

representation on the Area 2 Committee, rather than the Area 3 Committee.

The Committees made their recommendations to reestablish boundaries after reviewing a request from a producer/handler located near Salida, Colorado, a relatively new potato production area in Chaffee County. Salida is approximately 250 miles from the administrative headquarters of the Area 3 Committee in Greeley, Colorado, but only 65 miles from the administrative headquarters of the Area 2 Committee in Monte Vista, Colorado.

There are approximately 115 acres of potatoes grown in Chaffee County. Arable land in Chaffee County is generally limited to the area around Salida. Industry estimates place the potential for additional potato production at about 500 acres.

The Chaffee County production area is geographically separated from the rest of Area 3 potato production and is much closer to that of Area 2. Potatoes produced in Chaffee County are marketed similarly to those in Area 2. Potatoes grown in Chaffee County are, for example, often marketed through handlers from Area 2, but seldom marketed by Area 3 handlers located outside of Chaffee County.

The rule increases the opportunity for the producers or handlers to serve on an area committee by greatly decreasing travel time and cost to attend area Committee meetings. This rule also enable any Chaffee County producers to be in the same committee area with handlers who most often handle their production.

The rule also modifies the distribution of producer membership of the Area 2 Committee to accommodate the addition of Chaffee County to Area 2. Saguache County, immediately to the south of Chaffee County, currently has one producer representative on the Area 2 Committee. The rule combines Chaffee and Saguache Counties as one district for the purpose of nominating a producer member to the Area 2 Committee. The change will continue to provide balanced representation on the Area 2 Committee, consistent with acreage and production. Chaffee County handlers also will be represented as the Area 2 Committee has five handler member positions, two representing bulk handlers.

The close proximity of the Area 2 administrative office to Chaffee County will improve the efficiency of marketing order administration. Marketing order compliance in Chaffee County will be more efficiently administered by the Area 2 Administrative Committee office because of its proximity to Chaffee County.

Although this final rule removes Chaffee County from Area 3, regulatory language in the newly created section 948.153 only references the addition of Chaffee County to Area 2. Section 948.4 currently states that Area 3 includes and consists of all the remaining counties in the State of Colorado which are not included in Area 1 or Area 2. Therefore, the addition of Chaffee County to Area 2 automatically removes Chaffee County from Area 3, with no other corresponding change needed.

The proposed rule concerning this action was published in the January 30, 1995, **Federal Register** (60 FR 5597), with a 30-day comment period ending March 1, 1995. No comments were received.

Based on the above, the Administrator of the AMS has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

After consideration of all relevant matter presented, including the information and recommendations submitted by the committees and other available information, it is hereby found that this rule, as hereinafter set forth, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, it is found that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this action until 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** because: (1) the Area 2 committee is planning to conduct its annual nomination meeting on March 31, 1995; and (2) producers and handlers are aware of this action, which was recommended at open committee meetings, and need no additional time to prepare for operation under this rule.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 948

Marketing agreements, Potatoes, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 948 is amended as follows:

PART 948—IRISH POTATOES GROWN IN COLORADO

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 948 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

2. In §948.150, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

§948.150 Reestablishment of committee membership.

* * * * *

(a) Area No. 2 (San Luis Valley): Seven producers and five handlers selected as follows:

- Two (2) producers from Rio Grande County;
- One (1) producer from Chaffee County and Saguache County;
- One (1) producer from Conejos County;
- Two (2) producers from Alamosa County;
- One (1) producer from all other counties in Area No. 2;
- Two (2) handlers representing bulk handlers in Area No. 2;
- Three (3) handlers representing handlers in Area No. 2 other than bulk handlers.

* * * * *

3. A new §948.153 is added to read as follows:

§948.153 Reestablishment of area.

Pursuant to §948.53, Area No. 2 is reestablished as follows:

Area No. 2 (San Luis Valley) includes and consists of the counties of Chaffee, Saguache, Huerfano, Las Animas, Mineral, Archuleta, Rio Grande, Conejos, Costilla, and Alamosa, in the State of Colorado.

Dated: March 27, 1995.

Sharon Bomer Lauritsen,
Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division.
[FR Doc. 95–7961 Filed 3–30–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 95–AWP–1]

Amendment of Class D Airspace; Redding, CA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action amends the Class D airspace area at Redding, CA. This action is necessary due the recent closures of Enterprise Skypark, CA and Redding Sky Ranch Airport, CA. This amendment will delete the Redding Sky Ranch Airport and Enterprise Skypark from the Class D airspace area at Redding, CA.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 0901 UTC, July 20, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Speer, Airspace Specialist, System Management Branch, AWP–530, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region, Federal Aviation Administration, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California, 90261, telephone (310) 297–0010.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

On January 6, 1995, the FAA proposed to amend part 71 of the

Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) by amending the Class D airspace area at Redding, CA (60 FR 3777). The proposed action was necessary due to the closures of Enterprise Skypark, and Redding Sky Ranch Airport, CA. These locations will be deleted from the Class D airspace area at Redding, CA.

Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. No comments on the proposal were received. Class D airspace designations are published in paragraph 5000 of FAA Order 7400.9B, dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class D airspace designation listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

The Rule

This amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) amends the Class D airspace area at Redding, CA by deleting the Redding Sky Ranch Airport and Enterprise Skypark from the Class D airspace area at Redding, CA.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this regulation—(1) is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a “significant rule” under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a Regulatory Evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

Adoption of the Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. app. 1348(a), 1354(a), 1510; E. O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 14 CFR 11.69.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 6005 Class D Airspace

* * * * *

AWP CA D Redding, CA [Revised]

Redding Municipal Airport, CA
(lat. 40°30'32" N, Long. 122°17'36" W)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 3000 feet MSL within a 4.3-mile radius of the Redding Municipal Airport. This Class D airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

* * * * *

Issued in Los Angeles, California, on March 15, 1995.

Richard R. Lien,

Manager, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 95–7983 Filed 3–30–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

18 CFR Part 385

[Docket No. RM92–12–000]

Streamlining of Regulations Pertaining to Parts II and III of the Federal Power Act and the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; Correction to Order No. 575

March 24, 1995.

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: On January 13, 1995 (60 FR 4831, January 25, 1995), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission issued a final rule amending its regulations to streamline the processing of the Commission's workload and to reduce regulatory burdens on the electric utility and qualifying facility industries. This document corrects an error in an amendment to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure which was intended to remove the phrase “or revised initial” in Rule 713.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 24, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lois D. Cashell, Secretary of the Commission (202) 208–0400.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Accordingly, the final rule published January 25, 1995, in the **Federal Register** at 60 FR 4831 (FR Doc. 95–1449), is corrected as follows:

§ 385.713 [Corrected]

On page 4860, in the third column, the amendatory instruction for § 385.713 should be corrected to read as follows:

32. In § 385.713, in paragraph (a)(2)(i), the phrase “or, if appropriate under Rules 717 and 711, to a revised initial decision” is removed; in paragraph (a)(2)(iv), the phrase “or revised initial” is removed; and in paragraph (a)(3), the phrase “or any revised initial decision under Rule 717” is removed.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–7899 Filed 3–30–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 5

Delegations of Authority and Organization

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the regulations to set forth the current organizational structure of the agency as well as the current addresses for headquarters and field offices. This action is necessary to ensure the accuracy of the regulations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 31, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Edna Morgan, Division of Management Systems and Policy (HFA–340), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, 301–443–4976.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The regulations are being amended in 21 CFR 5.100 and 5.115 to reflect the current organizational structure of the agency and to provide current addresses for headquarters and for field and district offices.

Notice and comment on these revisions is not necessary under the Administrative Procedure Act because this is a rule of agency organization (5 U.S.C. 553(b)).