of the earth are published in paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9C dated August 17, 1995, and effective September 16, 1995, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E 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) establishes Class E airspace at Sturgis, SD to accommodate aircraft executing the GPS Runway 29 SIAP at Sturgis Municipal Airport. Controlled airspace extending upward from 700 feet AGL is needed to contain aircraft executing the approach. The area will be depicted on appropriate aeronautical charts thereby enabling pilots to circumnavigate the area or otherwise comply with IFR procedures.

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

Airspace, 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 14 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; 14 CFR 11.69.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9C, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 17, 1995, and effective September 16, 1995, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 6005 Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth.

* * * * *

AGL SD E5 Sturgis, SD [New]

Sturgis Municipal Airport, SD
(lat. 44°26′06″ N, long. 103°22′38″ W)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 7-mile radius of the Sturgis Municipal Airport.

* * * * *

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on June 20, 1986.

Maureen Woods,

Manager, Air Traffic Division.

[FR Doc. 96–17591 Filed 7–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

---

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 93–AWP–4]

Alteration of Jet Routes J–86 and J–92; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This action corrects a final rule published in the Federal Register on June 13, 1996 (Airspace Docket No. 93–AWP–4). In the airspace designation of Jet Route 86 (J–86), effective August 15, 1996, erroneously showed ''Miami, FL'' as the ending point for J–86. This action corrects the definition of J–86 by changing the ending point to read ''Dolphin, FL.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: 0901 UTC, August 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bill Nelson, 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: Federal Register Document 96–15062, Airspace Docket No. 93–AWP–4, published on June 13, 1996 (61 FR 29938), extended J–86 and realigned J–92 to enhance traffic flows and reduce controller workload. However, in the June 13 publication the description for J–86 erroneously indicated Miami, FL as the ending point for J–86. This action corrects that error.

Correction of Final Rule

§ 71.1 [Corrected]

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, the airspace designation for J–86, published in the Federal Register on June 13, 1996 (61 FR 29939); Federal Register Document 96–15062, Column 1) is corrected to read as follows:

* * * * *

J–86 [Revised]

From Beatty, NV; INT Beatty 131° and Boulder City, NV, 284° radials; Boulder City; Peach Springs, AZ; Winslow, AZ; El Paso, TX; Fort Stockton, TX; Junction, TX; Austin, TX; Humble, TX; Leeville, LA; INT Leeville 104° and Sarasota, FL, 286° radials; Sarasota; INT Sarasota 103° and La Belle, FL, 313° radials; La Belle; to Dolphin, FL.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 28, 1996.

Nancy B. Kalinowski,

Acting Program Director for Air Traffic Airspace Management.

[FR Doc. 96–17230 Filed 7–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

---

14 CFR Part 91

Delegation of Authority

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of delegation of authority.

SUMMARY: The Administrator of the FAA is delegating the authority to administer certain provisions of Special Aviation Regulation (SFAR) No. 74—Airspace and Flight Operations Requirements for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games, Atlanta, GA, to the Regional Administrator for the Southern Region. This delegation will enable the FAA to respond to the immediate needs of the Olympic Committee, local and Federal law enforcement officials and other safety personnel during the Olympic Games.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 10, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Alogna, Olympic Project Manager, Federal Aviation Administration, 1701 Columbia Ave., College Park, Georgia 30337; (404) 305–5051.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 12, 1996, the FAA published SFAR No. 74 in the Federal Register (61 FR 5492), which establishes airspace and flight operations requirements for the XXVI Olympic Games. This regulation is to provide for security of the venues, safe operations, and efficient management of air traffic to, within, and from these areas, and to prevent an unsafe congestion of sightseeing and other aircraft over the various games sites. Paragraph A.3 of SFAR No. 74 contains provisions to provide flexible and efficient management and control of air traffic, such as the authority to give priority to or exclude from certain requirements of

the SFAR flight operations dealing with essential military, medical and rescue, essential public health and welfare, Presidential and Vice Presidential delegations, visiting heads of state, the Olympic Committee and media whose planned activities have been coordinated with and accredited by the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games and law enforcement and security officials.

As circumstances may warrant, it may be necessary for the appropriate Regional Administrator to exercise the authority as stated above and provided for in paragraph A.3 of SFAR No. 74. This delegation will enable the Regional Administrator for the Southern Region to administer the provisions of paragraph A.3. of SFAR No. 74.

Delegation

Accordingly, I hereby delegate my authority to administer paragraph A.3. of SFAR No. 74 to the Regional Administrator of the Southern Region.

Issued in Washington, DC on June 3, 1996.

David R. Hinson,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–17588 Filed 7–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 184

[Docket No. 88G–0388]

Direct Food Substances Affirmed as Generally Recognized as Safe; Cocoa Butter Substitute Derived From High-Oleic Safflower or Sunflower Oil

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending its regulations to affirm that cocoa butter substitute manufactured from high-oleic safflower or sunflower oil is generally recognized as safe (GRAS). This action is in response to a petition filed by Fuji Oil Co., Ltd. (Fuji).

DATES: Effective July 10, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nega Beru, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–206), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW.,Washington, DC 20204, 202–418–3097.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

In accordance with the procedures described in § 170.35 (21 CFR 170.35), Fuji Oil Co., Ltd., 6–1, Hachiman-cho, Minami-ku, Osaka 542, Japan, submitted a petition (GRASP 8G0348) requesting that § 184.1259 (21 CFR 184.1259) be amended to affirm that the use of safflower or sunflower oil in the manufacture of cocoa butter substitute is GRAS.

In the Federal Register of January 26, 1989 (54 FR 3853), FDA published a notice of filing of Fuji's petition and gave interested parties an opportunity to submit comments to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 12420 Parklawn Dr., rm. 1–23, Rockville, MD 20857. FDA received three comments in response to that notice. These comments are discussed below.

In the filing notice, the agency gave notice that the petition had requested that § 184.1259 be amended to permit the use of safflower or sunflower oil in the manufacture of cocoa butter substitute. However, the petition requested, and the agency evaluated, the use of high-oleic safflower or sunflower oil in the manufacture of cocoa butter substitute. Therefore, because the filing notice did not make clear that the proposed starting materials for the manufacture of the petitioner's cocoa butter substitute are high-oleic rather than the typical high-linoleic safflower and sunflower oils, the agency published an amended filing notice in the Federal Register of April 28, 1995 (60 FR 20998), to give interested persons an opportunity to comment with respect to the above-mentioned change. No comments were received in response to the amended filing notice.

II. Standards for GRAS Affirmation

Pursuant to § 170.30 (21 CFR 170.30), general recognition of safety may be based only on the views of experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of substances added to food. The basis of such views may be either: (1) Scientific procedures, or (2) in the case of a substance used in food prior to January 1, 1958, experience based on common use in food (§ 170.30(a)). General recognition of safety based upon scientific procedures requires the same quantity and quality of scientific evidence as is required to obtain approval of a food additive and ordinarily is to be based upon published studies, which may be corroborated by unpublished studies and other data and information (§ 170.30(b)). General recognition of safety through experience based on common use in food prior to January 1, 1958, may be determined without the quantity or quality of scientific procedures required for approval of a food additive, and ordinarily is to be based upon generally available data and information concerning the pre-1958 history of use of the substance in food (§ 170.30(c)(1)).

Cocoa butter substitute from high-oleic safflower or sunflower oil was not used in food prior to 1958, and therefore cannot qualify for GRAS status based on a history of common use in food (§ 170.30(c)). Accordingly, FDA has evaluated the ingredient on the basis of scientific procedures (§ 170.30(b)).

In evaluating this petition, the agency reviewed data and information concerning: (1) The chemical composition of the cocoa butter substitute; (2) the process used to manufacture it; (3) the functional equivalence of the cocoa butter substitute to cocoa butter substitute made from palm oil; (4) use of the cocoa butter substitute in food; and (5) information regarding the safety of the cocoa butter substitute.

III. Identity, Specifications, and Manufacturing Process

The common or usual name of the petitioned substance is ''cocoa butter substitute primarily from high-oleic safflower or sunflower oil.'' Its chemical name is 1,3-distearoyl-2-olein (CAS Reg. No. 2846–04–0). The petitioner provided evidence to demonstrate that the specifications for cocoa butter substitute primarily from high-oleic safflower or sunflower oil conform to those for cocoa butter substitute primarily from palm oil, 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-3-stearin, which are set forth in § 184.1259(b)(1) through (b)(9).

Traditional safflower and sunflower oils typically contain high levels of linoleic acid and low levels of oleic acid. However, in the manufacture of its cocoa butter substitute, Fuji uses high-oleic acid-containing safflower or sunflower oil. The high-oleic acid varieties of safflower and sunflower were obtained through common breeding techniques and are the subjects of several published articles (Refs. 1 through 7).

According to Fuji, its cocoa butter substitute is manufactured by reacting ethyl stearate (obtained from food-grade stearic acid) with high-oleic safflower oil or sunflower oil under nitrogen gas in the presence of a catalyst (lipase enzyme preparation adsorbed onto granular celite (diatomaceous earth)) at 37 to 47 °C for 48 hours. After completion of the reaction, the catalyst