

TABLE 1.—MATERIAL INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Service Bulletin No.	Page	Revision	Date
RB.211-72-AE753	All	1	May 24, 2005.
RB.211-72-AF197	All	Original	December 20, 2006.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on October 17, 2007.
Peter A. White,
Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.
 [FR Doc. E7-20913 Filed 10-25-07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA-2006-25671; Airspace Docket No. 07-AWP-3]

Modification of Class D Airspace; Castle Airport, Atwater, CA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.
ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule modifies Class D airspace at Castle Airport, Atwater, CA. This action lowers the ceiling of the Atwater, Castle Class D airspace to below 2,000 feet mean sea level (MSL), changes the southern boundary of the airspace and add an extension to the north. FAA is taking this action to provide controlled airspace for the safety of aircraft executing Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs) and other Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) operations at Castle Airport. Except for editorial changes, this rule is the same as the Notice of Proposed Rule Making.

DATES: *Effective Date:* 0901 UTC, February 14, 2008. The Director of the Federal Register approves this incorporation by reference action under Title 1, Code of Federal Regulations, part 51, subject to the annual revision of FAA Order 7400.9 and publication of conforming amendments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Larry Tonish, System Support Specialists, Federal Aviation Administration, Western Service Area, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, WA 98057; telephone (425) 917-6766.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

On May 29, 2007, the FAA proposed to amend Title 14 Code of the Federal Regulations part 71 (14 CFR part 71) to modify Class D airspace at Castle

Airport, Atwater, CA (72 FR 29455). The proposal was the result of an informal meeting on April 26, 2007 with representatives from FAA, local and aviation communities at Atwater, CA. At that meeting, the participants discussed various airspace alternatives designed to accommodate IFR and Visual Flight Rules (VFR) operations in and out of nearby Merced Airport located 6 miles to the south of Castle Airport. The FAA, local and aviation communities agreed on an alternative that would reduce the ceiling of Class D airspace, modify the southern border, and add an extension on the north side of the Class D for safety of aircraft executing SIAP's and other IFR operations at Castle Airport. Class D airspace will be effective during specified dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will, thereafter, be published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

Interested parties were invited to participate in this rule making proceeding by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. Eight comments were received, 5 positive and 3 negative. Of the three negative comments, one commenter suggested no change. The no change proposal was discussed at the April 26, 2007 meeting, considered by the FAA and was not adopted because there were no landmarks to identify the common Class D boundary with Merced Airport. The remaining two commenters recommended that the Castle Class D airspace be truncated along Highway 99. This recommendation was also considered by the FAA and not adopted because it would not allow sufficient airspace to conduct terminal operations at Castle Airport.

The Rule

This amendment to 14 CFR part 71 modifies Class D airspace at Castle Airport, Atwater, CA. An Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) is being established at Castle Airport, Atwater, CA, which will meet criteria for Class D airspace. Class D airspace areas are published in Paragraph 5000 of FAA Order 7400.9R, dated August 15, 2007, and effective September 15, 2007, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class D airspace designations

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. 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, when promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

This rulemaking is promulgated under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart I, Section 40103. The FAA is charged with prescribing regulations to assign the use of airspace necessary to ensure the safety of aircraft and the efficient use of airspace. This regulation is within the scope of that authority as it would provide for the safety of aircraft operations at Castle airport.

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

■ 1. The authority citation for 14 CFR 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 7400.9R, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 15, 2007, and effective

September 15, 2007, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 5000 Class D Airspace area.

* * * * *

AWP CA D Castle Airport, Atwater, CA [Modified]

Castle Airport, Atwater, CA

(Lat. 37°22'50" N., long. 120°34'05" W.)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to but not including 2,000 feet MSL beginning at lat. 37°20'22" N., long. 120°38'49" W., and extending clockwise around the 4.5-nautical mile radius of the Castle Airport to lat. 37°20'02" N., long. 120°29'39" W., thence to the point of beginning; and within 1.9 miles each side of the El Nido VORTAC 320° radial from the 4.5-nautical mile radius to 17.6 miles from the El Nido VORTAC. This Class D airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective dates and times will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

* * * * *

Issued in Seattle, Washington, on September 10, 2007.

Clark Desing,

Manager, System Support Group, Western Service Center.

[FR Doc. 07-5262 Filed 10-25-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

16 CFR Parts 1630 and 1631

Technical Amendment to the Flammability Standards for Carpets and Rugs

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Final amendments.

SUMMARY: The Commission is amending the flammability standards for carpets and rugs to remove the reference to Eli Lilly Company Product No. 1588 in Catalog No. 79, December 1, 1969, as the standard ignition source and provide a technical specification defining the ignition source. The specification for the standard ignition source is a timed burning tablet, consisting of essentially pure methenamine, with a nominal heat of combustion value of 7180 calories/gram, a mass of 150 mg +/- 5 mg, flat, and a nominal diameter of 6 mm. The amendment has an immediate effective date.

DATES: The amendment is effective October 26, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia K. Adair, Project Manager, Directorate for Engineering Sciences, Consumer Product Safety Commission,

Washington, DC 20207; telephone (301) 504-7536.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

The standards for surface flammability of carpets and rugs appear at 16 CFR parts 1630 and 1631. They were codified and published in 1975, 40 FR 59931 and 59935 (December 30, 1975). The standards were originally issued in 1970 by the Department of Commerce under the authority of the Flammable Fabrics Act (FFA). Subpart A of 16 CFR parts 1630 and 1631 set forth the standards. Subpart B contains the implementing regulations of the standards. Subpart C contains alternative washing procedures for hide carpets and rugs and wool flotaki carpets and rugs. Subpart D of 16 CFR part 1630 contains the staff interpretations and policies.

16 CFR parts 1630 and 1631 establish minimum acceptance criteria for the surface flammability of carpets and rugs when exposed to a standard small source of ignition, a burning methenamine tablet, under prescribed conditions (the "pill test"). These standards reduce the risks of death, personal injury, and property damage associated with fires that result from the surface ignition of carpets and rugs.

Both standards require a timed burning tablet as the standard ignition source for flammability performance testing. The standards define the ignition source at 1630.1(f) and 1631.1(f) as a methenamine tablet, weighing approximately 0.149 grams (2.30 grains), sold as Product No. 1588 in Catalog No. 79, December 1, 1969 by the Eli Lilly Company, or an equal tablet.

In April 2002, Commission staff learned that the Eli Lilly Company was no longer producing the methenamine tablets specified in the carpet and rug standards. Although the standards allow for the use of "an equal" methenamine tablet and give parameters for chemical composition and weight of the tablet, they do not provide any guidance on determining whether tablets from alternative sources are "equal" to those manufactured by the Eli Lilly Company. In July 2003, CPSC staff met with representatives of the Carpet and Rug Institute (CRI) to discuss evaluation of alternative methenamine tablets for use in 16 CFR part 1630 and Part 1631. CRI members were experiencing differing test results using the old Eli Lilly tablets and currently available tablets. CRI members had begun to study the various characteristics of the current tablets. In one case, about 50% of one manufacturer's tablets were found broken in the bottle, with others

breaking later. This problem was attributed to the tablets having a domed top. The problem has since been corrected with a flat tablet.

CRI urged the Commission to specify clearly the characteristics of the "equal" tablets that should be used for determining compliance to the carpet and rug standards. In an effort to make such a determination, the Commission staff conducted a comparison study to evaluate the weight, chemical composition, and combustion characteristics of presently available brands of methenamine tablets relative to each other and those produced by the Eli Lilly Company. The outcome of the study indicated that tablets consisting of essentially pure methenamine, having a heat of combustion value of approximately 7180 calories/gram and weighing approximately 0.149 grams may be considered equivalent to the tablets produced by the Eli Lilly Company and referenced in the regulation.

On July 29, 2004, the Commission's Office of Compliance issued a letter to industry in response to inquiries received by the CPSC staff regarding the equivalency of methenamine tablets formerly manufactured by the Eli Lilly Company and similar tablets currently produced by other manufacturers. The letter stated that the Commission staff determined that tablets consisting of essentially pure methenamine and weighing approximately 0.149 grams may be considered equivalent to the tablets formerly produced by the Eli Lilly Company. Therefore, tablets meeting these criteria may be used for purposes of determining conformance with the carpet and rug standards.

B. Amending the Flammability Standards

1. Outcome of Commission Testing

As mentioned above, the Eli Lilly Company is no longer producing the methenamine tablets specified in the carpet and rug standards. The standards allow for the use of "an equal" methenamine tablet and give parameters for chemical composition and weight of the tablet, but they do not provide any guidance on determining whether tablets from the alternative sources are "equal" to those manufactured by the Eli Lilly Company. The Commission staff conducted a comparison study to evaluate the weight, chemical composition, and combustion characteristics of presently available brands of methenamine tablets relative to each other and those produced by the Eli Lilly Company. The outcome of the Commission's comparative study