

partment of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. 1655(c)).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on January 15, 1971.

H. B. HELSTROM,
Chief, Airspace and Air
Traffic Rules Division.

[FR Doc.71-839 Filed 1-20-71;8:47 am]

National Highway Safety Bureau

[49 CFR Part 571]

[Docket No. 71-1, Notice No. 1]

GLAZING MATERIALS FOR USE IN PASSENGER CARS, MULTIPURPOSE PASSENGER VEHICLES, TRUCKS, BUSES, AND MOTORCYCLES

Notice of Proposed Rule Making

Correction

In F.R. Doc. 71-272 appearing at page 326 in the issue for Saturday, January 9, 1971, the word "plan" in paragraph S4.1.2.2(b) of Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 205 in § 571.21 should read "plane".

Office of Pipeline Safety

[49 CFR Part 193]

[Notice 70-14A; Docket No. OPS-7]

RULEMAKING PROCEDURES FOR GAS PIPELINE REGULATIONS

Extension of Comment Period

On December 17, 1970, the Department of Transportation issued a notice of proposed rule making (35 F.R. 19521, Dec. 23, 1970) proposing procedural rules for gas pipeline regulations. The date for return of comments was set as January 29, 1971. Due to the holiday season, the mailing of copies of this proposal to the Office of Pipeline Safety mailing list was delayed more than had been anticipated. As a consequence, many persons may not have adequate time to prepare and submit comments before the prescribed date. Therefore, the date for submission of comments on Notice 70-14 is extended to February 18, 1971.

Interested persons are also requested to note that the docket for this rule making proceeding has been changed to Docket No. OPS-7.

This notice is issued under the authority of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 (49 U.S.C. sec. 1671 et seq.), Part 1 of the Regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (49 CFR Part 1), and the delegation of authority to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety, dated November 6, 1968 (33 F.R. 16468).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on January 15, 1971.

JOSEPH C. CALDWELL,
Acting Director,
Office of Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc.71-828 Filed 1-20-71;8:46 am]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[47 CFR Part 73]

[Docket Nos. 18476 etc.]

CERTAIN FM BROADCAST STATIONS

Table of Assignments

In the matter of amendment of § 73.202, Table of Assignments, FM Broadcast Stations (Doniphan, Mo.; Princeton, W. Va.; Auburn, Nebr.; Cayce, S.C.; Sallisaw, Okla.; Heber Springs, Ark.; Preston, Minn.; Barnstable, Nantucket, and Falmouth, Mass.; Mineral Wells, Tex.; Fayette, Hartselle, and Talladega, Ala.; Mariposa, Calif.; Greenville, Hartford, Cadiz, Elizabethtown, Burnside, and Greensburg, Ky.; Flora, Ill.; Jasper, Arab, and Demopolis, Ala.); Docket No. 18476, RM-1356, RM-1359, RM-1360, RM-1364, RM-1368, RM-1373, RM-1374, RM-1376, RM-1377, RM-1378, RM-1379, RM-1382, RM-1383, RM-1389, RM-1390, RM-1391, RM-1414, RM-1417, RM-1496.

1. In the further notice of proposed rule making, released January 8, 1971 (FCC 71-22), it was inadvertently stated that the channel substitution at Demopolis is from "252A" to "296A". The latter figure should have been 292A. The table of cities, present, and proposed assignments in paragraph 9, at the top of page 5, is corrected to read as follows:

City (Alabama)	Channel No.	
	Present	Proposed
Talladega.....		221A
Hartselle or Arab.....		221A
Arab and Jasper.....		221A
Jasper.....	273	221A, 273
Fayette.....	225	251 or 224A or 249A
Demopolis.....	252A	292A

Released: January 13, 1971.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.71-798 Filed 1-20-71;8:45 am]

[47 CFR Part 73]

[Docket No. 19116]

CERTAIN FM BROADCAST STATIONS

Table of Assignments

In the matter of amendment of § 73.202, Table of Assignments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Skowhegan, Augusta, Westbrook, and South Paris, Maine; Plymouth and Dover, N.H.; and Waterbury, Vt.; Docket No. 19116, RM-1442, RM-1464.

In the notice of proposed rule making, released January 8, 1971 (FCC 71-23), it was inadvertently stated that Channel 296A could be substituted for the present channel assignment at Water-

bury, Vt. The correct designation is Channel 269A. The last sentence of paragraph 10, page 6, is corrected to read as follows:

Channel 269A can be assigned to Waterbury in conformance with the rules and without making any other changes in the table; accordingly, we herein propose to assign Channel 286 to Skowhegan, delete Channel 287 at Waterbury and substitute 269A at Waterbury.

And the table of cities, proposed assignments to be added and deleted in paragraph 11, page 8, is corrected to read as follows:

City	Add	Delete
Augusta, Maine.....	281 or 282 or 294...	293
Skowhegan, Maine.....	286.....	296A
South Paris, Maine.....	221A.....	289A
Westbrook, Maine.....	295 or 288A.....	295A
Plymouth, N.H.....	Class A or 248 1/2.....	
Dover, N.H.....	287.....	1219
Waterbury, Vt.....	269A.....	287

Released: January 13, 1971.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.71-799 Filed 1-20-71;8:45 am]

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

[46 CFR Part 542]

[Docket No. 71-6]

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR OIL POLLUTION CLEANUP

Notice of Proposed Rule Making

On September 30, 1970, the Federal Maritime Commission published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (35 F.R. 15216) regulations to implement the financial responsibility provisions of section 11(p) (1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended by the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 97). These regulations (Commission General Order 27) set forth the procedures whereby the owner or operator of every vessel over 300 gross tons, including any barge of equivalent size, using any port or place in the United States or the navigable waters of the United States must evidence financial responsibility to meet the liability to the United States to which such vessel could be subjected for the discharge of oil into or upon the waters of the United States. The rules also include the qualifications required by the Commission for issuance of Certificates evidencing financial responsibility, and the basis for the denial, revocation, modification, or suspension of such Certificates.

Section 11(p) (3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act provides as follows:

Any claim for costs incurred by such vessel may be brought directly against the insurer or any other person providing evidence of financial responsibility as required under