several sections by the installation of curtains or partitions.

a. To compensate for lack of crowd awareness, there must be an audible alert concurrent with automatic presentation of supplemental oxygen masks in each section of the crew rest area, whether or not seats or berths are installed in the section. There must also be a means by which the flightcrew can manually deploy the oxygen masks.

b. A placard is required adjacent to each curtain that visually divides or separates the overhead crew rest area into small areas to serve a function of creating privacy. The placard must require that the curtain(s) remain open when the private area it creates is unoccupied. The vestibule area adjacent to the stair well is not considered a private area, and as such, its vacancy does not require a placard.

c. Each crew rest section created by the installation of a curtain must meet the requirements of items 4, 6, 7, and 10 of these special conditions with the curtain open or closed.

d. Overhead crew rest areas, which are visually divided to the extent that evacuation could be affected, must have exit signs meeting the requirements of § 25.812(b)(1)(i) in each separate area of the crew rest which direct occupants to the primary stairway exit.

e. Sections within an overhead crew rest area that are created by the installation of a rigid partition with a door physically separating the sections require either a secondary evacuation route from each section of the crew rest area to the main deck or it must be shown that any door between the sections cannot be jammed, rendering the door unusable. In either case, any door between compartments must be shown to be frangible from both directions and openable when crowded against. There can be no more than one door between each section of a crew rest area and the primary stairway exit. Exit signs meeting the requirements of § 25.812(b)(1)(i) that direct occupants to the primary stairway exit must be provided in each section of the crew rest area.

f. Each smaller area, within the main crew rest area, created by the installation of a partition with a door must individually meet the requirements of items 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 of these special conditions with the door open or closed.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 20, 1997.

John J. Hickey,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, ANM–100.

[FR Doc. 97–22921 Filed 8–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–4]

Proposed Realignment of Jet Routes; Texas

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to realign 14 jet routes located in the Dallas/Ft. Worth (DFW), TX, area. These proposed realignments would remove all high altitude navigation routes from the DFW Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range/Tactical Air Navigation (VORTAC) and realign them to existing navigational aids (NAVAIDs) located in the DFW area. This proposal is a portion of a master plan to relocate the DFW VORTAC 3/4 nautical miles (NM) to the west of its current position and to provide more NAVAID capacity for airport traffic use by eliminating the high altitude en route traffic service. Additionally, Jet Route J–66 will be further realigned west of the DFW area to include the Big Springs, TX, VORTAC as part of its route structure. This realignment would allow pilots to fly at lower minimum enroute altitudes (MEA) between the Newman, TX, and Abilene, TX, VORTACs.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 15, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to: Manager, Air Traffic Division, ASW–500, Docket No. 97–ASW–4, Federal Aviation Administration, 2601 Meacham Blvd; Fort Worth, TX 76193–0500.

The official docket may be examined in the Rules Docket, Office of the Chief Counsel, Room 916, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC, weekdays, except Federal holidays, between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Division, Federal Aviation Administration, 2601 Meacham Blvd; Fort Worth, TX 76193–0500.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Brown, Airspace and Rules Division, ATA–400, Office of Air Traffic Airspace Management, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–8783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal. Communications should identify the airspace docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–4.'' The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter. All communications received on or before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available for examination in the Rules Docket both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

Availability of NPRM's

Any person may obtain a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Air Traffic Airspace Management, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, or by calling (202) 267–8783. Communications must identify the notice number of this NPRM. Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future

NPRM's should call the FAA's Office of Rulemaking, (202) 267–9677, for a copy of Advisory Circular No. 11–2A, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Distribution System, which describes the application procedure.

The Proposal

The FAA is proposing an amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) to realign 14 jet routes located in the DFW area. These proposed realignments will remove all high altitude navigation routes from the DFW VORTAC. Ten of the jet routes will use the Ranger, TX, VORTAC, which is located approximately 8 NM to the west. One jet route will use the Cowboy, TX, Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range/Distance Measuring Equipment (VOR/DME), which is located approximately 6.5 NM to the east. Two jet routes will terminate at the Wichita Falls, TX, VORTAC rather than continue to the DFW area. These particular two jet routes originally terminated at the DFW VORTAC. The remaining jet route bypasses DFW altogether by proceeding direct from the Ardmore, OK, VORTAC to the Texarkana, AR, VORTAC. The DFW VORTAC will no longer service high altitude en route traffic, thereby increasing NAVAID capacity for DFW International Airport traffic area use.

Additionally, Jet Route J–66 will be further realigned west of the DFW area to include the Big Springs, TX, VORTAC as part of its route structure. This realignment would allow pilots to fly at lower minimum enroute altitudes (MEA) on J–66 between the Newman, TX, and Abilene, TX, VORTACs.

Jet routes are published in paragraph 2004 of FAA Order 7400.9D, dated September 4, 1996, and effective September 16, 1996, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The jet routes listed in this document would be published subsequently in the Order.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore—(1) is not a ''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, when promulgated, 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

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

The Proposed Amendment

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

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, CLASS B, CLASS C, CLASS D, AND CLASS E, AIRSPACE AREAS; AIRWAYS; ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

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

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9D, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated September 4, 1996, and effective September 16, 1996, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 2004—Jet Routes

* * * * *

J–4 [Revised]

From Los Angeles, CA, via INT Los Angeles 083° and Twentynine Palms, CA, 269° radials; Twentynine Palms; Parker, CA; Buckeye, AZ; San Simon, AZ; Newman, TX; Wink, TX; Abilene, TX; Ranger, TX; Belcher, LA; Jackson, MS; Meridian, MS; Montgomery, AL; INT Montgomery 051° and Colliers, SC, 268° radials; Colliers; Columbia, SC; Florence, SC; to Wilmington, NC.

* * * * *

J–21 [Revised]

From the INT of the United States/Mexican Border and the Laredo, TX, 172° radial via Laredo; San Antonio, TX; Austin, TX; Waco, TX; Ranger, TX; Ardmore, OK; Will Rogers, OK; Wichita, KS; Omaha, NE; Gopher, MN; to Duluth, MN.

* * * * *

J–25 [Revised]

From Matamoras, Mexico, via Brownsville, TX; INT of the Brownsville 358° and the Corpus Christi, TX, 178° radials; Corpus Christi; INT of the Corpus Christi 311° and the San Antonio, TX, 167° radials; San Antonio; Austin, TX; Waco, TX; Ranger, TX; Tulsa, OK; Kansas City, MO; Des Moines, IA; Mason City, IA; Gopher, MN; Brainerd, MN; to Winnipeg, MB, Canada. The airspace within Canada is excluded. The airspace within Mexico is excluded.

* * * * *

J–33 [Revised]

From Humble, TX, via INT Humble 349° and Ranger, TX, 135°T(129°M) radials; to Ranger.

* * * * *

J–42 [Revised]

From Delicias, Mexico, via Fort Stockton, TX; Abilene, TX; Ranger, TX; Texarkana, AR; Memphis, TN; Nashville, TN; Beckley, WV; Montebello, VA; Gordonsville, VA; Nottingham, MD; INT Nottingham 061° and Woodstown, NJ, 225° radials; Woodstown; Robbinsville, NJ; LaGuardia, NY; INT LaGuardia 042° and Hartford, CT, 236° radials; Hartford; Putman, CT; Boston, MA. The portion of this route outside of the United States is excluded.

* * * * *

J–52 [Revised]

From Vancouver, BC, Canada; via Spokane, WA; Salmon, ID; Dubois, ID; Rock Springs, WY; Falcon, CO; Hugo, CO; Lamar, CO; Liberal, KS; INT Liberal 137° and Ardmore, OK, 309° radials; Ardmore; Texarkana, AR; Sidon, MS; Bigbee, MS; Vulcan, AL; Atlanta, GA; Colliers, SC; Columbia, SC; Raleigh-Durham, NC; to Richmond, VA. The portion within Canada is excluded.

* * * * *

J–58 [Revised]

From Oakland, CA, via Manteca, CA; Coaldale, NV; Wilson Creek, NV; Milford, UT; Farmington, NM; Las Vegas, NM; Amarillo, TX; Wichita Falls, TX; Ranger, TX; Alexandria, LA; Harvey, LA; INT of Grand Isle, LA, 105° and Crestview, FL, 201° radials; INT of Grand Isle 105° and Sarasota, FL, 286° radials; Sarasota; Lee County, FL; to the INT Lee County 120° and Dolphin, FL, 293° radials; Dolphin.

* * * * *

J–66 [Revised]

From Newman, TX; via Big Spring, TX; Abilene, TX; Ranger, TX; Bonham, TX; Little Rock, AR; Memphis, TN; to Rome, GA.

* * * * *

J–72 [Revised]

From Boulder City, NV, via Peach Springs, AZ; Gallup, NM; Albuquerque NM; Texico, NM; to Wichita Falls, TX.

* * * * *

J–76 [Revised]

From Las Vegas, NV, via INT Las Vegas 090° and Tuba City, AZ, 268° radials; Tuba City; Las Vegas, NM; Tucumcari, NM; to Wichita Falls, TX.

* * * * *

J–87 [Revised]

From Humble, TX, via Navasota, TX; INT of Navasota 342°T(336°M) and Cowboy, TX, 166°T(160°M) radials; Cowboy; Tulsa, OK; Butler, MO; Kirksville, MO; Moline, IL; Joliet, IL; to Northbrook, IL.

* * * * *

J–105 [Revised]

From Ranger, TX; via McAlester, OK; Razorback, AR; Springfield, MO; Bradford, IL; to Badger, WI.

* * * * *

J–131 [Revised]

From San Antonio, TX, via INT San Antonio 007° and Ranger, TX, 214°T (208°M) radials; Ranger; Texarkana, AR; Little Rock, AR; to Pocket City, IN.

* * * * *

J–181 [Revised]

From Ranger, TX; Okmulgee, OK; Neosho, MO; INT Neosho 049° and Bradford, IL, 219° radials; to Bradford.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 21, 1997.

Reginald C. Matthews,

Acting Program Director for Air Traffic Airspace Management.

[FR Doc. 97–22974 Filed 8–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 120

[Docket No. 97N–0296]

Fruit and Vegetable Juice Beverages: Notice of Intent to Develop a HACCP Program, Interim Warning Statement, and Educational Program

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing a comprehensive program to address the incidence of foodborne illness related to consumption of fresh juice and to ultimately address the safety aspects of all juice products. This document informs consumers, juice processors, State and local officials, and other interested persons of FDA's plans to publish two proposals and to initiate several educational programs to minimize the hazards associated with fresh juice. This document will permit all interested persons to take advantage of the guidance provided by the upcoming proposals as quickly as possible, e.g., in time for the 1997 ''fresh apple cider'' season.

DATES: Submit written comments at any time.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 12420 Parklawn Dr., rm. 1–23 Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Geraldine A. June, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–158), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202–205–5099.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Escherichia coli O157:H7 has been recently implicated as a source of a number of foodborne disease outbreaks. During the last few years, several States have reported outbreaks of *E. coli* O157:H7 illness as a result of consumption of apple juice and cider that were not pasteurized or otherwise treated to destroy pathogens (Refs. 1, 2, and 3). Symptoms have ranged from diarrhea to hemolytic uremic syndrome. In October 1996, the Seattle-King County Department of Public Health and the Washington State Department of Health reported an outbreak of *E. coli* O157:H7 infections associated with consumption of unpasteurized apple juice that occurred in three western States and British Columbia and resulted in at least 66 cases of illness and the death of one child (Refs. 2 and 4).

Pathogens other than *E. coli* O157:H7 present in apple and other types of juice and juice products also have been documented as causing foodborne illness. There are reported outbreaks attributable to *Salmonella typhimurium and Cryptosporidium* in apple cider (Refs. 3, 5, and 6), and *Vibrio cholerae* in coconut milk (Ref. 7). In addition, there are reports of illness from consumption of unpasteurized orange juice contaminated with *S. hartford* (Ref. 8), orange juice drink contaminated with *S. agona* (Ref. 9), orange juice contaminated with *Bacillus cereus* (Ref. 10), and home-made carrot juice contaminated with *Clostridium botulinum* (Ref. 11).

Both fruit and vegetable juices have been vehicles for outbreaks of foodborne illness. Although fruit juice is acidic and thus inhibitory to the growth of most microorganisms, fruit juices, rather than vegetable juices, have been the source of most juice-associated outbreaks. The evidence also suggests that the groups at greatest risk of life-threatening illness are children, the elderly, and persons with compromised immune systems.

Illnesses caused by hazards other than microbial contamination have also been associated with foods, including juice. From 1990 to 1996, there has been one outbreak and 11 recalls of fruit juice or beverages containing fruit juice (Refs. 12 and 13). Ingestion of toxic metals as well as poisonous parts of the plants used to make the juice have been cited as the cause of some juice related illness.

Five recalls between 1990 and 1995 of fruit juices or beverages containing fruit juice were because of the presence of food ingredients that were inadvertently added to the product, not declared on the label, or not suitable for that food (Ref. 13). Food ingredients involved with these recalls were natamycin, sulfites, FD&C yellow No. 5, and salt.

Since 1991, there have been five recalls of juice products because of improper sanitation procedures or faulty equipment that resulted in cross-contamination with ingredients from other foods, minerals such as copper, glass, or other hazardous materials. These outbreaks and recalls demonstrate that juice and juice beverages may be susceptible to many hazards.

The October 1996 apple juice outbreak from *E. coli* O157:H7, and the agency's concern that the current regulatory program relative to fresh juice and juice products may not be adequate to ensure the production of safe juice products, persuaded FDA to gather information to help address these problems. FDA held a public meeting on December 16 and 17, 1996, to discuss the current state of the science and to review the technological and safety factors relating to the production and distribution of fresh juices. The agency was interested in learning about all aspects of juice production and distribution in an effort to consider how FDA's regulatory program should be revised, and whether additional measures are needed to reduce the risk of future outbreaks.

Experts from industry, academia, and the regulatory and consumer sectors presented information on illnesses and the epidemiology of outbreaks arising from contaminated juices; current concerns with emerging pathogens; the *E. coli* O157:H7 outbreak in October 1996 caused by contaminated unpasteurized apple juice; procedures for processing juices; and new and existing technologies to decrease or eliminate the number of pathogens or other contaminating microorganisms.

FDA received over 180 comments, most of which concerned apple juice specifically. Many comments pertained to juices in general and some referred only to apple juice, apple cider, or citrus juices. Most comments were concerned with changes in processing to improve the safety of juices. Among the changes recommended were requiring pasteurization of juices, requiring a Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) program, and