff sheets prohibited Eastern Shore from fulfilling the prescribed notice requirements under the General Terms and Conditions of its Tariff.

Copies of the filing have been mailed to each of the Company's jurisdictional customers and to interested State Commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and

Procedure (10 C.F.R. 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 16, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16667 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. RP72-134 PGA76-15A]

EASTERN SHORE NATURAL GAS CO.

Purchased Gas Cost Adjustment to Rates and Charges

JUNE 2, 1976.

Take notice that Eastern Shore Natural Gas Company (Eastern Shore) on May 17, 1976, tendered for filing Substitute Twenty-Eighth Revised Sheet No. 3A and Substitute Twenty-Eighth Revised PGA-1 to its FPC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1. These revised tariff sheets, effective May 1, 1976, decrease the commodity or delivery charges of Eastern Shore's Rate Schedules CD-1, CD-E, E-1, I-1 and PS-1 by .021¢ per Mcf to reflect corresponding changes by Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, Eastern Shore's sole supplier, in its filing of May 7, 1976.

Pursuant to Section 154.51 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act, Eastern Shore respectfully requests waiver of the notice requirements of Section 154.22 of those Regulations and of Section 20.2 of the General Terms and Conditions of its Tariff, to the extent necessary, to permit the tariff sheets submitted to become effective as of May 1, 1976, to coincide with the effective date of Transco's rate changes. In support thereof, Eastern Shore states that Transco's May 7 filing of its revised tariff sheets prohibited Eastern Shore from fulfilling the prescribed notice requirements under the General Terms and Conditions of its Tariff.

Eastern Shore states that copies of the filing have been mailed to each of the Company's jurisdictional customers and to interested State Commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (10 C.F.R. 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 16, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16681 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-409]

EL PASO ELECTRIC CO.

Conference

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that on June 14, 1976, Staff is convening an informal conference of all interested persons for the purpose of discussing the issues in the above referenced docket in Room No. 5200 at the offices of the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m.

Customers and other interested persons will be permitted to attend, but if such persons have not previously been permitted to intervene by order of the Commission, attendance at the conference will not be deemed to authorize intervention as a party in the proceedings.

All parties will be expected to come fully prepared to discuss the merits of all issues concerning the lawfulness of the proposed rate increase and any procedural matters preparatory to a full evidentiary hearing or to make commitments with respect to such issues and any offers of settlement or stipulations discussed at the conference.

Letters concerning this conference are being mailed to all parties to the proceeding, and all of the jurisdictional customers.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16690 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Project No. 176]

ESCONDIDO MUTUAL WATER CO.

Issuance of Annual License

JUNE 3, 1976.

On April 1, 1971, Escondido Mutual Water Company, Licensee for Project No. 176, located partially along the San Luis Rey River and Escondido Creek in the vicinity of the City of Escondido in San Diego County, California, filed an application for a new license under the Federal Power Act and Commission Regulations thereunder.

The license for Project No. 176 was issued effective in 1924 for a period ending June 24, 1974. Since the original date of expiration, the project has been under annual license. In order to authorize the continued operation and maintenance of the project pursuant to the Federal Power Act, pending Commission action on Licensee's application, it is appropriate and in the public interest to issue an annual license to Escondido Mutual Water Company for continued operation and maintenance of Project No. 176.

Take notice that an annual license is issued to Escondido Mutual Water Company (Licensee) under the Federal Power Act for the period June 25, 1976, to June 24, 1977, or until Federal takeover, or the issuance of a new license for the project, whichever comes first, for the continued operation and maintenance of Project No. 176, subject to the terms and conditions of its present license.

Should the terms and conditions of the original license which are incorporated into the annual license be clarified by any order of the Commission, they shall become effective immediately upon the issuance of such order. Further, should the Commission for any reason conclude that it does not have jurisdiction to issue an annual license under the circumstances of this case the annual license will terminate as of the date of our opinion to that effect.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16696 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. E-8121]

GULF STATES UTILITIES CO.

Order Requiring Payment of Refunds

JUNE 2, 1976.

Before Commissioners: Richard L. Dunham, Chairman; Don S. Smith, John H. Holloman III, and James G. Watt.

On April 10, 1973, Gulf States Utilities Company (Gulf States) filed a proposed resale rate increase affecting its wholesale customers, among them Sam Rayburn Dam Electric Cooperative (Sam Rayburn). Sam Rayburn filed a protest and motion requesting that the Commission reject the proposed increases as to it as barred by the Mobile[1]—Sierra[2] doctrine. Subsequent orders of the Commission issued on June 14, 1973 and August 7, 1973, set forth, inter alia, the Commission's conclusion that the contract between Sam Rayburn and Gulf States permitted the proposed rate increase. The Commission, therefore, allowed the increase to become effective as to Sam Rayburn subject to refund. However, as detailed below, inasmuch as the Court subsequently determined that the Sam Rayburn-Gulf States contract does not permit such a unilateral rate increase to be filed, the Commission shall herein order Gulf States to refund to Sam Rayburn, with interest, all monies collected from Sam Rayburn pursuant to the rate schedules filed in this docket.[3]

Sam Rayburn sought court review of the abovementioned Commission orders at the United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit. That Court

[1] *United Gas Pipe Line Co.* v. *Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1956).

[2] *F.P.C.* v. *Sierra Pacific Power Co.*, 350 U.S. 348 (1956).

[3] The Commission notes that Sam Rayburn filed, on May 11, 1976, a Request For Compliance asking for the relief granted in this order.

issued its judgment on July 11, 1975[4] that the Sam Rayburn-Gulf States contract prohibited unilaterally-filed rate changes, thereby reversing the Commission and rejecting the proposed increase as to Sam Rayburn. Rehearing of that decision was denied on January 12, 1976. The Court, on January 28, 1976, granted a motion for stay of its mandate until February 27, 1976. A motion to further extend the mandate was, however, denied on March 19, 1976, and the mandate of the Court was issued on March 22, 1976. Two subsequent applications to the Supreme Court for stay were denied on April 11, 1976 and April 19, 1976, respectively. A petition for a writ of certiorari was filed with the Supreme Court on April 7, 1976, and has not been acted upon.

The Commission orders: Gulf States shall, within thirty days of the date of issuance of this order, refund to Sam Rayburn, with simple interest compounded at 7% per annum, all monies collected from Sam Rayburn under the rate schedules proposed in Docket No. E-8121. Gulf States shall within fifteen days thereafter, file a report of refunds with this Commission indicating Gulf States' conformance with this order.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16679 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-714]

INDIANA & MICHIGAN ELECTRIC CO.

Tariff Change

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that Indiana & Michigan Electric Company, on May 28, 1976, tendered for filing proposed changes in its FPC Rate Schedule No. 25, Service to Michigan Power Company, an affiliate. The proposed changes would increase revenues from jurisdictional sales and service by $7,253,836, based on the 12-month period ending December 31, 1976. Indiana & Michigan Electric Company proposes that the rates and charges and terms and conditions of service revised by this filing shall become effective June 27, 1976.

Copies of the filing were served upon the Michigan Power Company and the Michigan Public Service Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said application should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 17, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this application are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16693 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-715]

INDIANA & MICHIGAN ELECTRIC CO.

Tariff Change

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that Indiana & Michigan Electric Company, on May 28, 1976 tendered for filing proposed changes in its FPC Rate Schedule No. 22, Service to Northern Indiana Public Service Company. The proposed changes would increase revenues from jurisdictional sales and service by $11,300,000, based on the 12-month period ending December 31, 1976. Indiana & Michigan Electric Company proposes that the rates and charges and terms and conditions of service which are revised by this filing shall become effective on June 27, 1976.

Copies of the filing were served upon the Northern Indiana Public Service Company and the Public Service Commission of Indiana.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said application should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 17, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this application are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16694 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-716]

INDIANA & MICHIGAN ELECTRIC CO.

Tariff Change

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that Indiana & Michigan Electric Company on May 28, 1976, tendered for filing proposed changes in its FPC Electric Tariffs MRS and WS and its FPC Rate Schedules No. 44-A, No. 44-B, No. 46, No. 48, No. 50, No. 52, No. 54 and No. 56. The proposed changes would increase revenues from jurisdictional sales and service by $25,700,000, based on the 12-month period ending December 31, 1976. Indiana & Michigan Electric Company proposes that the rates and charges and terms and conditions of service revised by this filing become effective June 27, 1976.

Copies of the filing were served upon the affected customers, the Public Service Commission of Indiana and the Michigan Public Service Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said application should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 17, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this application are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16695 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. RI76-124]

GLEN E. JEFFERY

Petition for Special Relief

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that on April 2, 1976, Glen E. Jeffery, Box 677, Meade, Kansas 67864, filed a petition for special relief in Docket No. RI76-124, pursuant to Order No. 481. Petitioner seeks a price of 45.0¢ per Mcf for the sale of gas to Northern Natural Gas Company from the Berns "A" well in Clerk County, Campbell Unit well in Clark County, and Theis "H" well in Meade County, Kansas. The petition is based on the installation of water lift equipment necessary if gas production is to be increased.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said petition should on or before June 24, 1976, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any party wishing to become a party to a proceeding, or to participate as a party in any hearing therein, must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16697 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[4] *Sam Rayburn Dam Electric Coperative* v. *F.P.C.*, 515 F. 2d 998 (D.C. Cir. 1975).

[Docket No. CI76-228]

KENT GLASGOW

Certification of Proposed Settlement Agreement

JUNE 1, 1976.

Take notice that on May 20, 1976, Presiding Administrative Law Judge Michel Levant certified to the Commission a Settlement Proposal presented by counsel for Kent Glasgow as a proposed settlement of the issues raised in Docket No. CI76-228. The proposed settlement agreement seeks Commission approval under Section 2.76 of the Commission's General Policy and Interpretations (18 CFR 2.76) of amendments to certain contracts between Kent Glasgow and Champlin Petroleum Company (Champlin) providing for an increase in the price of gas which Champlin will pay to Kent Glasgow from 20.5 to 64.3 cents per Mcf. The increase in price is intended to compensate Kent Glasgow for expenditures related to the correction of pipeline pressure differential problems.

If the Commission approves the proposal, Glasgow would withdraw its application for abandonment.

The record in this proceeding contains comments in support of the settlement proposal from all parties and the Commission Staff.

Any person, including the parties, may file comments on the proposed settlement agreement on or before June 14, 1976. Copies of the proposed settlement agreement are on file and available for public inspection in the Commission's Office of Public Information.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16671 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-699]

KENTUCKY UTILITIES CO.

Filing of Revised Fuel Clause

JUNE 1, 1976.

Take notice that on May 24, 1976, Kentucky Utilities Company (Kentucky) tendered for filing a revised fuel clause applicable to service rendered to the Old Dominion Power Company. Kentucky requests that the fuel clause be permitted to become effective as of January 1, 1976.

Kentucky states that the instant filing is made in order to comply with Section 35.14 of the Commission Regulations as same have been amended by Order No. 517.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 15, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16675 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-700]

KENTUCKY UTILITIES CO.

Filing of Revised Fuel Clause

JUNE 1, 1976.

Take notice that on May 24, 1976, Kentucky Utilities Company (Kentucky) tendered for filing a revised fuel clause applicable to service rendered to the City of Paris, Kentucky. Kentucky requests that the fuel clause be permitted to become effective as of January 1, 1976.

Kentucky states that the instant filing is made in order to comply with Section 35.14 of the Commission Regulations as same have been amended by Order No. 517.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 15, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16668 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Project No. 2444]

LAKE SUPERIOR DISTRICT POWER CO.

Order Accepting Withdrawal of Application for Surrender of License and Approving Plan for Rehabilitation of Project

MAY 28, 1976.

Before Commissioners: Richard L. Dunham, Chairman; Don S. Smith, John H. Holloman III, and James G. Watt.

On May 2, 1975, Lake Superior District Power Company, Licensee for White River Project No. 2444, located on the White River in the vicinity of the City of Ashland, Ashland County, Wisconsin, filed pursuant to Section 1.11(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 1.11(d) (1975), a notice of withdrawal of its pending application for surrender of the license for the project. In this notice of withdrawal, Licensee stated that it had assessed the comparative feasibility of abandoning the project or repairing the project and continuing operations for power production purposes, and had opted for the latter alternative.

Public notice of the filing of the notice of withdrawal was issued. On May 12, 1975, the State of Wisconsin, Department of Natural Resources (DNR) filed a petition to intervene in the proceeding. DNR asserted that, in the event that withdrawal of the application for surrender were allowed and restoration of the project ensued, the necessary construction would have an impact on the land, air, water, fish, wildlife, natural resources, and ecosystem of the State of Wisconsin. DNR requested that it be made a party to the proceeding in order to effectively carry out its responsibility to protect and manage the natural resources of the State.

By order issued June 2, 1975, the Commission permitted DNR to intervene in the proceeding and required Licensee to file its detailed plans and schedule for rehabilitation of the project.[1] In this order the Commission discussed the measures that would be necessary to restore the project to safe and efficient operating condition. These measures include: replacement of the penstock; replacement of the surge tank; stabilization of the slide area on the downstream slope of the south earthen embankment; repair of the concrete retaining wall at the south earthen embankment; refurbishment of the tainter gates, including replacement of the gate seals; and repair of the spalled concrete on the gate structure.

In the same order the Commission also discussed the need to take into consideration the possible impacts of the construction activity on the area downstream from the project. The Commission noted particularly the interests of the Indians on the Bad River Reservation, who had expressed concerns over the effect of the downstream transportation of silt and sediment upon trapping, fishing, and the harvesting of wild rice and wild cranberries.[2] Accordingly, the Commission stated that the rehabilitation plans submitted by Licensee should include consideration of timing the necessary construction and repairs in such a way as to avoid or minimize as much as possible the transportation of silt and sediment downstream.

---

[1] Order Permitting Intervention and Requiring Filing of Rehabilitation Plan, Lake Superior District Power Co., Project No. 2444, issued June 2, 1975. By order of August 27, 1975, the Commission granted an extension to December 30, 1975, for the filing of the rehabilitation plan.

[2] Although the Indians have not intervened in this proceeding, they have maintained a close interest in the course of events and have apprised the Commission of the serious nature of their concerns. In a letter dated May 9, 1975, the Bad River Tribal Council informed the Commission that rehabilitation of the White River Project would be in the best interests of the Bad River Reservation, provided that necessary precautions were taken to ensure that the construction would not cause a release of sediment downstream during the crucial fishing season.

The Commission deferred action on Licensee's notice of withdrawal of the application for surrender of license pending assessment of the rehabilitation plan.

On January 6, 1976, Licensee filed its "Specifications for Repair and Modification of the White River Dam." Accompanying the specifications was a report entitled "Environmental Survey of the White River Downstream from the White River Dam." [3] The specifications encompass all of the rehabilitation measures discussed in the Commission's order of June 2, 1975.

Upon review, the Commission staff recommended to Licensee that certain minor changes be made in the plans and specifications. By letter dated May 6, 1976, Licensee informed the Commission that the plans had been amended to incorporate the proposed changes.

Copies of the specifications and environmental survey were made available to DNR for consideration and comment. Subsequently DNR and Licensee consulted on the steps that should be taken to protect the environment during the rehabilitation period. In a letter to Licensee dated March 24, 1976, DNR outlined the understandings that had been reached on specific areas of concern as follows:

(1) No cofferdam would be necessary, for State Highway 112 crossing over the dam would be closed and the work would be done from the bridge and embankment. This work should cause no erosion problem.

(2) The gates would be removed from the dam for repair and painting. This work would be done in an area providing protection against stream pollution.

(3) The scour hole in the tailrace would be checked and, if found to be full of contaminants, would be cleaned.

(4) A fish barrier would be installed on the apron of the dam. This work would be coordinated with a representative of DNR.

These comments were transmitted to the Commission by Licensee in its letter dated May 6, 1976. In this letter, Licensee stated that the operating procedures set forth in DNR's letter would be adhered to, and that no problems are foreseen. Licensee did note a modification in the plans for a fish barrier at the site. These plans are discussed at greater length below.

The U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), was also afforded an opportunity to review and comment on the rehabilitation plans and environmental survey. In a letter to Licensee dated May 3, 1976, FWS discussed several matters of concern, and concluded that the proposed repair and modification would be acceptable subject to the following conditions:

(1) A fish barrier of a design acceptable to DNR should be installed at the dam at the time of repair and modification.

(2) Work on the project should be timed so that the dam will be open no earlier than late August or early September.

(3) A safe and adequate portage around the dam should be provided for canoeists.

(4) Flows over the dam should be maintained in conformance with applicable State regulations and statutes and with DNR concurrence.

(5) Standard methods of erosion control should be employed.

(6) The in-water use of construction equipment should be minimized.

(7) Care should be taken to ensure that no fuel, lubricants, preservatives, paint, or other pollutants enter the river.

Licensee addressed these matters in its letter of May 6, 1976. With regard to item number 3, Licensee stated that there is currently a boat landing at the north end of the dam that could also act as a portage route for any canoeists on the river. Licensee expressed concern over the timing of the reservoir drawndown suggested in item number 2; the problem concerning the timing of drawdown is also discussed in greater detail below. Licensee added that all of the other provisions set forth in the FWS letter would be adhered to during construction.

As noted above, the matters of placement of a fish barrier in the river during construction and the timing of the necessary drawdown of the reservoir were raised and discussed in the letters of the commenting agencies. The timing of the drawdown is also of particular importance to the Indians on the Bad River Reservation because of the possibility of silt and sediment being transported downstream. In view of this expressed interest, we find that these matters warrant further discussion.

Fish Barrier

In order to effectively carry out the needed repairs to the White River Project, it will be necessary to open the gates and drain the reservoir for a certain period of time; in fact, the gates will be physically removed from the dam during a part of this period. This action will result in removal of an insurmountable barrier to the upstream migration of fish. Both DNR and FWS have expressed concerns over the possible upstream migration of sea lamprey. As noted in Licensee's environmental survey:

> The sea lamprey has had a devastating effect on trout populations in Lake Superior where the lamprey feeds on the trout fluids and develops to maturity. The lampreys enter streams to spawn, but the parasitic activity is carried out while they are in Lake Superior. However, it helps facilitate their control to limit access to upstream areas where successful spawning may take place.[4]

DNR and FWS wish to prevent such spawning activity upstream from the White River Project.

Further concerns were raised by FWS over the upstream migration of smelt or other salmonids. FWS asserted in its letter of May 3, 1976 that smelt, if allowed to enter the White River system upstream from the dam, could establish themselves in the lakes where it is anticipated that they would have an adverse impact on the excellent indigenous brown trout sport fishery. This possibility is also discussed in Licensee's environmental survey.[5] Although it is pointed out in Licensee's report that the spawning runs for lamprey and smelt take place in the spring, and that the possibility of migration of these species past the dam during a late summer or fall drawdown is remote, it is also acknowledged that late spawners could gain access to the upstream watershed.

Thus, even though Licensee has planned the drawdown for the late summer and fall months (see discussion below), we find that the extra precaution of a fish barrier in the White River at or below the dam is warranted. Licensee has in fact agreed with DNR upon the use of such a barrier during the construction period. In its letter of May 6, 1976, Licensee indicated that it intends to forego its original plan to use a gravity weir structure in favor of installation of an electric barrier. We have no objection to the use of such a barrier, provided that the method meets with the approval of DNR, and provided further that an auxiliary source of power is available in case the primary source fails. This fish barrier should of course be in operation at the time the project gates are opened, and should remain in use until the gates are closed again.

Timing of Reservoir Drawdown

There is a general consensus among the commenting agencies and interested parties to this proceeding that the project reservoir should be drawn down during an annual period of low flows, although there is slight disagreement as to when the drawdown should begin. FWS states that the dam should be opened "no earlier than late August or early September," when flows of the White River should be near their seasonal low. Licensee proposes in its specifications for repair to begin draining the reservoir on approximately July 26, 1976, and to complete the drawdown prior to August 2, 1976. The gates would then remain open until approximately November 1, 1976. DNR has voiced no objection to the drawdown schedule proposed by Licensee.

The analysis in Licensee's environmental survey of the sediment transport characteristics of the White River indicates a relatively stable equilibrium as far as the deposition or erosion of sediment in the stream bed is concerned, implying that most of the sediment entering the stream from the watershed is carried to the mouth of the river rather than being deposited in the bed of the

[3] Both documents, dated December, 1975, were prepared for Licensee by Barr Engineering Company, Consulting Engineers, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

[4] Environmental Survey at 17–18.

[5] Id. at 18.

stream in significant quantities. During periods of flooding, however, when the river has overtopped its natural banks, sediment could be deposited on overbank areas where the flow velocities would be extremely low. The conclusion, as set forth in the environmental survey, is that a quantity of silt will undoubtedly be washed downstream when the reservoir is drawn down, however, the amount of silt will be minimized by conducting the drawdown slowly during the months when the lowest amount of precipitation is expected. Further, a slow drawdown will avoid rapid fluctuations in the water level that could adversely affect downstream wildlife. The months of August, September, October, and November are identified as the period over which White River flows are normally relatively low.[6]

Licensee anticipates that the reservoir will have to remain drained for a period of approximately three months. As proposed, this period would span the months of August, September, and October, during the time generally identified with seasonal low flows. Delaying the beginning of this period by one month, as recommended by FWS, could increase the likelihood of complications caused by the onset of cold weather.[7] Moreover, one of the concerns upon which FWS bases its recommendation is the possibility of the upstream migration of lamprey and smelt, an eventuality that would be precluded by the fish barrier discussed above.

Taking all of the pertinent factors into consideration, we find that the timing proposed by Licensee for the period of reservoir drawdown, and the proposed gradual draining of the reservoir over the span of an entire week, are well suited to minimizing any adverse impacts to the environment downstream from the White River Project, including the environment of the Bad River Reservation. In this regard we note that, due to the ultimate unpredictability of the weather, it is impossible to state with certainty that no such downstream impacts will occur. All that can be done is to go forward on the basis of past data and experience, thereby reducing to a bare minimum the risks involved. This step has indeed been taken. In any case, a rehabilitated White River Project will ensure, in the long run, a more stable downstream environment. To this end, we are requiring that the reservoir be refilled as soon as possible following the necessary repairs to the project works.

We have carefully reviewed Licensee's plans and specifications and environmental survey for the proposed rehabilitation, as well as the comments of all interested entities. The environmental impacts to the project area resulting from the construction will be temporary and short-term in nature, and all possible precautions are being taken to protect the integrity of the White River and its environs both upstream aend downstream from the project.

The structures and operations of the White River Project following the short period of repair will remain essentially the same as in the recent past. We conclude that our approval of Licensee's plan and schedule for rehabilitation of Project No. 2444, as hereinafter conditioned, would not constitute a major Federal action having a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, and would not therefore require preparation of a detailed impact statement pursuant to the provisions of Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 43 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C).

Rehabilitation of the White River Project would result in stabilization of the environment of the river and restoration of the power benefits of the project. We find that this development is appropriate for the purposes of the Federal Power Act, particularly Sections 10(a) and 10(c), 16 U.S.C. §§ 803(a) and 803(c), and that the public interest would be served by accepting the withdrawal of Licensee's application for surrender of license and approving the rehabilitation plans proffered in lieu thereof.

The Commission finds: (1) Rehabilitation of Project No. 2444, as proposed in the plans filed by Lake Superior District Power Company on January 6, 1976, would not be inconsistent with recreational use of the project.

(2) Approval of the rehabilitation plans for Project No. 2444, as hereinafter conditioned, would not constitute a major Federal action having a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

(3) It is appropriate for the purposes of the Federal Power Act and in the public interest that withdrawal of the application by Lake Superior District Power Company for surrender of the license for Project No. 2444 be accepted, and that the plans for rehabilitation of said project filed on January 6, 1976, be approved.

The Commission orders: (A) Withdrawal of the application by Lake Superior District Power Company for surrender of the license for Project No. 2444 is hereby accepted.

(B) The plans for rehabilitation of Project No. 2444, as filed by Lake Superior District Power Company on January 6, 1976 and subsequently amended, are hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

(i) A fish barrier of a design approved by the State of Wisconsin, Department of Natural Resources, shall be placed in the White River at a location that is satisfactory to that agency: *Provided,* That if the barrier is electric, there shall be an auxiliary source of electric power on hand at all times: *And provided further,* That the barrier shall be operating at the time the project gates are opened to drain the reservoir, and shall remain in continuous operation until the gates are closed to refill the reservoir; and

(ii) The reservoir shall be refilled as soon as possible following completion of repairs that require the gates to be removed or the reservoir to be drawn down: *Provided,* That while the reservoir is being refilled, any minimum flow releases required by the appropriate authorities of the State of Wisconsin shall be maintained.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16663 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[6] For full discussion, conclusions, and recommendations concerning the geology, hydraulics, and hydrology of the White River, see Environmental Survey, pp. 3-8, 19-20.

[7] Licensee also noted in its letter of May 6, 1976, that the highway over the project dam is part of a school bus route. Since this bridge must remain closed during construction, and the suggested later schedule would extend into the school year, a considerable detour for the buses would be necessary.

[Docket No. ER76-46]

MONTAUP ELECTRIC CO.

Notice of Conference on Rates and Charges

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that on June 21, 1976, a conference of all parties to intervene in this proceeding, Montaup Electric Company, and the Commission Staff will be held in the Commission's Conference Room No. 6200, at 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m. (DST).

Copies of this notice are being mailed this date to all jurisdictional customers and interested state Commissions.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16687 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. RP74-100]

NATIONAL FUEL GAS SUPPLY CORP.

Further Extending Time Within Which To File Exceptions

MAY 25, 1976.

On May 24, 1976, National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation filed a motion for a 30 day extension of time within which to file briefs on exceptions to the Presiding Administrative Law Judge's Initial Decision issued March 15, 1976, in the above-designated matter. The motion states that all parties have been contacted and no party objects to the requested extension.

Upon consideration, notice is hereby given that the time within which briefs on exceptions may be filed is extended to and including June 30, 1976. Briefs opposing exceptions may be filed on or before July 20, 1976.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16665 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

NATIONAL POWER SURVEY

Executive Advisory Committee and the Coordinating Committee; Order Renewing

JUNE 3, 1976.

This order renews the term of two Advisory Committees of the National Power

Survey for an additional period through June 30, 1976. The Executive Advisory Committee was established by Commission order issued August 11, 1972, 37 FR 24213, for a term ending two years thereafter, and renewed by Commission order issued August 7, 1974, 39 FR 29233. The Coordinating Committee was established by Commission order issued November 2, 1972, 37 FR 23868, for a term ending two years thereafter, and renewed by Commission order issued January 13, 1975, 39 FR 3250.

As presently constituted and proposed to be continued thereafter, the respective memberships of these two advisory committees are as set forth in Appendix A hereto.

The Federal Power Commission hereby determines that renewal of the aforesaid advisory committees of the National Power Survey, for the period set forth herein, is in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the Commission by law, and that such action is necessary and appropriate for the purposes of the Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 791(a) et seq.

The Commission renews these committees in accordance with the terms of this order and prior Commission orders:

Order Authorizing the Establishment of National Power Survey Advisory Committees and Prescribing Procedures, issued June 29, 1972, 37 FR 13380.

Order Establishing National Power Survey Executive Advisory Committee and Designating Initial Membership and Chairmanship, issued August 11, 1972, 37 FR 24213.

Order Establishing National Power Survey Coordinating Committee and Designating Initial Membership and Chairmanship, issued November 2, 1972, 37 FR 23868.

Order Amending National Power Survey Orders issued December 19, 1972, 37 FR 28661.

General Order No. 464–A, issued August 2, 1974, 39 FR 28929.

Order Renewing National Power Survey Executive Advisory Committees, issued August 7, 1974, 39 FR 29233.

Order Renewing National Power Survey Coordinating Committee, issued January 13, 1975, 39 FR 3250.

By Notice of Determination and Certification with Respect to Renewal of National Power Survey Advisory Committees, dated May 27, 1976, the Chairman of this Commission has determined and certified that the renewal of the aforesaid advisory committees of the National Power Survey for the period set forth herein is necessary in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the Commission by law. The Office of Management and Budget, Advisory Committee Management, has ascertained that the renewal of the aforesaid advisory committees of the National Power Survey is in accord with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 86 Stat. 770, 773–4.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16684 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. E-9155]

NORTHERN STATES POWER CO.

Order Accepting Settlement Agreement

JUNE 2, 1976.

On February 5, 1976, Northern States Power Company filed a proposed Settlement Agreement in the instant docket, along with a motion requesting approval of the Agreement and termination of the proceedings. The Commission finds that the Agreement is in the public interest and accepts and approves it.

Notice of filing of the proposed Agreement was issued February 17, 1976, with comments due on or before March 1, 1976. The Commission Staff filed comments in support of the Agreement.

Docket No. E-9155 was opened on December 6, 1974, when Northern States Power Company (NSP) filed a rate increase to eleven wholesale customers.[1] NSP's proposed rates would yield increased revenues of approximately $994,000 based on a test year ending September 30, 1974. Ten of the eleven customers subsequently intervened in opposition to the proposed rates and alleged that their service contracts contained anti-competitive provisions.

By Order issued February 5, 1975, the Commission suspended the effectiveness of the proposed increase for one day until February 7, 1975, subject to refund, and provided for a hearing in two phases: Phase I to consider rate levels and Phase II to consider anti-competition allegations.

By letter dated June 30, 1975, Commission Staff filed a position statement with respect to Phase I in which it concluded that, based upon its analysis, NSP's proposed rate increase is just and reasonable.

After negotiations with the customers and Staff, NSP filed a Settlement Agreement, dated January 26, 1976, and signed by NSP and the ten intervenor customers, which would terminate both Phases I and II of this proceeding.

The major elements of the Agreement are as follows:

(1) An overall revenue increase of $994,000, based on a test year ending September 30, 1974;

(2) Revision of the tariff clause entitled "Determination of Demand" to provide for a 60% ratchet on the highest demand billed in the previous eleven months and demand measurement intervals of 15 minutes;

(3) Revision of the service contract clause governing parallel operation by a Municipal customer to provide that, if a Municipality interconnects its electric system with any system other than NSP, the reliability planning and the cost of the interconnection will be shared among the Municipality, NSP, and the third system on the basis of the benefits derived by each from the interconnection;

(4) Elimination from the rate schedules of provisions expressly restricting retail competition between NSP and a customer;

(5) Revision of the rate schedules to require 24 months' prior notice by either party before the service contract can be terminated.

Review of the record demonstrates that the proposed rates are supported by cost evidence and that the rates are just and reasonable. Accordingly, approval and adoption of the Agreement are in the public interest.

In conjunction with acceptance and approval of the Agreement, the Commission shall require NSP to (1) refund any amounts collected in excess of the settlement rates, together with interest calculated at the rate of 9% per annum, (2) submit revised rate schedules, and (3) file refund compliance reports on any refunds made.

The Commission finds: The Agreement filed by Northern States Power Company in this proceeding should be accepted and approved as hereinafter conditioned.

The Commission orders: (A) The settlement agreement filed in this docket is hereby approved, incorporated by reference and accepted subject to the following conditions.

(B) Northern States Power Company shall within 30 days of the issuance of the order file rate schedules appropriate to reflect terms of the Agreement.

(C) Northern States Power Company shall refund, within 30 days after the rate schedules required in (B), supra, are accepted for filing, any and all amounts collected in excess of the settlement rates, with interest at 9% per annum.

(D) Northern States Power Company shall file a report within 15 days after refunds, if any, have been made, such report to show monthly billing determinants and revenues under prior, present and settlement rates. The report shall also show the monthly interest computation, together with a summary of such information for the total refund period.

(E) This order is without prejudice to any findings or orders which have been made or which may hereafter be made by the Commission and is without prejudice to any claims or contentions which may be made by the Commission, its Staff, Northern States Power Company, or any other party or person affected by this order in any proceeding now pending or hereafter instituted by or against Northern States Power Company or any other person or party.

(F) The Secretary shall cause prompt publication of this order in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16680 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[1] The Wisconsin Municipalities of Bangor, Black River Falls, Bloomer, Cadott, Cornell, New Richmond, Rice Lake, Spooner, Trempealeau, Westby, and Whitehall.

[Docket No. ES76-57]

NORTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE CO.

Application

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that on May 24, 1976, Northwestern Public Service Company (Applicant) filed an application seeking an order pursuant to Section 204 of the Federal Power Act authorizing the issuance of promissory notes to evidence short-term borrowings as needed for its business from time to time during the period beginning with the expiration of the previous authorization by the Commission in Docket No. E-8955 and ending July 1, 1977, provided that the aggregate principal amount of such notes outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $25,000,000.

Applicant is incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware and is qualified to do business as a foreign corporation in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota, and as a domesticated corporation in the State of Nebraska. The notes proposed to be issued pursuant to this Application will be short-term promissory notes which will be issued to commercial banks. Such notes shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed ¼ of 1% above the prime commercial rate of the lending bank, or principal lending bank, as it is in effect from time to time during the terms of such notes. The initial term, and each renewal or extended term, of the notes shall not exceed 360 days (although successive renewals or extensions may occur).

The net proceeds from the notes will be used in part to refund existing short-term borrowings which amounted to $17,000,000 as of the date of the application, and in part to provide funds which, with other funds of the Applicant, will be used for construction, extension and improvement of facilities. Applicant's construction program for the year ending December 31, 1976 is estimated at $15,250,000, of which approximately $8,500,000 is for Applicant's share of expenditures in connection with construction of a large electric generating plant near Beulah, North Dakota, the ownership of which is shared by Applicant and four other parties; $202,000 is for other electric production projects; $2,601,000 is for major electric transmission lines and substations; $1,912,000 is for routine extensions and additions to electric systems; $810,000 is for routine extensions and additions to natural gas distribution systems; and $225,000 is for miscellaneous and general items.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before June 23, 1976, file with the Federal Power Commission, D.C. 20426, petitions to intervene or protests in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Persons wishing to become parties to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file petitions to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules. The application is on file with the Commission and is available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16685 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. E-8927]

PENNSYLVANIA POWER AND LIGHT CO.

Extension of Time To File Exceptions

MAY 25, 1976.

On May 14, 1976, Intervenors filed a motion for an extension of time within which to file briefs on exceptions to the Presiding Administrative Law Judge's Initial Decision issued on April 20, 1976. The motion states that counsel for Pennsylvania Power and Light Company (PP&L) had no objection to the extension so long as it did not delay any other rate relief to which PP&L may be entitled or any other proceeding in which PP&L is presently involved before the Commission. Staff Counsel had no objection to the extension.

Upon consideration, notice is hereby given that the time within which briefs on exceptions may be filed in the above-designated matter is extended to and including June 21, 1976. Briefs opposing exceptions may be filed on or before July 12, 1976.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16664 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. RP76-103]

PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC.

Petition for Declaratory Order

JUNE 2, 1976.

Take notice that on May 24, 1976, Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc. (Public Service), 400 Cox Road, Gastonia, North Carolina 28052, filed in Docket No. RP76-103 a petition pursuant to Section 1.7(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure for a declaratory order under the Natural Gas Act determining that the Federal Power Commission is without jurisdiction to require that abandonment authorization be sought or obtained prior to the transportation in interstate commerce of the State of Texas' royalty portion of natural gas produced from certain state offshore leases, which gas is the subject of a gas purchase agreement between the State of Texas and Public Service.

Public Service states that it has entered into a contract with the State of Texas, acting by and through the School Land Board of Texas, for the purchase of an approximate total quantity of 1,100,000 Mcf per year of natural gas, representing the State of Texas' royalty portion of gas produced from state offshore leases to be taken in-kind by the state. The gas subject to the contract is produced by Superior Oil Company (Superior) from State Lease Nos. M-58093, M-58094, and M-69629, located in the Gulf of Mexico in Block No. 14-L, High Island Field, Jefferson County, Texas. Superior and its pipeline purchaser, Natural Gas Pipe Line Company of America, recognize a right in the State of Texas to take its royalty interest in the leases in "in kind" gas volumes.

Public Service seeks this supplemental supply of gas in an effort to partially offset the declining deliveries from its interstate pipeline supplier and thereby alleviate to some extent the curtailment of Public Service's customers in its North Carolina service area. Public Service states that the only pipeline company capable of transporting the gas involved has refused to do so unless the Commission rules that abandonment approval need not be obtained.

The petition states that neither the State of Texas, nor an agency of the State, is a "natural-gas" company within the meaning of the Natural Gas Act, and that the requirements of Section 7, including the abandonment provisions of that Section, operate only as to "natural-gas" companies.

Public Service states that expeditious Commission action to grant the requested declaratory order is required to avoid delay in ameliorating the present gas shortage experienced by Public Service and its customers and to avoid possible cancellation of the purchase contract by the State of Texas.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said petition should on or before June 24, 1976, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's rules.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16678 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

[Docket Nos. CS76-830, et al.]

SHEPHERD OFFSHORE VENTURES ET AL.

Applications for "Small Producer" Certificates [1]

JUNE 2, 1976.

Take notice that each of the Applicants listed herein has filed an application pur-

[1] This notice does not provide for consolidation for hearing of the several matters covered herein.

suant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act and § 157.40 of the Regulations thereunder for a "small producer" certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the sale for resale and delivery of natural gas in interstate commerce, all as more fully set forth in the applications which are on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said applications should on or before June 28, 1976, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, petitions to intervene or protests in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Persons wishing to become parties to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file petitions to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on all applications in which no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein if the Commission on its own review of the matter believes that a grant of the certificates is required by the public convenience and necessity. Where a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or where the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwse advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicants to appear or be represented at the hearing.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

Docket No.	Filing date	Applicant
CS76-830	May 20, 1976	Shepherd Offshore Ventures, Suite 209, 1800 St. James Place, Houston, Tex. 77056.
CS76-831	....do....	John Ekern Ott, 321 North Justine St., Chicago, Ill. 60607.
CS76-832	....do....	John A. Jackson, individually, and Katie Petroleum Co., 6019 Berkshire Lane, Dallas, Tex. 75225.
CS76-833	....do....	Donald Turrietta 2104 Charlevoix NW., Albuquerque, N. Mex. 87104.
CS76-834	....do....	Mark D. Wilson, 1705 Briscoe Ave., Artesia, N. Mex. 88210.
CS76-835	May 21, 1976	Clyde C. La Mar, P.O. Box 950, Douglas, Wyo. 82633.
CS76-836	....do....	William L. Pease, P.O. Box 371, Gillette, Wyo. 82716.
CS76-837	May 24, 1976	James E. Kemp, 2000 Mercantile Bank Bldg., Dallas, Tex. 75201.
CS76-838	....do....	Grady H. Vaughn III, 606 Mercantile Dallas Bldg., Dallas, Tex. 75201.
CS76-839	....do....	Joseph J. C. Paine, d.b.a. Paine & Associates, 1018 Patterson Bldg., Denver, Colo. 80202.
CS76-841	....do....	Elaine Wolf, Suite 1900, 1st of Denver Plaza, 633 17th St., Denver, Colo. 80202.
CS76-842	....do....	Devon Corp., 3300 Liberty Tower, Oklahoma City, Okla.
CS76-843	....do....	Henry Heidtbrink, 155 South Madison St., No. 302, Denver, Colo. 80209.
CS76-844	....do....	C. S. V. Oil Exploration Co., 2005 South 300 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115.
CS76-845	May 21, 1976	Marion Corp., P.O. Box 16006, Mobile, Ala. 36616.
CS76-846	May 26, 1976	Charles R. Wilcox, 2300 Western Federal Savings Bldg., Denver, Colo. 80202.
CS76-847	....do....	Nettie E. Wilcox, 2300 Western Federal Savings Bldg., Denver, Colo. 80202.
CS76-848	....do....	Vallery Corp., 3120 Security Life Bldg., Denver, Colo. 80202.

[FR Doc.76-16683 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. CP76-377]

SOUTHERN NATURAL GAS CO.

Application

JUNE 1, 1976.

Take notice that on May 24, 1976, Southern Natural Gas Company (Applicant), P.O. Box 2563, Birmingham, Alabama 35202, filed in Docket No. CP76-377 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon the Roxie Area Measuring Station No. 2 and service rendered thereby on Applicant's Cranfield-Gwinville pipeline in Franklin County, Mississippi, used to serve The Union Gas Company for Craft Petroleum Company, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The application indicates that The Union Gas Company has terminated gas deliveries at the request of Craft Petroleum Company and has advised Applicant that the measuring station may be abandoned. Applicant states that no service is currently being rendered by the subject facilities and that it has no further need for the facilities.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protests with reference to said application should on or before June 21, 1976, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that permission and approval for the proposed abandonment are required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16666 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. G-16388, et al and Docket Nos. G-12823, G-18886, RP61-15 and RP67-10]

SUPERIOR OIL CO. AND TEXAS GAS TRANSMISSION CORP.

Refunds

JUNE 1, 1976.

Take notice that on April 28, 1976, the Texas Gas Transmission Corporation (Texas Gas) tendered for filing its proposed plan for the flow-through of refunds received from United Gas Pipe Line Company (United), pursuant to the Commission order issued March 8, 1976, in Docket No. G-16388, et al., directing disbursements and the filing of a report setting forth the proposed flow-through of refunds. Texas Gas states that this filing pertains to refunds applicable to gas purchases from United from December 1, 1958 to December 31, 1968.

Texas Gas states that copies of this filing were sent to each of its jurisdictional customers and to interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 9, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16672 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. RP71-29, et al. (Phase II)]

UNITED GAS PIPE LINE CO.

Order Remanding Matter for Further Hearing; Proposed Tariff Sheets; Accepting and Suspending Use Thereof, and Requiring Further Evidence

MAY 28, 1976.

I. PROPOSED PERMANENT CURTAILMENT PLAN

On April 1, 1976, United Gas Pipe Line Company (United) tendered for filing proposed changes in its FPC Gas Tariff [1] designed to implement a permanent curtailment program when United's current interim plan expires on October 31, 1976. Simultaneously, United filed supporting testimony and exhibits describing the proposed plan and showing the projected impact upon United's customers during the 1976–77 curtailment seasons under both United's current plan and its proposed plan. Public notice of United's filing was issued on May 7, 1976, with comments and petitions to intervene due on May 21, 1976. Comments on United's proposed tariff sheets have been received from numerous parties in addition to motions for rejection or summary disposition of the proposed sheets.[2] Petitions to intervene will be treated by separate order.

A. SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN

As support for its proposed permanent plan, United cites the severe impact upon its direct market customers which would result should the effectiveness of the current interim curtailment plan be extended beyond October 31, 1976. United asserts that, because most small industrial customers do not have alternate fuel capability, the level of curtailment which it projects for next winter would, under the current plan, have a crippling economic impact in scores of communities in the Gulf South region of the United States. United states that its proposed plan would ameliorate this impact through the following devices. The feedstock requirements of the pipeline customers, although classified in Category II, will be curtailed whenever United is curtailing at or below the 300 Mcf per day Category III cutoff. Secondly, the proposed plan provides for a reclassification to Category II of certain high priority direct market industrial requirements now classified in Category III.[3] Third, United would curtail portions of the Category I requirements of its pipeline customers pro rata with the Category II requirements of its direct market customers.[4] The supporting testimony filed by United states that this prorata curtailment of pipeline Category I and direct market Category II requirements would not require the immediate actual curtailment of residential and small commercial customers behind the pipelines because (1) the reduction in deliveries to the pipelines would not be significant, (2) the pipelines are dependent on United for only a portion of their total gas supplies, (3) the pipelines have storage facilities, and (4) many of the pipelines' resale customers have supplemental supply sources.

B. MOTIONS TO REJECT

The Movants base their motions to reject United's tariff filing on various grounds, most of which can be categorized as urging rejections because of a conflict with either statutory law, judicial edict, or Commission regulations or policy. Our review of the proposed tariffs and supporting testimony leads us to conclude that none of the grounds cited constitutes an adequate basis for rejection at this point of the tariff filing.

C. LEGAL STANDARD FOR REJECTION ON SUMMARY DISPOSITION

It is well established that the substantive standard governing our evaluation of curtailment plans is found in Section 4(b) of the Natural Gas Act, and that the filing and review of proposed curtailment plans is properly undertaken in accordance with the procedures of Sections 4(c), (d) and (e) of the Act. *F.P.C. v. Louisiana Power & Light Company*, 406 U.S. 621 (1972). Under those procedures, our authority to summarily reject or dispose of tariff filings has been delineated by judicial rulings. Notably, *Municipal Light Boards, v. F.P.C.*, 450 F. 2d 1341 (D.C.C.A. 1971) distinguishes summary disposition from rejection, and allows disposition of a controversy on the pleadings without an evidentiary hearing only when there is neither a dispute as to material facts nor a need to ventilate the underlying facts to aid in policy determination. In contrast, a rejection is appropriate where the filing is deficient on its face because it is defective in form or a substantive legal nullity. A determination of nullity may be based upon either a conflict with the governing statute or failure to substantially comply with duly issued regulations. We have also summarily disposed of tariff filings because of inconsistency with Commission policy enunciated in previous adjudicative proceedings.[5]

D. BASIS FOR ACCEPTANCE AND SUSPENSION OF TARIFF FILING

Review of United's filing in light of its supporting testimony and the existing record in this proceeding indicates that it entails numerous issues of fact which, as discussed more fully below, require ventilation. Therefore, the filing is not susceptible to summary disposition. Nor do we find it formally defective. There remains the possibility that it is rejectable because inconsistent with a statute, regulation or policy. However, in view of the factual uncertainties associated with United's filing, we do not find that the filing, on its face, violates any such authorities.

Initially and most fundamentally, several Movants assert that United's proposed plan violates Section 4(b) of the Act since it discriminates against United's pipeline customers by simultaneously curtailing the pipeline Category I and and direct market Category II requirements. While it is a close question whether the Category I requirements are so vital that commencement of any curtailment into that Category before complete curtailment of lower categories constitutes an undue discrimination under Section 4(b), United's testimony does offer assurance that curtailment on such differential levels would not necessarily entail actual curtailment of the residential and small commercial

[1] United's proposed tariff sheets are designated Original Sheet No. 70–A, Original Sheet No. 70–B, Fifth Revised Sheet No. 71, Ninth Revised Sheet No. 72, Seventh Revised Sheet No. 72–A, and Original Sheet No. 72–B to First Revised Volume No. 1.

[2] Protests to the proposed tariff sheets were filed by the following: New Orleans Public Service Inc., Long Island Lighting Company, National Gas and Oil Corporation, Illinois Commerce Commission, Louisiana Power & Light Company, Brockway Glass Company, Gulf States Utilities Company, Mississippi Valley Gas Company and Carnegie Natural Gas Company. Protests and motions to reject the proposed tariff sheets were filed by the following (hereafter referred to as "movants"): Southern Natural Gas Company, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation, Algonquin Gas Transmission Company, New Jersey Natural Gas Company, Laclede Gas Company, Algonquin Customer Group, Brooklyn Union Gas Company, Consolidated Gas Supply Corporation, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, Mississippi River Transmission Corporation, General Motors Corporation, Public Service Commission of New York, and Mississippi Public Service Commission. Responses to motions to reject were filed by the following: United, Entex Incorporated, Louisiana Gas Service Company, United Municipal Distributors Group, The State Of Louisiana, Curtaulds North America, Inc., Stauffer Chemical Company, Scott Paper Company, Willamette Industries, Inc. and Allied, et al. Related motions were filed by National Gypsum Company and Willamette Industries Incorporation for increase in their entitlements under United's proposed plan; these latter motions are not treated herein.

[3] Such reclassified volumes would include (1) those direct market plant protection and process gas requirements now classified in Category III and (2) the total industrial requirements of direct market customers using less than 300 Mcf per day. In addition, a temporary Category II status would be accorded to a portion of the industrial requirements of all direct market customers whose total requirements are more than 300 but less than 3000 Mcf per day.

[4] Under the proposed plan, United would curtail pro rata up to 20 percent of each of (1) the Category II requirements of United's direct industrial and city gate customers and (2) the Category I requirements of United's pipeline customers. Thereafter direct industrial and city gate customer Category II requirements would be curtailed two percent for each additional one percent of pipeline Category I curtailment until such time as those Category II requirements were 100 percent curtailed and pipeline Category I requirements were 60 percent curtailed. The remaining Category I requirements of all customers would be curtailed pro rata.

[5] "Order Granting Motion For Summary Disposition And Ordering Refund," issued in *Georgia Power Company*, Docket No. E–9091, on August 5, 1975.

consumers behind the pipelines at least during the 1976–77 winter. By thus raising the issue differing impacts of curtailment upon partial and full-requirements customers, United presents a factual issue which requires further development through a hearing. There being such a factual issue, we are precluded from summarily dismissing the filing on this ground. Furthermore, since the "undue prejudice" standard is essentially a test of reasonableness under the facts of a particular case, it is similarly inappropriate to reject United's filing for violation of Section 4(d) in the absence of a factually complete record.

Movants also argue that United's differential treatment of its partial and full-requirements customers, conflicts with this Commission's policy respecting that distinction as stated in Opinion Nos. 647[6] and 754.[7] Movants observe that in Opinion No. 647 we stated:

> In approving this curtailment plan for United as it affects partial requirements customers, we shall allocate the impact of curtailment equally, insofar as may be possible, upon full and partial requirements customers treating both in the same manner. (49 F.P.C. 179 at 191)

Movants further observe that in Opinion No. 754 we rejected a provision imposed by the Presiding Judge which would have reduced curtailment entitlements from the pipeline by the amount of gas received from any other source to serve end-uses being completely curtailed by the pipeline. In response, we would first note that the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in *State of Louisiana* v. *F.P.C.*, 503 F.2d 844 (1974), recognized that the relative treatment of partial and full requirements customers is an unresolved issue in this proceeding (503 F.2d 869–871). It does not appear that substantial evidence directed to this issue has been developed on the record of this proceeding to date, and it is necessary for United to develop such evidence in support of its tariffs. Secondly, our concern in Opinion No. 754 was the preservation of an incentive to develop and utilize high-cost supplemental supply sources. In its supporting testimony United identifies several devices which temper the effect of curtailment upon customers behind pipelines (e.g. secondary interstate pipeline suppliers and existing storage facilities). To the extent that such devices can be utilized without imposing a burdensome additional cost on the pipeline customers, they can be helpful in cushioning the impact of curtailment on United's system without deterring their further use or development. Such utilization does not conflict with our policy, and we expect that United will meet its burden of proof and, quantify that utilization.

Movants further assert that United's filing conflicts with other Commission policies. It is urged that by simultaneously curtailing the pipeline Category I requirements with the direct market Category II requirements, United abandons the policies enunciated in Order No. 467 regarding end-use principals and regarding the full curtailment of lower priority volumes before curtailment of higher priority volumes. However, this assertion ignores the Commission's oft stated and judicially approved position on the role of the Order No. 467 policies:

> By these order, (Orders 467, 467–A and 467–B) the parties are on notice that we consider the type of curtailment plan set forth in the Orders to be just and nondiscriminatory and nonpreferential. This does not mean that the parties may not propose or the Commission may not adopt variations on the Section 2.78(a) plan, but there must be evidence in the record to support any such variations.[8]

Since it has been our practice to allow parties to challenge the merits of an Order 467 type plan as inappropriate in the circumstances of a particular case, we could hardly reject United's filing on the ground that it deviates from the Order 467 guidelines.

Many of the Movants argue that United's filing should be rejected because it is actually a request for a blanket grant of extraordinary relief which violates the Commission's rules by failing to meet the proper evidentiary standards for such relief. We reject such arguments out of hand. The Order 467–C procedures for obtaining extraordinary relief apply to relief from an existing and effective curtailment plan. The fact that United's proposal deviates from the Order 467 priorities does not require the imposition of the evidentiary standards of Order No. 467–C, but rather requires an evidentiary showing that the proposal is conssitent with Section 4(b) of the Natural Gas Act.

Finally, several of the Movants have requested that United be allowed to implement its filing only upon the condition that it be subject to a refund obligation sufficient to protect their customers from the unlawful preferences of that plan. While the imposition of a refund obligation is left to the Commission discretion by Section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act, such imposition here is problematic. First, Section 4(e) envisions the imposition of a refund obligation in cases "where increased rates or charges are thus made effective." This raises a question of the propriety of a refund in connection with the filing of a curtailment plan, wherein the main concern is a change in the rules governing allocation of gas among its customers during periods of shortage. Secondly, the quantification of the allegedly illegal preferences is a difficult matter due to the lack of a base from which to measure the extent of the preferences. In view of these difficulties, it is our conclusion that United's filing should be accepted without condition as to the payment of a money refund.

II. Remand Considerations

On November 8, 1974, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit vacated and remanded Commission Opinion Nos. 647 and 647–A in *State of Louisiana, et al.* v. *F.P.C., supra.* The Court directed replacement of the three-priority plan by the previously effective four-priority plan.[9] On November 29, 1974, the Court granted the Commission's motion for remand of the record and permitted the three-piority plan to continue for a reasonable time pending the Commission's decision on the remanded matters.

On March 7, 1975, the Commission issued an order on remand, *inter alia*, finding the four-priority plan just and reasonable and nondiscriminatory as implemented prior to January 12, 1973, the date of issuance of Opinion No. 647, but finding to the contrary after that date. United was directed to continue curtailing according to the three-priority plan. In its decision in *Louisiana Power & Light Company, et al.* v. *F.P.C.*, ____ F.2d ____ (5th Cir. Nos. 75–2183, *et al.*, issued February 5, 1976), the Court reviewed the order of March 7, 1975, and the order on rehearing issued May 2, 1975. The Court vacated the finding supporting the reinstitution of the three-priority plan but permitted use of the plan until the winter heating season 1976–77. The March 7, 1975, order was premised upon both the adequacy of alternate fuel capabilities of the electric utilities served by United and the serious and irreparable harm to United's direct market industrial customers. The record was found adequate as to the first premise but not as to the finding of irreparable harm to direct market industrials. The Court has directed the Commission to correct the defects in its prior orders or else the four-priority plan will control United's 1976–77 winter heating season curtailment.

A. Alternate Fuel Capabilities

Particularly significant to the future development of the record in Phase II of this proceeding is the emphasis of the Court upon the need to support the proposition that irreparable harm to United's direct market industrial customers would be averted by utilization of a given permanent curtailment plan with evidence as to alternate fuel capabilities of such customers:

> No record or extra-record support is provided for the assertion that a shut-down of gas service to United's industrial customers will create "serious and irreparable injury, including plant closings, employee lay-

[6] Issued in this docket on January 12, 1973.
[7] Issued in Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company, Docket No. RP71–119, on February 27, 1976.
[8] Order No. 467–B (slip) p. 6.
[9] The three-priority plan was formed by consolidating Categories III and IV of the four-priority plan, which contained the following hierarchy.
I. Gas ultimately used by domestic consumers;
II. Gas used by direct industrial customers for feedstock purposes;
III. Gas used to generate electricity for domestic consumption; and
IV. All other requirements.

offs, and other forms of economic dislocation." The validity of this assertion turns in large measure on the alternate fuel capabilities of United's industrial customers and the degree by which they can cope with deep curtailment. Accepting all of the disputed evidentiary citations in the March 7 order there is still no citation to evidence bearing on the alternate fuel capabilities of United's industrial customers—the logical basis of any finding of irreparable harm to this class of natural gas users by virtue of reinstatement of the four-priority plan. (Slip Opinion, p. 1668-9, footnotes omitted).

We read the foregoing broadly and consider it as an indication that any future curtailment plan which is designed to avoid serious and irreparable injury to direct market industrial or to other gas users who are dependent for some or all of their gas requirements upon United must be supported by evidence of such customers' alternate fuel capabilities.

B. DATA COLLECTION

Applying the foregoing, United's proposed plan is inadequately supported by the accompanying proposed testimony and exhibits. One purported principal feature of the plan is the protection of direct market industrial customers with requirements of 300 Mcf per day or less by placement of such customers' requirements permanently in Category II. None of the proposed exhibits or testimony accompanying United's April 1, 1976, filing reflect alternate fuel capabilities of such customers. We note that United has never before been required by this Commission to obtain such data. We are mindful of the extreme time pressure involved in completing action by November 1, 1976. Collection of data from all of the approximately 1500 such customers, we recognize may be an impossibility, but we believe an attempt to collect a representative sample is possible and, indeed, is required. Therefore, if United wishes to continue to support its proposed plan, United will be required to collect the data as to alternate fuel capabilities from all its direct market industrial customers having daily requirements between 50 Mcf and 300 Mcf by use of a request similar in form to the request required by order issued June 11, 1975, in Alabama-Tennessee Natural Gas Company, et al., Docket No. RP74-42, et al.[10], and by July 1, 1976,[11] to present as evidence a summary of the responses received in a tabular form with supporting analysis. Responses from customers with requirements below 50 Mcf per day will not be required since such customers' requirements would be comparable to residential and small commercial requirements and which, applying common knowledge, we will presume would have no significant alternate fuel capabilities, subject to a showing to the contrary.

Comparing the results of the end-use data response to the Opinion No. 647-A data collection effort with United's proposal exhibit MJG 5, it appears that a substantial number of direct market industrial customers having greater than 300 Mcf per day requirements make boiler fuel use of the gas. Since there is no present or proposed comparable evidence of boiler fuel requirements of direct market industrial customers having requirements below 300 Mcf per day, this data should be requested from such customers along with the data concerning alternate fuel capabilities.

C. THE FOUR-PRIORITY PLAN

Although the Court's statements were directed toward the three-priority plan reinstituted by the March 7, 1975, order, again we read the decision broadly as requiring the Commission's determination supported by substantial evidence that the four-priority plan imposed by the Court during the coming winter season is unjust and unreasonable or unduly discriminatory before it may be replaced by any other plan:

> * * * [T]his is the last year during which the three-priority plan will remain in operation without the support of a proper finding on the invalidity of the four-priority plan. Absent proper compliance by the Commission with our decision on remand, the four-priority plan will control curtailment on the United system for the 1976-77 winter heating season. (Slip Opinion p. 1673).

Thus, each party proposing a new curtailment plan will have the burden of demonstrating the invalidity of the four-priority plan as well as the justness and reasonableness of its proposed plan. We envision that such demonstration would include, but not be limited to, a comparative showing of the effect of the proposed plan versus that of the four-priority plan.

D. PREVIOUSLY RECOGNIZED ISSUES

In light of the Court's discussion of the issues of "misclassification" and of new and enlarged service giving rise to undue preferences and discrimination, we do not view the Court's reversal and remand of the orders of March 7 and May 2, 1975, as disturbing the Commission's assignment of previously identified issues into phased hearings:

> * * * [W]e hold that petitioners' challenge to the placing of the misclassification arguments in Phase I is not yet ripe for judicial review.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Moreover, we must give heed to the power of the Commission to control the scheduling and conduct of its own proceedings. *See, FCC* v. *Pottsville Broadcasting Co., supra.* We hold that the Commission did not err in refusing to consider petitioners' preference arguments in Phase I of the proceedings on remand (Slip Opinion, p. 1672-1673).

Consideration of the issues related to Section 12.3 of United's proposed tariff filed May 12, 1971, and the proceedings in Docket No. RP75-71 shall, therefore, continue in Phase III of this proceeding. Likewise, the allegations of undue preferences and discriminations arising out of new and enlarged service at a time that United knew or should have known that gas supply deficiences might arise shall be addressed by all parties and the Presiding Judge in this Phase II of the proceeding. Staff will prepare and circulate an environmental impact statement in conformity with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Section 102(c).

E. EXPEDITION

At the time that Phase II was established, it was assumed that, while the pace of the hearings would be deliberate, the complex nature of the issues relegated to it would cause it to be somewhat protracted. The Court's decision to implement the four-priority plan this coming heating season unless the four-priority plan is found invalid imposes a procrustean time limit requiring Phase II to be conducted with celerity. We therefore, direct that the Presiding Administrative Law Judge conduct the proceedings and render an initial decision as expeditiously as possible.

The Commission finds: (1) It is necessary and proper in the public interest in carrying out the provisions of the Natural Gas Act that the Commission enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of the terms and conditions of service contained in United's proposed tariff sheets tendered April 1, 1976, and that the proposed tariff sheets should be accepted for filing, suspended, and the use thereof deferred as hereinafter ordered.

(2) That United should be required to support its proposed tariff sheets with additional data concerning alternate fuel capabilities and boiler fuel requirements as indicated below.

(3) The motions to reject United's proposed tariff sheets, or to accept them subject to condition, should be denied.

The Commission orders: (A) Pending hearing and a decision hereon, United's proposed tariff sheets are accepted for filing, and suspended for the full statutory period of five months until November 1, 1976, or until such time as they are made effective in the manner provided by the Natural Gas Act.

(B) United shall present on or before July 1, 1976, as evidence in support of its proposed tariff sheets a tabulation and analysis of the responses to a request for disclosure of alternate fuel capabilities and boiler fuel requirements which shall be submitted to all its direct market industrial customers having requirements of 50 Mcf per day to 300 Mcf per day.

(C) All motions to reject United's proposed tariff sheets or to accept them subject to condition are hereby denied.

By the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16662 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[10] "Order reopening Proceedings, Providing for Hearing and Establishing Procedures."

[11] Subject to revision by the Presiding Judge upon a showing that a representative sample could not be obtained by adherence to this date.

[Docket No. ER76-707]

WISCONSIN POWER AND LIGHT CO.

Filing of New Interconnection Agreement

JUNE 3, 1976.

Take notice that on May 29, 1976, Wisconsin Power and Light Company (WPL) tendered for filing an Interconnection Agreement dated April 1, 1976 between Wisconsin Power and Light Company and Madison Gas and Electric Company (MGE). The Interconnection Agreement includes Appendix A through I and Service Schedule A through J inclusive and provides for existing and planned interconnections, both permanent and temporary, between the parties.

The provisions of the Interconnection Agreement are proposed to be effective as of April 1, 1976.

WPL states that signed copies of the filing and the Agreement have been provided to MGE.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Paragraphs 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 21, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16691 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-691]

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO.

Proposed Change in FPC Rate Schedule

JUNE 7, 1976.

Take notice that on May 19, 1976, Arkansas Power & Light Company (Company) tendered for filing proposed changes in one of the Company's rate schedules:

Arkansas Power & Light Company Rate Schedule FPC No. 45

The Company states that Rate Schedule FPC No. 45 is a contract between the Company and Farmers Electric Cooperative Corporation (Cooperative). Changes in FPC No. 45 include increase in capacity made available at six points of delivery for the years 1976, 1977, and 1978. In addition, the changes in FPC No. 45 provide for a review of the loads at three points of delivery subsequent to the summer peak load condition each year. These changes in FPC No. 45 are proposed to take effect on February 18, 1976. For this reason, the Company requests waiver of the Commission's thirty day rule on filings.

The Company states that due to a difficulty in making accurate estimates on the billing effect of this change, no billing data was filed. The Company states that there will be no change in rates or provisions in the schedule other than those noted above. The Company requests waiver of the Commission's regulations concerning this proposed filing.

The Company states that a copy of the filing has been mailed to Farmers Electric Cooperative Corporation.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Power Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 1.8 and 1.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8, 1.10). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before June 11, 1976. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16923 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

[FPMR Temporary Reg. F-392]

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Delegation of Authority

1. *Purpose.* This regulation delegates authority to the Secretary of Defense to represent the interests of the executive agencies of the Federal Government in a rate increase proceeding.

2. *Effective date.* This regulation is effective immediately.

3. *Delegation.*

a. Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 377, as amended, particularly sections 201(a)(4) and 205(d) (40 U.S.C. 481(a)(4) and 486(d)), authority is delegated to the Secretary of Defense to represent the consumer interests of the executive agencies of the Federal Government before the Delaware Public Service Commission (Docket No. 849) involving the application of the Diamond State Telephone Company for increases in its rates and charges.

b. The Secretary of Defense may redelegate this authority to any officer, official, or employee of the Department of Defense.

c. This authority shall be exercised in accordance with the policies, procedures, and controls prescribed by the General Services Administration, and shall be exercised in cooperation with the responsible officers, officials, and employees thereof.

JACK ECKERD,
Administrator of General Services.

JUNE 2, 1976.

[FR Doc.76-16704 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFERS

CHANGE OF WORKSHOP TIME

The National Commission on Electronic Fund Transfers will conduct a technology workshop in Washington, D.C. on June 15, 1976, as previously announced in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 20740, May 20, 1976).

The workshop will be held in the Ben Franklin Meeting Room on the 11th Floor of the Postal Service Building at 475 L'Enfant Plaza Southwest, and will begin at 9:00 a.m. rather than, as previously announced, at 10:00 a.m.

The workshop will be open to public observation on a first-call basis to the extent that limited space permits. Any person interested in observing the workshop should first call Ms. Janet Miller at (202) 254-7400 to check on the availability of space.

Dated: June 2, 1976.

JAMES O. HOWARD, JR.,
Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc.76-16838 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

PUBLIC REPORTS AND RECORDKEEPING

Public Hearing

Pursuant to Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given of a public meeting to be held by the Office of Management and Budget under the provisions of the Federal Reports Act of 1942 (44 U.S.C. 3506).

The purpose of the hearing is for the Office of Management and Budget to determine whether or not the provisions for public reports and recordkeeping contained in the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Training Administration Fiscal Year 1977 Forms Preparation Handbook (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of that agency.

The hearing, to be held in Room 2010, New Executive Office Building, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. on June 23, 1976, at 10:00 a.m., will be open to public observation and participation.

Further information regarding the meeting may be obtained from the Statistical Policy Division, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10201, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503, Telephone (202) 395-3772.

VELMA N. BALDWIN,
Assistant to the Director for Administration.

[FR Doc.76-16627 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-12502; File No. SR-BSE-76-9]

BOSTON STOCK EXCHANGE

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Proposed Rule Change

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15

U.S.C. 78s(b)(1), as amended by Pub. L. No. 94-29, 16 (June 4, 1975), notice is hereby given that on May 27, 1976, the above-mentioned self-regulatory organization filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission certain amendments and corrections to a proposed rule change originally filed on May 4, 1976, the terms and substance of which are as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE TERMS OF SUBSTANCE OF THE PROPOSED RULE CHANGE

CHAPTER II, SECTION 16

(a) No member or member organization shall, for his or its own account or for the account of any other person, effect on the Exchange a short sale (as defined in Rule 3b-3 of the Securities Exchange Act) of any security registered on, or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on the Exchange if trades in such security are reported pursuant to the consolidated transaction reporting system operated in accordance with a plan declared effective under Securities Exchange Act Rule 17a-15 (a "consolidated system") and information as to such trades is made available in accordance with such plan on a real time basis to vendors of market transaction information (i) below the price at which the last sale thereof, regular way, was reported in such consolidated system, or (ii) at such price unless such price is above the next preceding diffierent price at which a sale of such security, regular way, was reported in a consolidated system.

(b) In determining the price at which a short sale may be effected after a security goes ex-dividend, ex-right or ex-any other distribution, all sale prices prior to the "ex" date may be reduced by the value of such distribution.

(c) No member or member organization shall, for his or its own account or for the account of any other person, effect on the exchange a short sale of any security not covered by paragraph (a) of this rule (if all trades in such security are exempted from reporting pursuant to a consolidated system) (i) below the price at which the last sale thereof, regular way, was effected on the exchange, or (ii) at such price unless such price is above the next preceding different price at which a sale of such security, regular way, was effected on the Exchange.

(d) No member or member organization shall, by the use of any facility of the exchange, execute any sell order unless such order is marked either "long" or "short".

(e) No member or member organization shall mark any order to sell a security registered on, or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on the exchange "long" unless (i) the security to be delivered after sale is carried in the account for which the sale is to be effected, or (ii) the member or member organization is informed that the seller owns the security ordered to be sold and, as soon as possible without undue inconvenience or expense, will deliver the security owned to the account for which the sale is to be effected.

(f) The provisions of paragraphs (a) and (c) hereof shall not apply to

(1) Any sale by any person, for an account in which he has an interest, if such person owns the security sold and intends to deliver such security as soon as possible without undue inconvenience or expense;

(2) Any member or member organization in respect of a sale, for an account in which he or it has no interest, pursuant to a sell order which is marked "long";

(3) Any sale by a registered odd lot dealer on the exchange to offset odd lot orders of customers;

(4) Any sale by a registered odd lot dealer to liquidate a long position which is less than a round lot, provided such sale does not change the position of such dealer on the exchange to offset odd lot

(5) Any sale of a security covered by paragraph (a) of this rule (except a sale to a stabilizing bid complying with Securities Exchange Act Rule 10b-7) by a registered dealer specialist or market maker registered with the exchange in such security for his or its own account effected at a price equal to or above the last sale reported for such security in a consolidated system;

(6) Any sale of a security covered by paragraph (c) hereof on the Exchange (except a sale to a stabilizing bid complying with Securities Exchange Act Rule 10b-7) effected with the approval of the Exchange, which is necessary to equalize the price of such security thereon with the current price of such security on another national securities exchange which is the principal exchange market for such security;

(7) Any sale of a security for a special arbitrage account by a person who then owns another security by virtue of which he is, or presently will be, entitled to acquire an equivalent number of securities of the same class as the securities sold, provided such sale, or the purchase which such sale offsets, is affected for the bona fide purpose of profiting from a current difference between the price of the security sold and the security owned and that such right of acquisition was originally attached to or represented by another security or was issued to all holders of any such class of securities of the issuer;

(8) Any sale of a security on the Exchange effected for a special international arbitrage account for the bona fide purpose of profiting from a current difference between the price of such security on a securities market not within or subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and on a securities market subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, provided the seller, at the time of such sale knows, or by virtue of information currently received, has reasonable grounds to believe that an offer enabling him to cover such sale is then available to him in such foreign securities market and intends to accept such offer immediately;

(9) Any sale of a security on the Exchange effected in accordance with a special offering plan declared effected by the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to paragraph (d) of Rule 10b-2; or

(10) Any sale by an underwriter, or any member of a syndicate or group participating in the distribution of a security, in connection with an over-allotment of securities, or any lay-off sale by such a person in connection with a distribution of securities through rights pursuant to Rule 10b-8 or a standby underwriting commitment.

(g) This section shall not prohibit any transaction or transactions which the Commission, upon written request or upon its own motion, exempts, either unconditionally or on specified terms and conditions.

For the purpose of subparagraph (8) hereof a depository receipt of a security shall be deemed to be the same security as the security represented by such receipt.

STATEMENT OF BASIS AND PURPOSES

PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED RULE CHANGE

To conform existing rules on trading to the requirements of SEC Rule 10a-1.

BASIS OF THE PROPOSED RULE CHANGE

(i) Not applicable.
(ii) Not applicable.
(iii) Not applicable.
(iv) Not applicable.
(v) Not applicable.
(vi) Not applicable.
(vii) Not applicable.

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS, PARTICIPANTS OR OTHERS ON PROPOSED RULE CHANGE

No comments were solicited or received.

BURDEN ON COMPETITION

No burden on competition is perceived by adoption of the proposed amendment.

Within 35 days of the date of publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER, or within such longer period (i) as the Commission may designate up to 90 days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the above-mentioned self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission will:

(A) By order approve such proposed rule change, or

(B) Institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing. Persons desiring to make written submissions should file 6 copies thereof with the Secretary of the Commission, Washington, D.C. 20549. Copies of the filing with respect to the foregoing and of all written submissions will be available for inspection and copying in the Public Reference Room, 1100 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the above-mentioned self-regulatory organization. All submissions

should refer to the file number referenced in the caption above and should be submitted on or before July 9, 1976.

For the Commission by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

GEORGE A. FITZSIMMONS,
Secretary.

JUNE 2, 1976.

[FR Doc.76-16656 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Release No. 34-12493; SR-NASD-76-4]

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECURITIES DEALERS, INC.

Order Approving Proposed Rule Change

MAY 28, 1976.

On March 30, 1976, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD"), 1735 "K" Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, filed with the Commission, pursuant to Section 19(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Act"), as amended by the Securities Act Amendments of 1975, and Rule 19b-4 thereunder, copies of a proposed rule change. The proposal would amend Schedule D of the NASD By-Laws to permit stabilizing bids accompanied by penalty stipulations to appear on the National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations System ("NASDAQ") if the penalty stipulation is applicable to selling concessions only.

Notice of the proposed rule change together with the terms of substance of the proposed rule change was given by publication of a Commission Release (Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34-12303, April 1, 1976) and by publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (41 FR 15074, April 9, 1976).

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to registered securities associations, and in particular, the requirements of Section 15A and the rules and regulations thereunder.

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, That the proposed rule change filed with the Commission on March 30, 1976, be, and it hereby is, approved.

For the Commission by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

GEORGE A. FITZSIMMONS,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16653 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Release No. 34-12489]

NATIONAL SECURITIES CLEARING CORP.

Application for Registration as a Clearing Agency

The Securities and Exchange Commission hereby announces (i) the institution of proceedings, including hearings, to determine whether to grant or deny the application of the National Securities Clearing Corporation ("NSCC") for registration as a clearing agency, including the proposed merger of three New York-based clearing agencies currently performing the clearance of securities transactions contemplated by NSCC's application for registration (the "proposed merger"), and (ii) extension of the period for the receipt of public comments on NSCC's application for registration. In the proceedings, which are being instituted pursuant to subsections 17A (a) and (b) and subparagraph 19(a)(1)(B) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Act") and Rule 17Ab2-1 [17 CFR 240.17Ab2-1] thereunder, the Commission will consider and hold public hearings on the issues and grounds described herein. At the conclusion of the proceedings, the Commission, by order, will grant or deny NSCC's application for registration, unless the Commission, for good cause, extends the time for conclusion of the proceedings and publishes its reasons for so doing or NSCC agrees to an extension of the time for conclusion of the proceedings.

INTRODUCTION

American Stock Exchange Clearing Corporation ("ASECC"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of the American Stock Exchange, Inc. ("Amex"), Stock Clearing Corporation ("SCC"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of the New York Stock Exchange, Inc. ("NYSE"), and National Clearing Corporation ("NCC"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD") are "registered clearing agencies" under Section 17A of the Act and pursuant to Rule 17Ab2-1 [17 CFR 240.17Ab2-1] thereunder. NSCC, a New York business corporation, has been formed for the purpose of acquiring and merging the operations of ASECC, SCC and NCC. On March 29, 1976, NSCC filed with the Commission an application for registration as a clearing agency and submitted additional materials for the Commission to consider. On April 5, 1976, the Commission published notice of the filing and solicited public comments until May 17, 1976.[1]

Because ASECC, SCC and NCC, if combined, are likely to achieve a dominant position in securities processing, the Commission believes that NSCC's application raises important and novel legal and policy issues. Although the Commission has received comments on NSCC's application, the Commission believes that further exploration of the issues raised is desirable. Consequently, the Commission has instituted proceedings pursuant to subparagraph 19(a)(1)(B) of the Act to expand its effort to obtain the views of interested persons in order to assist the Commission in determining whether to grant or deny NSCC's application for registration.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF THE MERGER UNDER THE ACT

Paragraph 17A(a)(1) of the Act sets forth the Congressional finding that:

> [T]he prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions * * * [is] necessary for the protection of investors and persons facilitating transactions by and acting on behalf of investors[,] * * * [that] inefficient procedures for clearance and settlement impose unnecessary costs on investors[,] * * * [and that] new data processing and communication techniques create the opportunity for more efficient, effec and safe procedures for clearance and settlement.[2]

Paragraph 17A(a)(2) of the Act directs the Commission to "* * * use its authority under this title to facilitate the establishment of a national system for the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of transactions in securities * * *." Section 17A of the Act directs the Commission, in carrying out its responsibilities under Section 17A, to have

> due regard for the public interest, the protection of investors, the safeguarding of securities and funds, and maintenance of fair competition among brokers and dealers, clearing agencies, and transfer agents.

Subsection 17A(b) of the Act makes it unlawful for a clearing agency to perform clearance and settlement of transactions with respect to securities (other than exempted securities) unless the clearing agency has been registered with the Commission. In the exercise of its authority under Section 17A, on November 3, 1975, the Commission adopted Rule 17Ab2-1 [17 CFR 240.17Ab2-1] and related Form CA-1 [17 CFR 249b-200] for the registration of clearing agencies. Although paragraph 17A(b)(3) of the Act requires the Commission to make a number of determinations with respect to the applicant's operations, capabili-

---

[1] 41 FR 14455 (April 5, 1976). The Commission announced the filing in Release No. 34-12274 (March 29, 1976) also.

[2] Paragraph 17A(a)(1) provides: "The Congress finds that—

(A) The prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions, including the transfer of record ownership and the safeguarding of securities and funds related thereto, are necessary for the protection of investors and persons facilitating transactions by and acting on behalf of investors.

(B) Inefficient procedures for clearance and settlement impose unnecessary costs on investors and persons facilitating transactions by and acting on behalf of investors.

(C) New data processing and communications techniques create the opportunity for more efficient, effective, and safe procedures for clearance and settlement.

(D) The linking of all clearance and settlement facilities and the development of uniform standards and procedures for clearance and settlement will reduce unnecessary costs and increase the protection of investors and persons facilitating transactions by and acting on behalf of investors."

ties, and rules[3] before granting registration, paragraph (c)(1) of Rule 17Ab2–1 [17 CFR 240.17Ab2–1] provides that, if requested by an applicant for registration as a clearing agency, the Commission may register the applicant for eighteen months without making all the determinations called for by subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph 17A(b)(3) ("Subparagraphs (A) through (I)").

NSCC applied for registration under paragraph (c)(1) of Rule 17Ab2–1 [17 CFR 240.17Ab2–1] thereby requesting that registration be granted while the registrant is exempted, temporarily, from having to satisfy one or more of the requirements as to which the Commission is directed to make a determination pursuant to Subparagraphs (A) through (I). The Commission has registered thirteen clearing agencies, including ASECC, SCC and NCC, in accordance with paragraph (c)(1) of Rule 17Ab2–1 [17 CFR 240.17Ab2–1], upon the Commission's finding: that the applicant was so organized and had the capacity to safeguard securities and funds in its custody or control or for which it was responsible; that the applicant's rules did not impose any schedule of prices, or fix rates or other fees, for services rendered by participants; and that the applicant's rules assured the safeguarding of securities or funds which were in the custody or control of the applicant or for which it was responsible.

Because Commission approval of the proposed merger is likely to have a determinative impact on the development of a national system for clearance and settlement of securities transactions (a "National System"),[4] the Commission must conduct a broader inquiry with respect to NSCC's application than it has conducted with respect to the applications for registration filed and approved previously. In particular, in addition to making the three determinations made with respect to other clearing agencies registered pursuant to paragraph (c)(1) of Rule 17Ab2–1 [17 CFR 240.17Ab2–1], the Commission must determine whether the merger is consistent with the objectives expressed in paragraphs 17A(a)(1) and (2) of the Act.[5]

In accordance with the foregoing, the Commission believes that its consideration of NSCC's application should weigh any cost, efficiency, and safety benefits that the merger could be expected to produce against any anti-competitive impact that the merger might have.

The NSCC Application

Background

"Clearance and settlement" of securities transactions encompasses the processes by which the parties to securities transactions receive the money or securities to which the parties are entitled as a result of their securities transactions. Clearance and settlement traditionally has been performed by subsidiaries of the exchanges and of the NASD.

SCC and ASECC, serviced by Securities Industry Automation Corporation ("SIAC"),[6] now provide clearance and settlement services for transactions in NYSE and Amex-listed securities. SIAC operates a single system for both SCC and ASECC (the "SCC–ASECC System"). NCC, serviced by Bradford National Clearing Corporation ("Bradford"), provides clearance and settlement services for trades effected in the over-the-counter ("OTC") market for NASD members.

During the late Nineteen-Sixties, inefficiencies in clearance and settlement processes contributed to the securities industry's "Paperwork Crisis." Since the Paperwork Crisis, securities processing has changed substantially, and further changes are likely. Both the securities industry and the Commission have expended continued efforts to make securities processing safer, less costly, and more responsive to the changing needs of the securities industry and the public. In enacting legislation with respect to securities processing in 1975, Congress, while recognizing that much progress had been made in securities processing, sought to ensure that progress would continue and directed the Commission to participate actively in the development process.[7]

The impetus for the merger of ASECC, SCC and NCC appears to be a conviction, held by a significant segment of the New York broker-dealer community, that ASECC, SCC and NCC's existence as separate clearing facilities is unnecessarily costly and operationally burdensome.

The Merger Plan

The NSCC application comprises a number of documents filed with the Commission. The documents and comments on the application received to date, constituting Public File No. 600–15, are

---

[3] The determinations are set forth in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of subsection 17A(b)(3) of the Act. Subsection 17A(b)(3) provides: A clearing agency shall not be registered unless the Commission determines that—

(A) Such clearing agency is so organized and has the capacity to be able to facilitate the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions for which it is responsible, to safeguard securities and funds in its custody or control or for which it is responsible, to comply with the provisions of this title and the rules and regulations thereunder, to enforce (subject to any rule or order of the Commission pursuant to Section 17(d) or 19(g)(2) of this title) compliance by its participants with the rules of the clearing agency, and to carry out the purposes of this section.

(B) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (4) of this subsection, the rules of the clearing agency provide that any (i) registered broker or dealer, (ii) other registered clearing agency, (iii) registered investment company, (iv) bank, (v) insurance company, or (vi) other person or class of persons as the Commission, by rule, may from time to time designate as appropriate to the development of a national system for the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions may become a participant in such clearing agency.

(C) The rules of the clearing agency assure a fair representation of its shareholders (or members) and participants in the selection of its directors and administration of its affairs. (The Commission may determine that the representation of participants is fair if they are afforded a reasonable opportunity to acquire voting stock of the clearing agency, directly or indirectly, in reasonable proportion to their use of such clearing agency.)

(D) The rules of the clearing agency provide for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees, and other charges among its participants.

(E) The rules of the clearing agency do not impose any schedule of prices, or fix rates or other fees, for services rendered by its participants.

(F) The rules of the clearing agency are designed to promote the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions, to assure the safeguarding of securities and funds which are in the custody or control of the clearing agency or for which it is responsible, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in the clearance and settlement of securities transactions, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a national system for the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest; and are not designed to permit unfair discrimination in the admission of participants or among participants in the use of the clearing agency, or to regulate by virtue of any authority conferred by this title matters not related to the purposes of this section or the administration of the clearing agency.

(G) The rules of the clearing agency provide that (subject to any rule or order of the Commission pursuant to Section 17(d) or 19(g)(2) of this title) its participants shall be appropriately disciplined for violation of any provision of the rules of the clearing agency by expulsion, suspension, limitation of activities, functions, and operations, fine, censure, or any other fitting sanction.

(H) The rules of the clearing agency are in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsesction, and, in general, provide a fair procedure with respect to the disciplining of participants, the denial or participation to any person seeking participation therein, and the prohibition or limitation by the clearing agency of any person with respect to access to services offered by the clearing agency.

(I) The rules of the clearing agency do not impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of this title.

[4] Commentators have estimated that ASECC and SCC, which operate through a combined system, now clear approximately 75% of transactions processed by registered clearing agencies and that, if the merger were approved, NSCC would clear approximately 85% of transactions processed by registered clearing agencies. If the estimates are accurate, the proposed merger would increase concentration in an already concentrated area.

[5] Paragraphs 17A(a)(1) and (2) are discussed supra.

[6] SIAC is owned jointly by NYSE (67%) and Amex (33%).

[7] See discussion of Section 17A, supra; Section 17A was added to the Act by the Securities Acts Amendments of 1975.

available for copying and inspection at the Commission's Public Reference Room. While the Commission urges persons who may wish to comment on the application to examine all of the relevant documents, it recognizes that it may not be feasible for some persons to do so. Consequently, the Commission hopes that the following description, based on the documents filed, will provide information sufficient to acquaint interested persons with the most salient features of the merger plan.

According to NSCC's application, NSCC would effect the acquisition of the clearing agency operations of SCC, ASECC and NCC pursuant to an agreement under which each of SCC and ASECC will transfer to NSCC $300,000 in cash in exchange for 10,000 NSCC common shares and NCC will transfer net assets valued at $900,000 in exchange for 10,000 NSCC common shares and a $600,000 NSCC promissory note. The 30,000 NSCC common shares issued to SCC, ASECC and NCC will constitute all of NSCC's outstanding common shares. In addition, the rights and obligations between each of the merging clearing agencies and its participants will be assigned to and assumed by NSCC; the clearing funds of the merging clearing agencies will be transferred to NSCC; and NSCC will assume certain liabilities of the respective clearing agencies.

NSCC plans to operate under the governance of a sixteen-member board of directors, thirteen members of which are intended to represent NSCC's participants. Each of ASECC, SCC and NCC is to have one representative on the board. Of the fifteen members of NSCC's current board, five members were selected by each of Amex/ASECC, NYSE/SCC, and NASD/NCC. One member of each five member group is intended to represent the selecting exchange/clearing corporation.

Commencing with the transfer of the clearing agency businesses to NSCC as described above, NSCC will operate the business of each transfer or clearing agency as a separate division of NSCC (i.e., the SCC Division, the ASECC Division and the NCC Division). Each division's operations will be subject to substantially the same rules and agreements to which the predecessor of that division was subject prior to the transfer. Operation under the divisional structure is referred to as "Phase I."

During Phase I, NSCC would expect to complete and file with the Commission operating rules for the system that would combine SCC–ASECC's and NCC's systems, negotiate a facilities management contract with SIAC,[8] determine how the operations of the three divisions will be converted to a single system, and develop procedures for the selection of future directors which will comply with subparagraph 17A(b)(3)(C) of the Act.[9]

As is true of the present SIAC-operated, SCC–ASECC system, NSCC's CNS clearance system will utilize the services of The Depository Trust Company ("DTC")[10] to effect securities settlement. (Money settlement will occur in NSCC.) It is expected that, by the time the three-division structure has been converted to a single system ("Phase II"), DTC will expand its list of eligible securities to include all issues now cleared by NCC.

NSCC plans to offer all services now offered by either NCC or SCC–ASECC and to make its services available, directly or indirectly, to all participants of NCC and SCC–ASECC.[11]

NSCC will retain ties with NYSE, Amex, and NASD. NYSE, Amex and NASD are expected to provide self-regulatory and other services to NSCC in exchange for a volume-related fee. The services include conducting examinations of participants' and prospective participants' financial and operating condition and reporting unusual market conditions which might disrupt NSCC's clearance and settlement operations.

NSCC's submission states that fees to participants are to be set, by NSCC's board of directors, on a "cost basis." It is expected that NSCC will not earn profits or pay dividends on its shares.

ISSUES AND GROUNDS FOR CONSIDERATION

During the proceedings, and in particular in the course of the hearings provided for herein, the Commission will be considering and seeking comment from interested persons on the following issues and grounds in order to assist the Commission in determining whether to grant or deny NSCC's application for registration as a clearing agency.

COST SAVINGS ESTIMATED TO RESULT FROM THE MERGER[12]

NSCC's application contrasts the cost savings of two models. One model ("Model I") assumes the merger has been effected, and the other model ("Model II") assumes the continued existence of SCC–ASECC and NCC as separate, fully-interfaced facilities. NSCC estimates that, as a result of the merger (Model I), annual operating costs for the performance of clearing agency services currently performed by SCC–ASECC and NCC will be reduced $2.4 million (assuming low volume) to $4.1 million (assuming high volume) once Phase II has been inaugurated.[13] NSCC further estimates that, in Phase II, annual clearing costs of its participants would be reduced $10.0 million (assuming low volume) to $13.3 million (assuming high volume). In summary, NSCC estimates that the merger would result in total annual savings to the securities industry of between $12.4 million and $17.4 million.

NSCC estimates that, in contrast to Model I, Model II would increase annual operating costs for the performance of clearing agency services currently performed by SCC–ASECC and NCC $4.8 million (assuming low volume) to $5.3 million (assuming high volume) with the same level of participant savings as is estimated under Model I. Thus, NSCC estimates that Model II would produce annual operating cost savings to the industry of $7.6 million to $12.1 million.

The Commission would like interested persons to comment on the start-up and operating cost estimates furnished by NSCC and to furnish any different estimates or additional information concerning these costs.

SAFETY AND OTHER POTENTIAL BENEFITS

In NSCC's application, NSCC argues that the merged entity's single processing flow would reduce the overall exposure of a clearing agency to financial loss caused by participant defaults. In addition, NSCC argues, regulation of one entity rather than two entities would be simpler and more effective. The Commission would like interested persons to comment on the ways in which the merger would affect NSCC's exposure and on any regulatory benefits or detriments that might flow from the merger.

The Commission would like comments, also, on whether, and in what ways, the quality of services rendered by NSCC might differ from the quality of the comparable services now rendered by NCC and SCC–ASECC.

EFFECTS ON COMPETITION

The Commission seeks to identify all areas in which the merger might inhibit present or potential competition. The Commission is concerned particularly with the potential impact of the merger on clearing corporations and depositories. The Commission is concerned, also, with the potential impact of the merger on broker-dealers, transfer agents, securities markets and the investing public. In connection with its inquiry into the merger's potential impact on the members of the foregoing groups and others, the Commission wishes to consider

---

[8] NSCC has determined that SIAC will be its processor, although the terms of a contract with SIAC have not been determined. NCC's contract with Bradford, which is to be assigned to NSCC, will be terminated at the end of Phase I.

[9] Subparagraph 17A(b)(3)(C) provides, in part, that the rules of registered clearing agencies must afford participants "fair representation" in the selection of directors. See fn. 3, supra.

[10] DTC, formerly a wholly-owned subsidiary of the NYSE, is now owned by the following entities and groups: NYSE, 59.3%; Amex, 7.8%; NASD, 7.8%; PBW Stock Exchange, Inc., 0.2%; and institutional participants (principally banks), 24.9%.

[11] NSCC has not yet developed standards for direct access.

[12] While a capsulization of the cost savings which NSCC believes will flow from the merger is presented below, interested persons are encouraged to examine the cost figures submitted by NSCC. These figures appear in a "Justification for the Consolidation of New York Clearing Facilities," which is contained in the public file.

[13] The lower figure is based on estimated volume of 118,000 transaction sides ("low volume"); the higher figure is based on estimated volume of 225,000 transaction sides ("high volume").

whether, and to what extent, the effects might vary according to the geographic location of the affected members.

The Commission believes it must determine whether the benefits that might flow from the merger could be achieved in a manner that would have less anti-competitive impact than any that the merger might entail. For example, would an interfaced system in New York provide the same benefits as the merger and, if so, would an interfaced system be more conducive to the development of an interfaced national system? As a result of the merger, would SCC–ASECC gain competitive advantages over existing clearing corporations which it would not have were both SCC–ASECC and NCC permitted to compete in clearing listed and OTC transactions? Also, would the merger raise barriers, in addition to any which might otherwise exist now, to the entry of potential competitors into clearing?

Were SCC–ASECC and NCC to remain separate and each charge different fees for its clearing services, a participant could compete for customers by passing on, through lower commission rates, any amounts by which its clearing agency fees were lower than its competitor's clearing agency fees. Would the proposed merger reduce or eliminate the incentive for participants to keep clearing fees low by causing all participants to pay identical clearing agency fees?

In connection with its inquiry into the merger's impact on competition, the Commission intends to consider whether securities processing is an area in which competition does or can exist and, if so, what steps the Commission should take to preserve or encourage competition or, if not, what alternatives the Commission should explore to preserve the benefits that competition would produce, including innovation and low costs. To assist the Commission in this inquiry, the Commission would like to receive comments on whether the high percentage of transactions currently processed by SCC–ASECC would preclude the possibility of successful competition by NCC if both SCC–ASECC and NCC were permitted to clear transactions in all issues. Additionally, the Commission seeks comments on whether the high percentage of transactions which would be processed by NSCC would preclude the possibility of successful competition by any other clearing corporation.

NATIONAL SYSTEM FOR CLEARANCE AND SETTLEMENT

The merger will affect the development of a National System. The Commission, therefore, welcomes comments concerning whether and to what extent the merger might impede or enhance the development of a National System and whether the merger might inhibit or preclude the existence of any beneficial features of a potential National Systm, such as transfer agent depositories.

USER BOARD

In its application, NSCC states that it will be governed by a board of directors dominated by its participants ("users"). NSCC believes that a user-dominated board will provide an incentive for innovation, ensure that NSCC will keep processing costs at a minimum, and ensure that NSC is generally responsive to the needs of the industry.

The Commission invites comments on whether a user-dominated board would be likely to be an effective control against inefficiency, lack of innovation, and uncontrolled cost escalation. Moreover, the Commission would like comment with respect to possible desirable procedures for selecting board members; including, specifically, whether exchanges should be permitted to have representatives on the board, whether NSCC staff members should be permitted to be members of the board, whether the board should include public members, and what procedures would assure that a cross-section of users would be represented on the board.

REGULATORY FEES

The Commission seeks comment on the appropriateness of the transaction fee of 12¢ per side which NSCC proposes to pay to NYSE, Amex and NASD (the "self-regulatory organizations"). The fee is intended to compensate the self-regulatory organizations for performing certain self-regulatory services, including the conducting of examinations of the financial condition of NSCC participants. In particular, the Commission would like comments on whether it is appropriate for the fee to be assessed on the basis of the number of sides cleared through NSCC which originate through the trading facilities of the respective self-regulators and whether the amount of any fee charged and collected by NSCC should be determined annually by NSCC's board of directors based on the board's perception of the value of the services rendered to NSCC by the self-regulatory organizations.

METHODS OF CHARGING COSTS TO SERVICES

NSCC's application states that its fees will be determined on a "cost basis." The Commission would like comments on whether individual services, or services to certain geographic areas, should be charged at actual cost or at some variation from actual cost and, if the latter, for which services or geographic areas would variations from actual cost be appropriate.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RECEIPT OF COMMENTS ON NSCC'S APPLICATION

The time for receipt by the Commission of written comments on NSCC's application for registration as a clearing agency has been extended to June 21, 1976. Six copies of each comment letter should be submitted and addressed to George A. Fitzsimmons, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C. 20549. Reference should be made to File No. 600–15. All such communications will be placed in the file and will be available for public inspection. In addition to NSCC's application for registration as a clearing agency, all relevant releases and comment letters received to date have been placed in the file and are likewise available for public inspection.

INFORMATION PERTAINING TO PUBLIC HEARINGS

The public hearings are scheduled to commence at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 16, 1976, in Room 776 at the Commission's Offices in Washington, D.C. Any interested persons desiring to make an oral presentation of their views at the hearings are requested to write or call Ellen Siegler Bennett (telephone (202) 755–8946) prior to June 7, 1976. All witnesses are required to submit 25 copies of their prepared statements not later than four business days in advance of their scheduled date of appearance.

Persons making oral statements should limit their prepared presentations to twenty minutes and should be prepared to respond to specific inquiries from the Commission's staff. In advance of or during the hearings, any person may submit written questions to be directed to a particular witness or group of witnesses; but the presiding hearing officer will determine in his sole discretion whether or to what extent to direct those questions to any witness.

A list of witnesses, setting forth the time of their scheduled appearance, will be published in the SEC News Digest.

(Sections 17A, 19(a), 89 Stat. 141, 146; 15 U.S.C. 78q–1, 78s)

By the Commission.

GEORGE A. FITZSIMMONS,
Secretary.

MAY 28, 1976.

[FR Doc.76–16652 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

[Rel. No. 19551; 70–5862]

OHIO POWER CO.

Proposed Sale and Leaseback of Coal Transfer Facility

JUNE 2, 1976.

Notice is hereby given, That Ohio Power Company ("Ohio"), 301 Cleveland Avenue, S.W., Canton, Ohio 44701, an electric utility subsidiary company of American Electric Power Company, Inc., ("AEP"), a registered holding company, has filed an application-declaration and an amendment thereto with this Commission pursuant to applicable provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 ("Act") regarding the sale and leaseback of a coal transfer facility. Ohio requests approval of these transactions unless advised by the Commission that approval thereof under the Act is not required. All interested persons are referred to the application-declaration as amended, which is summarized below, for a complete statement of the proposed transactions.

Ohio states that the coal transfer facility, known as the Cook Coal Terminal ("Facility"), is presently under construction near Metropolis, Illinois. The Facility, which will be ready for operation by June 30, 1976, was built on

land acquired by Indiana Franklin Realty, Inc. ("Indiana Franklin"), a real estate subsidiary of AEP, and was constructed through Indiana Franklin. Funds for both land acquisition and construction were furnished by Ohio. It is proposed that the Facility be sold and that simultaneously the surface land thereunder be leased to United States Trust Company of New York as Trustee ("Trustee") under a trust for the benefit of The Pittston Company ("Pittston"), as beneficial owner. The lease of the surface lands underlying the Facility will be effectuated by a Site Lease, which will extend for an initial term of 25 years. During said initial term of the Site Lease, the Trustee will pay to Indiana Franklin for Ohio's account rent at the rate of $80,000 per year, being 10% of the approximate cost of such surface lands, $800,000. The Trustee will immediately lease the Facility and sublease the surface lands thereunder to Ohio. It is stated that Indiana Franklin will sell the Facility to the Trustee for a purchase price equal to its cost of construction, presently estimated at $69,000,000, including $2,500,000 which may be expended for a railway spur to be completed by the end of 1977, and excluding land costs. Title to the Facility will be conveyed to the Trustee in accordance with a Purchase Agreement which is to provide for a bargain and sale deed covering all right, title and interest of Indiana Franklin in and to that portion of the Facility which constitutes real property and a bill of sale with respect to those portions of the Facility constituting personal property.

It is proposed that pursuant to a Participation Agreement, Pittston will furnish to the Trustee funds toward the purchase of the Facility in an amount not less than 20% nor more than 23% of the total cost of the Facility. The balance of the purchase price will be loaned to the Trustee on behalf of Pittston by four lenders secured by a Mortgage encumbering the interests of the Trustee, as legal owner, and of Pittston, as beneficial owner, in the Facility and in the leases, hereinafter described, with Ohio. The Trustee will act both as mortgagor, on behalf of Pittston, and as mortgagee, on behalf of the lenders. The four lenders and their respective participation in the Mortgage loan are: John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company—42.4%; Teacher's Insurance and Annuity Association of America—28.8%; Aetna Life Insurance Company—19.2%; and Guardian Life Insurance Company—9.6%. It is stated that although Ohio is a party to the Participation Agreement, said Agreement expressly avoids any privity of contract between Ohio and such lenders. The proposed transactions are contingent upon receipt of a favorable ruling from the Internal Revenue Service that Pittston is entitled to the 10% investment tax credit and related accelerated depreciation for the property.

The surface lands leased to the Trustee pursuant to the Site Lease will be subleased to Ohio, and that portion of the Facility designated as real property improvements will be leased to Ohio, both pursuant to a Realty Lease Agreement from the Trustee to Ohio. That portion of the Facility designated as personal property will be leased to Ohio pursuant to an Equipment Lease Agreement. The term of the Realty Lease Agreement will be co-terminous with the term of the Equipment Lease Agreement, both of which will run concurrently with the Site Lease, unless sooner terminated pursuant to the Realty Lease and Equipment Lease Agreements. These latter Agreements provide that Ohio may terminate such leases at any time after the tenth anniversary of the closing date in the event that Ohio's Board of Directors deem the Facility to be economically obsolete or no longer suited for use in Ohio is obliged to pay the excess of the nate, Ohio must obtain bids for purchase of the Facility from unaffiliated parties. In the event that bids are obtained and the Facility is sold to any of the bidders, Ohio is obliged to pay the exces of the Termination Value, as defined in the Agreements, over the net of sales proceeds less certain expenses incidental to the sale of the Facility.

Both the Realty Lease and Equipment Lease Agreements contain provisions for four consecutive renewal terms of five years each at Ohio's option and at the then fair market rental value. Such renewals must be exercised jointly. Ohio will also have the option to purchase the Facility at the end of the initial term or any renewal term of the Realty Lease and Equipment Lease Agreements at a price equal to the fair market sales value of the Facilliy at the time the purchase option is exercised. Upon any renewal of the Realty Lease and Equipment Lease Agreements, the Site Lease will automatically be renewed for a like period at a rent equal to that specified for the initial term of the Site Lease. The Realty Lease and Equipment Lease Agreements are net leases pursuant to which, in conjunction with an Indemnity and Supplemental Agreement, Ohio shall pay to the Trustee the basic rent payable thereunder, and, as additional rent, will be responsible for all maintenance, insurance, taxes (other than certain net income taxes) and all other costs in connection with the operation of the Facility, unless such obligations are excused or terminated. Under the Realty Lease Agreement, Ohio will pay basic annual rent at the rate of 9.96% of the portion of the purchase price of the Facility allocated to real property plus approximately $80,000 per year for the sublease of the surface lands. Similarly, the Equipment Lease Agreement provides that Ohio will pay basic annual rent at a rate of 9.96% of the portion of the purchase price of the Facility allocated to personal property. Both the Realty Lease and Equipment Lease Agreements obligate Ohio to pay the rent thereunder in 100 consecutive quarterly installments during the initial terms thereunder; and both Agreements include in the rental payments an effective interest rate for the cost of money of 8.84%.

The Facility will be used by Ohio to transfer low-sulfur coal arriving from the West on unit trains to river barges for delivery to Ohio's steam electric generating plants. It is stated that Ohio considered all existing coal transfer terminal facilities, as well as those under construction, on the upper Mississippi and lower Ohio Rivers and found that such facilities were not suitable for handling unit trains. Consequently, construction of the Facility was undertaken. It is anticipated that during the initial period of operation of the Facility there will exist some unused capacity which, it is proposed, will be made available by Ohio to non-affiliated interests under short-term contracts. Any income received by Ohio from such non-affiliated users will be applied as a reduction of the cost of the operation of the Facility by Ohio. It is also anticipated that the Facility will transfer coal owned by Indiana & Michigan Electric Company ("I&M"), an electric generating subsidiary company of AEP, to I&M's Tanner's Creek Plant. Such transaction and all other transactions by Ohio with affiliated interests are excluded from the instant application-declaration and will be subject to further application and/or order of this Commission.

The proceeds from the sale of the Facility will be used to repay Ohio for funds it has advanced and will advance for construction thereof.

It is stated that no state commission and no federal commission, other than this Commission, has jurisdiction over the proposed transactions. The fees and expenses to be paid by Ohio in connection with the proposed transactions include real property transfer taxes of approximately $40,000; title insurance premiums of $110,000; and fees and expenses incurred by the participants, including legal fees, estimated to be not in excess of $300,000. Additional miscellaneous fees, commissions or expenses, including Ohio's legal fees, are estimated to be not in excess of $60,000.

Notice is further given, That any interested person may, not later than June 24, 1976, requestd in writing that a hearing be held on such matter, stating the nature of his interest, and reasons for such request, and the issues of fact or law raised by said application-declaration which he desires to controvert; or he may request that he be notified if the Commission should order a hearing thereon. Any such request should be addressed: Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C. 20549. A copy of such request should be served personally or by mail upon the applicant-declarant at the above-stated address and proof of service (by affidavit or, in case of an attorney at law, by certificate) should be filed with the request. At any time after said date, the application-declaration, as amended or as it may be further amended, may be granted and permitted to become effective as provided in Rule 23 of the General Rules

and Regulations promulgated under the Act, or the Commission may grant exemption from such rules as provided in Rules 20(a) and 100 thereof or take such other action as it may deem appropriate. Persons who request a hearing or advice as to whether a hearing is ordered will receive any notices and orders issued in this matter, including the date of the hearing (if ordered) and any postponements thereof.

For the Commission, by the Division of Corporate Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

GEORGE A. FITZSIMMONS,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16654 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Notice No. 64]

ASSIGNMENT OF HEARINGS

JUNE 4, 1976.

Cases assigned for hearing, postponement, cancellation or oral argument appear below and will be published only once. This list contains prospective assignments only and does not include cases previously assigned hearing dates. The hearings will be on the issues as presently reflected in the Official Docket of the Commission. An attempt will be made to publish notices of cancellation of hearings as promptly as possible, but interested parties should take appropriate steps to insure that they are notified of cancellation or postponements of hearings in which they are interested.

MC-F 12630, D. Q. Wise & Co., Inc.—Purchase—E. L. Beakley (Barbara Ann Brewer, Independent Executrix) and MC-F 12685, William F. Lewis, Inc.—Purchase (Portion)—E. L. Beakley (Barbara Ann Brewer, Independent Executrix) now assigned July 12, 1976 at Tulsa, Oklahoma is cancelled and reassigned July 12, 1976 (2 days) at Houston, Texas and July 14, 1976 (3 days) at Tulsa, Oklahoma in a hearing room to be later designated.

MC 98701 (Sub-No. 5), Cleveland Express, Inc., application dismissed.

MC 107295 (Sub-No. 805), Pre-Fab Transit Co., application dismissed.

MC 59135 Sub 31, Red Star Express Lines of Auburn, Incorporated, DBA Red Star Express Lines now assigned June 21, 1976, at Pittsburgh, Pa., will be held in the Federal Office Bldg., Room 2218, 1001 Liberty Avenue.

MC 59135 Sub 31, Red Star Express Lines of Auburn, Incorporated, dba Red Star Express Lines, now assigned June 28, 1976, at New York, N.Y., will be held in the Court of Claims, Room 238, Court Room A, 26 Federal Plaza.

MC 113855 (Sub 338), International Transport, Inc. now being assigned September 9, 1976 (2 days) at Salt Lake City, Utah in a hearing room to be later designated.

MC 133095 (Sub 91), Texas-Continental Express, Inc. now being assigned September 8, 1976 (1 day) at Salt Lake City, Utah in a hearing room to be later designated.

MC 33641 (Sub 119), IML Freight, Inc., MC-F 12484, IML Freight Inc.—Purchase (Portion)—Delbert H. Stephens and Ferdinand A. Klein, DBA Spokane-St. Maries Auto Freight and Warberg Brothers Company and MC-C 8830, Browning Freight Lines, Inc. Et Al vs. Warberg Brothers Company Et Al now being assigned September 13, 1976 (2 weeks) for continued hearing at Salt Lake City, Utah in a hearing room to be later designated.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16731 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Amendment No. 7; Application No. 48]

EASTERN CENTRAL MOTOR CARRIERS

Agreement Under Sec. 5a

MAY 28, 1976.

The Commission is in receipt of an application in the above-entitled proceeding for approval of amendments to the agreement therein approved.

Filed: May 24, 1976, by: James T. Henry, Executive Vice President, The Eastern Central Motor Carriers Association, Inc., P.O. Box 3600, Akron, Ohio 44310. John S. Fessenden (of Counsel), 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

The amendments involve: Changes to comply with Ex Parte 297, 349 I.C.C. 811 and 351 I.C.C. 437.

The complete application may be inspected at the Office of the Commission in Washington, D.C.

Any interested person desiring to protest and participate in this proceeding shall notify the Commission in writing on or before June 29, 1976. As provided by the General Rules of Practice of the Commission, persons other than applicants should fully disclose their interest and the position they intend to take with respect to the application. Otherwise, the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application, without further or formal hearing.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16726 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

[Amendment No. 2; Application No. 106]

HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS

Agreement Under Sec. 5a

MAY 28, 1976.

The Commission is in receipt of an application in the above-entitled proceeding for approval of amendments to the agreement therein approved.

Filed: May 21, 1976, by: Alan F. Wohlstetter, Executive Secretary and General Counsel, Household Goods Forwarders, Tariff Bureau, 1700 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

The amendments involve: Changes to comply with Ex Parte 297, 349 I.C.C. 811 and 351 I.C.C. 437.

The complete application may be inspected at the Office of the Commission, in Washington, D.C.

Any interested person desiring to protest and participate in this proceeding shall notify the Commission in writing on or before June 29, 1976. As provided by the General Rules of Practice of the Commission, persons other than applicants should fully disclose their interest and the position they intend to take with respect to the application. Otherwise, the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application, without further or formal hearing.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 76-16727 Filed 6-2-76; 8:45 am]

[Amendment No. 6; Application No. 9]

NATIONAL BUS TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION, INC.

Agreement Under Sec. 5a

MAY 28, 1976.

The Commission is in receipt of an application in the above-entitled proceeding for approval of amendments to the agreement therein approved.

Filed: May 11, 1976, by: P. J. Campbell, Chairman, National Bus Traffic Association, Inc., 506 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago, IL 60605. John S. Fessenden (of counsel), 618 Perpetual Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20004.

The amendments involve: Changes to comply with Ex Parte 297, 349 I.C.C. 811 and 351 I.C.C. 437.

The complete application may be inspected at the office of the Commission in Washington, D.C.

Any interested person desiring to protest and participate in this proceeding shall notify the Commission in writing on or before June 29, 1976. As provided by the General Rules of Practice of the Commission, persons other than applicants should fully disclose their interest and the position they intend to take with respect to the application. Otherwise, the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application, without further or formal hearing.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16727 Filed 6-2-76;8:45 am]

[Amendment No. 1; Application No. 66]

WESTERN TANK TRUCK CARRIERS

Agreement Under Sec. 5a

MAY 28, 1976.

The Commission is in receipt of an application in the above-entitled proceeding for approval of amendments to the agreement therein approved.

Filed April 29, 1976, as amended May 21, 1976 and May 25, 1976, by: J. R. Smith (Attorney-in-Fact), Western Tank Truck Carriers' Conference, Inc., 4060 Elati Street, Denver, Colorado 80216. Arthur R. Hauver, Jones, Meiklejohn, Kehl & Lyons, Suite 1600 Lincoln Center, 1660 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.

The amendments involve: Revisions in the bylaws and rules of procedure to comply with the standards promulgated in Ex Parte 297, 349 I.C.C. 811 and 351 I.C.C. 437; broaden the territorial scope to include the States of Iowa, Nevada

and Minnesota; delete reference to intrastate commerce and State regulatory agencies; eliminate the term "in tank vehicles" from the commodity description of "commodities in bulk"; and to make other changes, additions and deletions.

The complete application may be inspected at the Office of the Commission in Washington, D.C.

Any interested person desiring to protect and participate in this proceeding shall notify the Commission in writing on or before June 29, 1976. As provided by the General Rules of Practice of the Commission, persons other than applicants should fully disclose their interest and the position they intend to take with respect to the application. Otherwise, the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application, without further or formal hearing.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16728 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

IRREGULAR-ROUTE MOTOR COMMON CARRIERS OF PROPERTY—ELIMINATION OF GATEWAY LETTER NOTICES

JUNE 4, 1976.

The following letter-notices of proposals to eliminate gateways for the purpose of reducing highway congestion, alleviating air and noise pollution, minimizing safety hazards, and conserving fuel have been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Commission's Gateway Elimination Rules (49 CFR 1065), and notice thereof to all interested persons is hereby given as provided in such rules.

An original and two copies of protests against the proposed elimination of any gateway herein described may be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission within 10 days from the date of this publication. A copy must also be served upon applicant or its representative. Protests against the elimination of a gateway will not operate to stay commencement of the proposed operation.

Successively filed letter-notices of the same carrier under these rules will be numbered consecutively for convenience in identification. Protests, if any, must refer to such letter-notices by number.

No. MC 60233 (Sub-No. E1), filed June 7, 1974. Applicant: STANLEYS' EXPRESS, INC., P.O. Box 333, Yarmouth, Maine 04096. Applicant's representative: Erving H. Bickford (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and commodities requiring special equipment), between Kezar Falls, Maine, on the one hand, and, on the other, Boston, Mass. and points within 10 miles thereof. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Boston, Mass.

No. MC 60233 (Sub-No. E3), filed June 4, 1974. Applicant: STANLEYS' EXPRESS, INC., P.O. Box 333, Yarmouth, Maine 04096. Applicant's representative: Erving H. Bickford (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Mill and factory supplies, lumber and box shooks* (except those of unusual value, classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and commodities requiring special equipment), between Providence and Pawtucket, R.I., on the one hand, and, on the other, Ossipee, Tamworth, Sandwich, and Lincoln, N.H. and points in New Hampshire south and east of U.S. Highways 3 and 302 including points on the indicated portions of the highways specified. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Kezar Falls, Maine.

No. MC 92983 (Sub-No. E73), filed June 4, 1074. Applicant: AMERICAN BULK TRANSPORT CO., 818 Grand Ave., P.O. Box 2508, Kansas iCty, Mo. 64142. Applicant's representative: H. B. Foster (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (A) *Fish oil*, in bulk, in tank vehicles: from poines in Maine to points in Kansas and Nebraska; (B) *Such fish oil*, as is embraced within liquid mixtures of animal feed ingredients, in bulk, in tank vehicles: from points in Maine to points in Colorado (except Henderson); (C) *Fish oil*, in bulk, in tank vehicles: from points in Maine in points in Nevade: (D) *Fish oil*, in bulk, in tank vehicles: from points in Maine to points in Idaho, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of: (A) Frytown, Iowa; (B) Frytown, Iowa and Crete, Nebr.; (C) Frytown, Iowa and Nebraska; (D) Frytown, Iowa and Kansas.

No. MC 110683 (Sub-No. E4) (Correction), filed June 4, 1975, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER October 14, 1975, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: SMITH's TRANSFER CORP., P.O. Box 1000, Stanton, Va. 24401. Applicant's representative: Harry J. Jordan, 1000 16th St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General* commodities, except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk and commodities requiring special equipment, between points in Augusta, Rockbridge, and Rockingham Counties, Va., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Pennsylvania on and east of a line beginning at Philadelphia, Pa., and extending along the Pennsylvania Turnpike (Northeast extension) to intersection U.S. Highway 22, thence over U.S. Highway 22 to Pennsylvania Highway 33, thence over Pennsylvania Highway 33 to Interstate Highway 80 near East Stroudsburg, Pa., and thence over Interstate Highway 80 to the Pennsylvania-New Jersey State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Trenton, N.J. The purpose of this correction is to further define the territorial description.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E37), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in McHenry County, Ill., to points in Ohio east and north of a line beginning at the Ohio-Michigan State line at Toledo, Ohio, and extending along U.S. Highway 23 to Columbus, Ohio, thence along Interstate Highway 70 to the Ohio-West Virginia State line (except points in Wyandot, Crawford, Marion, Morrow, Delaware, Knox, and Franklin Counties, Ohio). The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E38), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Boone, Winnebago, Stephenson, Jo Daviess, Carroll, Ogle, DeKalb, Lee, Whiteside, and Rock Islands Counties, Ill., to points in Ohio east of a line beginning at the Ohio-Michigan State line at Toledo, Ohio, and extending along U.S. Highway 20/23 to junction U.S. Highway 23, thence along U.S. Highway 23 to junction U.S. Highway 62, thence along U.S. Highway 62 to Washington Court House, Ohio, and thence along U.S. Highway 22 to Cincinnati, Ohio. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., Monroe, Mich., and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E39), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Portage, Ind. to points in Ohio east and north of a line beginning at the Ohio-Michigan State line at Toledo, Ohio, and extending along Interstate Highway 75 to junction U.S. Highway 23, thence along U.S. Highway 23 to junction U.S. Highway 224, thence along U.S. Highway 224 to junction Ohio Highway 13, thence along Ohio Highway 13 to junction Interstate Highway 70, thence along Interstate Highway 70 to the Ohio-West Virginia State line; from Portage, Ind. to points in West Virginia north of

Interstate Highway 70. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Monroe, Michigan.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E40), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania within 50 miles of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Youngstown, Ohio to points in Columbia, Crawford, Dane, Dodge, Fond du Lac, Grant, Green, Iowa, Jefferson, Lafayette, Kenosha (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Ozaukee, Racine (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Richland, Rock, Sauk, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich. and Gary, Ind.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E41), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Cleveland and Lorain, Ohio, to points in Columbia, Crawford, Dane Dodge, Fond du Lac, Grant, Green, Iowa, Jefferson, Lafayette, Kenosha (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Ozaukee, Racine (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Richland, Rock, Sauk, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich., and Gary, Ind.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E42), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Cleveland, Ohio, to points in Douglas, Bayfield, Ashland, Iron, Vilas, Oneida, Price, Sawyer, Washburn, Burnett, Polk, Barron, Rusk, Lincoln, Taylor, Chippewa, Dunn, Saint Croix, Pierce, Eau Claire, Clark, Marathon, Portage, Wood, Pepin, Buffalo, Trempealeau, Jackson, Adams, Juneau, Monroe, LaCrosse, and Vernon Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich., Portage and Gary, Ind., and the plant site of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation in Putnam County, Ill.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E43), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Mansfield, Ohio, to points in Columbia, Crawford, Dane, Dodge, Fond du Lac, Grant, Green, Iowa, Jefferson, Lafayette, Kenosha (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Ozaukee, Racine (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Richland, Rock, Sauk, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich. and Gary Ind.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E44), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Mansfield, Ohio, to points in Douglas, Bayfield, Ashland, Iron, Vilas, Oneida, Price, Sawyer, Washburn, Burnett, Polk, Barron, Rush, Lincoln, Taylor, Chippewa, Dunn, St. Croix, Pierce, Eau Clair, Clark, Jackson, Trempeauleau, Buffalo, La Crosse, Monroe, Pepin, and Vernon Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Sturgis, Mich., Portage, Ind., Gary, Ind. and plant site of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation located in Putham County, Ill. (Hennepin, Ill.)

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E45), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Lake County, Ind., to points in Ohio on, east and north of a line beginning at the Ohio-Michigan State line at Toledo, Ohio and extending along U.S. Highway 20 to Norwalk, Ohio to junction U.S. Highway 250 to Bridgeport, Ohio at the Ohio-West Virginia State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Gary, Ind., and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E46), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Pittsburgh, Pa., Youngstown, Ohio and points within 50 miles of each located in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, to points in Douglas, Bayfield, Ashland, Iron, Burnett, Washburn, Sawyer, Price, Rusk, Barron, Polk, Saint Croix, Dunn, Chippewa, Taylor, Clark, Eau Claire, Pierce, Pepin, Buffalo, Trempealeau, Jackson, Monroe, La Crosse, Vilas, Forest, Florence, Oneida, Marinette, Lincoln, Langlade, Oconta, Marathon, Shawano, Menominee, Wood, Portage, Waupaca, Juneau, Adams, Waushara, Marquette, and Vernon Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich., Portage, Ind., Gary, Ind., and plant site of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Putnam County (Hennepin, Ill.).

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E47), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Cleveland, Ohio, to points in Illinois on and north of U.S. Highway 36. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich. and Gary, Ind.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E48), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Mansfield, Ohio, to points in Illinois on and north of Illinois Highway 17. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich. and Gary, Ind.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E49), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Mansfield, Ohio, to points in Illinois on and south of a line beginning at the Iowa-Illinois State line extending along Illinois Highway 17 to junction Illinois Highway 23, thence along Illinois Highway 23 to junction U.S. Highway 66, thence along U.S. Highway 66 to junction Illinois Highway 9, thence along Illinois Highway 9 to the Illinois-Indiana State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E50), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*,

by motor vehicle, over irregular routes; transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in the Chicago, Ill., commercial zone, as defined by the Commission in 1 M.C.C. 673, and Portage, Ind., to points in Pennsylvania. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E51), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as *a common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Joliet, Ill., to points in Ohio on, south, and east of a line beginning at the Ohio-West Virginia State line at Bridgeport, Ohio extending along Interstate Highway 70 to Columbus, Ohio to junction U.S. Highway 62, thence along U.S. Highway 62 to junction U.S. Highway 22 to Cincinnati, Ohio at the Ohio-Kentucky State line, including points in the Cincinnati, Ohio, commercial zone. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E52), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Decatur, Ill., to points in Ashtabula, Trumbull, Mahoning, Portage, Geauga, Lake, Cuahoga, Summit, Medina, Lorain, Erie, and Ottawa Counties, Ohio, that part of Lucas County east of Toledo, and that part of Sandusky County on and north of U.S. Highway 20 (including Fremont, Ohio). The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E53), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Cairo, Ill., to points in Ashtabula, Cleveland, Toledo, and Warren, Ohio. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E54), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Alton and East St. Louis, Ill., to points in Ashtabula, Trumbull, Geauga, Lake, Cuyahoga, Lorain, Erie, Ottawa Counties, and points in Lucas County East of and including Toledo, Ohio. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E55), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Alton, Chester and E. St. Louis, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania on, north and east of a line beginning at the Ohio-Pennsylvania State line on Interstate Highway 80 to junction U.S. Highway 322, thence along U.S. Highway 322 to junction U.S. Highway 15, thence along U.S. Highway 15 to the Pennsylvania-Maryland State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E56), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Cleveland, Ohio, to points in Lake, Porter, Jasper, and Newton Counties, Ind. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich. and Gary, Ind.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E58), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Porter County, Ind., on and north of Indiana Highway 8, to points in Ohio on, east and south of a line beginning at the Ohio-Kentucky State line at Ripley, Ohio, thence extending along U.S. Highway 62 to Washington Court House, Ohio, thence along U.S. Highway 35 to Chillicothe, Ohio and thence along U.S. Highway 50 to Belpre, Ohio at the Ohio-West Virginia State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E59), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel products*, from Pittsburgh, Pa., and Youngstown, Ohio and points within 50 miles of each located in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, to points in Illinois north of a line beginning at the Illinois-Iowa border extending along Illinois Highway 116 to Peoria, Ill., thence along U.S. Highway 24 to the Illinois-Indiana Border. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., Portage, Ind., and Sturgis, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E60), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Pittsburgh, Pa. and Youngstown, Ohio and points within 50 miles of each located in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, to points in Illinois on and south of a line beginning at Illinois-Iowa border, thence along Illinois Highway 116 to Peoria, Ill., extending along U.S. Highway 24 to the Illinois-Indiana border, except points in Iroquois, Ford, and Livingston Counties. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E61), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Lackawanna and Hamburg Townships, to points in that part of Iowa on and east of a line beginning at Keokuk, Iowa, and extending along U.S. Highway 218 to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, thence along U.S. Highway 151 to junction Iowa Highway 13, and thence along Iowa Highway 13 to Marquette, Iowa. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich., and Gary, Ind.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E62), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Lackawanna and Hamburg Townships, Erie County, New York, to points in Columbia, Crawford, Dane, Dodge, Fond du Lac, Grant, Green, Iowa, Jefferson, Lafayette, Kenosha, Ozaukee, Racine, Richland, Rock, Sauk, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, Wis. (except those parts of Kenosha and Racine Counties on and east of U.S. Highway 41). The purpose

of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich. and Gary, Ind.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E63), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Lackawanna and Hamburg Townships, Erie County, New York, to points in Illinois. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Sturgis, Mich., Gary, Ind., and Portage, Ind., Commercial Zone (Gary, Ind.)

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E65), filed November 13 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Champaign, Ill., to Ashtabula, Cleveland, Elyria, Toledo and Warren, Ohio. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E66), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATIOI SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323, Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Champaign, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania on, north and east of a line beginning at the Ohio-Pennsylvania State line extending along Interstate Highway 80 to junction on Pennsylvania Highway 36 at Brookville, Pa., thence along Pennsylvania Highway 36 to Holidaysburg, Pa., thence along U.S. Highway 22 to junction U.S. Highway 522, thence along U.S. Highway 522 to Pennsylvania Highway 641, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 641 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 997, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 997 to junction U.S. Highway 11, thence extending along U.S. Highway 11 to the Pennsylvania-Maryland State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E67), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323, Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in the Chicago, Ill., Commercial Zone, as defined by the Commission in 1 M.C.C. 673, to points in Pennsylvania on, south and east of a line beginning at the Ohio-Pennsylvania State line at Paris, Pa., extending along U.S. Highway 22 to Holidaysburg, Pa., to junction U.S. Highway 220 to Williamsport, Pa., thence along U.S. Highway 15 to Lawrenceville, Pa., at the Pennsylvania-New York State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E68), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Lake County, Ind., on and north of Indiana Highway 2, to points in Ohio on, south and east of a line beginning at the Ohio-West Virginia State line at Bridgeport, Ohio extending along Interstate Highway 70 to Columbus, Ohio, to junction U.S. Highway 62 to Washington Court House, Ohio, to junction U.S. Highway 22 to Cincinnati, Ohio at the Ohio-Kentucky State line, including ponits in Cincinnati, Ohio commercial zone as defined by the Commission. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E69), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Lake, McHenry, Kane, DuPage, Cook, and Will Counties, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania on, south and east of a line beginning at the Ohio-Pennsylvania State line at Paris, Pa., extending along U.S. Highway 22 to junction U.S. Highway 119 to Indiana, Pa., extending along U.S. Highway 422 to Ebensburg, Pa., to junction U.S. Highway 22 to Holidaysburg, Pa., to junction U.S. Highway 220 to Williamsport, Pa., to junction U.S. Highway 15 to Lawrenceville, Pa., at the Pennsylvania-New York State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E70), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from points in Jo Daviess, Carroll, Whiteside, Rock Island, Mercer, Henderson, Warren, Knox, Henry, Stark, Lee, Ogle, Stephenson, Winnebago, and Boone Counties, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania except Erie, Warren, Crawford, Mercer, Venango, and Lawrence Counties. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E71), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Decatur, Ill., to Doylestown, Easton, Philadelphia, and Stroudsburg, Pa. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Gary, Ind. and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E72), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Kankakee, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania on, south and east of a line beginning at the Ohio-Pennsylvania State line at W. Alexander, Pa., extending along U.S. Highway 40 to junction Interstate Highway 70, thence along Interstate Highway 70 to junction U.S. Highway 119, thence along U.S. Highway 119 to junction U.S. Highway 422, thence along U.S. Highway 422 to junction U.S. Highway 22, thence along U.S. Highway 22 to junction U.S. Highway 220, thence along U.S. Highway 220 to junction U.S. Highway 15, thence along U.S. Highway 15 to Lawrenceville, Pa., at the New York-Pennsylvania State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E73), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Decatur, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania north and east of a line beginning at Ohio-Pennsylvania State line at New Bedford, Pa., extending along U.S. Highway 422 to Indiana, Pa., to junction U.S. Highway 119, thence along U.S. Highway 119 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 56, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 56 to junction U.S. Highway 30, thence along U.S. Highway 30 to junction U.S. Highway 11, thence along U.S. Highway 11 to State line, Pa., at the Pennsylvania-Maryland State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind. and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E74), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from La Salle and Streator, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania on, east, and south of a line beginning at Genesee, Pa., at the New York-Pennsylvania State line extending along Pennsylvania Highway 449 to U.S. Highway 6, thence along U.S. Highway 6 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 872, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 872 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 120, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 120 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 555, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 555 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 255 to Dubois, Pa., extending along U.S. Highway 119 to Pennsylvania Highway 56, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 56 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 28, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 28 to junction U.S. Highway 22 to Paris, Pa., at the Pennsylvania-West Virginia State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E75), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Springfield, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania except those in Washington, Greene, and Fayette Counties. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E76), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Alton and East St. Louis, Ill., to Doylestown, Morrisville, Philadelphia, and Stroudsburg, Pa. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E77), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Danville, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania on, east, and north of a line beginning at the New York-Pennsylvania State line at Foster Brook, Pennsylvania, extending along U.S. Highway 219 to Pennsylvania Highway 153, to junction U.S. Highway 322 to Chester, Pa., at the Pennsylvania-New Jersey State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., and Monroe, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E78), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Pekin and Peoria, Ill., to points in Pennsylvania on, south, and east of a line beginning at the Ohio-Pennsylvania State line at Paris, Pa., extending along U.S. Highway 119, to junction U.S. Highway 422, to junction U.S. Highway 22, to junction U.S. Highway 220, to junction U.S. Highway 15 to Lawrenceville, Pa., at the Pennsylvania-New York State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E80), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Cambridge, Ohio, to points in Columbia, Crawford, Dane, Dodge, Fond du Lac, Grant, Green, Iowa, Jefferson, Lafayette, Kenosha (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Ozaukee, Racine (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Richland, Rock, Sauk, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., and Sturgis, Mich.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E81), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Portsmouth, Ohio, to points in Columbia, Crawford, Dane, Dodge, Fond du Lac, Grant, Green, Iowa, Jefferson, Lafayette, Kenosha (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Ozaukee, Racine (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Richland, Rock, Sauk, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E83), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Cincinnati, Ohio, to points in Columbia, Crawford, Dane, Dodge, Fond du Lac, Grant, Green, Iowa, Jefferson, Lafayette, Kenosha (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Ozaukee, Racine (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 41), Richland, Rock, Sauk, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Gary, Ind., and Middletown, Ohio.

No. MC 41406 (Sub-No. E84), filed November 13, 1975. Applicant: ARTIM TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, INC., 7105 Kennedy Ave., Hammond, Ind. 46323. Applicant's representative: E. Stephen Heisley, 666 Eleventh St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Steel and steel products*, from Zanesville, Ohio, to points in Columbia, Crawford, Dane, Dodge, Fond du Lac, Grant, Green, Iowa, Jefferson, Lafayette, Kenosha (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 4), Ozaukee, Racine (except points on and east of U.S. Highway 4), Richland, Rock, Sauk, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha Counties, Wis. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Gary, Ind., and Sturgis, Mich.

No. MC 102616 (Sub-No. E479), filed June 3, 1974. Applicant: COASTAL TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 5555, Akron, Ohio 44313. Applicant's representative: Fred H. Daly (same address as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Liquid chemicals*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Cincinnati, Dayton, Westwood, Fairmount, Cumminsville, St. Bernard, Avondale, Norwood, Oakley, Linwood, and Sedomsville, Ohio, and (a) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 52 to Cincinnati, (b) points on a lne beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 27 to junction Ohio Highway 73, (i) to junction U.S. Highway 127 to Cincinnati, and (ii) to junction Ohio Highway 4 to junction U.S. Highway 127, thence along U.S. Highway 127 to Middletown, (c) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 35 to junction U.S. Highway 127 to Cincinnati, (d) points on a line beginning at junction U.S. Highway 40 and U.S. Highway 25, and extending along U.S. Highway 25 to Cincinnati, (e) points on a line beginning at junction U.S. Highway U.S. Highway 25 and Ohio Highway 4, and extending along Ohio Highway 4

to junction U.S. Highway 127, thence along U.S. Highway 127 to Cincinnati, (f) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 40 to junction Ohio Highway 49, thence along Ohio Highway 49 to Dayton, to points in New York on and east of U.S. Interstate Highway 81. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Akron, Ohio, and Moundsville, West Virginia.

No. MC 102616 (Sub-No. E480), filed June 3, 1974. Applicant: COASTAL TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 5555, Akron, Ohio 44313. Applicant's representative: Fred H. Daly (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Liquid chemicals*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Akron, Cleveland, Mansfield, and Toledo, Ohio, and points in Ohio on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 30 to junction U.S. Highway 30S, thence along U.S. Highway 30S to junction U.S. Highway 25, thence along U.S. Highway 25 to the Ohio-Michigan State line, to points in Delaware and points in Maryland on and east of U.S. Interstate Highway 81. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Akron, Ohio, and Moundsville, W. Va.

No. MC 102616 (Sub-No. E481), filed June 3, 1974. Applicant: COASTAL TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 5555, Akron, Ohio 44313. Applicant's representative: Fred H. Daly (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Liquid chemicals*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Akron, Cleveland, Columbus, Mansfield, and Toledo, Ohio, and points in a line beginning at the Ohio-Michigan State line and extending along U.S. Highway 25, (i) to junction U.S. Highway 30S, thence along U.S. Highway 30S to junction U.S. Highway 30, thence along U.S. Highway 30 to the Ohio-Indiana State line, and (ii) to junction U.S. Highway 33, to points in Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 102616 (Sub-No. E482), filed June 3, 1974. Applicant: COASTAL TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 5555, Akron, Ohio 44313. Applicant's representative: Fred H. Daly (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Liquid chemicals*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Toledo, Ohio, to points in Pennsylvania on and east of U.S. Interstate Highway 81 and on and north of U.S. Interstate Highway 76. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateways of Akron, Ohio, and Moundsville, W. Va.

No. MC 102616 (Sub-No. E483), filed June 3, 1974. Applicant: COASTAL TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 5555, Akron, Ohio 44313. Applicant's representative: Fred H. Daly (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Liquid chemicals*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Akron, Cleveland, and Toledo, Ohio, and points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Michigan State line and extending along U.S. Highway 25 to junction U.S. Highway 6, to points in Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 102616 (Sub-No. E484), filed June 3, 1974. Applicant: COASTAL TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 5555, Akron, Ohio 44313. Applicant's representative: Fred H. Daly (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Chemicals*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Flint, Michigan, to (a) Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Mansfield, Springfield, Toledo, Westwood, Fairmount, Cumminsville, St. Bernard, Avondale, Norwood, Oakley, Linwood, and Sedamsville, Ohio, (b) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Michigan State line and extending along U.S. Highway 25 to Cincinnati, (c) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 52 to Cincinnati, (d) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 27 to junction Ohio Highway 73, thence over Ohio Highway 73, (i) to junction U.S. Highway 127, thence along U.S. Highway 127 to Cincinnati, (ii) to junction Ohio Highway 4, thence along Ohio Highway 4 to junction U.S. Highway 127, thence along U.S. Highway 127 to Middletown, (e) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 35 to junction U.S. Highway 127, thence along U.S. Highway 127 to Cincinnati, (f) points on a line beginning at junction of U.S. Highway 25 and Ohio Highway 4 and extending along Ohio Highway 4 to junction U.S. Highway 127, thence along U.S. Highway 127 to Cincinnati, (g) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 40 to junction Ohio Highway 49, thence along Ohio Highway 49 to Dayton. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Toledo, Ohio.

No. MC 102616 (Sub-No. E485), filed June 3, 1974. Applicant: COASTAL TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 5555, Akron, Ohio 44313. Applicant's representative: Fred H. Daly (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Petroleum products*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, (a) from Cincinnati, Dayton, Columbus, Springfield, Westwood, Fairmount, Cumminsville, St. Bernard, Avondale, Norwood, Oakley, Linwood, and Sedamsville, Ohio, (b) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 52 to Cincinnati, (c) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 27 to junction Ohio Highway 73, (i) to junction U.S. Highway 127 to Cincinnati, and (ii) to junction Ohio Highway 4 to junction U.S. Highway 127, thence along U.S. Highway 127 to Middletown, (d) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 35 to junction U.S. Highway 127 to Cincinnati, (e) points on a line beginning at junction U.S. Highway 40 and U.S. Highway 25, and extending along U.S. Highway 25 to Cincinnati, (f) points on a line beginning at junction U.S. Highway 25 and Ohio Highway 4, and extending along Ohio Highway 4 to junction U.S. Highway 127, thence along U.S. Highway 127 to Cincinnati, (g) points on a line beginning at the Ohio-Indiana State line and extending along U.S. Highway 40 to junction Ohio Highway 49, thence along Ohio Highway 49 to Dayton, to points in Michigan on and west of a line beginning at the Indiana-Michigan State line and extending along U.S. Highway 131, to junction U.S. Highway 31, thence along U.S. Highway 31 to Mackinac City, and points in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Granger, Indiana.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E182), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Anhydrous ammonia*, in bulk, in tank vehicles and *dry fertilizer*, in bags, from points in Texas east of U.S. Highway 83, to points in Arizona, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E183), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients*, from points in Texas east of U.S. Highway 83, to points in Nevada, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E184), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over ir-

regular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients* (except liquid sulphur and petroleum products), from points in Texas on, south, and east of a line beginning at the Texas-Oklahoma State line and extending along U.S. Highway 62 to junction U.S. Highway 83, thence along U.S. Highway 83 to the Gulf of Mexico, to points in Wyoming, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E185) filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Utah, to points in Alabama, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E186), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles from points in Utah, to points in Arkansas, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E187), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Washington, to points in Alabama, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plantsite and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E188), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Washington, to points in Arkansas, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E189), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients*, in bags, and in mixed loads of bulk and bags, from points in Washington, to points in Arkansas, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale Couuty, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E190), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Washington, to points in Georgia, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E191), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients*, from points in North Carolina, to points in Nevada, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E224), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizers and fertilizer ingredients*, from points in Florida, to points in Nevada, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E225), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Anhydrous ammonia*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, and *dry fertilizer*, in bags, from points in Maine, to points in Arizona, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E226), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients*, from points in New Jersey, to points in Nevada, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E227), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Idaho, to

points in South Carolina, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E228), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Idaho, to points in Georgia, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC–107064 (Sub-No. E229), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients*, in bags, and in mixed loads of bulk and bags, from points in Idaho, to points in Arkansas, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E230), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Idaho, to points in Arkansas, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E231), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES INC. P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Idaho, to points in Alabama, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E232), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer* and *fertilizer ingredients*, from points in Delaware to points in Nevada, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E233), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Anhydrous ammonia*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, and *dry fertilizer*, in bags, from points in New Hampshire, to points in Arizona, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E234), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Anhydrous ammonia*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, and *dry fertilizer*, in bags, from points in Delaware to points in Arizona, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E235), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer* and *fertilizer ingredients* (except liquid sulphur and petroleum products), from points in Maine to points in New Mexico, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and the storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No MC 107064 (Sub-No. E236), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer* and *fertilizer ingredients* (except liquid sulphur and petroleum products), from points in New Hampshire to points in New Mexico, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E237), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dalals, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions* and *liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Idaho to points in Mississippi, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E238), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer* and *fertilizer ingredients*, in bags, and in mixed loads of bulk and bags, from points in Idaho to points in Louisiana, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and

storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E239), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: Steere Tank Lines, Inc., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Anhydrous ammonia*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, and *dry fertilizer*, in bags from points in Massachusetts, to points in Arizona, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E240), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Anhydrous ammonia*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, and dry fertilizer, in bags, from points in Maryland to points in Arizona, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E421), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer* and *fertilizer ingredients*, from points in Maryland to points in Nevada, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii), to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E242), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in California, to points in Kentucky, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E243), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in California, to points in Georgia, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E244), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients*, from points in Maine, to points in Nevada, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E245), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients* (except liquid sulphur and petroleum products), from points in Florida, to points in Colorado, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E246), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Anhydrous ammonia*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, and *dry fertilizer*, in bags, from points in Florida, to points in Arizona, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E247), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients*, from points in Connecticut, to points in Nevada, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E248), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P. O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Anhydrous ammonia*, in bulk, in tank vehicles and *dry fertilizer*, in bags, from points in Connecticut, to points in Arizona, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E249), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE TANK LINES, INC., P. O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representative: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in California, to points in Tennessee (except Kingsport), restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107064 (Sub-No. E250), filed December 18, 1975. Applicant: STEERE

TANK LINES, INC., P.O. Box 2998, Dallas, Tex. 75221. Applicant's representatives: H. L. Rice, Jr. (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer solutions and liquid fertilizer ingredients*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in California, to points in South Carolina, restricted against the transportation of chemicals from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of the plant site and storage facilities of Occidental Chemical Co., in Hale County, Tex.

No. MC 107295 (Sub-No. E24) (Correction), filed May 14, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of March 12, 1975, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: PRE-FAB TRANSIT CO., P.O. Box 146, Farmer City, Ill. 61842. Applicant's representative: Dale L. Cox (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Buildings*, complete, knocked down, or in sections, from points in Illinois, to points in Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Washington Court House, Ohio.

NOTE.—The purpose of this correction is to correct the territorial description.

No. MC 109462 (Sub-No. E1) (Correction), filed May 15, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of July 1, 1975, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: LUMBER TRANSPORT, INC., P.O. Box 6181 S. Station, Fort Smith, Ark. 72901. Applicant's representative: Ronald E. Butler, 54 W. Lake St., Madisonville, Ky. 42431. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Composition board*, from points in New Mexico, to points in Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Michigan, and Missouri. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Miami, Okla.

NOTE.—The purpose of this correction is to correct the territorial description.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. E31) (Partial correction), filed May 8, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issues of July 8, 1975 and September 10, 1975, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. 02210. Applicant's representative: Lawrence T. Sheils (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, (2) between those points in Pennsylvania on, north and west of a line beginning at the Pennsylvania-West Virginia State line and extending along U.S. Highway 119 to Greensburg, thence along U.S. Highway 30 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 271, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 271 to Johnstown, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 403 to junction U.S. Highway 119, thence along U.S. Highway 119 to Du Bois, thence along U.S. Highway 219 to junction U.S. Highway 6, thence along U.S. Highway 6 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 14, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 14 to the Pennsylvania-New York State line, on the one hand, and, on the other, Danbury, Conn.; (6) between those points in Pennsylvania on, north and west of a line beginning at the Pennsylvania-West Virginia State line and extending along U.S. Highway 119 to Greensburg, thence along U.S. Highway 30 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 271, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 271 to Johnstown, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 56 to junction U.S. Highway 119, thence along U.S. Highway 119 to Du Bois, thence along U.S. Highway 219 to junction U.S. Highway 6, thence along U.S. Highway 6 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 14, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 14 to the Pennsylvania-New York State line, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Hartford, Middlesex, New London, Windham, and Tolland Counties, Conn.; and (8) between Lock Haven, Pa., on the one hand, and, on the other, Putnam, Norwich, New London, Middletown, New Britain, Hartford, Torrington, and Canaan, Conn. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Elmira, N.Y.

NOTE.—The purpose of this correction is to correct typographical errors. The remainder of the letter-notice remains as previously published.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. E162) (Partial correction), filed May 8, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of June 17, 1975, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. 02210. Applicant's representative: Lawrence T. Sheils (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, (4) between those points in Indiana on and west of a line beginning at the Indiana-Illinois State line and extending along U.S. Highway 40 to Terre Haute, thence along U.S. Highway 141 to the Indiana-Illinois State line, on the one hand, and, on the other, those points in Pennsylvania on, north, and east of a line beginning at the Pennsylvania-New Jersey State line, and extending along Pennsylvania Highway 611 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 412, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 412 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 212, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 212 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 309, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 309 to junction Pennsylvania Turnpike, thence along Pennsylvania Turnpike to junction Interstate Highway 81, thence along Interstate Highway 81 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 309, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 309 to junction U.S. Highway 6, thence along U.S. Highway 6 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 14, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 14 to the Pennsylvania-New York State line, and those in Tioga County, Pa. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Elmira, N.Y.

NOTE.—The purpose of this partial correction is to correct typographical errors. The remainder of the letter-notice remains as previously published.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. E174) (Correction), filed May 17, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER June 18, 1975, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer St., Boston, Mass. 02210. Applicant's representative: Lawrence T. Sheils (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, between (1) Westfield, Dunkirk, Fredonia, Brockton, Silver Creek, Farnham, Angola, North Collins, South Dayton, Lawtons, Gowanda, E. Aurora, Eden, N.Y., on the one hand, and, on the other, Gowanda, Pa. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Buffalo, N.Y. The purpose of this correction is to correct E. Autora to read as E. Aurora instead. The remainder of the letter-notice remains as previously published.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. E269) (Partial correction), filed May 17, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of June 17, 1975, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. 02210. Applicant's representative: Lawrence T. Sheils (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, (8) from Centre, Clinton, and Mifflin Counties, Pa., to those points in Iowa on, north, and west of a line beginning at the Mississippi River and extending along Iowa Highway 9 to Decorah, thence along U.S. Highway 52 to junction Iowa Highway 24, thence along Iowa Highway 24 to junction U.S. Highway 63, thence along U.S. Highway 63 to junction U.S. Highway 30, thence along U.S. Highway 30 to junction U.S. Highway 69, thence along U.S. Highway 69 to the Iowa-Missouri State line. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of LeRoy, N.Y.

NOTE.—The purpose of this partial correction is to correct a typographical error. The remainder of this letter-notice remains as previously published.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. E271) (Partial correction), filed May 17, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER July 15, 1975,

and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer St., Boston, Mass. 02210. Applicant's representative: Lawrence T. Sheils (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*: (1) from those points in Pennsylvania on and east of a line beginning at the Pennsylvania-Maryland State line and extending along U.S. Highway 11 to Northumberland, thence along U.S. Highway 15 to the Pennsylvania-New York State line to those points in Nebraska on, north, and west of a line beginning at the Missouri River and extending along Nebraska Highway 92 to junction Interstate Highway 80, thence along Interstate Highway 80 to junction U.S. Highway 77, thence along U.S. Highway 77 to the Nebraska-Kansas State line; (5) from those points in Pennsylvania on, north and west of a line beginning at the Pennsylvania-New York State line and extending along U.S. Highway 15 to junction U.S. Highway 6, thence along U.S. Highway 6 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 287, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 287 to junction U.S. Highway 220, thence along U.S. Highway 220 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 65, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 65 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 144, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 144 to junction U.S. Highway 322, thence along U.S. Highway 322 to Lewistown, thence along U.S. Highway 22 to Harrisburg, thence along Interstate Highway 83 to the Pennsylvania-Maryland State line to points in Nebraska. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of LeRoy, N.Y. The purpose of this partial correction is to correct the route descriptions. The remainder of the letter-notice remains as previously published.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. E486) (Correction), filed May 19, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of July 3, 1975, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer St., Boston, Mass. 02210. Applicant's representative: Lawrence T. Sheils (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, from those points in Pennsylvania on and west of U.S. Highway 15 and on, east, and north of a line beginning at the Pennsylvania-New York State line and extending along Pennsylvania Highway 49 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 249, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 249 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 287, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 287 to junction U.S. Highway 220, thence along U.S. Highway 220 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 120, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 120 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 64, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 64 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 144, thence along Pennsylvania Highway 144 to junction U.S. Highway 322, thence along U.S. Highway 322 to junction U.S. Highway 15, to those points in Missouri on, north, and west of a line beginning at the Missouri-Iowa State line and extending along U.S. Highway 63 to Kirksville, thence along Missouri Highway 6 to junction U.S. Highway 65, thence along U.S. Highway 65 to junction U.S. Highway 24, thence along U.S. Highway 24 to junction Missouri Highway 13, thence along Missouri Highway 13 to junction U.S. Highway 65, thence along U.S. Highway 65 to the Missouri-Arkansas State line. From Lewisburg, Milton, Wellsboro, and Williamsport, Pa., to points in Missouri. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Elmira, N.Y.

NOTE.—The purpose of this correction is to correct typographical errors.

No. MC 119864 (Sub-No. E13) (Partial correction), filed May 22, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of March 3, 1976, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: CRAIG TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, 26699 Eckel Road, Perrysburg, Ohio 43551. Applicant's representative: Dale K. Craig (same as above). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dairy products, canned goods, and packinghouse products and by-products:* (3) from points in Ohio on, north and west of a line beginning at the Ohio-Michigan State line and extending along U.S. Highway 127 to West Unity, thence along Ohio Highway 191 to junction U.S. Highway 6, thence along U.S. Highway 6 to Fremont, thence along U.S. Highway 20 to Elyria, thence along Ohio Highway 82 to junction U.S. Highway 42, thence along U.S. Highway 42 to Mansfield, thence along U.S. Highway 30N to junction U.S. Highway 30, thence along U.S. Highway 30 to Van Wert, thence along U.S. Highway 224 to the Indiana-Ohio State line, to points in Illinois on, north and west of a line beginning at the Indiana-Illinois State line and extending along Illinois Highway 17 to Kankakee, thence along U.S. Highway 45 to the Illinois-Kentucky State line, restricted to the transportation of shipments moving from, to or between plants, warehouses, or other facilities of food manufacturing and dairy establishments. The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Gary, Ind.

NOTE.—The purpose of this partial correction is to correct the territorial description. The remainder of the letter-notice remains as previously published.

No. MC 119864 (Sub-No. E23) (Partial correction), filed June 2, 1974, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of March 3, 1976, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: CRAIG TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, 26699 Eckel Road, Perrysburg, Ohio 43551. Applicant's representative: Dale K. Craig (same as above).

Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dairy products, canned goods, packinghouse products and by-products, and materials and supplies* used in the operation and maintenance of packinghouses, (3) from points in Illinois on, north and west of a line beginning at the Indiana-Illinois state line and extending along Illinois Highway 17 to Kankakee, thence along U.S. Highway 45 to the Illinois-Kentucky State line to points in Ohio on, north and west of a line beginning at the Ohio-Michigan State line and extending along U.S. Highway 127 to West Unity, thence along Ohio Highway 191 to junction U.S. Highway 6, thence along U.S. Highway 6 to Fremont, thence along U.S. Highway 20 to Elyria, thence along Ohio Highway 82 to junction U.S. Highway 42, thence along U.S. Highway 42 to Mansfield, thence along U.S. Highway 30N to junction U.S. Highway 30, thence along U.S. Highway 30 to Van Wert, thence along U.S. Highway 224 to the Indiana-Ohio State line, restricted to the transportation of shipments moving from, to or between plants, warehouses, or other facilities of food manufacturing and dairy establishments.

The purpose of this filing is to eliminate the gateway of Gary, Ind.

NOTE.—The purpose of this partial correction is to correct the territorial description. The remainder of the letter-notice remains as previously published.

By the Commission.

ROBERT L. OSWALD,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16730 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

federal register

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1976



PART II:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

■

PHA ACQUISITION OF HUD-OWNED PROPERTIES AND PROPERTIES WITH HUD-INSURED AND HUD-HELD MORTGAGES

Interim Rule

Title 24—Housing and Urban Development

CHAPTER VIII—LOW INCOME HOUSING, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. R-76-399]

PART 845—PHA ACQUISITION WITH OR WITHOUT REHABILITATION

PHA Acquisition of HUD-Owned Properties and Properties With HUD-Insured and HUD-Held Mortgages; Interim Rule

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is hereby publishing interim regulations to amend Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations by adding a new Part 845, "Acquisition With or Without Rehabilitation—Subpart D—PHA Acquisition of HUD-Owned Properties and Properties with HUD-Insured and HUD-Held mortgages."

Under this Subpart HUD will utilize $50 million of annual contributions contract authority under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (Act) for assistance to public housing agencies (PHAs) in the acquisition and subsequent rehabilitation or completion of construction, as required, of HUD-owned multifamily and single family properties and of multifamily properties with mortgages insured or held by HUD. HUD will select HUD-owned multifamily and single family properties to be offered, at prices and terms determined by HUD, to the appropriate PHA. HUD will also select for the same purpose multifamily properties with mortgages insured or held by HUD, after consulting with owners.

(Sec. 845.401.)

Because of the importance of this approach in making housing assistance more widely available to lower-income families and in assisting in the disposition of the acquired property inventory, HUD has determined that the public interest would be served by making the provisions of Subpart D effective upon publication. Therefore, HUD has found that good cause exists for making these regulations effective upon publication on an interim basis.

Written comments and suggestions will be received until June 19, 1976. HUD will make such modifications as it deems appropriate in the final regulations. Written comments should refer to the docket number and date and should be submitted to the Rules Docket Clerk, Office of the Secretary, Room 10141, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20410. A copy of each such communication will be available for public inspection during regular business hours at the above address.

A description of the principal features of the new Subpart D of Part 845 is set forth below.

1. (a) In selecting the properties, HUD will consider certain factors including, but not limited to, compliance with certain site and neighborhood standards; degree and complexity of the rehabilitation or completion of construction, as required; feasibility of funding the transaction under the limitations of the Act; feasibility of relocating site occupants, where applicable; and the administrative and operational capability of the PHA. In considering HUD-owned single family properties in soft market or hard to sell areas, HUD may offer such properties in combination with other properties in which the PHA may be interested.

(Sec. 845.402(a)(10).)

(b) In selecting properties with mortgages insured or held by HUD, HUD will rank the properties in the following order: (1) subsidized insured, (2) subsidized with HUD-held mortgages, (3) unsubsidized insured, and (4) unsubsidized with HUD-held mortgages. HUD will give priority to those projects with the lowest income tenant bodies and highest rent-to-income ratios, and to those projects where a mortgage assignment or foreclosure is anticipated.

(Sec. 845.402(b).)

2. Where the PHA is interested in acquiring a selected property, the PHA will submit to HUD an application for a program under the Act and, after approval thereof by HUD, a development program, all in accordance with the HUD prescribed forms and procedures. Following approval of the development program, HUD will enter into an Annual Contributions Contract (ACC) with the PHA, which will include a commitment for loan funds to finance the acquisition of the property and any required rehabilitation or completion as the case may be.

(Sec. 845.403–845.406.)

3. With the funds made available to the PHA under the ACC, the PHA will purchase the property at a closing arranged by the HUD field office.

(Sec. 845.407.)

4. The PHA will generally accomplish any required rehabilitation or completion of the property by contract after competitive bidding, in accordance with HUD prescribed forms and procedures; force account may be used only with HUD approval under exceptional circumstances.

(Sec. 845.408.)

5. Under § 845.412, tenants in occupancy will be given a preliminary notice advising them that the PHA intends to acquire the property pursuant to a financial assistance contract with HUD, and stating, among other things, that they will receive, not later than 10 days following acquisition of the property, either a notice of their right to continue in occupancy or a notice of displacement. If a tenant moves after the PHA has sent a notice of displacement, the tenant will be considered displaced for purposes of the Uniform Relocation Act. If the PHA has sent a tenant a notice of right to continue in occupancy, the following conditions will apply:

(a) The tenant will be assured of a right to occupy the same unit, or another unit in the same or a nearby building in the same project, for at least four years, which unit must be in decent, safe and sanitary condition.

(b) The tenant's monthly housing cost will be no greater than if he had remained in occupancy in the same dwelling unit under the regulations effective for the program which subsidized his occupancy prior to acquisition by the PHA.

(c) The tenant may be required to move temporarily to permit rehabilitation or demolition, but (1) only one such move may be required, (2) the temporary relocation may not be for more than one year, (3) the PHA must make available a unit which is in decent, safe and sanitary condition, and (4) the PHA must pay the actual reasonable expenses, including moving costs and increase in rent, incurred in connection with the temporary relocation.

(d) If the PHA fails to comply with any of these requirements, the tenant will be deemed to have been displaced and will become entitled to relocation payments and assistance pursuant to the applicable HUD regulations.

If the tenant is displaced, whether pursuant to notice or by reason of PHA failure to meet the required conditions, the computation of any replacement housing payment for rental assistance will be based upon the cost of renting a publicly owned or subsidized replacement dwelling, if available and offered to the displaced tenant, which meets all of the requirements for a "comparable replacement dwelling" except that it be "on the private market."

A Finding of Inapplicability respecting the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 has been made in accordance with HUD procedures. A finding of inapplicability of inflation impact statement requirements has also been made in accordance with HUD procedures. A copy of these findings will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the Office of the Rules Docket Clerk at the address shown above.

Accordingly, Title 24, Chapter VIII is amended by adding a new Part 845, Subpart D, to read as follows:

Subpart D—PHA Acquisition of HUD-Owned Properties and Properties With HUD-Insured and HUD-Held Mortgages

Sec.

845.401	Applicability and scope.
845.402	Selection of properties by HUD.
845.403	Notification of PHA.
845.404	Application for low-income housing program (and for preliminary loan where required), preliminary site report.
845.405	Preparation and submission of development program.
845.406	Approval of development program and execution of annual contributions contract.
845.407	Purchase of the property.
845.408	Rehabilitation or construction methods and standards.
845.409	Responsibilities during rehabilitation or construction.
845.410	Inspection upon completion and final settlement.
845.411	Warranties.
845.412	Relocation of tenants.

AUTHORITY: Sec. 7(d), Department of HUD Act (42 U.S.C. 3535(d)); sec. 5(b) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c (b)).

Subpart D—PHA Acquisition of HUD-Owned Properties and Properties With HUD-Insured and HUD-Held Mortgages

§ 845.401 Applicability and scope.

HUD will utilize $50 million of annual contributions contract authority for assistance to public housing agencies (PHAs) in the acquisition and subsequent rehabilitation or completion, as required, of HUD-owned multifamily and single family properties and of multifamily properties with mortgages insured or held by HUD. HUD will select the properties for such use after consultation with the owners in the case of properties with mortgages insured or held by HUD. Properties so selected by HUD will be made available to the PHAs having jurisdiction over the areas in which the properties are located at prices and terms to be determined by HUD and will be acquired, rehabilitated or completed, as required, by the PHAs with financial assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (Act) and in accordance with the provisions of this Subpart.

§ 845.402 Selection of properties by HUD.

(a) *General.* HUD shall select the properties after considering the following factors:

(1) Compliance with the site and neighborhood standards stated in 24 CFR 881.112 (a), (b), (d), (h) and (i).

(2) The degree and complexity of the rehabilitation or completion of construction necessary to place the property in acceptable physical condition.

(3) The feasibility of funding the acquisition and any rehabilitation or construction under the Act, including the limitation that the cost for dwelling construction and equipment shall not exceed 90 percent of the applicable prototype cost published by HUD and the further limitation that the total development cost shall not exceed 90 percent of the imputed development cost of a hypothetical newly constructed low-rent housing project developed by the PHA to accommodate the comparable number, sizes, and kinds of families to be accommodated by the property in question.

(4) Feasibility of relocating site occupants during and after the rehabilitation, if applicable.

(5) Whether the PHA has sufficient administrative and operational capability.

(6) The likelihood that the unit of general local government would not object under Section 213 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (HCD Act).

(7) Results of appropriate environmental review conducted in compliance with HUD requirements implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended; the likelihood of compliance with the A–95 requirements (OMB Circular A–95, January 13, 1976) if applicable; and probable results of Project Selection Criteria evaluation of Application for Low-Income Public Housing (24 CFR 200.700).

(8) If the property is situated in an area that has been identified by HUD as having special flood hazards, the community must have entered the National Flood Insurance Program under the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), and the project must be covered by flood insurance under that program and meet any relevant HUD standards and local requirements.

(9) Compliance with the provision of Section 6(a) of the Act which requires that "except in the case of housing predominantly for the elderly, high-rise elevator projects shall not be provided for families with children unless * * * [HUD] makes a determination that there is no practical alternative."

(10) In connection with HUD-owned single family properties in soft market or hard to sell areas (excluding areas which have been identified as Urban Homestead areas under the Urban Homestead Demonstration Program), whether HUD should offer such properties in combination with other properties in which the PHA may be interested. If a PHA expresses an interest in acquiring such properties, the field office shall provide the PHA with a list of all such properties.

(b) *Secretary-Owned Properties.* In selecting properties the field office may initially place emphasis on multifamily properties, then, single family properties and the extent to which the use of the property will help to meet the needs of the PHAs. All properties listed in the Secretary-owned inventory are available to interested PHAs.

(c) *Properties with Mortgages Insured or Held by HUD.*

(1) In selecting properties, the field office shall rank the properties in the following order:

(i) Subsidized insured projects,

(ii) Subsidized projects with HUD-held mortgages,

(iii) Unsubsidized insured projects,

(iv) Unsubsidized projects with HUD-held mortgages.

(2) Within these rankings priority shall be given to those projects with the lowest income tenant bodies and the highest rent-to-income ratios, to insured projects where a mortgage assignment or mortgage foreclosure is anticipated, and to projects with HUD-held mortgages where foreclosure is anticipated.

(3) With respect to those properties which HUD proposes to select in accordance with paragraph (c)(1) of this section, the owners shall be requested in writing to advise whether they are willing to consider a sale of the property to the PHA on a negotiated basis taking into account the amount necessary to satisfy the outstanding mortgage indebtedness, including delinquencies if any, or appropriate portions thereof in the case of uncompleted projects. This shall be subject to the willingness of the PHA to acquire the project and the acceptability of the project from the standpoint of meeting the cost limitations mentioned in paragraph (a)(3) of this section.

§ 845.403 Notification of PHA.

(a) For those properties which have been selected in accordance with § 845.402, the field office shall notify the PHA in writing indicating that the property is available and requesting the PHA to advise, within a specified time, whether it is interested in acquiring the property for subsequent rehabilitation or completion, as required, with financial assistance under the Act.

(b) Upon receipt of an affirmative response from the PHA, the field office shall invite the PHA (and owner, where applicable) to attend a conference at which the basic terms and conditions shall be discussed. The PHA will be furnished with such information and assistance as may be needed for the expeditious preparation and submission to HUD of an application for a low-income housing program and preliminary loan, and preparation and submission of a preliminary site report, all on HUD prescribed forms.

§ 845.404 Application for Low-Income Housing Program (and for preliminary loan where required); preliminary site report.

(a) The PHA shall submit to HUD the application for a low-income housing program (and for a preliminary loan, where required) and all related documents, as well as a preliminary site report, all on HUD prescribed forms.

"Included with the application shall be:

(1) A signed certification of the PHA's intention to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, Executive Order 11063, Executive Order 11246 and Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

(2) A completed Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan, if the application is for five (5) or more units. In utilizing preferences or priorities for the selection of tenants, other than those who previously were occupants of the project and who will return to the project upon completion of rehabilitation, no requirement or priority may be based upon the length of time the applicant has resided in the jurisdiction. Applicants who are working or who have been notified that they are hired to work in the jurisdiction shall be treated as residents of the jurisdiction.

(b) Promptly after receipt of the material submitted in accordance with paragraph (a) of this section, the field office shall:

(1) If the application is subject to A–95 clearance, send a copy of the preliminary site report to the appropriate clearinghouse for review (unless this was previously done by the PHA).

(2) For purposes of compliance with section 213 of the HUD Act, forward (unless this was previously done by the PHA) a copy of the preliminary site report with a brief description of the proposed project to the chief executive officer (or such other designee as such officer may designate) of the unit of general local government in which the project is located.

(3) Review the application and other material in accordance with applicable HUD procedures.

(c) If the application is determined to be approvable, the field office shall issue a program reservation and approval of a preliminary loan, if applicable.

(d) Promptly after execution of the preliminary loan contract, the PHA shall obtain HUD approval for obtaining legal and architectural services, where such services are necessary in connection with the project.

§ 845.405 Preparation and submission of development program.

The field office shall conduct a Development Conference to discuss the requirements of a development program with the PHA and those who will participate in the preparation of the development program. The development program describes the basic elements of the project and includes a development cost budget prepared on HUD prescribed forms in accordance with applicable instructions. Following the Development Conference, the PHA shall prepare the development program and submit it to HUD for its review and approval.

§ 845.406 Approval of development program and execution of annual contributions contract.

The field office shall review the development program in accordance with applicable HUD procedures. After the development program is approved, the field office shall authorize and proceed to accomplish execution of an annual contributions contract. This shall include a commitment for loan funds to pay off the preliminary loan, if any, and to finance the acquisition and any necessary rehabilitation or completion of construction of the property.

§ 845.407 Purchase of the property.

(a) The PHA shall submit a requisition to HUD for sufficient loan funds to cover the purchase price and other PHA project expenses.

(b) The field office shall arrange for the closing at which the purchase of the property will be accomplished. Any necessary rehabilitation or completion of construction will be performed thereafter in accordance with Sections 845.408, 845.409 and 845.410.

§ 845.408 Rehabilitation or construction methods and standards.

(a) *Contracting.* Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, the PHA shall accomplish the necessary rehabilitation or completion of the construction of the property by contract after competitive bidding. The PHA shall, prior to taking of bids, submit for HUD approval the bidding and contract documents prepared on the HUD prescribed forms. HUD shall supply the PHA with the current Davis-Bacon wage rate determination to be used in conjunction with the bid documents.

(b) *Force Account.* (1) The Force Account method, whereby the PHA uses its existing staff or hires additional personnel to perform the work, may be used in exceptional cases with the approval of the Field Office Director for all the work or in combination with contracts for units of work which can be better or more economically performed by an independent contractor. Force Account work shall be subject to Davis-Bacon wage rates. The PHA must justify use of the Force Account method and demonstrate the capabilities of the PHA to successfully implement the force Account method.

(2) For purpose of this paragraph (b), an exceptional case may be, but is not limited to: (i) a project or unit of work of unusually small size, or (ii) a project involving properties requiring only minor rehabilitation or construction, or (iii) a project involving individual small structures requiring major rehabilitation or construction, but where it is necessary to utilize many separate sets of detailed plans and specifications and other contract documents and the work of preparing, advertising, awarding and administering such contracts would be disproportionately difficult, time-consuming, and high in cost.

(c) *Advertising for Bids and Contract Award.* (1) The documents submitted pursuant to paragraph (a) of this Section shall be reviewed by the Field office and, if approved, the PHA shall be authorized to advertise for bids.

(2) After opening the bids, the PHA shall identify the bid which in its judgment is the lowest responsible bid, and the PHA shall submit its recommendation for contract award to the field office for HUD approval.

(3) The field office shall review the proposed contract award and the material submitted by the PHA in connection therewith, and shall notify the PHA of HUD's approval or disaproval of the recommendation made by the PHA.

(4) After HUD approval, the PHA shall execute the construction contract(s) with the contractor(s).

(d) *Rehabilitation or Construction Standards.* Rehabilitation or Construction shall be in compliance with (1) HUD MINimum Design Standards for Rehabilitation for Residential Properties, or HUD Minimum Property Standards, as appropriate, (2) in the case of congregate or single room occupant housing, the appropriate HUD guidelines and standards, (3) HUD requirements pursuant to section 209 of the HCD Act for projects for the elderly or handicapped, (4) HUD requirements pertaining to noise abatement and control, (5) regulations issued pursuant to the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, 42 U.S.C. 4801, and (6) applicable State and local laws, codes, ordinances and regulations.

§ 845.409 Responsibilities during rehabilitation or construction.

(a) The PHA shall accomplish completion of rehabilitation or construction with all practicable dispatch in a sound, efficient manner without waste or extravagance, in strict accordance with the contract documents, and in accordance with the procedures and requirements prescribed by HUD.

(b) The PHA shall at all times retain, preserve and enforce all its rights under the rehabilitation or construction and equipment contracts and under its agreement with the architect for services to be rendered during rehabilitation or construction. The PHA shall not, without prior approval of HUD, waive, release, compromise, or fail to enforce any right or fail to prosecute any claim which it may have under any such contract or agreement.

(c) The PHA shall designate a Contracting Officer to represent it in the administration of rehabilitation or construction and equipment contracts, with power to perform the functions of the PHA as required by such contracts. The designation shall define the scope and limitations of the Contracting Officer's authority. The designation shall be made prior to the issuance of the Notice to Proceed, and the Notice to Proceed shall include a notification concerning the designation and the name of the Contracting Officer.

(d) (1) The PHA shall promptly inform the field office by direct wire of the date on which work actually starts at the site.

(2) The PHA shall submit to the field office periodic reports and other material related to rehabilitation or construction, including copies of all revised drawings, working sketches, correspondence, etc., in the prescribed form and number of copies required by HUD.

(e) The PHA shall provide competent and adequate architectural and engineering inspection of rehabilitation or construction. Such inspectors shall be selected by the PHA and approved by HUD. The PHA shall promptly forward a copy of each inspection report to the field office. This report shall include comments on action taken to remedy deficiencies disclosed by the report.

(f) HUD representatives shall make site visits from time to time, and shall make a report to HUD of each of their visits. HUD shall send a copy of each report to the PHA, with a recommendation of the action, if any, to be taken by the PHA. The HUD report shall include its evaluation of the adequacy of the PHA inspections and the PHA actions with respect thereto.

§ 845.410 Inspection upon completion and final settlement.

(a) The contractor shall notify the PHA in writing as to the date when, in his opinion, the contract work, or stage when applicable, will be completed and ready for final inspection. If the PHA determines that the state of the work is as represented, the PHA shall promptly notify the Field Office and request HUD's participation in the final inspection. The final inspection shall be made jointly by the representatives of the PHA, HUD and the contractor.

(b) If the inspection discloses no deficiencies other than punch list items or items awaiting seasonal opportunity to

complete, the PHA shall submit for HUD approval an Interim Certificate of Completion which shall detail the items. The PHA shall also submit for HUD approval a proposed time schedule agreed to by the contractor for completion of the items. Upon HUD approval of the Interim Certificate and schedule for completion, the PHA may release the monies to the contractor less the withholdings required by the contract. The PHA may permit occupancy prior to PHA sign-off on all punch list items and items awaiting seasonal opportunity.

(c) The contractor shall complete the punch list items and items awaiting seasonal opportunity to complete in accordance with the time schedule for completion of the items as approved by HUD. The contractor will be paid for such items only after inspection and acceptance by the PHA and after HUD approval. The PHA shall not accept any items if there is a dispute as to whether such items have been completed. If the PHA is satisfied that the applicable requirements of the contract have been met, the PHA shall submit to HUD for approval a Final Certificate of Completion and, upon approval thereof by HUD, shall release to the contractor the amounts withheld respect to such items in accordance with the applicable provisions of the contract.

§ 845.411 Warranties.

The rehabilitation or construction and equipment contracts shall specify the warranty periods applicable to items completed as of the date of the approved Interim Certificate of Completion and to items completed after the date of the Interim Certificate, and shall also provide for assignment to the PHA of manufacturers' and suppliers' warranties covering equipment or supplies.

§ 845.412 Relocation of tenants.

(a) *Applicability of Uniform Act.* Any tenant in occupancy on the date the PHA acquires the real property as part of the project and who thereafter moves or moves his personal property from the real property shall be considered a displaced person within the meaning of the Uniform Relocatoin Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act), (84 Stat. 1899; 42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq., Pub. L. 91-646), unless the tenant is permitted to continue in occupancy of a dwelling in accordance with paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section. The relocation of any displaced person shall be carried out in compliance with HUD regulations appearing at Part 42 of this Title, as modified by the special policies contained in this section.

(b) *Preliminary notice of each tenant.* Not later than 30 days after the date of execution of the applicable Annual Contributions Contract, the PHA shall issue to each tenant a written communication which shall:

(1) State that the PHA intends to acquire the real property occupied by the tenant and has entered into a contract with HUD under which the funds necessary to acquire the property will be made available;

(2) Inform the tenant whether or not it appears that he will be required to relocate permanently as a result of the PHA's acquisition of the real property;

(3) State that the communication is not a notice to vacate the real property and that, if the tenant moves for any reason, except after being issued a notice of displacement as described in paragraph (d) of this section, he will not be considered a displaced person under the Uniform Act;

(4) Indicate that as soon as feasible, but not later than 10 days following the date of acquisition of the real property, the tenant will receive from the PHA an appropriate notice as specified under paragraph (c) or (d) of this section, as the case may be (the provisions of such notice or notices as are referred to shall be generally described in the communication);

(5) Generally describe the relocation payments and other assistance for which the tenant would be eligible, if displaced under the Uniform Act, including conditions of eligibility therefor; and

(6) Inform the tenant of the policies contained in paragraphs (d)(3), (d)(4)(ii) and (d)(4)(iiii) of this section.

(c) *Notice of right to continue in occupancy.* Not later than 10 days after the date of acquisition of the real property, the PHA shall furnish each tenant who will not be displaced a written notice of his right to continue in occupancy, which contains the following conditions:

(1) The tenant shall have the right to lease and occupy a decent, safe and sanitary dwelling which is either his current dwelling or another dwelling located within the same building or nearby building identified as part of the same project, for a period of at least four years beginning on the date of acquisition, or the date the dwelling is placed in decent, safe and sanitary condition, or the date of termination of any temporary relocation, whichever is later, for so long as he complies with the terms of his lease and the rules, regulations and procedures of the PHA. The PHA will assure that at the beginning of such 4-year period the dwelling is decent, safe and sanitary as determined under the housing quality standards set forth at Sec. 882.109 of this Title.

(2) The tenant's monthly housing cost for the first year of the 4-year period, including rental payment and estimated utilities costs, shall not exceed his average monthly housing cost for the 3 months immediately prior to acquisition, or longer period which the PHA determines will more accurately reflect the housing cost to the tenant. Thereafter, increases in the tenant's monthly rental cost shall not be imposed more than once a year and such rental cost shall not exceed that which the tenant would have paid if he had remained in the dwelling occupied prior to acquisition under the regulations effective for the program which subsidized his occupancy prior to acquisition.

(3) The tenant shall not be required to move from his dwelling unless the move is necessary to permit rehabilitation or demolition. If such move is required to be made, (i) not more than one temporary relocation by the tenant shall be required, (ii) the temporary relocation shall not exceed one year in duration, (iii) the PHA shall make available to the tenant for the temporary period decent, safe and sanitary housing meeting the standards of § 882.109, and (iv) the PHA shall pay actual reasonable expenses, including any moving costs or increase in rent, incurred by the tenant in connection with the temporary relocation.

(4) If the PHA fails to comply with any requirement to which it is committed in accordance with this notice, the tenant shall automatically be deemed to have been issued a notice of displacement as described in paragraph (d) of this section and to be entitled to relocation payments and other relocation assistance under HUD regulations at Part 42 of this Title, as modified by the special policies contained in this section.

(d) *Notice of displacement.* To be eligible as a displaced person for relocation payments and other assistance under the Uniform Act, the tenant must be issued scribed in this paragraph (d):

(1) *Timing of notice.* Not later than 10 days after the date of acquisition of the real property, the PHA shall issue to each tenant wno will be displaced a written notice of displacement. The notice shall be effective not later than the date of acquisition.

(2) *Contents of notice.* The notice shall state that if the tenant moves himself or his personal property from the real property on or after the effective date of the notice, he will be considered a displaced person under the Uniform Act and will be entitled to certain relocation payments and other assistance, which shall be generally described, including the maximum allowable dollar amount or range of each payment for which he will apparently be eligible, any conditions of eligibility, and the procedures for obtaining the payment. The basis of the computation of a replacement housing payment, as set forth in paragraph (e) of this section, shall also be fully described.

(3) *Tenant request for notice of displacement.* At any time after the execution of the ACC, a tenant believing that he will qualify as a displaced person under this section may request the PHA to issue him a notice of displacement. Within 30 days after receiving his request, the PHA shall consider the tenant's stated reasons for making the request and shall either issue a notice of displacement or a written statement denying the request and stating the reasons for denial.

(4) *Automatic notice of displacement.* A person shall be deemed to have been issued a notice of displacement, effective immediately or on the date of acquisition, whichever is earlier, if the PHA:

(i) Within 30 days after the date of execution of the ACC, fails to issue to the tenant the preliminary notice described in paragraph (b) of this section, except that subsequent issuance of a preliminary notice as described in paragraph (b) shall have the effect of cancelling the notice of displacement; or

(ii) Within 10 days after the date of acquisition of the property, fails to issue to the tenant either the written notice of displacement described in paragraph (d) of this section, or the written notice of the right to continue in occupancy described in paragraph (c) of this section; or

(iii) Fails to fully meet its commitments as set forth in the notice of the right to continue in occupancy as described in paragraph (c) of this section.

(e) *Computation of replacement housing payment.* If a tenant is displaced, the computation of any replacement housing payment for rental assistance under § 42.95(c)(1) of this Title shall be based upon the cost of renting a publicly owned or subsidized replacement dwelling, if available and offered to the displaced tenant, which meets all of the requirements of the term "comparable replacement dwelling" as defined in Sec. 42.20 (b) of this Title except the requirement at Sec. 42.20(b)(3) that it be "on the private market." The offer of an actual, available, comparable, subsidized or publicly owned unit must be documented in the relocation case file, if such unit is used for purposes of calculating the replacement housing payment.

(f) *Notice of determination not to acquire.* If, after execution of the ACC, the PHA determines not to acquire the property, the PHA shall serve a written notice on each tenant occupying the property. The notice shall state that the PHA has determined not to acquire the property and that any tenant moving from the property thereafter will not be eligible as a displaced person for relocation payments and assistance under the Uniform Act.

(g) *Manner of notices.* Any notice which the PHA is required to provide under this section shall be personally served, receipt documented, or sent by certified or registered first-class mail, return receipt requested.

(h) *Temporary relocation costs.* Actual reasonable expenses, including any costs for moving or any increase in rent, incurred in connection with any temporary relocation carried out in accordance with paragraph (c)(3) of this section shall be borne as a development cost of the project.

[It is hereby certified that the economic and inflationary impacts of this interim amendment have been carefully evaluated in accordance with OMB Circular A-107.]

Effective date: These regulations are effective June 9, 1976.

JOHN B. RHINELANDER,
Acting Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

[FR Doc.76-16490 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

federal register

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1976



PART III:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

■

EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERS' RELIEF PROGRAM

Title 24—Housing and Urban Development

CHAPTER XV—MORTGAGE INSURANCE AND LOAN PROGRAMS UNDER THE EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERS' RELIEF ACT, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. R-76-355]

PART 2700—EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERS' RELIEF PROGRAM

Direct Loans

On December 30, 1975, the Department of Housing and Urban Development published its final rule on the Emergency Homeowners' Relief Program (40 FR 59866). Subsequently, it received the Department of Justice's disapproval of the plan to have private attorneys handle collection-related litigation in the direct loan program. Accordingly, the Department is amending Supart E and Appendix 7 of Part 2700 to provide that collection-related litigation in the direct loan program will be handled by the Department of Justice. In addition, this amendment gives servicers in the direct loan program an option to purchase direct loans from the Secretary, upon default by the homeowner, so that the servicer can pursue its own collection litigation.

Inasmuch as this amendment reflects a policy position of the Department of Justice which is not subject to rule making procedures under 5 U.S.C. 553 and does no represent an independent policy determination by HUD subject to 24 CFR Part 10, comment and public procedures are not applicable and the amendment is being made effective upon publication.

A Finding of Inapplicability of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, has been made in accordance with procedures set forth in HUD Handbook 1390.1. That Finding of Inapplicability is available for public inspection during normal business hours in the office of the Rules Docket Clerk, Room 10141, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. Similarly, a Statement of Inapplicability of inflation impact statement procedures with respect to these regulation amendments is available for public inspection during normal business hours at the same office.

Thus, pursuant to authority contained in section 108(a) of the Emergency Homeowners' Relief Act, (12 U.S.C. 2707 (a)), Part 2700, Subparts E and F of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations are amended as follows:

1. In Subpart E—Direct Loans, § 2700.430 is revised to read as set forth below:

§ 2700.430 Collection.

(a) If a homeowner defaults on a direct loan, the servicer shall elect (1) to wait while the Department of Justice proceeds against the mortgage securing the loan or attempts to collect on the note, and then to make an accounting and payment to the Secretary, as provided in § 2700.435, or (2) to make an accounting and payment, as provided in § 2700.435, without waiting while the Department of Justice proceeds against the mortgage or note.

(b) If, pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, the servicer elects to make an accounting without waiting while the Department of Justice against the mortgage or note, the servicer, at the time of that accounting, will have the option of purchasing the loan and underlying mortgage for a price equal to 0.5 times the unpaid principal balance.

2. In Subpart E, § 2700.435 is revised to read as follows:

§ 2700.435 Payment to the Secretary.

(a) Before the expiration of the period of 90 days after the date of default, or such other time period as the Secretary approves, the servicer shall transmit to the Secretary on the last working day of the month the complete credit and collection file pertaining to the emergency loan.

(b) At the same time the servicer makes the transmittal as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, it shall share the loss on the loan by making a payment to the Secretary in an amount equal to 10 percent of the sum of: (1) the unpaid principal amount of the loan less the amount recovered; and (2) the uncollected interest earned up to the date of the final accounting. Accompanying that payment shall be a final accounting of the loan in the form specified in Subpart F, Appendix 7 of this part and the note and mortgage executed in connection with the emergency loan.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section, in the event that the aggregate loss borne by the Secretary reaches 40 percent of the aggregate amount advanced by the servicer on behalf of the Secretary under this subpart, the servicer shall bear the burden of any loss in excess of that 40 percent by making an appropriate payment to the Secretary within the time period specified in paragraph (a) of this section.

(d) If at the time of default or at any time subsequent to default, a person primarily or secondarily liable for the repayment of the loan is a "person in military service," as such term is defined in the Soldier's and Sailor's Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, the period he is in the military service and 3 months thereafter will be excluded in computing the time within which an accounting and payment are to be made pursuant to paragraph (a).

3. In Subpart F, Appendix 7 of Part 2700 is amended to read as follows:

Appendix 7 - Direct Loan Final Accounting

HUD FORM NO. EHRP—
April 1976

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING
EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERS' RELIEF PROGRAM

DIRECT LOAN FINAL ACCOUNTING

1. SERVICER'S NAME, ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE:

3. *(HUD USE ONLY)*
Transfer Number: _____

4. DATE OF DEFAULT:

5. DATE OF FORECLOSURE (If applicable):

2. MORTGAGEE REFERENCE NUMBER:

6. DATES OF MILITARY SERVICE (If applicable under 24 CFR, Section 2700.435(d))

7. HOMEOWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE:

8. PROPERTY LOCATION:

SCHEDULE I - COMPUTATION OF SERVICER'S SHARE OF LOSS OF LOAN

A. Unpaid Principal ..... $ _____
B. Less: Recoveries ..... _____
C. Net Amount ..... _____
D. Uncollected Interest ..... _____
E. Sum of Lines C and D ..... _____
F. 90 percent of Line E ..... _____
G. Servicer's Share of Loss (Line E minus Line F) ..... $ _____

SCHEDULE II - COMPUTATION OF CEILING ON LOSS BEARABLE BY HUD

A. Aggregate Losses Borne by HUD before this Claim ..... $ _____
B. 90% of Loss on Loan (Schedule I, Line F) _____
C. Sum of Lines A and B ..... _____
D. 40 % of Aggregate Amount of Funds Advanced; Pursuant to 24 CFR, Part 2700, Subpart E _____
E. Additional Servicer's Loss (Line C minus Line D) ..... $ _____ (Not to be below zero)

SCHEDULE III - OPTION TO PURCHASE

☐ I am exercising my option to purchase the loan.
☐ I am not exercising my option to purchase the loan.

Purchase Price (Line A, Schedule I x 0.5) ..... $ _____

SCHEDULE IV - COMPUTATION OF REMITTANCE DUE HUD

A. Servicer's Share of Loss on Loan (Schedule I, Line G) ..... $ _____
B. Additional Servicer's Loss (Schedule II, Line E) ..... _____
C. Purchase Price (Schedule III) ..... _____
D. Remittance due HUD (Total of Lines A, B and C) ..... $ _____

WARNING

Section 1001 of the U.S. Criminal Code (18 U. S. C.) provides in part; "Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department ... of the United States knowingly and willfully ... makes any false ... or fraudulent statements or representations ... shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned hereby certifies that to the best of his knowledge the amounts listed above comprise the complete basis of the final settlement on the direct loan for the property and homeowner identified above, and the information shown herein is true and correct and is documented to the extent required in the credit and collection file transmitted herewith.

_____ _____

Date *Signature and Title of Official of the Servicer*

NOTE.—It is hereby certified that the economic and inflationary impacts of this regulation have been carefully evaluated in accordance with OMB Circular A–107.

Effective Date. This regulation shall be deemed effective on June 9, 1976.

JOHN B. RHINELANDER,
Acting Secretary of
Housing and Urban Development.

[FR Doc.76–16645 Filed 6–8–76;8:45 am]

federal register

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1976



PART IV:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of Assistant Secretary for Housing Production and Mortgage Credit

■

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Prototype Cost Limits

Title 24—Housing and Urban Development

CHAPTER II—OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HOUSING PRODUCTION AND MORTGAGE CREDIT—FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER [FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION], DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. R-76-398]

PART 275—LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Prototype Cost Limits

On Tuesday, June 10, 1975, the Department published (40 FR 24818) prototype per unit cost schedules for low-rent public housing pursuant to Section 15(5) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937. Subsequent to initial publication, the schedules were revised whenever it was found that all or part of the costs for a given area were unworkable.

Section 15(5) of the Act further provides that the prototype costs be determined at least annually and specifies that the costs are not effective until published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Continuity of contract approvals, therefore, requires publication of these updated schedules for immediate effectiveness.

We believe also that the need for current prototype cost schedules outweighs, in this instance, the advantages of the customary notice of rulemaking and comment procedure, particularly since the updating of these costs is based not only upon information developed in HUD field offices but upon requests for changes submitted by the public as well. Although these schedules will be effective upon publication, timely written comments will nevertheless be considered in preparing revisions to cost limits for individual areas, such revisions to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on or before July 1, 1976, and at such time thereafter as the Department finds necessary. Comments with repect to cost limits for a given location should be filed with the Director, Office of Underwriting Standards, HUD Central Office, Room 6156, 451 7th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20410, and a copy should be sent to the local HUD Area Office. A list of these offices and their addresses follow:

REGION I

Connecticut, Hartford, 06105, 999 Asylum Ave.
Massachusetts, Boston, 02114, Bulfinch Bldg., 15 New Chardon St.
New Hampshire, Manchester, 03101, Davison Bldg., 1230 Elm St.

REGION II

New Jersey, Camden, 08103, The Parkdale Bldg., 519 Federal St.
New Jersey, Newark, 07102, 1 Raymond Plaza, Gateway Bldg.
New York, Buffalo, 14202, Grant Bldg., 560 Main St.
New York, New York, 10019, 666 Fifth Ave.
Puerto Rico, San Juan, 00936, P.O. Box 3869 GPO, 255 Ponce de Leon Ave., Hato Rey, P.R.

REGION III

District of Columbia, Washington, 20009, Universal North Bldg., 1875 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Maryland, Baltimore, 21201, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Mercantile Bank & Trust Bldg.
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 19106, Curtis Bldg., 625 Walnut St.
Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, 15212, 2 Allegheny Center.
Virginia, Richmond, 23219, 701 East Franklin St.

REGION IV

Alabama, Birmingham, 35233, Daniel Bldg., 15 South 20th St.
Florida, Jacksonville, 32204, Peninsular Plaza, 661 Riverside Ave.
Georgia, Atlanta, 30303, Peachtree Center Bldg., 230 Peachtree St., N.W.
Kentucky, Louisville, 40201, Children's Hospital Foundation Bldg., 601 South Floyd St.
Mississippi, Jackson, 39213, Jackson Mall, 300 Woodrow Wilson Ave., West.
North Carolina, Greensboro, 27408, 2309 West Cone Blvd., Northwest Plaza.
South Carolina, Columbia, 29202, 1801 Main St., Jefferson Sq.
Tennessee, Knoxville, 37919, 1 Northshore Bldg., 1111 Northshore Dr.

REGION V

Illinois, Chicago, 60602, 1 North Dearborn St.
Indiana, Indianapolis, 46205, 4720 Kingsway Drive.
Michigan, Detroit, 48226, 15th Fl., McNamara Bldg., 427 Michigan Ave.
Minnesota, Minneapolis-St. Paul, 55104, Griggs-Midway Bldg., 1821 University Ave., St. Paul, Minn.
Ohio, Columbus, 43215, 60 East Main St.
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 53203, 744 North Fourth St.,

REGION VI

Arkansas, Little Rock, 72201, Union National Bank Bldg., 1 Union National Plaza.
Louisiana, New Orleans, 70113, Plaza Tower, 1001 Howard Ave.
Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, 73102, 301 North Hudson St.
Texas, Dallas, 75201, 2001 Bryan Tower.
Texas, San Antonio, 78285, Kallison Bldg., 410 South Main Ave., P.O. Box 9163.

REGION VII

Kansas, Kansas City, 66101, 2 Gateway Center, Fourth and State Sts.
Missouri, St. Louis, 63101, 210 North 12th St.
Nebraska, Omaha, 68106, Univac Bldg., 7100 West Center Rd.

REGION VIII

Colorado, Denver, 80202, Title Bldg., 909 17th St.

REGION IX

California, Los Angeles, 90057, 2500 Wilshire Blvd.
California, San Francisco, 94111, 1 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1600.

REGION X

Oregon, Portland, 97204, 520 Southwest Sixth Ave., Cascade Bldg.
Washington, Seattle, 98101, Arcade Plaza Bldg., 1321 Second Ave.

The Department has determined that these changes do not have a substantial environmental impact. A finding of inapplicability has been filed with the Rules Docket Clerk, Room 10141, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., and is available for public inspection during regular business hours.

Accordingly, the appendix to Part 275 is revised as follows:

APPENDIX

PROTOTYPE COST LIMITS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

(Sec. 209 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, P.L. 91-609, Sec. 15(5) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, 50 Stat. 888, 42 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.; Sec. 7(d) of the Department of HUD Act, 42 U.S.C. 3535(d); and Secretary's delegation of authority, published at 36 FR 5007, Mar. 16, 1971).

A. Unit prototype cost.—1. Prototype cost comprises the cost of dwelling structures, account No. 1460, and dwelling equipment, account No. 1465, as described in "Low-Rent Housing Accounting Handbook 7510.1," Chapter 3, Section 15, which include their pro rata share of the builder's fee and overhead, insurance, social security, sales tax, and bonds.

2. Prototype cost does not include the costs of site acquisition, site improvement, nondwelling structures or spaces (and equipment), planning (architectural-engineering fees, permit fees, inspection, and similar costs), relocation, interest or local authority administrative costs, all of which are described in "Low-Rent Housing Accounting Handbook 7510.1," Chapter 3, Section 15.

3. Prototype cost takes into account compliance with applicable HUD Minimum Property Standards and planning and design criteria described in HUD Handbook 7410.1, Chapter 3. Current copies of HUD Handbooks are maintained and available for public inspection in the Office of Public Information, Room 1104, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20410, and in each of the Department's Regional, Area and FHA Insuring Offices.

4. Prototype cost takes into account the extra durability required for economical maintenance of assisted housing and the provision of amenities designed to guarantee safe and healthy family life and neighborhood environment.

B. Project prototype costs.—1. The project prototype cost is the sum of the unit prototype costs for the dwellings of various sizes and types comprising the project. The total cost of dwelling construction and equipment (accounts 1460 and 1465), and the related proportionate share of the contingency established by any development cost budget shall not exceed the sum of 105 percent of the project prototype costs for the dwellings to be constructed.

2. A request for approval of a cost which exceeds the 105 percent cost limitation but which is not in excess of the statutory 110 percent may be submitted to the Regional Administrator. Such requests must be supported by a detailed justification with respect to the particular project, taking into account all of the circumstances involved and demonstrating that such approval is necessary and desirable in carrying out the objectives of the Act.

3. If it is found at any time between annual updates that all or part of the current prototype costs for an area office jurisdiction are unworkable, the procedures outlined in HUD Handbooks 7410.1 and 7410.2 (1-74) will be followed for requesting revisions.

4. Development cost budgets, awards of main construction—contracts, preliminary contracts of sale, and contracts of sale for turnkey projects will not be approved unless an appropriate prototype cost for the area is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Effective date: This regulation shall be effective June 9, 1976.

It is hereby certified that the economic and inflationary impacts of this regulation have been carefully evaluated in accordance with OMB Circular A-107.

WILLIAM L. WARFIELD,
Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Housing Production and Mortgage Credit.

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION I							
CONNECTICUT							
HARTFORD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,800	17,700	19,450	23,350	28,100	31,250	32,700
ROW DWELLINGS	13,650	16,250	18,150	21,600	25,900	28,900	30,250
WALKUP	13,300	16,400	18,500	22,100	25,450	28,000	29,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,400	23,650	30,050	------	------	------	------
DANBURY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,400	18,450	20,350	24,400	29,300	32,550	34,150
ROW DWELLINGS	14,250	17,000	18,950	22,500	27,100	30,150	31,550
WALKUP	13,050	16,050	18,250	21,550	24,850	27,550	28,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,950	23,250	29,400	------	------	------	------
NEW MILFORD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,100	16,850	18,650	22,300	26,850	29,850	31,250
ROW DWELLINGS	13,050	15,550	17,300	20,650	24,800	27,650	28,850
WALKUP	12,700	15,650	17,800	21,050	24,200	26,850	28,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,000	23,250	29,400	------	------	------	------
NEW HAVEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,100	16,900	18,600	22,300	26,900	29,900	31,250
ROW DWELLINGS	13,000	15,550	17,300	20,650	24,800	27,650	28,900
WALKUP	12,700	15,650	17,700	21,150	24,350	26,850	28,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,850	21,900	27,800	------	------	------	------
BRIDGEPORT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,100	16,850	18,650	22,300	26,850	29,850	31,250
ROW DWELLINGS	13,050	15,550	17,300	20,650	24,800	27,650	28,850
WALKUP	12,350	15,250	17,300	20,450	23,650	26,150	27,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,050	21,000	26,550	------	------	------	------
NEW LONDON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,300	19,100	22,750	27,600	30,650	32,000
ROW DWELLINGS	13,250	15,900	17,750	21,150	25,400	28,350	29,650
WALKUP	12,300	14,550	16,500	19,600	22,650	25,000	26,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,750	22,950	29,250	------	------	------	------
WINDHAM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,300	19,100	22,750	27,600	30,650	32,000
ROW DWELLINGS	13,250	15,900	17,750	21,150	25,400	28,350	29,650
WALKUP	13,500	15,950	18,100	21,500	24,850	27,450	28,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,450	22,600	28,700	------	------	------	------
STAMFORD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	17,700	21,200	23,400	28,000	33,850	37,450	39,300
ROW DWELLINGS	16,300	19,500	21,750	25,850	31,150	34,750	36,300
WALKUP	15,900	19,650	22,250	26,400	30,550	33,650	35,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,400	22,550	28,600	------	------	------	------
RIDGEFIELD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	17,700	21,200	23,400	28,000	33,850	37,450	39,300
ROW DWELLINGS	16,300	19,500	21,750	25,850	31,150	34,750	36,300
WALKUP	15,900	19,650	22,250	26,400	30,550	33,650	35,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	21,750	25,250	32,100	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION I--CONTINUED							
CONNECTICUT--CONTINUED							
NORWICH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,150	17,050	18,800	22,450	27,050	30,050	31,500
ROW DWELLINGS	13,100	15,650	17,500	20,750	24,900	27,850	29,000
WALKUP	12,800	15,700	17,850	21,200	24,400	26,950	28,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,750	22,950	29,250	------	------	------	------
MAINE:							
BANGOR:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,650	16,300	17,200	20,500	24,700	27,400	28,600
ROW DWELLINGS	13,250	15,800	17,550	20,950	25,200	28,000	29,300
WALKUP	11,250	13,900	15,850	18,650	21,700	23,850	25,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,250	18,950	23,950	------	------	------	------
AUGUSTA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,050	16,700	18,500	22,200	26,650	29,650	30,950
ROW DWELLINGS	13,650	16,250	18,100	21,650	26,000	28,950	30,200
WALKUP	11,600	14,350	16,400	19,300	22,400	24,650	25,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,850	19,600	24,750	------	------	------	------
BRUNSWICK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,950	16,600	18,350	21,950	26,450	29,350	30,750
ROW DWELLINGS	13,500	16,100	17,950	21,450	25,800	28,600	29,950
WALKUP	11,450	14,150	16,250	19,150	22,200	24,300	25,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,350	24,450	------	------	------	------
CALAIS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,950	17,800	19,700	23,500	28,350	31,550	33,000
ROW DWELLINGS	14,250	17,300	19,250	23,050	27,700	30,700	32,150
WALKUP	12,350	15,200	17,400	20,550	23,850	26,100	27,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,800	20,750	26,150	------	------	------	------
LEWISTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,950	16,600	18,350	21,950	26,450	29,350	30,750
ROW DWELLINGS	13,500	16,100	17,950	21,450	25,800	28,600	29,950
WALKUP	11,450	14,150	16,250	19,150	22,200	24,300	25,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,350	24,450	------	------	------	------
PORTLAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,950	16,600	18,350	21,950	26,450	29,350	30,750
ROW DWELLINGS	13,500	16,100	17,950	21,450	25,800	28,600	29,950
WALKUP	11,650	14,400	16,450	19,400	22,550	24,750	26,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,750	19,450	24,600	------	------	------	------
WATERVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,500	16,050	17,750	21,300	25,600	28,400	29,700
ROW DWELLINGS	13,150	15,650	17,350	20,750	25,000	27,750	29,000
WALKUP	11,100	13,800	15,700	18,500	21,450	23,600	24,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,050	18,750	23,650	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION I--CONTINUED							
MASSACHUSETTS							
BOSTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,150	18,000	19,900	23,850	28,650	31,850	33,350
ROW DWELLINGS	14,950	17,850	19,850	23,650	28,550	31,750	33,150
WALKUP	16,000	19,150	21,200	25,350	30,550	33,850	35,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,000	23,250	29,450	------	------	------	------
CAPE COD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,200	19,000	22,750	27,450	30,350	31,850
ROW DWELLINGS	13,900	16,500	18,450	21,950	26,450	29,450	30,750
WALKUP	14,750	17,600	19,700	23,350	28,300	31,450	32,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,050	22,200	28,050	------	------	------	------
PITTSFIELD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,300	17,050	18,900	22,600	27,150	30,150	31,600
ROW DWELLINGS	14,150	16,850	18,800	22,350	26,950	29,950	31,250
WALKUP	15,200	18,000	20,050	23,850	28,800	32,000	33,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,100	21,000	26,700	------	------	------	------
SPRINGFIELD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,300	17,050	18,850	22,650	27,200	30,250	31,700
ROW DWELLINGS	13,800	16,450	18,250	21,850	26,250	29,200	30,450
WALKUP	14,300	17,050	18,800	22,600	27,200	30,200	31,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,000	23,350	29,400	------	------	------	------
WORCESTER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,550	17,300	19,200	22,900	27,650	30,700	32,150
ROW DWELLINGS	14,450	17,250	19,150	22,800	27,500	30,550	31,900
WALKUP	14,950	18,000	20,000	23,700	28,650	31,800	33,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,450	22,750	28,700	------	------	------	------
FALL RIVER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,150	16,900	18,750	22,350	26,950	29,950	31,300
ROW DWELLINGS	13,200	15,700	17,550	20,900	25,100	27,950	29,200
WALKUP	14,800	17,450	19,600	23,350	28,250	31,400	32,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,700	21,750	27,550	------	------	------	------
LOWELL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,750	17,650	19,600	23,400	28,150	31,250	32,800
ROW DWELLINGS	14,400	17,100	18,950	22,650	27,200	30,300	31,650
WALKUP	15,300	18,150	20,150	24,100	28,950	32,250	33,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,500	22,800	28,800	------	------	------	------
SALEM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,400	17,150	18,950	22,700	27,350	30,300	31,800
ROW DWELLINGS	13,900	16,500	18,400	21,900	26,350	29,350	30,650
WALKUP	14,750	17,650	19,650	23,500	28,300	31,450	32,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,600	21,700	27,400	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION I--CONTINUED							
NEW HAMPSHIRE							
MANCHESTER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,400	17,900	19,750	23,700	28,400	31,600	33,250
ROW DWELLINGS	14,250	17,200	19,050	22,600	27,200	30,350	31,650
WALKUP	14,150	17,550	19,950	23,600	27,350	30,000	31,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,750	23,000	29,000	------	------	------	------
CONCORD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,500	19,250	21,250	25,350	30,450	33,900	35,600
ROW DWELLINGS	15,200	18,300	20,350	24,150	29,150	32,400	33,800
WALKUP	14,700	18,300	20,800	24,600	28,500	31,250	32,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	21,100	24,650	31,100	------	------	------	------
DOVER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,000	17,250	19,150	22,850	27,400	30,550	32,050
ROW DWELLINGS	13,800	16,550	18,450	21,850	26,300	29,300	30,600
WALKUP	13,650	16,850	19,250	22,750	28,450	31,700	32,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,050	22,100	27,950	------	------	------	------
KEENE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,800	18,350	20,250	24,250	29,050	32,300	34,000
ROW DWELLINGS	14,550	17,550	19,500	23,200	27,900	31,200	32,450
WALKUP	14,450	17,900	20,350	24,250	28,000	30,700	32,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,500	23,500	29,700	------	------	------	------
NASHUA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,400	17,900	19,750	23,700	28,400	31,600	33,250
ROW DWELLINGS	14,250	17,200	19,050	22,600	27,200	30,350	31,650
WALKUP	14,550	17,950	20,550	24,250	28,050	30,900	32,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,750	23,000	28,950	------	------	------	------
PORTSMOUTH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,150	18,700	20,700	24,800	29,800	33,150	34,800
ROW DWELLINGS	14,950	17,950	20,000	23,750	28,500	31,700	33,200
WALKUP	12,700	15,750	17,950	21,250	24,550	26,950	28,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,650	24,000	30,400	------	------	------	------
RHODE ISLAND							
PROVIDENCE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,000	18,050	20,000	23,800	28,750	31,900	33,350
ROW DWELLINGS	14,450	17,050	19,050	22,750	27,350	30,400	31,800
WALKUP	14,250	16,900	18,900	22,550	27,200	30,200	31,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,650	24,050	30,250	------	------	------	------
NEWPORT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,150	18,150	20,100	24,100	28,950	32,150	33,600
ROW DWELLINGS	14,550	17,150	19,200	22,900	27,700	30,700	32,150
WALKUP	14,450	17,050	19,050	22,800	27,400	30,450	32,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,800	24,350	30,650	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION I--CONTINUED							
RHODE ISLAND--CONTINUED							
WESTERLY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,150	18,150	20,100	24,100	28,950	32,150	33,600
ROW DWELLINGS	14,550	17,150	19,200	22,900	27,700	30,700	32,150
WALKUP	14,500	17,150	19,150	22,950	27,700	30,700	32,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,800	24,350	30,650	------	------	------	------
PAWTUCKET:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,000	18,050	20,000	23,800	28,750	31,900	33,350
ROW DWELLINGS	14,450	17,050	19,050	22,750	27,350	30,400	31,800
WALKUP	14,250	16,900	18,900	22,550	27,200	30,200	31,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,600	24,000	30,200	------	------	------	------
WOONSOCKET:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,850	17,750	19,750	23,600	28,400	31,450	32,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,150	16,900	18,800	22,500	27,050	30,050	31,450
WALKUP	14,050	16,800	18,550	22,150	26,900	29,950	31,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,150	23,500	29,600	------	------	------	------
VERMONT							
BURLINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,200	18,250	20,150	24,050	28,950	32,200	33,700
ROW DWELLINGS	15,150	17,950	20,000	23,800	28,500	31,850	33,350
WALKUP	13,400	16,450	18,850	22,300	25,750	28,450	29,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,600	20,450	25,950	------	------	------	------
BENNINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,200	18,250	20,150	24,050	28,950	32,200	33,700
ROW DWELLINGS	15,150	17,950	20,000	23,800	28,500	31,850	33,350
WALKUP	13,400	16,450	18,850	22,300	25,750	28,450	29,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,600	20,450	25,950	------	------	------	------
BRATTLEBORO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,200	18,250	20,150	24,050	28,950	32,200	33,700
ROW DWELLINGS	15,150	17,950	20,000	23,800	28,500	31,850	33,350
WALKUP	13,400	16,450	18,850	22,300	25,750	28,450	29,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,600	20,450	25,950	------	------	------	------
MONTPELIER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,850	17,700	19,650	23,350	28,100	31,250	32,750
ROW DWELLINGS	14,650	17,450	19,400	23,050	27,650	30,900	32,350
WALKUP	13,050	16,050	18,300	21,700	24,950	27,600	28,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,600	20,450	25,950	------	------	------	------
RUTLAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,050	17,900	19,800	23,800	28,450	31,750	33,200
ROW DWELLINGS	14,900	17,700	19,650	23,350	28,000	31,350	32,700
WALKUP	13,200	16,150	18,450	21,950	25,300	27,900	29,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,500	20,350	25,700	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION II							
NEW JERSEY							
CAMDEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,750	17,750	19,650	23,400	28,300	31,400	32,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,050	16,800	18,600	22,200	26,550	29,700	31,000
WALKUP	12,650	15,650	17,850	21,100	24,550	26,950	28,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,050	21,000	26,600	------	------	------	------
ATLANTIC CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,750	17,700	19,600	23,350	28,200	31,300	32,850
ROW DWELLINGS	14,100	16,900	18,750	22,300	26,700	29,950	31,150
WALKUP	11,750	14,600	16,600	19,600	22,750	25,050	26,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,200	20,000	25,350	------	------	------	------
BURLINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,800	17,800	19,750	23,450	28,350	31,450	33,050
ROW DWELLINGS	14,100	16,850	18,750	22,250	26,600	29,750	31,050
WALKUP	12,950	16,000	18,150	21,450	24,900	27,350	28,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,100	21,150	26,750	------	------	------	------
GLOUCESTER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,750	17,750	19,650	23,400	28,300	31,400	32,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,050	16,800	18,600	22,200	26,550	29,700	31,000
WALKUP	12,250	15,200	17,200	20,350	23,650	26,050	27,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,050	21,000	26,600	------	------	------	------
TRENTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,150	18,000	20,050	23,900	28,800	32,000	33,600
ROW DWELLINGS	14,350	17,050	19,050	22,600	27,100	30,250	31,650
WALKUP	13,000	16,050	18,150	21,600	24,950	27,400	28,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,900	23,050	29,200	------	------	------	------
VINELAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,350	19,550	21,700	25,850	31,200	34,700	36,350
ROW DWELLINGS	15,450	18,550	20,550	24,500	29,300	32,700	34,200
WALKUP	13,050	16,200	18,450	21,750	25,100	27,750	29,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,650	21,650	27,450	------	------	------	------
NEWARK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,150	19,100	22,800	27,400	30,400	31,850
ROW DWELLINGS	13,800	16,400	18,200	21,600	26,050	29,050	30,350
WALKUP	13,650	17,000	19,350	22,900	26,550	29,200	30,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,550	23,900	30,200	------	------	------	------
ASBURY PARK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,150	19,100	22,800	27,400	30,400	31,850
ROW DWELLINGS	13,800	16,400	18,200	21,600	26,050	29,050	30,350
WALKUP	13,400	16,650	18,950	22,450	26,050	28,650	30,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,700	22,900	28,900	------	------	------	------
NORTH BERGEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,150	19,100	22,800	27,400	30,400	31,850
ROW DWELLINGS	13,800	16,400	18,200	21,600	26,050	29,050	30,350
WALKUP	14,000	17,350	19,750	23,400	27,200	29,900	31,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,200	23,500	29,700	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION II--CONTINUED							
NEW JERSEY--CONTINUED							
FREEHOLD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,150	19,100	22,800	27,400	30,400	31,850
ROW DWELLINGS	13,800	16,400	18,200	21,600	26,050	29,050	30,350
WALKUP	13,350	16,650	18,900	22,400	26,000	28,600	30,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,700	22,900	28,900	------	------	------	------
NEW YORK							
ALBANY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,500	18,500	20,400	24,350	29,500	32,650	34,300
ROW DWELLINGS	14,550	17,550	19,550	23,250	27,950	31,150	32,600
WALKUP	15,150	18,850	21,400	25,400	29,400	32,300	34,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,100	23,250	29,600	------	------	------	------
GLEN FALLS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,000	16,750	18,600	22,150	26,600	29,600	31,100
ROW DWELLINGS	13,400	16,000	17,750	21,100	25,350	28,300	29,550
WALKUP	14,550	17,850	20,400	24,150	28,050	30,750	32,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,000	22,250	28,150	------	------	------	------
MASSENA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,850	17,800	19,650	23,450	28,250	31,350	33,000
ROW DWELLINGS	14,200	16,950	18,850	22,400	26,850	29,950	31,350
WALKUP	14,650	18,150	20,550	24,400	28,250	31,000	32,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,350	22,400	28,400	------	------	------	------
PLATTSBURGH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,700	17,550	19,500	23,250	28,050	31,100	32,650
ROW DWELLINGS	14,100	16,800	18,650	22,200	26,600	29,700	31,000
WALKUP	14,550	17,850	20,400	24,150	28,050	30,750	32,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,000	22,250	28,150	------	------	------	------
SYRACUSE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,600	18,650	20,500	24,550	29,700	32,950	34,500
ROW DWELLINGS	14,900	17,750	19,700	23,450	28,150	31,450	32,900
WALKUP	15,350	18,950	21,500	25,600	29,650	32,500	34,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,100	23,350	29,600	------	------	------	------
POUGHKEEPSIE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,950	19,050	21,100	25,200	30,400	33,750	35,350
ROW DWELLINGS	15,350	18,100	20,200	24,050	28,900	32,250	33,700
WALKUP	15,750	19,550	22,200	26,350	30,450	33,500	35,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,750	24,050	30,500	------	------	------	------
WATERTOWN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,400	18,300	20,300	24,200	29,150	32,400	33,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,650	17,450	19,450	23,050	27,700	30,900	32,350
WALKUP	15,050	18,700	21,300	25,150	29,200	31,950	33,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,800	22,950	29,100	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION II--CONTINUED							
NEW YORK--CONTINUED							
SCHENECTADY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,500	18,500	20,400	24,350	29,500	32,650	34,300
ROW DWELLINGS	14,550	17,550	19,550	23,250	27,950	31,150	32,600
WALKUP	15,150	18,850	21,400	25,400	29,400	32,300	34,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,100	23,250	29,600	------	------	------	------
BINGHAMTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,450	18,300	20,350	24,300	29,300	32,550	34,150
ROW DWELLINGS	15,050	18,000	19,950	23,700	28,500	31,850	33,250
WALKUP	15,100	18,750	21,300	25,200	29,250	32,000	33,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,150	23,400	29,650	------	------	------	------
ITHACA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,350	18,200	20,250	24,150	29,050	32,300	33,800
ROW DWELLINGS	14,950	17,850	19,800	23,550	28,250	31,550	32,950
WALKUP	15,000	18,650	21,050	25,050	29,150	31,900	33,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,750	22,900	29,050	------	------	------	------
BUFFALO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,700	18,750	20,850	24,850	29,900	33,250	34,850
ROW DWELLINGS	15,400	18,400	20,400	24,300	29,150	32,600	33,950
WALKUP	13,800	16,950	19,250	22,800	26,400	29,000	30,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,150	23,500	29,550	------	------	------	------
ROCHESTER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,300	18,300	20,250	24,200	29,250	32,350	33,950
ROW DWELLINGS	15,000	17,950	20,000	23,650	28,450	31,700	33,150
WALKUP	13,350	16,450	18,700	22,200	25,700	28,250	29,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,700	22,950	28,900	------	------	------	------
JAMESTOWN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,250	18,200	20,200	24,150	29,050	32,300	33,850
ROW DWELLINGS	14,900	17,900	19,800	23,500	28,300	31,650	32,950
WALKUP	13,350	16,450	18,700	22,200	25,700	28,250	29,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,550	22,750	28,750	------	------	------	------
ELMIRA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,300	19,500	21,700	25,850	31,150	34,550	36,250
ROW DWELLINGS	16,000	19,200	21,250	25,200	30,300	33,850	35,300
WALKUP	14,350	17,650	20,000	23,750	27,450	30,250	31,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,950	24,400	30,800	------	------	------	------
NEW YORK CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,350	19,600	21,700	25,950	31,200	34,700	36,350
ROW DWELLINGS	15,700	18,700	20,750	24,700	29,650	33,000	34,600
WALKUP	17,050	21,150	23,950	28,400	32,900	36,150	38,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	29,600	34,200	38,900	46,650	54,100	57,550	------
NASSAU COUNTY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	17,600	21,050	23,500	27,900	33,700	37,350	39,150
ROW DWELLINGS	16,950	20,150	22,400	26,550	31,900	35,550	37,200
WALKUP	20,100	24,900	28,250	33,400	38,700	42,600	44,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	24,850	28,700	32,650	39,200	45,400	48,400	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION II--CONTINUED							
NEW YORK--CONTINUED							
PUTNAM COUNTY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,300	18,300	20,250	24,250	29,200	32,350	33,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,700	17,450	19,350	23,000	27,650	30,850	32,250
WALKUP	17,450	21,550	24,450	29,000	33,550	36,900	40,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	22,650	26,150	29,750	35,700	41,350	44,100	------
SUFFOLK COUNTY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,550	19,800	21,950	26,200	31,550	35,000	36,700
ROW DWELLINGS	15,900	18,850	21,000	24,950	29,900	33,350	34,900
WALKUP	18,850	23,300	26,550	31,350	36,300	40,000	42,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	23,150	26,800	30,450	36,500	42,350	45,050	------
WESTCHESTER COUNTY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,950	19,100	21,100	25,300	29,900	33,800	35,450
ROW DWELLINGS	15,300	18,200	20,200	24,100	28,850	32,200	33,800
WALKUP	18,150	22,500	25,450	30,150	35,000	38,550	40,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	22,350	25,800	29,400	35,200	40,800	43,450	------
ORANGE CO.:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,350	19,550	21,650	25,900	31,150	34,550	36,200
ROW DWELLINGS	15,650	18,600	20,700	24,550	29,550	32,900	34,450
WALKUP	18,550	23,050	26,150	31,000	35,850	39,500	41,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	24,250	27,950	31,700	38,100	44,250	47,100	------
ROCKLAND COUNTY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,200	19,350	21,500	25,650	30,900	34,350	36,000
ROW DWELLINGS	15,500	18,500	20,550	24,400	29,300	32,700	34,250
WALKUP	18,450	22,850	25,950	30,700	35,650	39,150	41,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	23,750	27,450	31,150	37,400	43,400	46,150	------
PUERTO RICO							
SAN JUAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,800	16,500	18,300	21,850	26,350	29,200	30,700
ROW DWELLINGS	13,200	15,800	17,600	20,700	25,000	27,800	29,150
WALKUP	12,650	15,650	17,750	21,100	24,400	26,850	28,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,200	16,650	21,050	23,400	25,700	------	------
OLD SAN JUAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,500	19,800	21,900	26,200	31,600	35,050	36,800
ROW DWELLINGS	15,850	18,950	21,100	24,900	30,050	33,400	35,000
WALKUP	15,200	18,700	21,300	25,300	29,250	32,250	34,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,050	19,950	25,250	28,100	30,850	------	------
PONCE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,850	16,600	18,350	21,950	26,400	29,250	30,750
ROW DWELLINGS	13,250	15,900	17,650	20,750	25,100	27,850	29,200
WALKUP	12,750	15,700	17,850	21,100	24,500	26,900	28,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,350	16,700	21,150	23,500	25,800	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION II--CONTINUED							
PUERTO RICO--CONTINUED							
MAYAGUEZ:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,850	16,600	18,350	21,950	26,400	29,250	30,750
ROW DWELLINGS	13,250	15,900	17,650	20,750	25,100	27,850	29,200
WALKUP	12,750	15,700	17,850	21,100	24,500	26,900	28,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,350	16,700	21,150	23,500	25,800	------	------
ARECIBO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,850	16,600	18,350	21,950	26,400	29,250	30,750
ROW DWELLINGS	13,250	15,900	17,650	20,750	25,100	27,850	29,200
WALKUP	12,750	15,700	17,850	21,100	24,500	26,900	28,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,350	16,700	21,150	23,500	25,800	------	------
VIRGIN ISLANDS							
ST. THOMAS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,900	20,250	22,400	26,800	32,250	35,800	37,550
ROW DWELLINGS	16,200	19,300	21,400	25,500	30,600	34,100	35,700
WALKUP	15,750	19,250	21,950	26,000	30,200	33,150	34,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,850	23,900	26,550	29,200	------	------
ST. CROIX:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,450	19,650	21,850	26,200	31,400	34,900	36,550
ROW DWELLINGS	15,850	18,900	21,000	24,900	29,900	33,350	34,850
WALKUP	15,150	18,650	21,200	25,100	29,150	32,100	33,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,800	18,400	23,300	25,950	28,500	------	------
REGION III							
DELAWARE							
WILMINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,900	15,550	17,200	20,500	24,650	27,500	28,800
ROW DWELLINGS	12,400	14,800	16,300	19,500	23,550	26,100	27,400
WALKUP	11,100	13,600	15,450	18,450	21,400	23,350	24,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,300	21,250	27,100	------	------	------	------
DOVER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,950	15,700	17,300	20,650	24,800	27,650	28,950
ROW DWELLINGS	12,450	14,900	16,500	19,600	23,750	26,250	27,550
WALKUP	11,150	13,750	15,600	18,550	21,500	23,600	24,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,450	21,450	27,250	------	------	------	------
WASHINGTON, D.C.							
WASHINGTON, D.C.:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,350	18,350	20,250	24,250	29,200	32,500	33,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,600	17,500	19,350	23,050	27,800	30,950	32,250
WALKUP	12,250	15,050	17,350	20,300	23,600	26,050	27,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,550	19,100	24,250	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION III--CONTINUED							
MARYLAND							
BALTIMORE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,100	15,750	17,450	20,800	24,950	27,950	29,150
ROW DWELLINGS	12,550	15,100	16,650	19,900	23,900	26,550	27,850
WALKUP	11,150	13,800	15,650	18,550	21,550	23,650	24,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,800	20,700	26,250	------	------	------	------
ABERDEEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,950	15,500	17,250	20,550	24,650	27,550	28,750
ROW DWELLINGS	12,400	14,850	16,400	19,650	23,550	26,200	27,450
WALKUP	10,950	13,500	15,350	18,150	21,050	23,150	24,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,800	20,700	26,250	------	------	------	------
HAGERSTOWN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,700	16,350	18,150	21,700	26,050	29,100	30,350
ROW DWELLINGS	13,050	15,650	17,350	20,700	24,850	27,600	28,950
WALKUP	11,700	14,500	16,400	19,500	22,600	24,800	26,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,350	20,150	25,500	------	------	------	------
SALISBURY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,900	15,500	17,150	20,450	24,600	27,450	28,650
ROW DWELLINGS	12,400	14,750	16,350	19,550	23,500	26,150	27,350
WALKUP	11,250	13,950	15,800	18,800	21,750	23,900	25,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,050	21,000	26,550	------	------	------	------
ANNAPOLIS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,500	14,900	16,550	19,800	23,800	26,550	27,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,900	14,350	15,800	18,900	22,650	25,300	26,450
WALKUP	10,750	13,300	15,150	17,850	20,700	22,750	23,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,100	20,000	25,250	------	------	------	------
CAMBRIDGE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,150	14,600	16,150	19,250	23,150	25,850	27,000
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	13,900	15,400	18,400	22,100	24,650	25,750
WALKUP	10,100	12,450	14,050	16,750	19,400	21,300	22,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,200	20,000	25,300	------	------	------	------
CUMBERLAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,400	14,850	16,400	19,650	23,550	26,400	27,500
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,200	15,650	18,800	22,550	25,100	26,250
WALKUP	10,550	13,050	14,750	17,550	20,300	22,300	23,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,800	19,550	24,800	------	------	------	------
FREDERICK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,650	15,250	16,900	20,150	24,200	27,100	28,200
ROW DWELLINGS	12,200	14,550	16,150	19,250	23,150	25,750	26,950
WALKUP	10,850	13,350	15,200	18,050	20,800	22,850	24,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,350	20,150	25,500	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION III--CONTINUED							
PENNSYLVANIA							
PHILADELPHIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,000	18,150	19,700	23,900	28,700	32,000	33,400
ROW DWELLINGS	14,400	17,300	19,100	22,750	27,350	30,500	31,700
WALKUP	12,300	15,250	17,300	20,450	23,750	26,150	27,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,150	19,950	25,300	------	------	------	------
ALLENTOWN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,600	17,550	19,350	23,150	27,800	31,000	32,400
ROW DWELLINGS	13,950	16,800	18,500	22,050	26,500	29,550	30,750
WALKUP	11,950	14,800	16,800	19,850	22,950	25,350	26,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,150	18,700	23,700	------	------	------	------
BELLEFONTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,300	18,450	20,400	24,300	29,150	32,600	34,050
ROW DWELLINGS	14,650	17,650	19,500	23,200	27,850	31,100	32,300
WALKUP	12,600	15,550	17,650	20,800	24,200	26,650	27,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,100	19,750	25,150	------	------	------	------
WELLSBORO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,300	19,500	21,700	25,850	31,150	34,550	36,250
ROW DWELLINGS	16,000	19,200	21,250	25,200	30,300	33,850	35,300
WALKUP	14,350	17,650	20,000	23,750	27,450	30,250	31,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,950	24,400	30,800	------	------	------	------
HARRISBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,650	17,700	19,550	23,300	28,000	31,250	32,600
ROW DWELLINGS	14,050	16,850	18,600	22,150	26,650	29,750	30,950
WALKUP	12,000	14,850	16,850	19,950	23,200	25,500	26,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,350	19,000	24,100	------	------	------	------
LANCASTER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,250	17,250	19,000	22,650	27,300	30,450	31,800
ROW DWELLINGS	13,700	16,450	18,150	21,650	26,050	29,000	30,150
WALKUP	11,700	14,450	16,450	19,500	22,600	24,900	26,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,150	18,700	23,700	------	------	------	------
YORK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,250	17,250	19,000	22,650	27,300	30,450	31,800
ROW DWELLINGS	13,700	16,450	18,150	21,650	26,050	29,000	30,150
WALKUP	11,700	14,450	16,450	19,500	22,600	24,900	26,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,150	18,700	23,700	------	------	------	------
POTTSTOWN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,250	17,250	19,000	22,650	27,300	30,450	31,800
ROW DWELLINGS	13,700	16,450	18,150	21,650	26,050	29,000	30,150
WALKUP	11,700	14,450	16,450	19,500	22,600	24,900	26,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,150	18,700	23,700	------	------	------	------
READING:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,250	17,250	19,000	22,650	27,300	30,450	31,800
ROW DWELLINGS	13,700	16,450	18,150	21,650	26,050	29,000	30,150
WALKUP	11,900	14,700	16,800	19,800	22,950	25,300	26,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,150	18,700	23,700	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION III--CONTINUED							
PENNSYLVANIA--CONTINUED							
SCRANTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,450	19,200	22,900	27,550	30,750	32,050
ROW DWELLINGS	13,850	16,600	18,300	21,850	26,250	29,300	30,450
WALKUP	11,100	13,700	15,600	18,450	21,400	23,600	24,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,200	19,950	25,350	------	------	------	------
BETHLEHEM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,900	16,750	18,450	22,050	26,450	29,550	30,750
ROW DWELLINGS	13,350	16,000	17,550	21,000	25,300	28,100	29,150
WALKUP	11,300	14,100	15,950	18,900	21,900	24,000	25,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,400	19,100	24,200	------	------	------	------
PITTSBURGH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,800	17,700	19,600	23,300	28,050	31,250	32,650
ROW DWELLINGS	14,100	16,900	18,550	22,200	26,700	29,800	31,000
WALKUP	12,850	16,000	18,200	21,600	25,000	27,550	28,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,050	21,050	26,600	------	------	------	------
ALTOONA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,150	16,950	18,800	22,350	26,800	29,900	31,250
ROW DWELLINGS	13,450	16,250	17,800	21,300	25,600	28,500	29,800
WALKUP	12,400	15,300	17,550	20,750	23,950	26,400	27,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,900	19,650	24,800	------	------	------	------
ERIE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,650	17,550	19,450	23,150	27,850	31,000	32,400
ROW DWELLINGS	14,000	16,750	18,450	21,900	26,450	29,550	30,750
WALKUP	12,350	15,250	17,450	20,550	23,850	26,300	27,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,850	20,650	26,150	------	------	------	------
JOHNSTOWN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,100	16,900	18,750	22,300	26,750	29,850	31,200
ROW DWELLINGS	13,350	16,000	17,650	20,950	25,350	28,200	29,350
WALKUP	12,350	15,250	17,450	20,550	23,850	26,300	27,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,050	19,850	25,100	------	------	------	------
NEW CASTLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,100	16,900	18,750	22,300	26,750	29,850	31,200
ROW DWELLINGS	13,450	16,100	17,750	21,150	25,500	28,400	29,600
WALKUP	12,350	15,250	17,450	20,600	23,900	26,300	27,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,050	19,850	25,100	------	------	------	------
SHARON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,350	18,350	20,450	24,250	29,150	32,450	34,000
ROW DWELLINGS	14,650	17,600	19,350	23,000	27,700	30,950	32,250
WALKUP	12,350	15,250	17,450	20,550	23,850	26,300	27,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,050	19,850	25,100	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION III--CONTINUED							
VIRGINIA							
RICHMOND, VA.:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,700	15,300	18,800	22,500	27,100	30,150	31,450
ROW DWELLINGS	11,400	13,800	16,950	20,300	24,450	27,150	28,300
WALKUP	11,050	13,850	17,400	20,550	23,750	26,150	27,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,150	22,150	28,100	------	------	------	------
NORFOLK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,900	14,300	17,500	20,900	25,200	28,100	29,300
ROW DWELLINGS	10,600	12,900	15,800	18,950	22,750	25,300	26,350
WALKUP	9,800	12,150	15,500	18,200	21,050	23,250	24,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,900	23,850	------	------	------	------
VIRGINIA BEACH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,250	13,600	16,600	19,850	23,850	26,650	27,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,200	15,000	17,950	21,600	24,050	25,050
WALKUP	9,800	12,150	15,500	18,200	21,050	23,250	24,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,900	23,850	------	------	------	------
PORTSMOUTH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,200	13,600	16,600	19,800	23,850	26,600	27,750
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,200	14,950	17,850	21,550	24,000	25,000
WALKUP	9,650	11,950	15,200	17,900	20,700	22,900	24,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,900	23,850	------	------	------	------
CHESAPEAKE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,250	13,600	16,600	19,850	23,850	26,650	27,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,200	15,000	17,950	21,600	24,050	25,050
WALKUP	9,500	11,800	15,050	17,600	20,400	22,550	23,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,900	23,850	------	------	------	------
SUFFOLK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,250	13,600	16,600	19,850	23,850	26,650	27,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,200	15,000	17,950	21,600	24,050	25,050
WALKUP	9,800	12,150	15,500	18,200	21,050	23,250	24,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,850	17,300	21,800	------	------	------	------
ROANOKE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,500	13,900	17,000	20,250	24,350	27,200	28,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,250	12,500	15,300	18,300	22,050	24,550	25,600
WALKUP	9,800	12,150	15,500	18,200	21,050	23,250	24,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,800	17,100	21,650	------	------	------	------
LYNCHBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,250	13,600	16,600	19,850	23,850	26,650	27,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,200	15,000	17,950	21,600	24,050	25,050
WALKUP	9,800	12,150	15,500	18,200	21,050	23,250	24,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,800	17,100	21,650	------	------	------	------
DANVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,250	13,600	16,600	19,850	23,850	26,650	27,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,200	15,000	17,950	21,600	24,050	25,050
WALKUP	9,900	12,300	15,700	18,400	21,300	23,600	24,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,800	17,100	21,650	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION III--CONTINUED							
VIRGINIA--CONTINUED							
NEWPORT NEWS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,650	16,750	20,050	24,150	26,800	27,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,100	12,250	15,100	18,050	21,750	24,200	25,200
WALKUP	10,050	12,500	15,900	18,750	21,700	24,000	25,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,350	19,050	24,000	------	------	------	------
HAMPTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,650	16,750	20,050	24,150	26,800	27,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,100	12,250	15,100	18,050	21,750	24,200	25,200
WALKUP	9,850	12,250	15,550	18,350	21,250	23,500	24,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,350	19,050	24,000	------	------	------	------
FREDERICKSBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,450	13,750	17,000	20,250	24,350	27,100	28,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,150	12,400	15,200	18,200	22,000	24,350	25,350
WALKUP	10,000	12,250	15,600	18,400	21,400	23,550	24,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,800	23,750	------	------	------	------
WARRENTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,450	13,750	17,000	20,250	24,350	27,100	28,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,150	12,400	15,200	18,200	22,000	24,350	25,350
WALKUP	10,000	12,250	15,600	18,400	21,400	23,550	24,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,800	23,750	------	------	------	------
HARRISONBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,400	13,700	16,850	20,150	24,250	26,950	28,100
ROW DWELLINGS	10,150	12,300	15,150	18,150	21,850	24,300	25,300
WALKUP	9,900	12,300	15,700	18,400	21,400	23,600	24,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,950	17,400	22,000	------	------	------	------
BRISTOL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	14,100	17,300	20,750	25,000	27,750	28,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,500	12,700	15,600	18,650	22,500	25,000	26,100
WALKUP	10,000	12,350	15,750	18,450	21,450	23,600	24,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,850	18,350	23,300	------	------	------	------
EASTERN SHORE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,650	16,750	20,050	24,150	26,800	27,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,100	12,250	15,100	18,050	21,750	24,200	25,200
WALKUP	9,800	12,150	15,500	18,250	21,100	23,350	24,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,950	17,400	22,000	------	------	------	------
CHARLOTTESVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,200	15,950	19,600	23,300	28,200	31,350	32,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,800	14,300	17,600	21,100	25,400	28,250	29,400
WALKUP	11,500	14,300	18,900	21,400	24,850	27,400	28,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,350	20,200	25,600	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION III--CONTINUED							
WEST VIRGINIA							
CHARLESTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,050	14,600	18,100	21,500	25,850	28,900	30,150
ROW DWELLINGS	11,550	14,000	17,200	20,550	24,650	27,450	28,600
WALKUP	10,600	13,200	16,800	19,850	23,250	25,400	26,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,200	19,900	25,300	------	------	------	------
BECKLEY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,250	17,550	20,950	25,250	28,150	29,300
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,650	16,750	20,000	24,000	26,850	28,050
WALKUP	10,350	12,900	16,400	19,350	22,350	24,750	25,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,450	24,600	------	------	------	------
BLUEFIELD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,250	17,550	20,950	25,250	28,150	29,300
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,650	16,750	20,000	24,000	26,850	28,050
WALKUP	10,350	12,900	16,400	19,350	22,350	24,750	25,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,450	24,600	------	------	------	------
HUNTINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,900	14,350	17,700	21,100	25,450	28,400	29,600
ROW DWELLINGS	11,300	13,700	16,950	20,200	24,200	27,050	28,200
WALKUP	10,500	13,000	16,500	19,550	22,650	25,000	26,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,900	19,600	24,900	------	------	------	------
PARKERSBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,150	14,650	18,150	21,600	26,050	29,050	30,300
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	14,050	17,350	20,700	24,750	27,650	28,850
WALKUP	10,500	13,000	16,500	19,550	22,650	25,000	26,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,900	19,600	24,900	------	------	------	------
WHEELING:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,250	17,550	20,950	25,250	28,150	29,300
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,650	16,750	20,000	24,000	26,850	28,050
WALKUP	10,350	12,900	16,400	19,350	22,350	24,750	25,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,450	24,600	------	------	------	------
MARTINSBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,950	13,350	16,400	19,550	23,500	26,250	27,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,750	15,600	18,550	22,450	24,950	26,100
WALKUP	9,500	11,850	15,100	17,800	20,650	22,800	23,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,450	24,600	------	------	------	------
FAIRMONT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,100	14,600	18,050	21,500	25,850	28,900	30,150
ROW DWELLINGS	11,550	14,000	17,200	20,550	24,650	27,450	28,750
WALKUP	10,250	12,700	16,150	19,100	22,100	24,400	25,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,650	19,450	24,550	------	------	------	------
POINT PLEASANT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,700	16,950	20,200	24,250	27,100	28,250
ROW DWELLINGS	10,850	13,100	16,150	19,250	23,100	25,750	26,950
WALKUP	10,000	12,450	15,850	18,600	21,550	23,850	25,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,850	19,550	24,800	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV							
ALABAMA							
BIRMINGHAM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,650	12,950	15,900	19,100	23,000	25,500	26,700
ROW DWELLINGS	10,300	12,300	15,200	18,100	21,800	24,250	25,450
WALKUP	8,750	10,800	13,750	16,150	18,800	20,800	21,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,500	17,000	21,400	------	------	------	------
DOTHAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,350	15,200	18,300	21,950	24,300	25,550
ROW DWELLINGS	9,750	11,750	14,500	17,200	20,750	23,100	24,250
WALKUP	8,250	10,350	13,100	15,550	18,000	19,800	20,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,100	16,450	20,750	------	------	------	------
FLORENCE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,400	15,250	18,400	22,100	24,550	25,700
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,800	14,550	17,500	21,000	23,300	24,400
WALKUP	8,300	10,400	13,150	15,600	18,150	19,900	20,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,350	16,850	21,200	------	------	------	------
HUNTSVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,000	12,200	15,050	17,900	21,650	24,050	12,800
ROW DWELLINGS	9,700	11,600	14,400	17,100	20,650	23,000	24,050
WALKUP	8,200	10,250	13,000	15,300	17,750	19,550	20,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,100	16,450	20,800	------	------	------	------
MOBILE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,150	13,500	16,700	19,850	23,950	26,600	27,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,650	12,900	15,900	18,900	22,750	25,300	26,550
WALKUP	9,050	11,300	14,300	16,900	19,700	21,700	22,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,200	17,700	22,250	------	------	------	------
MONTGOMERY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,150	12,300	15,150	18,250	21,900	24,250	25,450
ROW DWELLINGS	9,750	11,750	14,500	17,200	20,750	23,100	24,250
WALKUP	8,250	10,300	13,050	15,500	17,900	19,700	20,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,250	16,700	20,950	------	------	------	------
TUSCALOOSA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,000	12,200	15,050	17,900	21,650	24,050	25,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,700	11,600	14,400	17,100	20,650	23,000	24,050
WALKUP	8,200	10,250	13,000	15,300	17,750	19,550	20,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,100	16,450	20,800	------	------	------	------
FLORIDA							
JACKSONVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,900	13,100	16,200	19,400	23,250	25,800	27,050
ROW DWELLINGS	10,400	12,550	15,450	18,350	22,050	24,650	25,750
WALKUP	9,200	11,450	14,650	17,200	20,000	21,950	23,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,650	19,250	24,500	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
FLORIDA--CONTINUED							
FORT WALTON BEACH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,750	13,050	16,000	19,150	23,050	25,500	26,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,500	15,350	18,250	21,800	24,450	25,450
WALKUP	9,150	11,400	14,500	17,000	19,850	21,750	22,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,500	19,150	24,300	------	------	------	------
GAINESVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,250	13,700	16,850	20,150	24,250	26,800	28,100
ROW DWELLINGS	10,750	13,050	16,050	19,050	22,900	25,600	26,750
WALKUP	9,200	11,400	14,650	17,200	19,900	21,950	23,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,300	20,050	25,550	------	------	------	------
PANAMA CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,750	13,050	16,000	19,150	23,050	25,500	26,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,500	15,350	18,250	21,800	24,450	25,450
WALKUP	9,150	11,400	14,500	17,000	19,850	21,750	22,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,500	19,150	24,300	------	------	------	------
PENSACOLA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,750	13,050	16,000	19,150	23,050	25,500	26,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,500	15,350	18,250	21,800	24,450	25,450
WALKUP	8,950	11,200	14,150	16,700	19,450	21,300	22,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,500	19,150	24,300	------	------	------	------
TALLAHASSEE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,150	13,400	16,550	19,850	23,850	26,450	27,700
ROW DWELLINGS	10,600	12,800	15,800	18,850	22,550	25,200	26,350
WALKUP	9,000	11,250	14,450	16,800	19,650	21,550	22,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,000	19,750	25,050	------	------	------	------
MIAMI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,850	14,250	17,500	20,950	25,250	28,050	29,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,500	16,850	19,950	24,050	26,750	28,050
WALKUP	9,400	11,850	15,050	17,800	20,600	22,700	23,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,450	18,000	22,750	------	------	------	------
FORT LAUDERDALE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,050	14,400	17,750	21,250	25,600	28,400	29,850
ROW DWELLINGS	11,400	13,750	17,050	20,300	24,350	27,050	28,400
WALKUP	8,600	10,900	13,900	16,300	18,900	20,800	21,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,750	17,250	21,700	------	------	------	------
FORT MYERS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,600	12,700	15,600	18,700	22,550	25,050	27,100
ROW DWELLINGS	10,000	12,100	15,000	17,850	21,400	23,850	25,050
WALKUP	8,200	10,300	13,050	15,500	17,950	19,700	20,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,450	16,850	21,300	------	------	------	------
KEY WEST:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,850	14,250	17,500	20,950	25,250	28,050	29,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,500	16,850	19,950	24,050	26,750	28,050
WALKUP	9,400	11,850	15,050	17,800	20,600	22,700	23,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,450	18,000	22,750	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
FLORIDA--CONTINUED							
WEST PALM BEACH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,100	13,350	16,400	19,650	23,650	26,250	27,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,700	15,750	18,700	22,500	24,950	26,250
WALKUP	9,000	11,350	14,450	17,100	19,850	21,850	22,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,100	17,550	22,200	------	------	------	------
TAMPA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,050	12,050	14,900	17,850	21,350	23,800	24,900
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,550	14,350	17,000	20,400	22,800	23,800
WALKUP	9,550	11,900	15,150	17,950	20,800	22,800	24,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,750	18,350	23,150	------	------	------	------
COCOA BEACH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,000	11,950	14,800	17,650	21,200	23,650	24,700
ROW DWELLINGS	9,500	11,450	14,200	16,800	20,250	22,600	23,600
WALKUP	9,500	11,850	15,000	17,750	20,650	22,600	23,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,650	18,250	22,950	------	------	------	------
DAYTONA BEACH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,050	17,450	20,900	24,950	27,850	29,150
ROW DWELLINGS	11,150	13,500	16,750	19,850	23,850	26,650	27,850
WALKUP	11,150	13,950	17,600	20,900	24,200	26,750	27,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,500	21,500	27,100	------	------	------	------
FORT PIERCE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,650	12,700	15,800	18,850	22,650	25,250	26,450
ROW DWELLINGS	10,100	12,150	15,100	17,950	21,550	24,100	25,100
WALKUP	10,200	12,650	16,050	19,000	22,250	24,150	25,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,750	19,450	24,450	------	------	------	------
LAKELAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,100	15,000	18,000	21,500	24,050	25,050
ROW DWELLINGS	9,600	11,600	14,450	17,150	20,500	22,950	24,050
WALKUP	9,750	12,050	15,250	18,050	20,900	23,050	24,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,750	18,300	23,100	------	------	------	------
ORLANDO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,900	11,800	14,650	17,450	20,950	23,300	24,300
ROW DWELLINGS	9,350	11,250	14,000	16,550	19,900	22,200	23,250
WALKUP	9,100	11,400	14,400	17,050	19,700	21,750	22,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,350	17,750	22,500	------	------	------	------
SARASOTA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,250	12,350	15,400	18,300	21,950	24,500	25,600
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,900	14,750	17,400	21,000	23,400	24,450
WALKUP	9,950	12,400	15,700	18,700	21,700	23,850	25,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,150	18,800	23,750	------	------	------	------
ST. PETERSBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,900	11,800	14,650	17,450	20,950	23,300	24,300
ROW DWELLINGS	9,350	11,250	14,000	16,550	19,900	22,200	23,250
WALKUP	9,400	11,750	14,850	17,550	20,350	22,450	23,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,550	18,000	22,650	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
GEORGIA							
ATLANTA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,350	12,450	15,300	18,300	22,050	24,400	25,550
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,800	14,650	17,400	20,950	23,300	24,350
WALKUP	8,700	10,750	13,700	16,100	18,750	20,550	21,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,350	18,950	24,050	------	------	------	------
ALBANY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,400	15,200	18,150	21,750	24,250	25,350
ROW DWELLINGS	9,750	11,750	14,500	17,250	20,700	23,100	24,200
WALKUP	8,600	10,700	13,550	15,950	18,650	20,400	21,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,850	23,800	------	------	------	------
AUGUSTA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,600	12,650	15,750	18,800	22,600	25,050	26,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,150	12,150	14,950	17,950	21,550	23,900	25,050
WALKUP	8,750	10,750	13,700	16,200	18,750	20,750	21,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,200	17,650	22,350	------	------	------	------
BRUNSWICK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,700	11,650	14,300	17,100	20,550	22,850	23,900
ROW DWELLINGS	9,150	11,100	13,650	16,250	19,500	21,750	22,800
WALKUP	7,950	9,850	12,450	14,700	17,100	18,800	19,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,850	23,800	------	------	------	------
COLUMBUS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,050	12,100	15,000	17,950	21,600	23,900	25,100
ROW DWELLINGS	9,700	11,650	14,350	17,150	20,600	22,850	23,900
WALKUP	8,550	10,550	13,450	15,800	18,350	20,300	21,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,100	18,700	23,650	------	------	------	------
MACON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,200	15,200	18,100	21,850	24,150	25,300
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,750	14,450	17,250	20,800	23,050	24,150
WALKUP	8,300	10,250	13,050	15,350	17,850	19,700	20,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,100	18,700	23,650	------	------	------	------
ROME:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,750	11,700	14,500	17,350	20,800	23,050	24,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,300	11,200	13,800	16,500	19,750	21,950	23,000
WALKUP	8,050	9,900	12,700	14,900	17,250	19,000	20,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,900	18,500	23,400	------	------	------	------
SAVANNAH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,700	11,650	14,300	17,100	20,550	22,850	23,900
ROW DWELLINGS	9,150	11,100	13,650	16,250	19,500	21,750	22,800
WALKUP	7,950	9,850	12,450	14,700	17,100	18,800	19,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,850	23,800	------	------	------	------
VALDOSTA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,000	12,050	14,900	17,850	21,450	23,750	24,850
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,550	14,250	16,950	20,350	22,600	23,700
WALKUP	8,450	10,400	13,300	15,650	18,150	20,000	20,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,900	18,500	23,400	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
KENTUCKY							
LOUISVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,850	13,000	16,050	19,250	23,150	25,650	26,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,500	15,400	18,300	22,000	24,500	25,600
WALKUP	9,800	12,100	15,400	18,200	21,100	23,150	24,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,900	19,700	24,900	------	------	------	------
ASHLAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,200	13,450	16,600	19,900	23,950	26,600	27,900
ROW DWELLINGS	10,700	12,850	15,950	18,900	22,750	25,300	26,400
WALKUP	9,850	12,200	15,450	18,250	21,250	23,450	24,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,400	20,400	25,750	------	------	------	------
BOWLING GREEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,450	12,600	15,450	18,550	22,400	24,800	26,000
ROW DWELLINGS	10,000	12,050	14,950	17,650	21,350	23,700	24,800
WALKUP	9,050	11,200	14,300	16,950	19,600	21,600	22,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,350	19,000	24,050	------	------	------	------
CORBIN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,850	13,000	16,050	19,250	23,150	25,650	26,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,500	15,400	18,300	22,000	24,500	25,600
WALKUP	9,350	11,600	14,800	17,450	20,300	22,350	23,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,900	19,700	24,900	------	------	------	------
COVINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	14,000	17,200	20,600	24,850	27,600	28,900
ROW DWELLINGS	11,050	13,350	16,550	19,600	23,700	26,250	27,500
WALKUP	10,450	13,050	16,500	19,500	22,600	24,850	26,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,850	20,850	26,250	------	------	------	------
FRANKFORT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,150	12,100	15,000	18,000	21,700	23,950	25,150
ROW DWELLINGS	9,650	11,650	14,400	17,100	20,600	22,850	23,900
WALKUP	9,100	11,400	14,400	17,050	19,650	21,800	22,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,550	18,200	22,950	------	------	------	------
HOPKINSVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,350	15,200	18,250	21,950	24,400	25,550
ROW DWELLINGS	9,850	11,850	14,650	17,350	20,900	23,300	24,350
WALKUP	8,500	10,600	13,400	15,900	18,450	20,350	21,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,050	18,700	23,650	------	------	------	------
LEXINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,500	12,650	15,550	18,700	22,550	25,000	26,150
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,100	15,000	17,750	21,400	23,800	24,950
WALKUP	10,100	12,500	15,850	18,800	21,800	23,950	25,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,900	19,700	24,900	------	------	------	------
MIDDLESBORO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,850	13,000	16,050	19,250	23,150	25,650	26,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,500	15,400	18,300	22,000	24,500	25,600
WALKUP	9,450	11,700	14,900	17,700	20,450	22,450	23,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,900	19,700	24,900	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
KENTUCKY--CONTINUED							
MURRAY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,350	15,200	18,250	21,950	24,400	25,550
ROW DWELLINGS	9,850	11,850	14,650	17,350	20,900	23,300	24,350
WALKUP	8,300	10,400	13,100	15,550	18,050	19,950	20,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,050	18,700	23,650	------	------	------	------
NEWPORT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,300	16,300	19,600	23,700	26,150	27,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,600	12,750	15,750	18,650	22,550	25,000	26,150
WALKUP	9,600	11,950	15,000	17,850	20,650	22,850	23,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,050	19,900	25,150	------	------	------	------
OWENSBORO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,300	16,300	19,600	23,700	26,150	27,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,600	12,750	15,750	18,650	22,550	25,000	26,150
WALKUP	9,600	11,950	15,000	17,850	20,650	22,850	23,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,050	19,900	25,150	------	------	------	------
PADUCAH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,150	12,100	15,000	18,000	21,700	23,950	25,150
ROW DWELLINGS	9,650	11,650	14,400	17,100	20,600	22,900	23,900
WALKUP	9,100	11,400	14,400	17,050	19,650	21,800	22,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,050	18,700	23,650	------	------	------	------
MISSISSIPPI							
JACKSON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,200	15,050	17,950	21,650	24,000	25,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,200	11,050	13,550	16,200	19,450	21,550	22,650
WALKUP	8,350	10,450	13,400	15,800	18,250	20,150	21,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,750	23,800	------	------	------	------
BILOXI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,850	11,800	14,700	17,400	21,050	23,350	24,450
ROW DWELLINGS	9,100	10,950	13,550	16,150	19,400	21,550	22,600
WALKUP	8,700	10,900	13,900	16,300	18,850	20,850	21,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,550	19,300	24,500	------	------	------	------
CORINTH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,250	12,450	15,350	18,350	22,150	24,600	25,700
ROW DWELLINGS	8,950	10,900	13,550	16,050	19,400	21,500	22,550
WALKUP	8,750	10,850	13,800	16,250	18,900	20,700	21,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,500	19,150	24,150	------	------	------	------
GREENVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,200	15,050	17,950	21,650	24,000	25,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,200	11,050	13,550	16,200	19,450	21,550	22,650
WALKUP	8,350	10,450	13,400	15,800	18,250	20,150	21,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,050	18,650	23,700	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
MISSISSIPPI--CONTINUED							
GREENWOOD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,200	15,050	17,950	21,650	24,000	25,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,200	11,050	13,550	16,200	19,450	21,550	22,650
WALKUP	8,750	10,900	13,900	16,350	18,950	20,850	21,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,750	23,800	------	------	------	------
GULFPORT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,150	12,250	15,100	18,000	21,700	24,050	25,250
ROW DWELLINGS	9,250	11,100	13,650	16,250	19,500	21,650	22,700
WALKUP	8,250	10,350	13,100	15,400	17,850	19,650	20,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,350	19,050	24,050	------	------	------	------
HATTIESBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,200	15,050	17,950	21,650	24,000	25,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,200	11,050	13,550	16,200	19,450	21,550	22,650
WALKUP	8,350	10,450	13,400	15,800	18,250	20,150	21,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,750	23,800	------	------	------	------
SOUTHAVEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,950	11,950	14,850	17,650	21,250	23,550	24,750
ROW DWELLINGS	9,000	10,850	13,400	15,900	19,150	21,250	22,250
WALKUP	8,850	11,050	14,100	16,500	19,200	21,250	22,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,850	18,550	23,400	------	------	------	------
TUPELO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,200	15,050	17,950	21,650	24,000	25,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,400	11,350	13,900	16,650	19,950	22,200	23,300
WALKUP	8,550	10,700	13,750	16,050	18,650	20,550	21,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,750	23,800	------	------	------	------
NORTH CAROLINA							
GREENSBORO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,900	13,000	15,850	18,950	22,600	25,100	26,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,800	12,700	15,700	18,550	22,250	24,700	25,850
WALKUP	9,250	11,200	14,200	16,700	19,350	21,150	22,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,500	20,400	25,850	------	------	------	------
ASHEVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,200	13,350	16,350	19,550	23,350	25,850	27,050
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,400	16,450	19,350	23,300	25,900	27,000
WALKUP	9,750	12,050	15,200	17,800	20,500	22,200	23,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,050	20,900	26,400	------	------	------	------
CHARLOTTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,200	16,100	19,200	22,900	25,450	26,550
ROW DWELLINGS	10,950	13,050	15,950	18,800	22,500	25,000	26,150
WALKUP	9,750	12,000	15,150	17,750	20,450	22,400	23,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,500	20,400	25,850	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
NORTH CAROLINA--CONTINUED							
CHEROKEE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,400	13,600	16,700	19,950	23,700	26,250	27,450
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
DURHAM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,700	12,750	15,600	18,650	22,250	24,700	25,850
ROW DWELLINGS	10,750	12,700	15,600	18,450	22,150	24,550	25,700
WALKUP	9,150	10,750	14,200	16,650	19,200	20,950	22,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,450	20,350	25,800	------	------	------	------
ELIZABETH CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,700	14,050	17,050	20,350	24,350	27,100	28,250
ROW DWELLINGS	10,700	12,900	15,700	18,750	22,500	24,950	26,000
WALKUP	9,800	12,050	15,250	17,800	20,550	22,700	23,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,800	20,750	26,200	------	------	------	------
GREENVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,750	12,850	15,650	18,650	22,350	24,800	25,900
ROW DWELLINGS	10,750	12,750	15,650	18,350	22,100	24,500	25,650
WALKUP	8,900	11,000	14,000	16,300	18,800	20,500	21,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,250	19,550	24,300	------	------	------	------
RALEIGH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,750	12,900	15,700	18,750	22,400	24,800	25,900
ROW DWELLINGS	10,750	12,850	15,600	18,450	22,150	24,550	25,700
WALKUP	9,000	11,150	14,050	16,600	19,150	21,000	22,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,450	20,350	25,800	------	------	------	------
WILMINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,450	12,600	15,500	18,650	22,400	24,850	25,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,500	15,200	17,900	21,350	23,750	24,850
WALKUP	9,600	11,750	14,800	17,250	20,000	21,900	22,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,500	20,150	25,100	------	------	------	------
WINSTON-SALEM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,000	13,100	16,000	19,150	22,900	25,300	26,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,600	12,650	15,450	18,250	21,950	24,300	25,400
WALKUP	9,450	11,600	14,600	17,100	19,700	21,500	22,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,450	20,350	25,800	------	------	------	------
FAYETTEVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,750	12,900	15,700	18,750	22,400	24,800	25,900
ROW DWELLINGS	10,650	12,650	15,450	18,250	21,950	24,300	25,400
WALKUP	9,450	11,600	14,650	17,150	19,850	21,650	22,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,100	19,550	24,250	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
SOUTH CAROLINA							
COLUMBIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	8,900	10,800	13,250	15,900	19,100	21,200	22,200
ROW DWELLINGS	8,600	10,300	12,700	15,100	18,200	20,200	21,150
WALKUP	7,450	9,250	11,800	14,100	16,050	17,650	18,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,450	15,650	19,700	------	------	------	------
AIKEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	8,900	10,800	13,250	15,900	19,050	21,250	22,250
ROW DWELLINGS	8,550	10,300	12,700	15,050	18,200	20,150	21,150
WALKUP	7,750	9,700	12,250	14,450	16,750	18,450	19,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,650	15,850	20,100	------	------	------	------
ANDERSON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	8,800	10,650	13,100	15,700	18,900	20,950	22,050
ROW DWELLINGS	8,500	10,150	12,600	14,950	18,000	20,000	20,900
WALKUP	7,200	8,900	11,400	13,450	15,550	17,200	18,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,600	15,750	19,800	------	------	------	------
BEAUFORT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,100	11,050	13,550	16,250	19,550	21,700	22,800
ROW DWELLINGS	8,800	10,650	13,000	15,450	18,550	20,700	21,700
WALKUP	7,650	9,500	12,000	14,150	16,450	18,150	19,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,800	16,000	20,200	------	------	------	------
CHARLESTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,800	11,900	14,650	17,550	21,050	23,350	24,550
ROW DWELLINGS	9,450	11,350	14,100	16,750	20,100	22,350	23,350
WALKUP	8,000	10,050	12,700	14,950	17,350	19,100	20,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,100	16,400	20,700	------	------	------	------
FLORENCE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	8,550	10,350	12,700	15,300	18,350	20,450	21,400
ROW DWELLINGS	8,200	9,850	12,150	14,500	17,500	19,400	20,350
WALKUP	7,150	8,950	11,300	13,350	15,450	17,050	18,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,650	15,850	20,100	------	------	------	------
GREENVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	8,950	10,850	13,350	15,950	19,250	21,350	22,350
ROW DWELLINGS	8,650	10,350	12,750	15,200	18,300	20,350	21,300
WALKUP	7,250	9,050	11,450	13,500	15,700	17,300	18,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,650	15,850	20,100	------	------	------	------
GREENWOOD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	8,950	10,850	13,400	16,000	19,200	21,350	22,400
ROW DWELLINGS	8,650	10,350	12,800	15,200	18,300	20,400	21,300
WALKUP	7,500	9,300	11,900	14,000	16,150	17,950	18,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,600	15,750	19,800	------	------	------	------
MYRTLE BEACH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,100	11,050	13,550	16,250	19,550	21,700	22,800
ROW DWELLINGS	8,800	10,650	13,000	15,450	18,550	20,700	21,700
WALKUP	7,650	9,500	12,000	14,150	16,450	18,150	19,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,800	16,000	20,200	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
SOUTH CAROLINA--CONTINUED							
NORTH AUGUSTA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,500	11,450	14,100	16,900	20,250	22,450	23,600
ROW DWELLINGS	9,000	10,900	13,450	15,950	19,350	21,350	22,350
WALKUP	7,850	9,800	12,500	14,650	17,000	18,800	19,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,250	16,550	20,900	------	------	------	------
ORANGEBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	8,900	10,800	13,250	15,900	19,100	21,200	22,200
ROW DWELLINGS	8,600	10,300	12,700	15,100	18,200	20,200	21,150
WALKUP	7,450	9,250	11,800	14,100	16,050	17,650	18,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,450	15,650	19,700	------	------	------	------
ROCKHILL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,000	10,950	13,450	16,150	19,350	21,600	22,600
ROW DWELLINGS	8,700	10,450	12,850	15,300	18,450	20,500	21,450
WALKUP	7,600	9,500	11,950	14,100	16,350	18,050	19,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,650	15,850	20,100	------	------	------	------
SPARTANSBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,200	11,100	13,600	16,350	19,700	21,800	22,850
ROW DWELLINGS	8,800	10,550	13,050	15,550	18,750	20,800	21,750
WALKUP	7,650	9,550	12,050	14,200	16,500	18,200	19,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,650	15,850	20,100	------	------	------	------
TENNESSEE							
KNOXVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,300	16,350	19,650	23,700	26,250	27,450
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,700	15,700	18,700	22,500	24,950	26,200
WALKUP	10,400	13,000	16,450	19,450	22,650	24,900	26,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,600	16,950	21,400	------	------	------	------
CHATTANOOGA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,700	12,900	15,850	19,000	23,000	25,300	26,550
ROW DWELLINGS	11,150	13,400	16,650	19,800	23,750	26,450	27,700
WALKUP	11,200	14,000	17,750	21,000	24,400	26,850	28,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,700	18,250	22,900	------	------	------	------
JOHNSON CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,450	12,650	15,550	18,550	22,500	24,900	26,050
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,050	14,900	17,750	21,350	23,650	24,850
WALKUP	10,400	13,000	16,450	19,450	22,550	24,850	26,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,600	16,950	21,400	------	------	------	------
KINGSPORT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,850	13,100	16,100	19,250	23,300	25,750	27,050
ROW DWELLINGS	10,400	12,500	15,450	18,400	22,100	24,500	25,700
WALKUP	9,850	12,200	15,450	18,300	21,250	23,400	24,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,600	16,950	21,400	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IV--CONTINUED							
TENNESSEE--CONTINUED							
OAK RIDGE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,700	12,900	15,900	19,000	22,950	25,450	26,650
ROW DWELLINGS	10,300	12,350	15,300	18,200	21,900	24,300	25,500
WALKUP	10,400	13,000	16,450	19,450	22,650	24,900	26,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,600	16,950	21,400	------	------	------	------
MEMPHIS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,400	12,600	15,500	18,500	22,350	24,850	25,950
ROW DWELLINGS	9,600	11,650	14,450	17,150	20,600	22,950	24,000
WALKUP	8,800	10,900	13,900	16,400	19,000	20,900	21,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,100	16,350	20,600	------	------	------	------
JACKSON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,250	13,600	16,700	20,000	24,100	26,800	27,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,600	15,550	18,500	22,200	24,750	26,000
WALKUP	9,800	12,050	15,500	18,250	21,100	23,200	24,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,100	16,350	20,600	------	------	------	------
UNION CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,700	16,800	20,100	24,300	26,950	28,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,400	12,650	15,650	18,600	22,400	24,950	26,200
WALKUP	8,600	10,600	13,600	16,100	18,600	20,500	21,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,400	17,850	22,500	------	------	------	------
NASHVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,050	12,100	14,950	17,850	21,450	23,900	24,950
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,650	14,200	17,000	20,400	22,750	23,850
WALKUP	8,550	10,650	13,550	15,950	18,600	20,450	21,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,050	16,400	20,700	------	------	------	------
CLARKSVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,650	11,700	14,400	17,200	20,750	23,050	24,150
ROW DWELLINGS	9,300	11,150	13,750	16,400	19,700	21,900	23,000
WALKUP	7,850	9,800	12,500	14,700	17,050	18,800	19,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,650	17,100	21,600	------	------	------	------
COLUMBIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,150	15,000	17,900	21,500	23,950	25,050
ROW DWELLINGS	9,600	11,700	14,250	17,050	20,500	22,800	23,900
WALKUP	8,600	10,750	13,750	16,050	18,700	20,650	21,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,100	17,750	22,450	------	------	------	------
REGION V							
ILLINOIS							
CHICAGO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,450	16,400	20,100	23,950	28,800	32,100	33,600
ROW DWELLINGS	13,000	15,700	19,300	23,050	27,700	30,800	32,300
WALKUP	12,750	15,800	19,950	23,700	25,550	30,200	31,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,850	19,600	24,800	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION V--CONTINUED							
ILLINOIS--CONTINUED							
MOLINE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,050	15,850	19,600	23,300	28,100	31,200	32,650
ROW DWELLINGS	12,250	14,800	18,250	21,750	26,200	29,100	30,550
WALKUP	12,000	14,950	18,900	22,400	24,100	28,500	29,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,850	18,450	23,300	------	------	------	------
ROCKFORD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,750	15,450	18,950	22,700	27,300	30,300	31,750
ROW DWELLINGS	12,000	14,450	17,850	21,200	25,500	28,400	29,800
WALKUP	11,750	14,600	18,500	21,850	23,550	27,900	29,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,500	17,900	22,750	------	------	------	------
ROCK ISLAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,050	15,850	19,600	23,300	28,100	31,200	32,650
ROW DWELLINGS	12,250	14,800	18,250	21,750	26,200	29,100	30,550
WALKUP	12,000	14,950	18,900	22,400	24,100	28,500	29,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,850	18,450	23,300	------	------	------	------
STERLING:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,000	15,750	19,400	23,100	27,800	31,000	32,400
ROW DWELLINGS	12,150	14,650	18,250	21,650	25,900	28,900	30,250
WALKUP	11,950	14,850	18,850	22,250	24,050	28,350	29,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,800	18,350	23,150	------	------	------	------
SPRINGFIELD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,350	15,000	18,450	22,050	26,500	29,450	30,850
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	13,950	17,250	20,550	24,750	27,550	28,800
WALKUP	11,100	13,750	17,450	20,700	23,850	26,450	26,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,300	17,750	22,400	------	------	------	------
BELLEVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,850	15,550	19,250	22,900	27,550	30,650	32,150
ROW DWELLINGS	12,150	14,550	18,000	21,400	25,750	28,750	30,000
WALKUP	11,500	14,300	18,150	21,450	24,850	27,500	28,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,400	17,850	22,550	------	------	------	------
CARBONDALE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,350	15,000	18,450	22,050	26,500	29,450	30,850
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	13,950	17,250	20,450	24,750	27,550	28,800
WALKUP	11,100	13,750	17,450	20,700	23,850	26,450	27,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,300	17,750	22,450	------	------	------	------
CHAMPAIGN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,850	14,300	17,800	21,150	25,350	28,200	29,600
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,450	16,550	19,850	23,750	26,550	27,650
WALKUP	10,700	13,250	16,800	19,900	22,900	25,300	26,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,700	17,000	21,500	------	------	------	------
DANVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,450	15,100	18,600	22,200	26,700	29,650	31,000
ROW DWELLINGS	11,700	14,150	17,400	20,700	24,900	27,700	28,950
WALKUP	11,250	13,850	17,550	20,800	24,100	26,650	27,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,400	17,850	22,550	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION V--CONTINUED							
ILLINOIS--CONTINUED							
EAST ST LOUIS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,200	14,700	18,300	21,800	26,100	29,100	30,450
ROW DWELLINGS	11,450	13,700	17,050	20,200	24,300	27,150	28,350
WALKUP	10,250	12,700	16,150	19,050	22,000	24,350	25,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,250	24,400	------	------	------	------
LA SALLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,450	16,250	20,100	23,950	28,800	32,000	33,600
ROW DWELLINGS	12,650	15,200	18,800	22,350	26,900	29,950	31,350
WALKUP	11,350	14,100	17,700	21,050	24,250	26,900	28,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,050	18,700	23,650	------	------	------	------
PEORIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,550	15,150	18,750	22,400	26,850	29,950	31,350
ROW DWELLINGS	11,800	14,200	17,550	20,850	25,150	28,000	29,300
WALKUP	11,350	13,950	17,700	21,050	24,300	26,850	28,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,600	18,150	22,850	------	------	------	------
QUINCY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,250	17,600	21,050	25,200	28,050	29,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,100	13,400	16,400	19,600	23,550	26,150	27,500
WALKUP	10,550	13,150	16,600	19,600	22,800	25,150	26,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,550	16,850	21,300	------	------	------	------
INDIANA							
INIANAPOLIS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,700	12,900	15,900	19,000	22,800	25,350	26,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,150	12,300	15,200	18,100	21,700	24,250	25,300
WALKUP	9,650	12,100	15,300	18,100	20,900	23,050	24,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,850	18,450	23,350	------	------	------	------
BLOOMINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,500	12,700	15,650	18,700	22,400	24,950	26,100
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,100	14,950	17,700	21,350	23,750	24,850
WALKUP	10,000	12,500	15,750	18,650	21,700	23,850	25,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,150	18,700	23,800	------	------	------	------
EVANSVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,300	15,200	18,150	21,750	23,250	25,350
ROW DWELLINGS	9,750	11,700	14,450	17,200	20,700	23,100	24,150
WALKUP	10,150	12,750	16,100	19,050	22,000	24,250	25,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,600	18,200	23,100	------	------	------	------
FORT WAYNE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,350	12,500	15,400	18,350	22,050	24,700	25,700
ROW DWELLINGS	9,900	11,950	14,700	17,550	21,100	23,550	24,600
WALKUP	9,550	12,000	15,200	17,850	20,700	22,800	24,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,800	18,300	23,250	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION V--CONTINUED							
INDIANA--CONTINUED							
GARY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,800	13,100	16,150	19,250	23,100	25,650	26,900
ROW DWELLINGS	10,300	12,500	15,400	18,250	21,950	24,600	25,600
WALKUP	10,600	13,150	16,600	19,650	22,700	25,050	26,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,200	19,950	25,250	------	------	------	------
HAMMOND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,350	13,850	17,000	20,250	24,300	27,100	28,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	13,200	16,250	19,300	23,200	25,900	27,050
WALKUP	9,850	12,350	15,550	18,400	21,300	23,450	24,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,100	18,700	23,700	------	------	------	------
LAFAYETTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,950	13,250	16,300	19,400	23,250	26,000	27,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,450	12,650	15,600	18,550	22,250	24,850	25,900
WALKUP	9,900	12,350	15,700	18,500	21,450	23,650	24,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,300	18,900	23,900	------	------	------	------
SOUTH BEND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,350	16,400	19,600	23,500	26,200	27,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,500	12,750	15,700	18,600	22,400	25,050	26,150
WALKUP	10,150	12,700	16,000	18,900	21,850	24,050	25,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,400	19,100	24,200	------	------	------	------
TERRE HAUTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,700	16,900	20,150	24,150	26,900	28,100
ROW DWELLINGS	10,850	13,050	16,150	19,200	23,000	25,650	26,850
WALKUP	10,300	12,800	16,200	19,200	22,250	24,500	25,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,650	19,350	24,600	------	------	------	------
MICHIGAN							
DETROIT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,500	14,250	17,500	20,900	25,150	28,000	29,250
ROW DWELLINGS	11,200	13,500	16,700	19,850	23,950	26,600	27,850
WALKUP	10,350	12,800	16,250	19,250	22,200	24,550	25,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,700	18,250	23,100	------	------	------	------
ANN ARBOR:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,500	15,300	18,800	22,450	27,050	30,100	31,450
ROW DWELLINGS	12,050	14,500	17,950	21,350	25,750	28,600	29,950
WALKUP	10,750	13,300	16,850	20,000	23,050	25,500	26,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,700	18,250	23,100	------	------	------	------
FLINT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,100	15,950	19,600	23,400	28,100	31,300	32,900
ROW DWELLINGS	12,600	15,150	18,700	22,200	26,700	29,700	31,250
WALKUP	10,100	12,600	15,900	18,850	21,850	24,050	25,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,050	17,500	22,200	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION V--CONTINUED							
MICHIGAN--CONTINUED							
SAGINAW:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,900	14,750	18,100	21,500	25,900	28,850	30,250
ROW DWELLINGS	11,600	14,000	17,200	20,500	24,650	27,400	28,800
WALKUP	10,200	12,750	16,100	19,150	22,200	24,400	25,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,050	17,500	22,200	------	------	------	------
YPSILANTI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,300	16,200	19,900	23,650	28,500	31,750	33,200
ROW DWELLINGS	12,800	15,300	18,950	22,600	27,200	30,150	31,650
WALKUP	10,350	12,850	16,200	19,250	22,200	24,550	25,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,500	18,100	22,850	------	------	------	------
GRAND RAPIDS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,700	12,900	15,900	18,950	22,800	25,500	26,600
ROW DWELLINGS	10,250	12,350	15,300	18,150	21,800	24,300	25,450
WALKUP	10,450	13,150	16,650	19,600	22,750	25,200	26,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,250	16,600	20,900	------	------	------	------
BATTLE CREEK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,950	13,200	16,250	19,450	23,400	26,050	27,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,500	12,650	15,600	18,600	22,400	24,950	26,100
WALKUP	10,450	13,000	16,550	19,550	22,600	25,000	26,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,550	16,950	21,350	------	------	------	------
BENTON HARBOR:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,850	14,300	17,550	20,900	25,150	28,150	29,350
ROW DWELLINGS	11,350	13,650	16,850	20,050	24,100	25,650	28,050
WALKUP	11,150	13,900	17,600	20,900	24,000	26,600	27,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,300	17,850	22,500	------	------	------	------
JACKSON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,350	13,800	17,000	20,200	24,400	27,200	28,450
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,150	16,300	19,400	23,350	26,000	27,200
WALKUP	11,200	14,100	17,750	21,050	24,250	26,900	28,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,200	17,700	22,350	------	------	------	------
KALAMAZOO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,750	13,000	16,050	19,050	23,000	25,700	26,750
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,450	15,400	18,300	22,050	24,500	25,700
WALKUP	9,950	12,500	15,850	18,700	21,700	23,950	25,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,350	16,700	21,100	------	------	------	------
LANSING:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,700	15,300	18,900	22,500	27,050	30,200	31,600
ROW DWELLINGS	12,200	17,200	18,150	21,600	25,950	28,800	30,250
WALKUP	10,900	13,600	17,250	20,400	23,600	26,100	27,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,800	17,350	21,850	------	------	------	------
MARQUETTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,550	15,350	18,300	22,100	24,650	25,750
ROW DWELLINGS	9,900	11,950	14,750	17,550	21,050	23,450	24,600
WALKUP	10,100	12,700	16,000	18,900	21,900	24,250	25,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,500	15,750	19,850	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION V--CONTINUED							
MICHIGAN--CONTINUED							
MUSKEGON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,750	13,000	16,050	19,100	23,000	25,700	26,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,400	12,450	15,400	18,300	21,950	24,500	25,750
WALKUP	9,300	11,600	14,700	17,350	20,050	22,150	23,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,250	16,600	20,900	------	------	------	------
TRAVERSE CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,250	17,550	20,900	25,100	28,100	29,250
ROW DWELLINGS	11,350	13,650	16,850	20,000	24,100	26,850	28,100
WALKUP	10,200	12,700	16,050	19,050	22,000	24,400	25,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,600	18,200	22,950	------	------	------	------
MINNESOTA							
MINNEAPOLIS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,750	15,400	19,050	22,750	27,300	30,400	31,800
ROW DWELLINGS	12,150	14,750	18,100	21,600	25,950	28,900	30,250
WALKUP	10,150	12,700	15,950	18,800	21,750	24,050	25,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,200	17,600	22,350	------	------	------	------
DULUTH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,950	15,650	19,300	23,100	27,700	30,900	32,300
ROW DWELLINGS	12,450	14,900	18,400	21,950	26,350	29,400	30,700
WALKUP	10,700	13,250	16,850	19,900	23,000	25,450	26,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,400	17,900	22,600	------	------	------	------
MANKATO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,100	14,800	18,150	21,700	26,100	29,100	30,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,700	14,000	17,300	20,650	24,850	27,650	28,900
WALKUP	10,700	13,200	16,800	19,900	22,900	25,300	26,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,500	16,850	21,250	------	------	------	------
ROCHESTER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,500	15,100	18,600	22,200	26,750	29,700	31,050
ROW DWELLINGS	11,950	14,350	17,700	21,150	25,350	28,200	29,600
WALKUP	9,850	12,250	15,500	18,300	21,200	23,450	24,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,150	16,500	20,950	------	------	------	------
ST CLOUD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,100	14,600	18,150	21,600	25,900	28,800	30,150
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	14,050	17,300	20,650	24,750	27,650	28,850
WALKUP	10,150	12,600	16,050	18,950	21,900	24,150	25,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,000	16,250	20,600	------	------	------	------
WORTHINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,600	14,000	17,350	20,700	24,750	27,650	28,900
ROW DWELLINGS	11,150	13,350	16,500	19,650	23,650	26,250	27,550
WALKUP	9,300	11,500	14,650	17,300	19,950	22,000	23,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,900	16,150	20,500	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION V--CONTINUED							
OHIO							
CINCINATTI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,000	13,200	16,350	19,550	23,400	26,150	27,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,750	13,000	16,050	19,050	22,850	25,500	26,750
WALKUP	10,500	13,000	16,550	19,600	22,600	24,950	26,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,800	24,150	30,500	------	------	------	------
DAYTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,000	13,250	16,400	19,600	23,450	26,200	27,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,750	13,000	16,050	19,050	22,850	25,500	26,750
WALKUP	10,500	13,000	16,550	19,600	22,600	24,950	26,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,800	24,150	30,500	------	------	------	------
CLEVELAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,450	15,200	18,600	22,250	26,700	29,750	31,150
ROW DWELLINGS	12,100	14,500	17,950	21,450	25,700	28,750	30,000
WALKUP	11,050	13,650	17,250	20,550	23,750	26,200	27,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,600	20,550	26,000	------	------	------	------
AKRON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,950	13,350	16,450	19,550	23,450	26,100	27,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,950	14,300	17,700	21,000	25,300	28,200	29,550
WALKUP	10,750	13,350	16,850	19,950	23,100	25,500	26,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,800	19,550	24,750	------	------	------	------
FINDLEY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,250	12,450	15,400	18,350	22,000	24,450	25,650
ROW DWELLINGS	10,950	13,150	16,250	19,350	23,350	25,950	27,200
WALKUP	9,950	12,350	15,600	18,600	21,550	23,700	24,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,950	18,550	23,550	------	------	------	------
LORAIN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,800	13,150	16,200	19,350	23,250	25,800	27,000
ROW DWELLINGS	11,600	13,850	17,150	20,400	24,550	27,400	28,650
WALKUP	10,550	13,000	16,500	19,550	22,700	25,050	26,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,850	19,600	24,800	------	------	------	------
MANSFIELD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,550	12,850	15,850	18,850	22,600	25,150	26,350
ROW DWELLINGS	11,150	13,350	16,500	19,650	23,700	26,450	27,650
WALKUP	10,250	12,650	16,050	19,100	22,100	24,300	25,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,350	19,100	24,150	------	------	------	------
TOLEDO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,200	13,550	16,750	19,900	23,950	26,650	27,900
ROW DWELLINGS	11,900	14,250	17,600	20,950	25,200	28,100	29,350
WALKUP	10,800	13,450	17,050	20,200	23,350	25,800	27,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,250	20,100	25,400	------	------	------	------
YOUNGSTOWN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,550	12,850	15,850	18,850	22,600	25,150	26,350
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,450	16,650	19,850	23,950	26,650	27,900
WALKUP	10,250	12,650	16,050	19,100	22,100	24,300	25,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,450	19,150	24,200	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION V--CONTINUED							
OHIO--CONTINUED							
COLUMBUS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,150	17,500	20,850	25,050	28,000	29,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,550	13,950	17,200	20,450	24,550	27,400	28,700
WALKUP	10,200	12,650	16,000	19,050	21,900	24,200	25,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,400	19,050	24,100	------	------	------	------
ATHENS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,900	14,400	17,750	21,100	25,450	28,500	29,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,350	13,600	16,800	20,050	24,050	26,800	28,050
WALKUP	10,350	12,850	16,300	19,350	22,350	24,650	25,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,300	24,450	------	------	------	------
LIMA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,150	17,500	20,850	25,050	28,000	29,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,300	13,600	16,800	20,000	24,050	26,750	28,050
WALKUP	10,300	12,800	16,150	19,250	22,200	24,450	25,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,400	19,050	24,100	------	------	------	------
MARIETTA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,900	14,400	17,750	21,100	25,450	28,500	29,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,750	14,100	17,450	20,750	24,950	27,850	29,150
WALKUP	10,150	12,600	15,950	19,000	21,850	24,100	25,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,300	24,450	------	------	------	------
NEWARK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,450	13,850	17,050	20,300	24,500	27,400	28,500
ROW DWELLINGS	11,300	13,600	16,750	19,950	24,000	26,700	27,950
WALKUP	9,950	12,400	15,700	18,650	21,500	23,700	24,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,000	18,650	23,500	------	------	------	------
SPRINGFIELD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,150	17,500	20,850	25,050	28,000	29,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,450	13,850	17,050	20,300	24,400	27,150	28,450
WALKUP	10,200	12,650	16,000	19,050	21,900	24,200	25,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,400	19,050	24,100	------	------	------	------
TROY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,500	14,000	17,200	20,500	24,650	27,600	28,750
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,250	16,350	19,500	23,350	26,000	27,250
WALKUP	10,100	12,650	15,950	19,000	21,850	24,150	25,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,100	18,750	23,700	------	------	------	------
ZANESVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,900	14,400	17,750	21,100	25,450	28,500	29,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,750	14,100	17,450	20,750	24,950	27,850	29,150
WALKUP	10,150	12,600	15,950	19,000	21,900	24,150	25,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,300	24,450	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION V--CONTINUED							
WISCONSIN							
MILWAUKEE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,900	14,450	17,800	21,200	25,500	28,450	29,800
ROW DWELLINGS	11,300	13,550	16,600	19,850	23,900	26,550	27,850
WALKUP	10,750	13,250	16,850	19,850	23,050	25,450	26,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,550	16,900	21,350	------	------	------	------
EAU CLAIRE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,550	13,950	17,200	20,600	24,700	27,600	28,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,650	12,700	15,650	18,650	22,400	24,950	26,150
WALKUP	10,800	13,400	17,000	20,050	23,250	25,550	26,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,200	16,500	20,800	------	------	------	------
GREEN BAY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,350	16,450	19,700	23,550	26,350	27,600
ROW DWELLINGS	10,100	12,100	14,900	17,850	21,350	23,800	24,950
WALKUP	10,000	12,400	15,650	18,550	21,450	23,750	24,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,550	15,750	19,950	------	------	------	------
MADISON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,700	14,200	17,500	20,900	25,150	28,050	29,300
ROW DWELLINGS	10,800	12,850	15,900	18,950	22,750	25,450	26,550
WALKUP	10,650	13,150	16,700	19,700	22,850	25,200	26,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,450	16,800	21,200	------	------	------	------
REEDSVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,650	16,750	20,100	24,050	26,950	28,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,450	15,250	18,300	21,900	24,450	25,650
WALKUP	10,250	12,750	16,000	19,000	22,050	24,250	25,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,900	16,100	20,400	------	------	------	------
SUPERIOR:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,050	14,550	17,900	21,400	25,700	28,700	30,000
ROW DWELLINGS	11,050	13,200	16,250	19,450	23,400	26,000	27,250
WALKUP	11,200	13,800	17,500	20,700	23,900	26,400	27,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,750	17,150	21,700	------	------	------	------
WAUSAU:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,650	16,750	20,100	24,050	26,950	28,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,300	12,400	15,200	18,250	21,800	24,350	25,550
WALKUP	10,250	12,700	15,950	18,900	21,850	24,150	25,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,850	16,050	20,350	------	------	------	------
REGION VI							
ARKANSAS							
LITTLE ROCK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,000	13,350	16,500	19,650	23,600	26,300	27,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,500	12,750	15,700	18,700	22,500	25,000	26,200
WALKUP	9,450	11,750	14,850	17,650	20,500	22,600	23,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,350	16,550	21,100	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
ARKANSAS--CONTINUED							
FAYETTEVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,950	13,200	16,400	19,450	23,500	26,050	27,250
ROW DWELLINGS	10,450	12,700	15,600	18,600	22,400	24,850	25,950
WALKUP	8,500	10,650	13,450	15,850	18,450	20,300	21,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,200	16,450	20,750	------	------	------	------
FORT SMITH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,350	12,550	15,500	18,400	22,150	24,650	25,700
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,150	15,050	17,850	21,500	23,900	25,000
WALKUP	8,950	11,100	14,050	16,600	19,250	21,250	22,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,450	16,800	21,250	------	------	------	------
JONESBORO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,250	12,300	15,350	18,200	21,900	24,350	25,300
ROW DWELLINGS	9,850	11,950	14,850	17,550	21,150	23,700	24,550
WALKUP	8,800	10,900	13,800	16,350	18,900	20,850	21,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,000	16,250	20,550	------	------	------	------
TEXARKANA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,600	12,750	15,800	18,800	22,650	25,100	26,250
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,250	15,050	17,900	21,600	24,000	25,050
WALKUP	9,000	11,200	14,150	16,800	19,500	21,500	22,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,200	16,450	20,750	------	------	------	------
LOUISIANA							
NEW ORLEANS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,700	11,750	14,400	17,100	20,700	23,050	23,950
ROW DWELLINGS	9,100	11,050	13,800	16,400	19,650	21,800	22,900
WALKUP	8,800	11,000	13,850	16,300	18,900	20,900	21,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,700	18,150	23,100	------	------	------	------
BATON ROUGE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,450	12,550	15,450	18,300	22,100	24,650	25,600
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,850	14,750	17,500	20,950	23,300	24,450
WALKUP	8,450	10,550	13,300	15,700	18,150	20,050	20,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,550	18,000	22,900	------	------	------	------
BURAS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,850	11,900	14,650	17,450	21,000	23,400	24,450
ROW DWELLINGS	9,350	11,250	14,050	16,700	20,050	22,350	23,300
WALKUP	8,400	10,500	13,250	15,700	18,150	20,050	21,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,900	18,500	23,500	------	------	------	------
HOUMA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,650	11,650	14,300	17,000	20,550	22,850	23,750
ROW DWELLINGS	9,050	11,000	13,650	16,250	19,500	21,650	22,750
WALKUP	8,650	10,850	13,550	16,050	18,600	20,550	21,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,550	18,000	22,900	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
LOUISIANA--CONTINUED							
LAFAYETTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,650	11,650	14,300	17,000	20,550	22,850	23,750
ROW DWELLINGS	9,050	11,000	13,650	16,250	19,500	21,650	22,750
WALKUP	8,750	10,950	13,650	16,200	18,800	20,700	21,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,550	18,000	22,900	------	------	------	------
LAKE CHARLES:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,400	12,550	15,400	18,300	22,100	24,550	25,600
ROW DWELLINGS	9,750	11,800	14,750	17,500	20,950	23,300	24,450
WALKUP	8,900	11,150	14,100	16,600	19,250	21,300	22,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,700	18,150	23,100	------	------	------	------
SHREVEPORT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,100	13,350	16,550	19,600	23,700	26,450	27,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,300	12,550	15,500	18,450	22,300	24,700	25,800
WALKUP	8,750	10,950	13,850	16,450	18,950	21,000	22,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,600	16,950	21,500	------	------	------	------
ALEXANDRIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,100	15,000	17,850	21,400	23,950	25,000
ROW DWELLINGS	9,950	11,450	14,150	16,850	20,200	22,550	23,550
WALKUP	8,550	10,600	13,450	15,900	18,400	20,300	21,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,150	16,450	20,750	------	------	------	------
MARSHALL, TEXAS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,150	12,150	15,050	17,950	21,500	24,050	25,050
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,650	14,350	17,150	20,600	22,950	23,950
WALKUP	8,500	10,550	13,350	15,800	18,350	20,250	21,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,550	15,700	19,950	------	------	------	------
MONROE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,050	12,000	14,850	17,650	21,250	23,800	24,700
ROW DWELLINGS	9,400	11,400	14,050	16,800	20,150	22,450	23,400
WALKUP	8,750	10,850	13,800	16,300	18,850	20,800	21,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,450	16,750	21,350	------	------	------	------
NEW MEXICO							
ALBUQUERQUE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,100	13,300	14,850	17,700	21,300	23,800	24,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,650	14,100	16,800	20,100	22,400	23,500
WALKUP	9,300	11,500	13,050	15,450	17,950	19,700	20,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,850	21,950	27,800	------	------	------	------
ALAMOGORDO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	13,900	15,550	18,500	22,300	24,900	25,950
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,150	14,650	17,450	20,850	23,200	24,350
WALKUP	9,650	12,000	13,550	16,050	18,600	20,500	21,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,700	20,550	26,000	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
NEW MEXICO--CONTINUED							
ARTESIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	13,900	15,500	18,450	22,300	24,850	25,750
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,150	14,700	17,600	20,950	23,350	24,450
WALKUP	9,700	12,050	13,600	16,200	18,700	20,650	21,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,000	20,900	26,500	------	------	------	------
CARLSBAD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,200	15,800	18,800	22,650	25,250	26,250
ROW DWELLINGS	11,150	13,450	14,950	17,900	21,300	23,750	24,900
WALKUP	9,600	12,050	13,600	16,050	18,600	20,550	21,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,000	20,900	26,500	------	------	------	------
CLOVIS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	13,900	15,500	18,450	22,300	24,850	25,750
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,150	14,700	17,600	20,950	23,350	24,450
WALKUP	9,600	11,950	13,450	16,050	18,500	20,450	21,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,750	20,600	26,000	------	------	------	------
FORT SUMNER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,050	14,500	16,150	19,200	23,200	25,900	26,950
ROW DWELLINGS	11,450	13,750	15,300	18,250	21,850	24,300	25,500
WALKUP	10,100	12,550	14,150	16,800	19,450	21,450	22,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,500	21,550	27,200	------	------	------	------
GALLUP:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,700	15,250	17,050	20,250	24,450	27,300	28,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,150	15,800	18,800	22,450	25,000	26,200
WALKUP	10,350	12,950	14,600	17,350	20,100	22,100	23,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,000	22,150	27,900	------	------	------	------
HOBBS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	13,900	15,500	18,450	22,300	24,850	25,750
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,150	14,700	17,600	20,950	23,350	24,450
WALKUP	9,700	12,050	13,600	16,200	18,700	20,650	21,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,750	20,600	26,000	------	------	------	------
LA CRUCES:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	13,900	15,500	18,450	22,300	24,850	25,750
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,150	14,700	17,600	20,950	23,350	24,450
WALKUP	9,900	12,300	13,850	16,450	19,050	21,000	22,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,750	20,600	26,000	------	------	------	------
LAS VEGAS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,950	14,350	16,000	19,000	22,950	25,600	26,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,600	13,800	15,350	18,350	21,950	24,400	25,550
WALKUP	10,100	12,550	14,200	16,850	19,450	21,500	22,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,500	21,450	27,200	------	------	------	------
LOS ALAMOS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,400	14,900	16,600	19,650	23,800	26,600	27,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,150	15,800	18,800	22,500	25,000	26,250
WALKUP	10,400	12,950	14,600	17,300	20,000	22,050	23,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,950	22,100	27,850	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
NEW MEXICO--CONTINUED							
RATON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,850	14,250	15,900	18,850	22,750	25,400	26,450
ROW DWELLINGS	11,600	13,800	15,350	18,350	21,950	24,400	25,550
WALKUP	10,100	12,550	14,200	16,850	19,450	21,500	22,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,500	21,450	27,200	------	------	------	------
SANTA FE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,900	14,250	15,950	18,900	22,800	25,450	26,500
ROW DWELLINGS	11,600	13,800	15,350	18,350	21,950	24,400	25,550
WALKUP	10,100	12,550	14,200	16,850	19,450	21,500	22,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,500	21,450	27,200	------	------	------	------
SILVER CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,300	14,850	16,500	19,550	23,700	26,450	27,450
ROW DWELLINGS	11,700	14,050	15,600	18,600	22,300	24,800	26,050
WALKUP	10,300	12,850	14,500	17,050	19,850	21,900	22,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,850	21,900	27,750	------	------	------	------
TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,500	13,750	15,400	18,300	22,050	24,550	25,550
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	13,000	14,600	17,400	20,750	23,150	24,250
WALKUP	9,600	11,950	13,500	16,000	18,550	20,450	21,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,500	20,400	25,800	------	------	------	------
FARMINGTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,400	14,900	16,650	19,800	23,850	26,650	27,750
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,150	15,800	18,800	22,450	25,000	26,200
WALKUP	10,350	12,950	14,600	17,350	20,100	22,100	23,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,000	22,150	27,900	------	------	------	------
TERRA AMARILLO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,400	14,900	16,600	19,650	23,800	26,600	27,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,150	15,800	18,800	22,500	25,000	26,250
WALKUP	10,400	12,950	14,600	17,300	20,000	22,050	23,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,950	22,100	27,850	------	------	------	------
TAOS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,050	16,800	18,750	22,250	26,900	30,000	31,200
ROW DWELLINGS	13,400	16,000	17,850	21,200	25,500	28,300	29,700
WALKUP	11,600	14,350	16,200	19,200	22,250	24,500	25,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,800	21,950	27,700	------	------	------	------
SOCORRO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,500	13,750	15,400	18,300	22,050	24,550	25,550
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	13,000	14,600	17,400	20,750	23,150	24,250
WALKUP	9,600	11,950	13,500	16,000	18,550	20,450	21,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,500	20,400	25,800	------	------	------	------
RUIDOSO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,400	14,900	16,600	19,650	23,800	26,600	27,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,150	15,800	18,800	22,500	25,000	26,250
WALKUP	10,400	12,950	14,600	17,300	20,000	22,050	23,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,950	22,100	27,850	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
NEW MEXICO--CONTINUED							
DULCE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,500	18,600	20,700	24,650	29,700	33,200	34,600
ROW DWELLINGS	14,750	17,650	19,700	23,450	28,050	31,250	32,700
WALKUP	12,750	15,750	17,900	21,200	24,600	27,050	28,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	23,200	27,000	34,100	------	------	------	------
ISLETA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,450	16,100	18,000	21,450	25,900	28,900	30,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,150	13,350	14,850	17,750	21,150	23,650	24,700
WALKUP	9,700	11,950	13,550	16,050	18,600	20,400	21,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,500	20,400	25,800	------	------	------	------
JEMEZ:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,550	16,300	18,200	21,650	26,100	29,100	30,350
ROW DWELLINGS	12,950	15,500	17,350	20,600	24,700	27,400	31,450
WALKUP	11,200	13,850	15,700	18,600	21,600	23,700	24,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,300	23,700	29,950	------	------	------	------
LAGUNA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,800	16,600	18,500	22,050	26,550	29,650	30,900
ROW DWELLINGS	13,200	15,750	17,550	21,000	25,050	27,900	31,900
WALKUP	11,350	14,100	16,000	18,950	22,000	24,150	25,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,650	24,150	30,500	------	------	------	------
MESCALERO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,300	19,650	21,900	26,100	31,450	35,050	36,450
ROW DWELLINGS	15,550	18,700	20,800	24,800	29,600	32,950	34,650
WALKUP	13,500	16,650	18,950	22,450	26,050	28,550	29,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	24,450	28,550	36,100	------	------	------	------
PENASCO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,400	19,400	23,150	27,900	31,150	32,400
ROW DWELLINGS	13,800	16,550	18,450	22,000	26,300	29,250	30,650
WALKUP	11,950	14,850	16,800	19,900	23,000	25,350	26,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	21,750	25,350	32,000	------	------	------	------
POJOAQUE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,200	17,100	19,050	22,700	27,300	30,500	31,700
ROW DWELLINGS	13,500	16,250	18,050	21,550	25,750	28,650	30,100
WALKUP	11,750	14,500	16,500	19,550	22,650	24,850	26,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	21,250	24,850	31,400	------	------	------	------
OKLAHOMA							
OKLAHOMA CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,750	11,750	14,600	17,400	20,850	23,300	24,350
ROW DWELLINGS	9,200	11,100	13,650	16,300	19,550	21,800	22,750
WALKUP	8,750	10,950	13,800	16,350	19,050	20,950	22,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,350	19,000	24,050	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
OKLAHOMA--CONTINUED							
ADA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,250	15,300	18,200	21,900	24,500	25,450
ROW DWELLINGS	9,600	11,600	14,300	17,050	20,400	22,750	23,800
WALKUP	9,150	11,500	14,450	17,150	20,000	21,950	23,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,300	24,400	------	------	------	------
ARDMORE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,500	12,550	15,700	18,650	22,400	25,050	26,100
ROW DWELLINGS	9,850	11,900	14,650	17,450	20,950	23,350	24,350
WALKUP	9,650	12,000	15,150	18,000	20,900	23,000	24,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,400	20,200	25,550	------	------	------	------
ENID:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,400	12,450	15,450	18,500	22,200	24,750	25,750
ROW DWELLINGS	9,750	11,800	14,450	17,250	20,700	23,100	24,150
WALKUP	8,900	11,050	13,900	16,550	19,300	21,200	22,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,300	19,900	25,300	------	------	------	------
GUYMON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,550	12,650	15,800	18,750	22,500	25,150	26,250
ROW DWELLINGS	9,950	11,950	14,750	17,550	21,100	23,500	24,500
WALKUP	9,500	11,750	14,900	17,650	20,500	22,650	23,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,500	20,350	25,650	------	------	------	------
LAWTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,950	12,000	14,850	17,700	21,300	23,750	24,750
ROW DWELLINGS	9,400	11,300	13,900	16,600	19,900	22,200	23,200
WALKUP	8,900	11,150	14,100	16,600	19,400	21,300	22,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,150	18,700	23,700	------	------	------	------
SHAWNEE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,250	15,300	18,200	21,900	24,500	25,450
ROW DWELLINGS	9,600	11,600	14,300	17,050	20,400	22,750	23,800
WALKUP	9,150	11,500	14,450	17,150	20,000	21,950	23,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,300	24,400	------	------	------	------
STILLWATER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,250	15,300	18,200	21,900	24,500	25,450
ROW DWELLINGS	9,600	11,600	14,300	17,050	20,400	22,750	23,800
WALKUP	9,150	11,500	14,450	17,150	20,000	21,950	23,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,300	24,400	------	------	------	------
WOODWARD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,400	12,450	15,450	18,500	22,200	24,750	25,750
ROW DWELLINGS	9,750	11,800	14,450	17,250	20,700	23,100	24,150
WALKUP	9,300	11,650	14,600	17,400	20,250	22,250	23,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,300	19,900	25,300	------	------	------	------
TULSA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,450	12,600	15,650	18,600	22,400	24,950	26,000
ROW DWELLINGS	9,700	11,800	14,550	17,250	20,750	23,150	24,200
WALKUP	8,800	10,950	13,800	16,350	19,000	20,900	21,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,550	15,650	19,850	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
OKLAHOMA--CONTINUED							
BARTLESVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,000	13,250	16,450	19,550	23,500	26,150	27,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,400	15,250	18,400	21,750	24,250	25,400
WALKUP	8,850	11,050	13,850	16,450	19,200	21,100	22,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,550	15,650	19,850	------	------	------	------
MCALESTER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,200	16,450	19,550	23,450	26,150	27,250
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,350	15,250	18,150	21,750	24,250	25,350
WALKUP	8,600	10,750	13,500	16,000	18,550	20,400	21,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,150	15,300	19,350	------	------	------	------
MUSKOGEE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,150	13,400	16,650	19,750	23,750	26,450	27,600
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,800	15,900	18,850	22,600	25,250	26,350
WALKUP	8,800	10,950	13,750	16,300	18,950	20,850	21,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,950	16,150	20,500	------	------	------	------
TEXAS							
DALLAS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,450	12,650	15,600	18,600	22,350	24,950	26,000
ROW DWELLINGS	9,000	10,700	13,350	15,900	19,150	21,300	22,250
WALKUP	8,200	10,250	12,950	15,300	17,800	19,500	20,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,150	16,450	20,850	------	------	------	------
SHERMAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,600	12,800	15,800	18,850	22,750	25,200	26,450
ROW DWELLINGS	8,900	10,700	13,300	15,850	19,000	21,200	22,200
WALKUP	8,200	10,250	12,900	15,300	17,800	19,450	20,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,400	16,800	21,200	------	------	------	------
TYLER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,250	15,100	18,050	21,700	24,100	25,150
ROW DWELLINGS	8,750	10,500	13,100	15,500	18,700	20,800	21,750
WALKUP	7,750	9,650	12,200	14,400	16,700	18,350	19,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,650	17,100	21,650	------	------	------	------
WACO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,050	12,150	15,050	17,900	21,600	23,950	25,100
ROW DWELLINGS	8,700	10,450	12,950	15,450	18,600	20,700	21,650
WALKUP	7,750	9,700	12,200	14,400	16,800	18,350	19,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,700	16,650	21,050	------	------	------	------
FORT WORTH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,300	15,300	18,250	21,900	24,400	25,500
ROW DWELLINGS	9,600	11,500	14,300	17,050	20,400	22,800	23,850
WALKUP	8,600	10,700	13,500	16,000	18,550	20,450	21,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,100	17,500	22,250	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
TEXAS--CONTINUED							
ABILENE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,650	12,800	15,900	18,950	22,750	25,450	26,500
ROW DWELLINGS	9,900	11,850	14,750	17,550	21,100	23,600	24,550
WALKUP	8,100	10,100	12,750	15,100	17,450	19,300	20,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,650	18,100	22,950	------	------	------	------
SAN ANGELO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,500	12,650	15,750	18,800	22,550	25,200	26,300
ROW DWELLINGS	10,000	11,950	14,800	17,650	21,250	23,700	24,800
WALKUP	8,450	10,500	13,250	15,750	18,300	20,100	21,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,750	18,300	23,150	------	------	------	------
WICHITA FALLS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,650	12,750	15,950	18,950	22,700	25,450	26,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,000	11,950	14,800	17,650	21,250	23,700	24,800
WALKUP	9,400	11,750	14,800	17,550	20,450	22,450	23,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,750	18,300	23,150	------	------	------	------
HOUSTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	8,850	10,700	13,150	15,650	18,850	21,050	21,950
ROW DWELLINGS	7,800	9,450	11,700	13,900	16,700	18,550	19,450
WALKUP	7,150	8,950	11,250	13,350	15,400	17,000	17,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,650	15,900	20,050	------	------	------	------
BEAUMONT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,050	10,950	13,550	16,050	19,400	21,600	22,550
ROW DWELLINGS	8,000	9,650	11,950	14,200	17,100	19,000	19,900
WALKUP	7,250	9,100	11,450	13,550	15,700	17,350	18,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,000	16,300	20,600	------	------	------	------
BRYAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,450	12,650	15,600	18,550	22,400	25,000	25,950
ROW DWELLINGS	8,400	10,200	12,600	14,950	17,950	20,000	20,900
WALKUP	6,550	8,200	10,350	12,300	14,200	15,700	16,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,450	15,650	19,750	------	------	------	------
EL CAMPO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,700	11,650	14,350	17,050	20,600	22,950	23,950
ROW DWELLINGS	7,750	9,400	11,600	13,750	16,550	18,400	19,300
WALKUP	7,350	9,200	11,600	13,750	15,900	17,550	18,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,550	15,750	19,900	------	------	------	------
LUFKIN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,550	11,500	14,200	16,900	20,350	22,700	23,750
ROW DWELLINGS	8,400	10,200	12,650	15,000	18,000	20,050	20,950
WALKUP	7,150	8,950	11,300	13,400	15,500	17,100	17,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,650	15,900	20,050	------	------	------	------
TEXAS CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	8,850	10,700	13,150	15,650	18,850	21,050	21,950
ROW DWELLINGS	7,800	9,450	11,700	13,900	16,700	18,550	19,450
WALKUP	7,450	9,300	11,750	13,900	16,100	17,800	18,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,650	15,900	20,050	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
TEXAS--CONTINUED							
LUBBOCK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,200	15,100	18,050	21,800	24,200	25,200
ROW DWELLINGS	8,700	10,450	13,050	15,450	18,550	20,700	21,650
WALKUP	7,850	9,900	12,450	14,700	17,050	18,700	19,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,000	17,400	22,050	------	------	------	------
AMARILLO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,800	13,000	16,150	19,250	23,250	25,800	26,900
ROW DWELLINGS	9,200	11,100	13,750	16,350	19,650	21,900	22,800
WALKUP	8,300	10,350	13,100	15,500	18,000	19,800	20,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,400	17,900	22,650	------	------	------	------
EL PASO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,150	15,050	17,950	21,650	24,150	25,150
ROW DWELLINGS	9,700	11,500	14,400	17,100	20,500	23,000	23,900
WALKUP	8,750	10,850	13,700	16,150	18,800	20,650	21,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,600	17,050	21,550	------	------	------	------
MIDLAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,700	11,700	14,500	17,350	20,800	23,200	24,200
ROW DWELLINGS	8,400	10,150	12,550	15,000	18,000	20,050	21,000
WALKUP	7,800	9,850	12,400	14,650	17,000	18,650	19,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,400	16,600	21,100	------	------	------	------
ODESSA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,700	11,700	14,500	17,350	20,800	23,200	24,200
ROW DWELLINGS	8,350	10,050	12,450	14,800	17,800	19,850	20,750
WALKUP	7,500	9,350	11,800	14,000	16,200	17,800	18,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,400	16,600	21,100	------	------	------	------
SAN ANTONIO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,200	11,000	13,650	16,300	19,650	21,800	22,750
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	10,600	13,000	15,550	18,700	20,850	21,650
WALKUP	8,400	10,600	13,300	15,750	18,350	20,150	21,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,550	18,100	23,000	------	------	------	------
AUSTIN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,550	11,450	14,150	16,900	20,350	22,650	23,600
ROW DWELLINGS	9,050	10,950	13,500	16,100	19,350	21,550	22,450
WALKUP	8,250	10,500	13,100	15,650	18,150	19,850	20,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,450	17,950	22,750	------	------	------	------
CORPUS CHRISTI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,950	11,950	14,900	17,750	21,300	23,750	24,700
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,550	14,350	17,050	20,500	22,850	23,750
WALKUP	9,050	11,300	14,300	16,800	19,500	21,450	22,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,450	16,750	21,300	------	------	------	------
DEL RIO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,050	10,800	13,400	16,050	19,250	21,450	22,250
ROW DWELLINGS	8,500	10,300	12,750	15,200	18,250	20,350	21,200
WALKUP	8,400	10,550	13,300	15,750	18,350	20,150	21,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,850	24,000	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VI--CONTINUED							
TEXAS--CONTINUED							
EAGLE PASS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,600	12,650	15,700	18,750	22,550	25,000	26,050
ROW DWELLINGS	8,750	10,600	13,050	15,600	18,750	20,900	21,750
WALKUP	8,650	11,000	13,750	16,400	19,000	20,850	21,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,350	24,500	------	------	------	------
HARLINGEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,950	11,950	14,800	17,750	21,250	23,700	24,700
ROW DWELLINGS	9,050	10,900	13,500	16,150	19,300	21,550	22,450
WALKUP	8,650	11,000	13,800	16,400	19,050	20,950	22,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,400	17,800	22,600	------	------	------	------
JUNCTION:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,850	11,900	14,700	17,500	21,100	23,450	24,400
ROW DWELLINGS	8,850	10,750	13,300	15,800	19,050	21,250	22,100
WALKUP	8,800	11,050	13,900	16,600	19,200	21,150	22,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,900	19,650	24,850	------	------	------	------
LAREDO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,850	11,850	14,650	17,500	21,000	23,400	24,350
ROW DWELLINGS	9,300	11,300	13,950	16,650	19,950	22,250	23,150
WALKUP	7,650	9,650	12,100	14,350	16,750	18,350	19,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,200	18,850	24,000	------	------	------	------
VICTORIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,300	11,200	13,900	16,550	19,850	22,100	23,000
ROW DWELLINGS	8,800	10,700	13,150	15,700	18,900	21,100	21,950
WALKUP	8,950	11,250	14,150	16,800	19,550	21,450	22,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,800	19,500	24,750	------	------	------	------
REGION VII							
IOWA							
DES MOINES:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,200	17,500	20,950	25,200	27,950	29,300
ROW DWELLINGS	11,300	13,600	16,700	19,900	23,950	26,650	27,850
WALKUP	10,700	13,450	17,000	20,150	23,350	25,600	26,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,450	19,050	24,150	------	------	------	------
BETTENDORF:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,300	14,800	18,250	21,800	26,300	29,200	30,550
ROW DWELLINGS	11,700	14,100	17,350	20,650	24,950	27,800	29,000
WALKUP	11,250	14,000	17,750	20,900	24,300	26,700	28,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,000	19,650	24,900	------	------	------	------
CEDAR RAPIDS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,200	14,700	18,150	21,550	26,000	28,900	30,200
ROW DWELLINGS	12,050	14,500	17,850	21,250	25,550	28,500	29,750
WALKUP	11,200	13,900	17,650	21,700	25,100	26,550	27,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,850	19,550	24,800	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VII--CONTINUED							
IOWA--CONTINUED							
COUNCIL BLUFFS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,650	12,900	15,850	18,950	22,850	25,300	26,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,250	15,050	18,100	21,650	24,200	25,250
WALKUP	10,300	12,900	16,350	19,400	22,400	24,650	25,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,150	17,600	22,200	------	------	------	------
DAVENPORT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,200	14,700	18,150	21,550	26,000	28,900	30,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	14,050	17,250	20,550	24,700	27,600	28,750
WALKUP	11,200	13,900	17,650	21,700	25,100	26,550	27,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,000	19,650	24,900	------	------	------	------
DUBUQUE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,200	14,700	18,150	21,550	26,000	28,900	30,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	14,050	17,250	20,550	24,700	27,600	28,750
WALKUP	11,200	13,900	17,650	21,700	25,100	26,550	27,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,400	24,550	------	------	------	------
MASON CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,200	14,700	18,150	21,550	26,000	28,900	30,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	14,050	17,250	20,550	24,700	27,600	28,750
WALKUP	10,600	13,200	16,750	20,650	23,850	25,250	26,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,400	24,550	------	------	------	------
SIOUX CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,200	14,700	18,150	21,550	26,000	28,900	30,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,550	13,900	17,150	20,450	24,600	27,400	28,600
WALKUP	10,650	13,200	16,750	20,700	23,900	25,300	26,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,400	24,550	------	------	------	------
WATERLOO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,200	14,700	18,150	21,550	26,000	28,900	30,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	14,050	17,250	20,550	24,700	27,600	28,750
WALKUP	11,200	13,900	17,650	21,700	25,100	26,550	27,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,700	19,400	24,550	------	------	------	------
KANSAS							
KANSAS CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,300	16,100	19,850	23,600	28,450	31,600	33,100
ROW DWELLINGS	12,450	14,950	18,500	22,000	26,500	29,500	30,800
WALKUP	11,150	13,800	17,600	20,750	24,000	26,500	27,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,700	20,500	25,950	------	------	------	------
TOPEKA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,950	15,600	19,350	22,950	27,650	30,750	32,200
ROW DWELLINGS	12,400	14,750	18,350	21,800	26,250	29,300	30,600
WALKUP	10,350	13,000	16,500	19,400	22,500	24,900	26,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,600	21,550	27,250	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VII--CONTINUED							
KANSAS--CONTINUED							
HOLTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,900	18,000	22,250	26,400	31,800	35,400	37,100
ROW DWELLINGS	12,950	15,450	19,200	22,800	27,500	30,700	32,000
WALKUP	10,850	13,600	17,250	20,300	23,550	26,050	27,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,450	21,400	27,050	------	------	------	------
GARDEN CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,100	14,600	18,050	21,500	25,900	28,750	30,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,600	13,850	17,150	20,400	24,550	27,450	28,600
WALKUP	9,750	12,100	15,350	18,250	21,100	23,250	24,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,450	20,200	25,450	------	------	------	------
PITTSBURG:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,900	14,350	17,750	21,100	25,450	28,300	29,600
ROW DWELLINGS	11,350	13,600	16,850	20,000	24,150	26,950	28,100
WALKUP	9,500	11,950	15,100	17,800	20,700	22,900	23,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,050	19,750	24,950	------	------	------	------
SALINA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,900	14,350	17,750	21,200	25,550	28,350	29,700
ROW DWELLINGS	11,400	13,650	17,000	20,100	24,200	27,050	28,250
WALKUP	9,600	12,000	15,200	17,850	20,800	22,900	23,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,200	19,850	25,050	------	------	------	------
WICHITA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,500	15,100	18,750	22,200	26,750	29,750	31,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,900	14,250	17,750	21,000	25,400	28,300	29,550
WALKUP	10,000	12,550	15,950	18,750	21,800	23,950	25,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,050	19,750	24,950	------	------	------	------
MISSOURI							
KANSAS CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,300	16,100	19,850	23,600	28,450	31,600	33,100
ROW DWELLINGS	12,450	14,950	18,500	22,000	26,500	29,500	30,800
WALKUP	11,150	13,800	17,600	20,750	24,000	26,500	27,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,700	20,500	25,950	------	------	------	------
JOPLIN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,300	14,950	18,450	21,950	26,450	29,450	30,800
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	13,900	17,300	20,550	24,750	27,500	28,700
WALKUP	10,400	12,850	16,400	19,350	22,400	24,650	25,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,550	19,200	24,250	------	------	------	------
ST. JOSEPH:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,800	15,350	19,000	22,600	27,300	30,400	31,800
ROW DWELLINGS	12,000	14,350	17,750	21,050	25,400	28,350	29,550
WALKUP	10,700	13,350	16,900	19,950	23,200	25,500	26,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,950	19,700	24,950	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VII--CONTINUED							
MISSOURI--CONTINUED							
SEDALIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,800	15,350	19,000	22,600	27,300	30,400	31,800
ROW DWELLINGS	12,000	14,350	17,750	21,050	25,400	28,350	29,550
WALKUP	10,700	13,350	16,900	19,950	23,200	25,500	26,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,950	19,700	24,950	------	------	------	------
SPRINGFIELD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,850	15,450	19,150	22,800	27,500	30,600	32,000
ROW DWELLINGS	12,050	14,450	17,850	21,250	25,600	28,550	29,800
WALKUP	10,200	12,650	16,000	18,900	21,950	24,200	25,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,850	19,550	24,750	------	------	------	------
ST. LOUIS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,700	15,300	18,850	22,500	27,100	30,150	31,550
ROW DWELLINGS	11,800	14,050	17,500	20,850	25,000	27,950	29,150
WALKUP	9,100	11,350	14,350	16,950	19,750	21,650	22,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,350	20,150	25,450	------	------	------	------
CAPE GIRARDEAU:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,000	14,500	17,950	21,400	25,800	28,750	30,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,300	13,500	16,650	19,850	23,800	26,500	27,700
WALKUP	8,650	10,800	13,600	16,150	18,800	20,550	21,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,250	24,350	------	------	------	------
COLUMBIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,500	15,000	18,600	22,200	26,700	29,650	31,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,600	13,850	17,150	20,500	24,600	27,400	28,650
WALKUP	9,000	11,200	14,100	16,750	19,450	21,300	22,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,250	24,400	------	------	------	------
KIRKSVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,500	15,000	18,600	22,200	26,700	29,650	31,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,600	13,850	17,150	20,500	24,600	27,400	28,650
WALKUP	9,050	11,250	14,200	16,850	19,550	21,500	22,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,600	19,250	24,400	------	------	------	------
ROLLA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,350	13,650	16,900	20,150	24,250	26,950	28,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,650	15,700	18,650	22,400	25,000	26,100
WALKUP	8,150	10,150	12,850	15,200	17,700	19,400	20,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,250	17,700	22,350	------	------	------	------
NEBRASKA							
OMAHA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	14,050	17,300	20,600	24,850	27,600	28,850
ROW DWELLINGS	11,100	13,350	16,450	19,650	23,700	26,300	27,450
WALKUP	9,750	12,150	15,350	18,150	21,050	23,200	24,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,300	18,900	23,950	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VII--CONTINUED							
NEBRASKA--CONTINUED							
GRAND ISLAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,200	14,600	17,950	21,450	25,850	28,700	30,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,750	14,150	17,500	20,900	25,150	27,900	29,150
WALKUP	10,100	12,650	16,050	18,950	22,000	24,200	25,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,850	19,550	24,600	------	------	------	------
LINCOLN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,550	14,000	17,150	20,500	24,650	27,400	28,700
ROW DWELLINGS	11,200	13,450	16,500	19,750	23,850	26,400	27,600
WALKUP	9,300	11,550	14,550	17,300	20,050	22,100	23,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,100	18,650	23,450	------	------	------	------
MACY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,900	16,700	20,650	24,700	29,700	33,200	34,700
ROW DWELLINGS	13,300	16,000	19,800	23,600	28,350	31,600	32,900
WALKUP	11,450	14,200	18,000	21,250	24,700	27,350	27,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,250	22,250	28,200	------	------	------	------
NORFOLK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,200	17,500	20,950	25,200	28,100	29,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,300	13,550	16,800	20,000	24,050	26,800	27,900
WALKUP	9,600	11,900	15,100	17,850	20,750	22,950	24,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,050	19,700	25,000	------	------	------	------
NORTH PLATTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,700	12,850	15,850	19,000	22,800	25,450	26,650
ROW DWELLINGS	10,100	12,150	15,000	17,900	21,450	23,900	24,950
WALKUP	9,450	11,700	14,900	17,650	20,450	22,650	23,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,400	19,050	24,100	------	------	------	------
SANTEE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,900	16,700	20,650	24,700	29,700	33,200	34,700
ROW DWELLINGS	13,300	16,000	19,800	23,600	28,350	31,600	32,900
WALKUP	11,450	14,200	18,000	21,250	24,700	27,350	28,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,250	22,250	28,200	------	------	------	------
SCOTTSBLUFF:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,000	14,500	17,750	21,200	25,500	28,400	29,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,400	13,650	16,950	20,200	24,250	27,000	28,150
WALKUP	10,000	12,400	15,800	18,700	21,550	23,850	25,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,550	19,200	22,950	------	------	------	------
WINNEBAGO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,900	16,700	20,650	24,700	29,700	33,200	34,700
ROW DWELLINGS	13,300	16,000	19,800	23,600	28,350	31,600	32,900
WALKUP	11,450	14,200	18,000	21,250	24,700	27,350	28,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,250	22,250	28,200	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VIII							
COLORADO							
DENVER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,200	13,450	16,500	19,650	23,700	26,450	27,650
ROW DWELLINGS	10,650	12,800	15,850	18,800	22,650	25,250	26,450
WALKUP	9,450	11,800	14,950	17,650	20,350	22,500	23,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,250	17,850	22,450	------	------	------	------
COLORADO SPRINGS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,200	13,450	16,500	19,650	23,700	26,450	27,650
ROW DWELLINGS	10,650	12,800	15,850	18,800	22,650	25,250	26,450
WALKUP	9,450	11,800	14,950	17,650	20,350	22,500	23,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,250	17,850	22,450	------	------	------	------
DURANGO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,200	17,500	20,800	25,100	28,000	29,250
ROW DWELLINGS	11,200	13,450	16,550	19,750	23,800	26,500	27,750
WALKUP	9,900	12,350	15,650	18,450	21,450	23,550	24,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,000	18,650	23,600	------	------	------	------
GRAND JUNCTION:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,600	14,000	17,250	20,600	24,750	27,550	28,800
ROW DWELLINGS	11,150	13,300	16,400	19,600	23,650	26,150	27,500
WALKUP	9,850	12,250	15,500	18,350	21,200	23,400	24,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,900	18,500	23,350	------	------	------	------
GREELEY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,600	14,050	17,300	20,650	24,850	27,700	28,900
ROW DWELLINGS	11,200	13,450	16,550	19,750	23,800	26,500	27,750
WALKUP	9,900	12,350	15,650	18,450	21,450	23,550	24,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,500	17,100	21,500	------	------	------	------
PUEBLO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,850	13,050	16,200	19,300	23,150	25,800	27,000
ROW DWELLINGS	10,450	12,550	15,400	18,400	22,150	24,550	25,800
WALKUP	9,150	11,450	14,550	17,200	19,750	21,900	22,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,900	17,350	19,700	------	------	------	------
MONTANA							
HELENA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,350	16,450	19,600	23,650	26,350	27,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,600	12,650	15,800	18,750	22,650	25,150	26,350
WALKUP	10,000	12,600	16,000	18,850	21,800	24,100	25,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,700	20,550	26,100	------	------	------	------
BILLINGS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,800	13,000	16,050	19,100	23,000	25,550	26,750
ROW DWELLINGS	10,300	12,200	15,200	18,050	21,750	24,200	25,350
WALKUP	9,550	12,100	15,400	18,100	20,850	23,150	24,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,250	19,900	25,300	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VIII--CONTINUED							
MONTANA--CONTINUED							
BOZEMAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,550	16,750	20,000	24,050	26,750	28,000
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	12,900	16,050	19,100	23,050	25,550	26,750
WALKUP	10,150	12,850	16,250	19,200	22,100	24,450	25,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,000	20,900	26,500	------	------	------	------
BUTTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,500	13,850	17,100	20,300	24,450	27,250	28,550
ROW DWELLINGS	11,050	13,200	16,250	19,400	23,450	25,950	27,250
WALKUP	10,200	13,000	16,350	19,300	22,300	24,700	25,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,350	21,250	27,050	------	------	------	------
GLASGOW:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,550	16,750	20,000	24,050	26,750	28,000
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	12,900	16,050	19,100	23,050	25,550	26,750
WALKUP	10,150	12,850	16,250	19,200	22,100	24,450	25,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,000	20,900	26,500	------	------	------	------
GREAT FALLS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,600	13,900	17,200	20,550	24,600	27,450	28,700
ROW DWELLINGS	11,150	13,300	16,400	19,700	23,700	26,250	27,750
WALKUP	10,500	13,200	16,650	19,600	22,700	25,150	26,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,600	21,450	27,300	------	------	------	------
HAVRE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,550	16,750	20,000	24,050	26,750	28,000
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	12,900	16,050	19,100	23,050	25,550	26,750
WALKUP	10,150	12,850	16,250	19,200	22,100	24,450	25,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,000	20,900	26,500	------	------	------	------
KALISPEL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,850	13,100	16,200	19,250	23,100	25,750	27,000
ROW DWELLINGS	10,400	12,450	15,400	18,400	22,150	24,550	25,750
WALKUP	9,850	12,450	15,700	18,550	21,350	23,650	24,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,350	20,150	25,600	------	------	------	------
MILES CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,550	16,750	20,000	24,050	26,750	28,000
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	12,900	16,050	19,100	23,050	25,550	26,750
WALKUP	10,150	12,850	16,250	19,200	22,100	24,450	25,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,000	20,900	26,500	------	------	------	------
MISSOULA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,800	13,000	16,050	19,100	23,000	25,550	26,750
ROW DWELLINGS	10,300	12,200	15,200	18,050	21,750	24,200	25,350
WALKUP	9,550	12,100	15,400	18,100	20,850	23,150	24,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,250	19,900	25,300	------	------	------	------
RONAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,750	18,900	23,400	27,800	33,450	37,350	39,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,100	17,500	20,850	25,200	27,950	29,250
WALKUP	11,100	14,100	17,750	21,000	24,250	26,750	27,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,700	22,750	28,950	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VIII--CONTINUED							
MONTANA--CONTINUED							
BROWNING:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,750	18,900	23,400	27,800	33,450	37,350	39,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,100	17,500	20,850	25,200	27,950	29,250
WALKUP	11,100	14,100	17,750	21,000	24,250	26,750	27,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,700	22,750	28,950	------	------	------	------
HARLEM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,750	18,900	23,400	27,800	33,450	37,350	39,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,100	17,500	20,850	25,200	27,950	29,250
WALKUP	11,100	14,100	17,750	21,000	24,250	26,750	27,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,700	22,750	28,950	------	------	------	------
WOLF POINT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,800	19,050	23,400	27,950	33,500	37,400	39,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,100	17,500	20,850	25,200	27,950	29,250
WALKUP	11,100	14,100	17,750	21,000	24,250	26,750	27,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,700	22,750	28,950	------	------	------	------
LODGE GRASS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,750	18,900	23,350	27,800	33,450	37,250	38,950
ROW DWELLINGS	11,850	14,100	17,500	20,850	25,200	27,950	29,250
WALKUP	11,100	14,100	17,750	21,000	24,250	26,750	27,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,700	22,750	28,950	------	------	------	------
NORTH DAKOTA							
FARGO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,900	13,050	16,150	19,400	23,300	25,800	27,100
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,600	15,450	18,350	22,200	24,600	25,750
WALKUP	10,500	13,150	16,350	19,400	22,700	24,950	26,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,750	19,500	24,650	------	------	------	------
BISMARCK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,200	13,450	16,500	19,800	23,900	26,450	27,750
ROW DWELLINGS	10,650	12,850	15,800	18,850	22,800	25,250	26,450
WALKUP	10,750	13,450	16,600	19,800	23,250	25,500	26,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,150	19,900	25,150	------	------	------	------
DICKINSON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,700	12,850	15,900	19,050	22,900	25,450	26,700
ROW DWELLINGS	10,150	12,350	15,250	18,100	21,850	24,200	25,300
WALKUP	10,300	12,950	16,000	18,950	22,350	24,550	25,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,450	19,200	24,200	------	------	------	------
GRAND FORKS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,550	12,650	15,600	18,750	22,550	24,950	26,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,150	12,350	15,250	18,100	21,850	24,200	25,300
WALKUP	10,150	12,650	15,700	18,650	22,000	24,150	25,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,450	19,200	24,200	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VIII--CONTINUED							
NORTH DAKOTA--CONTINUED							
MINOT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,650	12,750	15,700	18,850	22,750	25,200	26,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,100	12,250	15,100	18,000	21,650	24,050	25,150
WALKUP	10,150	12,700	15,850	18,900	22,100	24,350	25,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,400	19,050	23,950	------	------	------	------
SOUTH DAKOTA							
SIOUX FALLS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,000	13,200	16,300	19,450	23,350	26,050	27,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,550	15,550	18,500	22,350	24,600	25,900
WALKUP	9,400	11,650	14,800	17,500	20,300	22,400	23,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,200	16,550	20,850	------	------	------	------
ABERDEEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,300	16,400	19,500	23,400	26,250	27,300
ROW DWELLINGS	10,400	12,650	15,650	18,600	22,400	24,800	26,050
WALKUP	9,550	11,950	15,050	17,850	20,650	22,750	24,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,250	16,600	21,000	------	------	------	------
PIERRE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,600	14,050	17,250	20,500	24,850	27,600	28,750
ROW DWELLINGS	10,850	13,100	16,150	19,250	23,250	25,750	26,950
WALKUP	9,450	11,850	14,850	17,650	20,450	22,500	23,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,350	17,850	22,600	------	------	------	------
RAPID CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,100	13,450	16,550	19,650	23,600	26,400	27,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,450	12,800	15,750	18,850	22,550	24,950	26,300
WALKUP	9,800	12,300	15,550	18,300	21,200	23,450	24,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,250	16,600	20,950	------	------	------	------
MISSION:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,150	18,250	22,550	26,800	32,300	36,000	37,500
ROW DWELLINGS	14,300	17,400	21,400	25,600	30,800	34,050	35,800
WALKUP	12,900	16,200	20,450	24,200	28,050	30,800	32,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,550	22,800	28,800	------	------	------	------
FORT THOMPSON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,150	18,250	22,550	26,800	32,300	36,000	37,500
ROW DWELLINGS	14,300	17,400	21,400	25,600	30,800	34,050	35,800
WALKUP	12,900	16,200	20,450	24,200	28,050	30,800	32,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,550	22,800	28,800	------	------	------	------
MCLAUGHLIN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,900	17,950	22,200	26,350	31,700	35,400	36,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,300	17,400	21,400	25,600	30,800	34,050	35,800
WALKUP	12,900	16,200	20,450	24,200	28,050	30,800	32,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,550	22,800	28,800	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VIII--CONTINUED							
SOUTH DAKOTA--CONTINUED							
EAGLE BUTTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,900	17,950	22,200	26,350	31,700	35,400	36,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,300	17,400	21,400	25,600	30,800	34,050	35,800
WALKUP	12,900	16,200	20,450	24,200	28,050	30,800	32,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,550	22,800	28,800	------	------	------	------
WAGNER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,900	17,950	22,200	26,350	31,700	35,400	36,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,300	17,400	21,400	25,600	30,800	34,050	35,800
WALKUP	12,900	16,200	20,450	24,200	28,050	30,800	32,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,550	22,800	28,800	------	------	------	------
SISSETON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,900	17,950	22,200	26,350	31,700	35,400	36,950
ROW DWELLINGS	14,300	17,400	21,400	25,600	30,800	34,050	35,800
WALKUP	12,900	16,200	20,450	24,200	28,050	30,800	32,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,550	22,800	28,800	------	------	------	------
UTAH							
SALT LAKE CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,350	13,700	16,950	20,250	24,400	27,050	28,400
ROW DWELLINGS	9,900	11,900	14,700	17,600	21,050	23,400	24,500
WALKUP	8,950	11,200	14,300	16,850	19,550	21,550	22,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,600	17,050	21,550	------	------	------	------
CEDAR CITY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,150	17,450	20,800	25,050	27,900	29,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,150	12,250	15,050	18,050	21,650	24,150	25,200
WALKUP	9,250	11,600	14,750	17,300	20,150	22,150	23,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,150	17,650	22,300	------	------	------	------
LOGAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	13,950	17,200	20,500	24,700	27,550	28,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,100	14,900	17,850	21,450	23,850	24,950
WALKUP	9,200	11,400	14,600	17,100	19,900	21,850	23,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,850	17,350	21,900	------	------	------	------
MOAB:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,250	17,550	20,900	25,200	28,100	29,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,300	15,200	18,100	21,800	24,200	25,400
WALKUP	9,300	11,650	14,800	17,400	20,250	22,250	23,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,200	17,700	22,350	------	------	------	------
PROVO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,350	13,700	16,950	20,250	24,400	27,050	28,400
ROW DWELLINGS	9,900	11,900	14,700	17,600	21,050	23,400	24,500
WALKUP	8,950	11,200	14,300	16,850	19,550	21,550	22,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,600	17,050	21,550	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VIII--CONTINUED							
UTAH--CONTINUED							
VERNAL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,200	17,500	20,850	25,150	27,950	29,300
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,300	15,200	18,100	21,800	24,200	25,400
WALKUP	9,300	11,650	14,800	17,400	20,250	22,250	23,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,150	17,650	22,300	------	------	------	------
WYOMING							
CASPER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,700	12,950	15,950	19,000	22,850	25,450	26,700
ROW DWELLINGS	10,100	12,150	15,100	17,950	21,550	24,050	25,100
WALKUP	9,950	12,500	15,900	18,650	21,700	23,900	25,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,500	18,050	22,900	------	------	------	------
CHEYENNE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,100	12,250	15,050	17,950	21,650	24,100	25,250
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,550	14,350	17,800	20,500	22,750	23,750
WALKUP	9,450	11,850	15,050	17,700	20,500	22,700	23,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,700	17,150	21,650	------	------	------	------
CODY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,250	12,500	15,350	18,450	22,150	24,600	25,800
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,700	14,550	17,350	20,800	23,100	24,250
WALKUP	9,650	12,100	15,350	18,100	20,850	23,050	24,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,950	17,400	22,050	------	------	------	------
GILLETTE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,350	16,500	19,600	23,700	26,350	27,600
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,550	15,650	18,550	22,250	24,900	25,900
WALKUP	10,250	13,000	16,450	19,350	22,500	24,750	25,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,050	18,600	23,650	------	------	------	------
JACKSON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,650	12,850	15,800	18,800	22,700	25,250	26,450
ROW DWELLINGS	10,050	12,050	15,000	17,800	21,400	23,900	24,800
WALKUP	9,900	12,350	15,800	18,500	21,550	23,700	24,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,350	17,950	22,650	------	------	------	------
LARAMIE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,350	15,250	18,150	21,950	24,400	25,600
ROW DWELLINGS	9,750	11,650	14,500	17,200	20,700	23,050	24,100
WALKUP	9,550	12,050	15,300	18,050	20,800	22,950	24,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,850	17,300	21,900	------	------	------	------
POWELL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,250	12,500	15,350	18,450	22,150	24,600	25,800
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,700	14,550	17,350	20,800	23,100	24,250
WALKUP	9,650	12,100	15,350	18,100	20,850	23,050	24,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,950	17,400	22,050	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION VIII--CONTINUED							
WYOMING--CONTINUED							
RIVERTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,150	17,450	20,750	25,000	27,800	29,150
ROW DWELLINGS	11,100	13,300	16,550	19,650	23,550	26,350	27,400
WALKUP	10,250	13,000	16,450	19,350	22,500	24,750	25,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,050	18,600	23,650	------	------	------	------
ROCK SPRINGS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,250	12,500	15,350	18,450	22,150	24,600	25,800
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,700	14,550	17,350	20,800	23,100	24,250
WALKUP	9,650	12,100	15,350	18,100	20,850	23,050	24,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,950	17,400	22,050	------	------	------	------
REGION IX							
ARIZONA							
PHOENIX:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,150	14,600	18,050	21,450	25,850	28,800	30,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,300	13,650	16,850	20,150	24,150	27,000	28,150
WALKUP	10,500	13,100	16,650	19,650	22,700	25,050	26,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,500	20,300	25,750	------	------	------	------
CASA GRANDE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,600	15,200	18,750	22,350	26,950	29,900	31,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,800	13,650	17,500	20,900	25,100	28,000	29,200
WALKUP	10,100	12,700	16,100	19,050	22,000	24,250	25,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,850	20,700	26,250	------	------	------	------
DOUGLAS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,550	15,050	18,650	22,100	26,600	29,700	31,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	14,100	17,400	20,700	24,850	27,800	29,000
WALKUP	10,850	13,550	17,200	20,350	23,400	25,850	27,150
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,750	20,550	26,050	------	------	------	------
FLAGSTAFF:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,400	15,000	18,600	22,050	25,900	29,550	31,000
ROW DWELLINGS	11,650	14,100	17,400	20,700	24,850	27,800	29,000
WALKUP	10,800	13,500	17,150	20,200	23,350	25,800	27,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,800	21,750	27,450	------	------	------	------
KAIBAB:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,500	17,450	21,550	25,700	30,900	34,500	36,050
ROW DWELLINGS	12,800	15,400	19,000	22,750	27,250	30,400	31,750
WALKUP	11,850	14,850	18,950	22,300	25,850	28,450	29,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,150	22,350	28,250	------	------	------	------
KINGMAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,600	15,200	18,750	22,350	26,950	29,900	31,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,800	13,650	17,500	20,900	25,100	28,000	29,200
WALKUP	10,900	13,700	17,300	20,500	23,650	26,100	27,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,850	20,700	26,250	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IX--CONTINUED							
ARIZONA--CONTINUED							
SACATON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,250	17,250	21,200	25,300	30,450	33,850	35,500
ROW DWELLINGS	13,350	16,100	19,850	23,650	28,450	31,750	33,150
WALKUP	11,800	14,850	18,700	22,100	25,500	28,150	29,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,100	23,300	29,550	------	------	------	------
SAN CARLOS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,350	17,300	21,400	25,400	30,650	34,100	35,750
ROW DWELLINGS	13,400	16,250	20,050	23,900	28,700	31,950	33,350
WALKUP	11,900	14,900	18,750	22,350	25,700	28,400	29,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,250	23,450	29,750	------	------	------	------
SELLS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,650	17,750	21,850	26,050	31,400	34,900	36,600
ROW DWELLINGS	13,750	16,650	20,450	24,400	29,300	32,700	34,150
WALKUP	12,150	15,250	19,200	22,750	26,300	29,000	30,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,700	24,000	30,450	------	------	------	------
WHITE RIVER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,800	17,750	21,950	26,150	31,450	34,950	36,750
ROW DWELLINGS	13,800	16,650	20,550	24,450	29,400	32,900	34,250
WALKUP	12,150	15,250	19,200	22,800	26,350	29,100	30,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,800	24,100	30,500	------	------	------	------
SAFFORD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,800	15,300	19,000	22,600	27,150	30,300	31,800
ROW DWELLINGS	11,900	14,400	17,850	21,200	25,500	28,500	29,700
WALKUP	11,050	13,800	17,550	20,800	24,000	26,450	27,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,950	20,850	26,350	------	------	------	------
CAMP VERDE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,850	16,700	20,600	24,450	29,550	32,900	34,500
ROW DWELLINGS	12,900	15,700	19,300	22,950	27,650	30,850	32,200
WALKUP	11,500	14,350	18,150	21,550	24,800	27,300	28,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,550	22,700	28,700	------	------	------	------
KEAMS CANYON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,250	19,550	24,200	28,800	34,700	38,550	40,450
ROW DWELLINGS	15,150	18,300	22,700	27,000	32,350	36,150	37,650
WALKUP	13,450	16,800	21,200	25,150	29,000	31,950	33,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	21,900	25,300	32,000	------	------	------	------
FORT MCDOWELL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,700	16,500	20,450	24,250	29,200	32,550	34,150
ROW DWELLINGS	12,800	15,500	19,100	22,700	27,250	30,600	31,850
WALKUP	11,300	14,150	17,950	21,200	24,450	27,100	28,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,300	22,400	28,350	------	------	------	------
PARKER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,200	17,200	21,150	25,150	30,350	33,800	35,400
ROW DWELLINGS	13,350	16,100	19,800	23,600	28,350	31,700	33,100
WALKUP	11,950	14,950	18,900	22,350	25,800	28,550	29,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,050	23,250	29,450	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IX--CONTINUED							
ARIZONA--CONTINUED							
PEACH SPRINGS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,450	17,450	21,650	25,650	31,000	34,500	36,100
ROW DWELLINGS	13,550	16,400	20,200	24,100	28,950	32,250	33,700
WALKUP	12,000	15,000	19,000	22,450	25,900	28,650	30,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,450	23,750	29,950	------	------	------	------
TUCSON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,150	17,050	21,050	24,950	30,100	33,600	35,200
ROW DWELLINGS	13,150	15,900	19,650	23,400	28,150	31,450	32,850
WALKUP	11,350	14,200	17,950	21,200	24,450	27,000	28,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,300	22,400	28,300	------	------	------	------
YUMA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,850	15,500	19,100	22,700	27,350	30,450	31,950
ROW DWELLINGS	11,950	14,450	17,900	21,250	25,650	28,550	29,750
WALKUP	11,200	13,900	17,600	20,900	24,100	26,550	27,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,850	20,800	26,250	------	------	------	------
SAWMILL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,250	19,550	24,200	28,800	34,700	38,550	40,450
ROW DWELLINGS	15,150	18,300	22,700	27,000	32,350	36,150	37,650
WALKUP	13,450	16,800	21,200	25,150	29,000	31,950	33,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	21,900	25,300	32,000	------	------	------	------
NOGALES:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,800	17,800	22,000	26,100	31,500	35,150	36,800
ROW DWELLINGS	13,750	16,650	20,550	24,550	29,500	32,850	34,200
WALKUP	12,850	15,950	20,200	24,000	27,700	30,500	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,150	23,450	29,700	------	------	------	------
CALIFORNIA							
LOS ANGELES:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,000	13,150	16,350	19,500	23,450	26,200	27,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,250	12,400	15,300	18,200	21,950	24,400	25,500
WALKUP	9,200	11,550	14,450	17,150	19,800	21,850	22,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,300	22,450	28,300	------	------	------	------
BAKERSFIELD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,000	13,150	16,350	19,500	23,450	26,200	27,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,250	12,400	15,300	18,200	21,950	24,400	25,500
WALKUP	9,200	11,550	14,450	17,150	19,800	21,850	22,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,300	22,450	28,300	------	------	------	------
INYOKERN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,450	13,650	16,950	20,150	24,300	27,200	28,450
ROW DWELLINGS	10,600	12,900	15,750	18,850	22,700	25,200	26,400
WALKUP	9,550	11,950	15,000	17,800	20,550	22,600	23,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,900	23,200	29,300	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IX--CONTINUED							
CALIFORNIA--CONTINUED							
LANCASTER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,050	13,300	16,450	19,600	23,600	26,400	27,650
ROW DWELLINGS	10,300	12,550	15,450	18,400	22,100	24,550	25,700
WALKUP	9,300	11,650	14,550	17,250	20,050	22,000	23,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,400	22,650	28,650	------	------	------	------
LONE PINE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,150	16,850	20,900	24,950	30,050	33,600	35,100
ROW DWELLINGS	13,100	15,950	19,600	23,300	28,000	31,200	32,550
WALKUP	11,600	14,450	18,250	21,600	25,000	27,550	28,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	23,750	27,550	34,900	------	------	------	------
MOJAVE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,350	13,550	16,850	20,050	24,150	26,950	28,150
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,800	15,700	18,800	22,600	25,150	26,250
WALKUP	9,500	11,850	14,900	17,600	20,300	22,450	23,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,800	23,100	29,200	------	------	------	------
OJAI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,750	11,700	14,550	17,300	20,800	23,250	24,300
ROW DWELLINGS	9,050	11,000	13,550	16,150	19,400	21,600	22,600
WALKUP	8,750	10,950	13,800	16,400	18,950	20,750	21,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,400	21,400	26,900	------	------	------	------
OXNARD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,250	15,200	18,100	21,750	24,300	25,500
ROW DWELLINGS	9,500	11,550	14,200	16,950	20,350	22,700	23,650
WALKUP	9,050	11,350	14,250	16,850	19,500	21,600	22,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,300	22,450	28,300	------	------	------	------
PASO ROBLES:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,550	12,600	15,600	18,600	22,350	25,000	26,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,900	14,600	17,450	20,900	23,400	24,350
WALKUP	9,500	11,850	14,900	17,600	20,300	22,450	23,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,800	23,100	29,200	------	------	------	------
PIRU:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,750	11,700	14,550	17,300	20,800	23,250	24,300
ROW DWELLINGS	9,050	11,000	13,550	16,150	19,400	21,600	22,600
WALKUP	8,750	10,950	13,800	16,400	18,950	20,750	21,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,400	21,400	26,900	------	------	------	------
RIDGECREST:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,600	12,650	15,700	18,700	22,600	25,200	26,400
ROW DWELLINGS	9,850	11,950	14,700	17,500	21,050	23,450	24,450
WALKUP	9,550	11,950	15,000	17,800	20,550	22,600	23,750
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,900	23,200	29,300	------	------	------	------
SAN BERNARDINO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,250	15,200	18,100	21,750	24,300	25,500
ROW DWELLINGS	9,500	11,550	14,200	16,950	20,350	22,700	23,650
WALKUP	9,200	11,550	14,450	17,150	19,800	21,850	22,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,300	22,450	28,300	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IX--CONTINUED							
CALIFORNIA--CONTINUED							
SANTA BARBARA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,250	12,350	15,300	18,200	21,950	24,450	25,650
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,650	14,350	17,050	20,550	22,850	23,800
WALKUP	9,350	11,700	14,700	17,350	20,200	22,200	23,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,400	22,650	28,650	------	------	------	------
SANTA MARIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,550	12,600	15,600	18,600	22,350	25,000	26,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,900	14,600	17,450	20,900	23,400	24,350
WALKUP	9,500	11,850	14,900	17,600	20,300	22,450	23,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,800	23,100	29,200	------	------	------	------
TEHACHAPI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,550	12,600	15,600	18,600	22,350	25,000	26,200
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,900	14,600	17,450	20,900	23,400	24,350
WALKUP	9,500	11,850	14,900	17,600	20,300	22,450	23,550
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,800	23,100	29,200	------	------	------	------
VENTURA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,250	15,200	18,100	21,750	24,300	25,500
ROW DWELLINGS	9,500	11,550	14,200	16,950	20,350	22,700	23,650
WALKUP	9,200	11,550	14,450	17,150	19,800	21,850	22,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,300	22,450	28,300	------	------	------	------
SANTA ANA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,550	12,650	15,650	18,650	22,500	25,000	26,250
ROW DWELLINGS	9,850	11,900	14,600	17,450	21,000	23,400	24,400
WALKUP	9,550	11,850	14,950	17,650	20,450	22,500	23,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,200	23,400	29,650	------	------	------	------
SACRAMENTO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,050	12,050	14,900	17,700	21,350	23,750	24,850
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,500	14,200	16,900	20,350	22,650	23,650
WALKUP	8,800	11,050	14,000	16,450	19,100	21,050	22,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,000	22,050	27,850	------	------	------	------
CHICO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,150	12,200	15,100	17,900	21,550	24,050	25,100
ROW DWELLINGS	9,650	11,600	14,400	17,050	20,550	22,850	23,950
WALKUP	8,300	10,400	13,200	15,500	17,950	19,850	20,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,200	22,250	28,100	------	------	------	------
DAVIS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,200	12,300	15,200	18,100	21,750	24,200	25,250
ROW DWELLINGS	9,700	11,750	14,500	17,150	20,650	23,000	24,100
WALKUP	9,100	11,300	14,350	16,950	19,650	21,650	22,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,350	22,350	28,400	------	------	------	------
FT BIDWELL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	15,450	18,600	23,050	25,200	27,900	29,600	30,300
ROW DWELLINGS	14,700	17,700	21,950	24,000	26,550	27,600	28,650
WALKUP	13,350	16,050	19,900	21,700	24,050	25,000	26,000
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	21,050	24,300	30,700	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IX--CONTINUED							
CALIFORNIA--CONTINUED							
PLACERVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,050	12,050	15,000	17,800	21,450	23,850	24,950
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,550	14,250	17,000	20,400	22,750	23,750
WALKUP	9,100	11,300	14,400	16,950	19,650	21,650	22,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,450	22,750	28,650	------	------	------	------
REDDING:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,300	12,400	15,350	18,250	21,950	24,450	25,550
ROW DWELLINGS	9,800	11,850	14,600	17,400	20,850	23,300	24,350
WALKUP	9,100	11,300	14,400	16,950	19,650	21,650	22,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,450	22,750	28,650	------	------	------	------
STOCKTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,050	12,050	14,900	17,700	21,350	23,750	24,850
ROW DWELLINGS	9,550	11,500	14,200	16,900	20,350	22,650	23,650
WALKUP	8,800	11,050	13,950	16,450	19,100	21,050	22,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,000	22,050	27,850	------	------	------	------
SUSANVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,650	16,450	20,400	23,050	25,750	27,450	28,700
ROW DWELLINGS	13,000	15,650	19,400	21,950	24,500	26,150	27,300
WALKUP	11,750	14,200	17,600	19,900	22,200	23,700	24,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,200	22,250	28,100	------	------	------	------
YREKA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,350	12,500	15,400	18,350	22,100	24,650	25,700
ROW DWELLINGS	9,850	11,900	14,700	17,500	21,050	23,400	24,500
WALKUP	9,150	11,400	14,450	17,050	19,750	21,750	22,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,600	22,850	28,850	------	------	------	------
SAN FRANCISCO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,200	19,550	24,200	28,800	34,700	38,600	40,350
ROW DWELLINGS	15,500	18,700	23,050	27,500	32,950	36,750	38,450
WALKUP	13,350	16,650	21,050	24,850	28,850	31,750	33,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	21,700	25,200	31,800	------	------	------	------
FRESNO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,150	13,300	16,500	19,600	23,650	26,300	27,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,550	12,750	15,750	18,750	22,500	25,100	26,250
WALKUP	9,000	11,150	14,150	16,650	19,350	21,300	22,350
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,300	22,450	28,400	------	------	------	------
GRINDSTONE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,400	17,400	21,550	24,400	27,200	29,000	30,300
ROW DWELLINGS	13,750	16,550	20,550	23,200	25,900	27,600	28,850
WALKUP	12,050	14,550	18,050	20,400	22,700	24,250	25,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,400	20,100	25,400	------	------	------	------
HOOPA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,350	19,650	24,400	26,600	29,500	30,650	32,050
ROW DWELLINGS	15,550	18,700	23,200	25,300	28,100	29,100	30,250
WALKUP	13,700	16,450	20,400	22,250	24,650	25,600	26,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,000	21,950	27,750	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IX--CONTINUED							
CALIFORNIA--CONTINUED							
MODESTO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,700	14,200	17,450	20,750	25,000	27,800	29,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,150	13,450	16,600	19,750	23,700	26,400	27,700
WALKUP	9,150	11,400	14,400	16,900	19,600	21,700	22,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,400	20,100	25,400	------	------	------	------
OAKLAND-MARIN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,350	16,100	19,900	23,700	28,500	31,750	33,200
ROW DWELLINGS	12,750	15,350	18,950	22,550	27,100	30,200	31,550
WALKUP	10,800	13,400	17,000	20,050	23,300	25,650	26,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,500	22,700	28,650	------	------	------	------
SAN JOSE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,400	14,900	18,400	21,950	26,400	29,450	30,750
ROW DWELLINGS	11,800	14,250	17,500	20,900	25,100	28,000	29,200
WALKUP	10,050	12,450	15,750	18,600	21,600	23,750	24,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,100	21,000	26,500	------	------	------	------
SAN RAFAEL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,200	17,450	20,800	25,000	27,850	29,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,450	16,600	19,850	23,800	26,550	27,750
WALKUP	11,150	13,800	17,400	20,550	23,900	26,250	27,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,750	20,650	26,000	------	------	------	------
SAN DIEGO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,600	16,850	20,000	24,050	26,850	28,000
ROW DWELLINGS	10,800	13,000	16,050	19,050	22,900	25,600	26,800
WALKUP	9,200	11,500	14,600	17,150	19,900	21,900	22,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,900	20,800	26,300	------	------	------	------
EL CAJON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,300	13,600	16,850	20,000	24,050	26,850	28,000
ROW DWELLINGS	10,800	13,000	16,050	19,050	22,900	25,600	26,800
WALKUP	9,400	11,800	15,000	17,700	20,500	22,500	23,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,900	20,800	26,300	------	------	------	------
ARROWHEAD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,950	14,350	17,800	21,250	25,600	28,500	29,800
ROW DWELLINGS	11,200	13,600	16,650	19,900	23,950	26,600	27,800
WALKUP	9,800	12,200	15,450	18,250	21,200	23,250	24,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,200	22,550	28,650	------	------	------	------
BARSTOW:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,100	17,450	20,900	25,050	27,950	29,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,250	16,250	19,550	23,450	26,150	27,200
WALKUP	9,650	11,950	15,100	17,850	20,650	22,750	23,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,050	22,150	28,100	------	------	------	------
BIG BEAR:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,950	14,350	17,800	21,250	25,600	28,500	29,800
ROW DWELLINGS	11,200	13,600	16,650	19,900	23,950	26,600	27,800
WALKUP	9,800	12,200	15,450	18,250	21,200	23,250	24,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,400	22,550	28,650	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IX--CONTINUED							
CALIFORNIA--CONTINUED							
DESERT CENTER:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,650	13,950	17,300	20,650	24,850	27,700	29,050
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	13,150	16,150	19,300	23,250	25,850	27,050
WALKUP	9,600	11,850	14,950	17,750	20,550	22,550	23,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,900	22,050	27,850	------	------	------	------
NEEDLES:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,100	17,450	20,900	25,050	27,950	29,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,250	16,250	19,550	23,450	26,150	27,200
WALKUP	9,650	11,950	15,100	17,850	20,650	22,750	23,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,050	22,150	28,100	------	------	------	------
VICTORVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,800	14,100	17,450	20,900	25,050	27,950	29,200
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,250	16,250	19,550	23,450	26,150	27,200
WALKUP	9,650	11,950	15,100	17,850	20,650	22,750	23,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,050	22,150	28,100	------	------	------	------
HAWAII							
HONOLULU:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	14,950	18,150	22,400	26,600	34,550	35,700	37,350
ROW DWELLINGS	14,350	17,200	21,300	25,300	30,500	34,000	35,500
WALKUP	13,250	16,500	20,900	24,750	28,600	31,550	33,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,400	21,450	27,150	------	------	------	------
HILO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,550	19,950	24,650	29,300	35,250	39,200	41,150
ROW DWELLINGS	15,650	18,950	23,400	27,800	33,500	37,350	39,050
WALKUP	14,650	18,150	23,050	27,250	31,550	34,700	36,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,300	23,250	29,800	------	------	------	------
KAUAI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	17,300	21,050	25,800	30,750	37,150	41,200	43,150
ROW DWELLINGS	16,450	19,900	24,650	29,150	35,200	39,300	41,000
WALKUP	14,900	18,550	23,500	27,800	32,250	35,450	37,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,750	24,100	30,500	------	------	------	------
KONO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,800	20,450	25,100	29,950	36,100	40,100	41,950
ROW DWELLINGS	16,050	19,350	23,950	28,350	34,250	38,200	39,850
WALKUP	14,900	18,550	23,500	27,800	32,250	35,450	37,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,750	24,100	30,500	------	------	------	------
MAUI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,400	19,850	24,350	29,100	35,050	39,000	40,800
ROW DWELLINGS	15,600	18,850	23,300	27,600	33,300	37,150	38,850
WALKUP	14,500	18,050	22,900	27,000	31,250	34,500	36,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	20,150	23,450	29,650	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION IX--CONTINUED							
HAWAII--CONTINUED							
GUAM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,750	16,600	20,500	24,350	29,400	32,700	34,250
ROW DWELLINGS	13,100	15,700	19,500	23,150	28,050	31,050	32,500
WALKUP	12,150	15,050	19,100	22,600	26,200	28,750	30,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,850	19,650	24,900	------	------	------	------
NEVADA							
RENO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,450	13,700	17,000	20,200	24,400	27,100	28,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,350	12,550	15,450	18,350	22,100	24,750	25,750
WALKUP	10,550	13,050	16,700	19,700	22,800	25,150	26,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,350	21,400	27,000	------	------	------	------
LAS VEGAS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,850	14,200	17,700	21,050	25,200	28,200	29,500
ROW DWELLINGS	10,750	13,000	16,000	19,000	22,950	25,650	26,750
WALKUP	10,900	13,450	17,100	20,200	23,500	25,850	27,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,950	22,000	27,750	------	------	------	------
ELKO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	------	------	22,850	26,750	31,950	35,400	37,100
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
FALLON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	------	------	22,850	26,750	31,950	35,400	37,100
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
GARDNERVILLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	------	------	21,050	24,700	29,600	32,650	34,250
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
REGION X							
ALASKA							
ANCHORAGE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,950	20,500	25,300	30,250	36,250	40,300	42,250
ROW DWELLINGS	16,150	19,550	24,100	28,650	34,650	38,500	40,200
WALKUP	15,650	19,550	24,700	29,300	33,900	37,300	39,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	23,600	27,550	34,850	------	------	------	------
FAIRBANKS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	18,100	21,800	26,900	32,200	38,700	43,000	45,050
ROW DWELLINGS	17,250	20,850	25,650	30,500	36,900	41,000	42,900
WALKUP	16,650	20,800	26,350	31,150	36,100	39,800	41,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	25,050	29,100	36,800	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION X--CONTINUED							
ALASKA--CONTINUED							
JUNEAU:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,400	19,850	24,400	29,200	35,000	39,000	40,900
ROW DWELLINGS	15,700	18,950	23,400	27,900	33,650	37,350	39,050
WALKUP	15,650	19,550	24,800	29,300	33,900	37,400	39,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	22,850	26,600	33,600	------	------	------	------
KETCHIKAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,300	19,750	24,350	29,100	34,800	38,850	40,650
ROW DWELLINGS	15,500	18,800	23,200	27,500	33,250	36,900	38,650
WALKUP	15,700	19,600	24,850	29,400	34,000	37,500	39,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	23,150	26,900	34,000	------	------	------	------
KODIAK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,300	19,750	24,350	29,100	34,900	38,850	40,700
ROW DWELLINGS	15,500	18,800	23,200	27,500	33,250	36,900	38,650
WALKUP	15,700	19,600	24,850	29,450	34,000	37,500	39,400
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	23,250	27,000	34,200	------	------	------	------
SITKA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	16,400	19,800	24,450	29,200	35,000	39,000	40,850
ROW DWELLINGS	15,700	18,900	23,300	27,600	33,400	37,100	38,900
WALKUP	15,900	19,900	25,100	29,850	34,450	37,900	39,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	23,850	27,750	35,050	------	------	------	------
KENAI:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	18,850	22,800	28,150	33,500	40,200	44,950	46,900
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
YAKUTAT:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	18,850	22,800	28,150	33,500	40,200	44,950	46,900
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
FORT YUKON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	31,050	37,650	46,550	55,450	67,600	------	------
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
GALENA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	33,350	40,550	50,050	59,600	72,600	------	------
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
COASTAL AREA, NORTH OF ALEUTIANS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	37,550	45,700	56,400	67,100	81,950	------	------
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION X--CONTINUED							
ALASKA--CONTINUED							
TOK JUNCTION:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	28,750	34,900	43,050	51,250	62,500	------	------
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
BARTER ISLAND, NORTH COASTAL AREA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	38,700	47,000	58,050	69,100	84,350	------	------
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
INLAND AREA, NORTH OF ALEUTIANS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	42,650	52,150	64,400	76,750	93,550	------	------
ROW DWELLINGS	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
WALKUP	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
IDAHO							
BOISE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,000	13,300	16,300	19,550	23,500	26,100	27,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,450	12,600	15,500	18,550	22,350	24,850	26,050
WALKUP	9,850	12,250	15,600	18,450	21,250	23,500	24,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,400	16,750	21,200	------	------	------	------
IDAHO FALLS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,350	13,850	16,950	20,300	24,400	27,100	28,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,800	13,150	16,150	19,200	23,200	25,850	27,550
WALKUP	10,300	12,750	16,150	19,150	22,050	24,450	25,600
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,950	17,350	22,000	------	------	------	------
MCCALL:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,500	13,950	17,050	20,500	24,550	27,300	28,650
ROW DWELLINGS	11,000	13,250	16,250	19,450	23,400	26,050	27,300
WALKUP	10,400	12,900	16,300	19,250	22,300	24,650	25,800
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,050	17,450	22,200	------	------	------	------
POCATELLO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,050	14,700	18,050	21,600	26,000	28,850	30,250
ROW DWELLINGS	11,550	14,000	17,150	20,500	24,600	27,450	28,800
WALKUP	10,800	13,600	17,200	20,400	23,500	26,050	27,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,950	18,500	23,400	------	------	------	------
TWIN FALLS:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,000	14,550	17,900	21,400	25,800	28,650	30,100
ROW DWELLINGS	11,400	13,850	17,050	18,550	24,450	27,250	28,600
WALKUP	10,750	13,450	17,100	20,200	23,350	25,800	27,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,800	18,400	23,200	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION X--CONTINUED							
IDAHO--CONTINUED							
LEWISTON:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	11,750	14,250	17,650	20,900	25,250	28,100	29,400
ROW DWELLINGS	11,250	13,550	16,800	19,900	24,000	26,700	27,950
WALKUP	9,800	12,150	15,450	18,200	21,050	23,250	24,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,800	17,300	21,800	------	------	------	------
COEUR D ALENE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,950	16,850	20,850	24,800	29,900	33,300	34,800
ROW DWELLINGS	10,800	13,100	16,150	19,150	23,200	25,700	26,950
WALKUP	10,450	12,950	16,550	19,450	22,500	24,850	26,050
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,150	18,900	23,800	------	------	------	------
OREGON							
PORTLAND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,000	12,000	14,800	17,750	21,300	23,650	24,800
ROW DWELLINGS	9,500	11,550	14,250	16,850	20,400	22,650	23,650
WALKUP	8,300	10,400	13,150	15,500	18,050	19,850	20,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,050	16,200	20,550	------	------	------	------
ONTARIO:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	10,600	12,800	15,700	18,900	22,650	25,200	26,450
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,250	15,050	17,900	21,650	24,150	25,300
WALKUP	8,900	11,100	14,000	16,650	19,150	21,200	22,200
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,700	17,100	21,750	------	------	------	------
BEND:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,700	11,700	14,400	17,300	20,750	23,000	24,150
ROW DWELLINGS	9,200	11,200	13,900	16,400	19,850	22,050	23,000
WALKUP	7,950	9,900	12,550	14,800	17,250	18,900	19,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,050	16,200	20,550	------	------	------	------
COOS BAY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,750	11,800	14,500	17,450	20,900	23,250	24,300
ROW DWELLINGS	9,300	11,250	13,950	16,450	19,950	22,150	23,100
WALKUP	8,550	10,650	13,500	15,950	18,600	20,400	21,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,400	16,700	21,000	------	------	------	------
EUGENE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,300	11,250	13,850	16,650	19,900	22,150	23,200
ROW DWELLINGS	8,850	10,800	13,350	15,750	19,050	21,200	22,100
WALKUP	7,650	9,100	12,150	14,350	16,700	18,350	19,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,750	15,950	20,200	------	------	------	------
MEDFORD:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,450	11,350	14,000	16,800	19,100	22,450	23,450
ROW DWELLINGS	9,000	10,900	13,500	15,950	19,300	21,450	22,350
WALKUP	8,150	10,100	12,850	15,100	17,600	19,400	20,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	13,900	16,050	20,350	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION X--CONTINUED							
OREGON--CONTINUED							
WEST SALEM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	9,550	11,600	14,200	17,100	20,500	22,750	23,850
ROW DWELLINGS	9,100	11,100	13,750	16,200	19,650	21,800	22,750
WALKUP	7,950	9,900	12,500	14,750	17,200	18,900	19,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	14,100	16,450	20,700	------	------	------	------
WASHINGTON							
SEATTLE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,800	15,500	19,100	22,800	27,350	30,350	31,850
ROW DWELLINGS	10,150	12,250	15,150	18,000	21,650	24,100	25,200
WALKUP	9,950	12,400	15,700	18,550	21,500	23,650	24,850
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,650	20,500	25,850	------	------	------	------
PORT ANGELES:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,150	15,850	19,550	23,350	28,100	31,250	32,700
ROW DWELLINGS	10,400	12,600	15,450	18,450	22,250	24,700	25,900
WALKUP	9,750	12,100	15,350	18,100	21,000	23,100	24,300
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,050	21,050	26,600	------	------	------	------
TAHOLA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,800	16,650	20,550	24,500	29,500	32,800	34,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,900	13,250	16,200	19,400	23,350	25,950	27,200
WALKUP	10,250	12,700	16,300	19,000	22,050	24,250	25,500
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	19,000	22,100	27,950	------	------	------	------
LONGVIEW:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,200	15,950	19,700	23,500	28,300	31,450	32,950
ROW DWELLINGS	10,500	12,750	15,650	18,550	22,450	25,000	26,100
WALKUP	10,300	12,800	16,250	19,200	22,200	24,500	25,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,150	21,250	26,800	------	------	------	------
ABERDEEN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,950	15,600	19,200	23,000	27,700	30,700	32,150
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,350	15,250	18,200	21,900	24,300	25,500
WALKUP	10,050	12,500	15,900	18,650	21,650	23,950	25,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,750	20,600	26,150	------	------	------	------
BELLINGHAM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,950	15,600	19,200	23,000	27,700	30,700	32,150
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,350	15,250	18,200	21,900	24,300	25,500
WALKUP	10,050	12,500	15,900	18,650	21,650	23,950	25,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,750	20,600	26,150	------	------	------	------
OLYMPIA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	12,950	15,600	19,200	23,000	27,700	30,700	32,150
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,350	15,250	18,200	21,900	24,300	25,500
WALKUP	10,050	12,500	15,900	18,650	21,650	23,950	25,100
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	17,750	20,600	26,150	------	------	------	------

PROTOTYPE PER UNIT COST SCHEDULE

	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
REGION X--CONTINUED							
WASHINGTON--CONTINUED							
YAKIMA:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,400	16,250	19,900	23,950	28,750	32,050	33,600
ROW DWELLINGS	10,850	12,900	15,950	18,950	22,800	25,350	26,450
WALKUP	9,900	12,350	15,700	18,600	21,500	23,750	24,900
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,500	21,600	27,300	------	------	------	------
NESPELEM:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,800	16,700	20,600	24,500	29,500	32,800	34,400
ROW DWELLINGS	10,700	12,900	15,950	18,950	22,900	25,400	26,550
WALKUP	10,700	13,300	16,900	19,900	23,050	25,450	26,700
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	18,200	21,150	26,900	------	------	------	------
SPOKANE:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,150	15,900	19,600	23,300	28,100	31,250	32,750
ROW DWELLINGS	10,200	12,300	15,200	18,050	21,800	24,200	25,300
WALKUP	10,200	12,650	16,100	18,950	21,950	24,250	25,450
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,000	17,450	22,150	------	------	------	------
CHENEY:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,250	16,100	19,900	23,650	28,500	31,750	33,200
ROW DWELLINGS	10,300	12,500	15,400	18,300	22,050	24,500	25,650
WALKUP	9,350	11,600	14,750	17,350	20,100	22,150	23,250
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	15,200	17,750	22,350	------	------	------	------
KENNEWICK:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,400	16,200	20,000	23,800	28,600	31,850	33,350
ROW DWELLINGS	10,600	12,800	15,850	18,900	22,700	25,200	26,400
WALKUP	10,300	12,750	16,250	19,100	22,150	24,400	25,650
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,350	19,000	24,100	------	------	------	------
PULLMAN:							
DETACHED AND SEMIDETACHED	13,800	16,600	20,500	24,500	29,400	32,750	34,250
ROW DWELLINGS	10,950	13,250	16,250	19,350	23,300	25,950	27,150
WALKUP	10,400	12,900	16,450	19,400	22,500	24,850	25,950
ELEVATOR-STRUCTURE	16,500	19,300	24,400	------	------	------	------

[FR Doc.76-16493 Filed 6-8-76;8:45 am]

Just Released

CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS

(Revised as of April 1, 1976)

Title 21—Food and Drugs (Parts 300–499)---------- $5.95

NOTE: Previously announced price of $2.75 for this volume, listed on back of FEDERAL REGISTER dated May 7, 1976, was in error.

[A Cumulative checklist of CFR issuances for 1976 appears in the first issue of the Federal Register each month under Title 1]

**Order from Superintendent of Documents,
United States Government Printing Office,
Washington, D.C. 20402**