transiting the United States. Assuming that proper risk management techniques continue to be applied in Mexico and that accident and exposure risk are minimized by proper handling during transport, the risk of exposure to hog cholera from pork in transit from Mexico through the United States is minimal.

Shipments of pork and pork products from Yucatan transiting the United States will most likely be ocean shipments to Miami with final destinations in the Caribbean and South America. Because no overland transit of pork and pork products through the United States is expected as a result of this rulemaking, no increase in U.S. trucking or other U.S.-based economic activity is expected.

Both the United States and Mexico are net pork importers. U.S. pork imports represent approximately 2 to 3 percent of production, and Mexican imports represent 7 to 8 percent of production. With favorable income growth expected in Mexico due to trade liberalization, meat imports, including pork products, are expected to grow and limit Mexican pork exports. However, facilitating export opportunities for the Mexican pork industry may provide incentives for continued efforts to eradicate hog cholera from infected Mexican States.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12778

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Preempts all State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule; (2) has no retroactive effect; and (3) does not require administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule contains no new information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 94

Animal diseases, Imports, Livestock, Meat and meat products, Milk, Poultry and poultry products, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, 9 CFR part 94 is amended as follows:

PART 94—RINDERPEST, FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, FOWL PEST (FOWL PLAGUE), VELOGENIC VISCEROTROPIC NEWCASTLE DISEASE, AFRICAN SWINE FEVER, HOG CHOLERA, AND BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY: PROHIBITED AND RESTRICTED IMPORTATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 94 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 147a, 150ee, 161, 162, and 450; 19 U.S.C. 1306; 21 U.S.C. 111, 114a, 134a, 134b, 134c, 134f, 136, and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 42 U.S.C. 4331 and 4332; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(d).

§ 94.15 [Amended]

2. In § 94.15, paragraph (b), the introductory text and paragraph (b)(2) are amended by removing the words ''Chihuahua or Sonora'' and adding the words ''Chihuahua, Sonora, or Yucatan'' in their place.

Done in Washington, DC, this 19th day of June 1996.

Lonnie J. King,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 96–16159 Filed 6–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

10 CFR Part 436

[Docket No. EE–RM–95–501]

Federal Energy Management and Planning Programs; Methodology and Procedures for Life Cycle Cost Analyses

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, DOE.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) is publishing a final rule to implement its Federal Energy Management Program to include application of the life cycle costing methodology when evaluating and comparing the cost effectiveness of water conservation measures in Federal buildings. The amendments are directed principally toward updating the life cycle cost methodology and procedures in subpart A in light of changes in law requiring the use of life cycle costing methodology when installing water conservation measures.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This regulation is effective July 25, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Theodore C. Collins, Federal Energy Management Program, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Mail Station EE–92, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586–8017.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

On August 25, 1995, DOE published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to amend some of the provisions in 10 CFR part 436 which are applicable to programs for the management of energy consumption by Federal agencies (60 FR 44286). The amendments are directed principally toward updating the life cycle cost methodology and procedures in subpart A in light of changes in law requiring the use of life cycle costing methodology when installing water conservation measures.

Section 152 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Pub.L. 102–486) amended the legislatively mandated policies with regard to federal energy management originally set forth in section 542 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (Act or NECPA). 42 U.S.C. 8252. This amendment to section 542 expands the purpose of the Federal Energy Management Program to include the conservation and the efficient use of water, in addition to non-renewable energy, by the Federal government.

Section 543 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(a)) ''Energy Management Goals'' was also amended by section 152 of the Energy Policy Act by adding an energy management requirement for Federal agencies that ''Not later than January 1, 2005, each agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable, install in Federal buildings owned by the United States all energy and water conservation measures with payback periods of less than 10 years, as determined by using the methods and procedures developed pursuant to section 544.'' To implement this statutory provision, it is necessary to amend the life cycle cost regulations as set forth in part 436 of the Code of Federal Regulations, pursuant to section 544 of the Act, so that the life cycle cost methodology and procedures can be applied to the installation of water conservation measures which are implemented by Federal agencies to meet the requirements of the Act.

In response to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, DOE received no written comments and there were no commenters at a public hearing held on October 12, 1995 in Washington, DC. In view of the above, no changes have been

made to the rule proposed on August 25, 1995.

II. Background of the Life Cycle Cost Methodology

On January 23, 1980, DOE published a final Life Cycle Cost rule (LCC) (45 FR 5620) which established the methodology and procedures for calculating and comparing the life cycle cost of proposed investments to upgrade the economic efficiency of Federal buildings through energy conservation or substitution of renewable energy sources. The LCC rule was published pursuant to section 381(a)(2) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C 6361(a)(2), section 10 of Executive Order 11912, and Title V, part 3, of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (NECPA).

On November 30, 1990, DOE published final amendments to 10 CFR part 436 (55 FR 48217) to update the guidelines applicable to Federal agency in-house energy management programs. That rulemaking was directed principally toward updating the life cycle cost methodology and procedures in subpart A of 10 CFR part 436 in light of provisions in the Federal Energy Management Improvement Act of 1988 granting DOE more discretion in setting discount and energy cost escalation rates (Pub. L. 100–615).

The principle uses of the LCC rule are determining the cost effectiveness of proposed investments and assigning priorities among proposed cost-effective investments. The methodology and procedures of the LCC rule are amplified in a manual published for DOE by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) HB135, revised as necessary to reflect amendments. It is referred to as the ''Life Cycle Costing Manual for the Federal Energy Management Program.'' The methodology required by the LCC rule involves a systematic analysis of all significant costs associated with proposed investments, the principal purpose of which is to increase energy efficiency on a life-cycle cost effectiveness basis. This analysis relates investment costs to future costs associated with a proposed investment. The LCC rule provides for standardized assumptions for establishing and comparing relevant cost. See 10 CFR 436.14.

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102–486) amended NECPA by adding water and the use of renewable energy sources to the purpose of NECPA (42 U.S.C. 8252) and requiring the use of the life cycle cost methodology when installing in Federal buildings energy and water conservation measures with payback periods of less than 10 years (42 U.S.C. 8253(b)). The amendments published today relating to water conservation measures are pursuant to this authority.

III. General Discussion of Amendments

These amendments for the most part insert the term ''water'' in the various provisions of the rule to reflect the fact that the conservation and efficient use of water are now included within the purpose and scope of the Federal Energy Management Program. The methodology and procedures for applying life cycle cost analyses to water conservation measures have been determined to be generally consistent with the treatment of energy. In those instances where the nature of water conservation measures require different treatment, a separate provision is added. Overall, only minor changes to the rule have been made to comply with the mandates imposed by the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

The basic requirements of the life cycle cost methodology and procedures are not changed by the amendments. Their coverage is expanded so that they apply to water conservation measures which are the primary subject of the amendments. To accommodate the differences found when examining factors which may be unique only to water or energy, the Department of Energy is adding new and revised definitions in § 436.11 to allow for the computation of factors unique to water conservation measures for the purpose of performing the life cycle costing calculations. It is the intent of the amendatory language to make clear that the application of the life cycle cost methodology and procedures to water conservation measures are treated parallel, where practicable, to energy conservation measures when determining life cycle cost effectiveness. For example, the new definition of ''building water system'' parallels that of ''building energy system.'' The difference is the type of system which is the subject of the analysis. In many instances, the Department of Energy has amended the rule with addition of the terms ''and water'' or ''or water,'' as determined appropriate, to meet the requirement of the Act to apply life cycle cost methodology and procedures to water conservation measures.

There are a few minor changes which serve to clarify and facilitate agency implementation. Section 436.13 presumes that investment in a retrofit to an existing Federal building is not life cycle cost-effective if it is occupied under a lease which includes the cost of utilities in the rent and does not provide a pass-through of energy or water savings to the government. Language was added to be explicit that this presumption applies only to Federal investment and should not necessarily be used to determine the cost effectiveness of building owners' investments in their Federally-leased buildings. Such investments are, in fact, cost-effective and are encouraged. The assumption in section 436.14 that ''water prices will not escalate'' is based upon the fact that there are no escalation rates established for water at the national level. However, agencies are permitted to use escalation rates when they are available from suppliers. Section 436.23 was modified to allow agencies to include future price changes when they estimate simple payback time in order to be consistent with national consensus standards developed by the American Society of Testing and Materials.

IV. Review Under Executive Order 12866

This rule was reviewed under the provisions of this Executive Order governing Regulatory Planning and Review. DOE has determined that this rule does not constitute a ''significant regulatory action'' and is therefore not subject to the provisions of section 6 of the Executive Order requiring review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

V. Review Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule was reviewed under the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, Public Law 96–354 (5 U.S.C. 601–612). DOE has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, therefore, no regulatory flexibility analysis has been performed.

VI. Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520) requires that Federal agencies obtain approval from the OMB before collecting information from 10 or more persons. There are no information collection requirements in these amendments.

VII. Review Under the National Environmental Policy Act

DOE has determined that promulgation of this rule falls within the interpreting/amending rulemaking class, Category A5 of appendix A to subpart D, ''Categorical Exclusions Applicable to General Agency Actions,'' of the DOE National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations. 10 CFR part 1021. It is therefore categorically

excluded from preparation of either an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321, *et. seq*).

VIII. Review Under Executive Order 12612

Executive Order 12612, 52 FR 41685 (October 30, 1987), requires that regulations, rules, legislation, and any other policy actions be reviewed for any substantial direct effects on States, on the relationship between the National government and the States, or in the distribution of power and responsibilities among various levels of government. If there are sufficient substantial direct effects, then the Executive Order requires preparation of a federalism assessment to be used in all decisions involved in promulgating and implementing a policy action. The rule revises certain policy and procedural requirements applicable only to Federal energy management programs. Therefore, the Department of Energy has determined that the rule will not have a substantial direct effect on the institutional interests or traditional functions of States.

IX. Review Under Executive Order 12988

With respect to the review of existing regulations and the promulgation of new regulations, section 3 (a) of Executive Order 12988, ''Civil Justice Reform,'' 61 FR 4729 (February 7, 1996), imposes on Executive agencies the general duty to adhere to the following requirements: (1) Eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity; (2) write regulations to minimize litigation; and (3) provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct rather than a general standard and promote simplificaiton and burden reduction. With regard to the review required by section 3(a), section 3(b) of Executive Order 12988 specifically requires that Executive agencies make every reasonable effort to ensure that the regulation: (1) Clearly specifies the preemptive effect, if any; (2) clearly specifies any effect on existing Federal law or regulation; (3) provides a clear legal standard for affected conduct while promoting simplification and burden reduction; (4) specifies the retroactive effect, if any; (5) adequately defines key terms; and (6) addresses other important issues affecting clarity and general draftsmanship under any guidelines issued by the Attorney General. Section 3(c) of Executive Order 12988 requires agencies to review regulations in light of applicable standards in section 3(a) and section 3(b) to determine whether they are met or it is unreasonable to meet one or more of them. DOE has completed the required review and determined that, to the extent permitted by law, the final regulations meet the relevant standards of Executive Order 12988.

List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 436

Energy Conservation, Federal buildings and facilities.

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 4, 1996.

Christine A. Ervin,

Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 10 CFR part 436 is amended as follows:

PART 436—FEDERAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING PROGRAMS

1. The authority citation for part 436 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 6361; 42 U.S.C. 8251–8263; and 42 U.S.C. 8287–8287c.

2. Section 436.1 is revised as follows:

§ 436.1 Scope.

This part sets forth the rules for Federal energy management and planning programs to reduce Federal energy consumption and to promote life cycle cost effective investments in building energy systems, building water systems and energy and water conservation measures for Federal buildings.

3. Section 436.2 is amended by revising paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 436.2 General objectives.

* * * * *

(b) To promote the methodology and procedures for conducting life cycle cost analyses of proposed investments in building energy systems, building water systems and energy and water conservation measures;

* * * * *

4. Section 436.10 is revised to read as follows:

§ 436.10 Purpose.

This subpart establishes a methodology and procedures for estimating and comparing the life cycle costs of Federal buildings, for determining the life cycle cost effectiveness of energy conservation measures and water conservation measures, and for rank ordering life cycle cost effective measures in order to design a new Federal building or to retrofit an existing Federal building. It also establishes the method by which efficiency shall be considered when entering into or renewing leases of Federal building space.

5. Section 436.11 is amended by:

(a) Revising the definitions of *component price, Federal building, life cycle cost, replacement cost, retrofit,* and *salvage value,* and (b) adding definitions for *building water system, non-water operation and maintenance costs,* and *water conservation measures* in alphabetical order to read as follows:

§ 436.11 Definitions.

* * * * *

Building water system means a water conservation measure or any portion of the structure of a building or any mechanical, electrical, or other functional system supporting the building, the nature or selection of which for a new building influences significantly the cost of water consumed.

Component price means any variable sub-element of the total charge for a fuel or energy or water, including but not limited to such charges as ''demand charges,'' ''off-peak charges'' and ''seasonal charges.''

* * * * *

Federal building means an energy or water conservation measure or any building, structure, or facility, or part thereof, including the associated energy and water consuming support systems, which is constructed, renovated, leased, or purchased in whole or in part for use by the Federal government. This term also means a collection of such buildings, structures, or facilities and the energy and water consuming support systems for such collection.

* * * * *

Life cycle cost means the total cost of owning, operating and maintaining a building over its useful life (including its fuel and water, energy, labor, and replacement components), determined on the basis of a systematic evaluation and comparison of alternative building systems, except that in the case of leased buildings, the life cycle cost shall be calculated over the effective remaining term of the lease.

* * * * *

Non-water operation and maintenance costs mean material and labor cost for routine upkeep, repair and operation exclusive of water cost.

* * * * *

Replacement costs mean future cost to replace a building energy system or building water system, an energy or water conservation measure, or any component thereof.

Retrofit means installation of a building energy system or building water system alternative in an existing Federal building.

Salvage value means the value of any building energy system or building water system removed or replaced during the study period, or recovered through resale or remaining at the end of the study period.

* * * * *

Water conservation measures mean measures that are applied to an existing Federal building that improve the efficiency of water use, reduce the amount of water for sewage disposal and are life cycle cost effective and that involve water conservation, improvements in operation and maintenance efficiencies, or retrofit activities.

6. Section 436.13 is amended by revising paragraph (a), the introductory text of paragraph (b) and paragraph (b)(2) to read as follows:

§ 436.13 Presuming cost-effectiveness results.

(a) If the investment and other costs for an energy or water conservation measure considered for retrofit to an existing Federal building or a building energy system or building water system considered for incorporation into a new building design are insignificant, a Federal agency may presume that such a system is life cycle cost-effective without further analysis.

(b) A Federal agency may presume that an investment in an energy or water conservation measure retrofit to an existing Federal building is not life cycle cost-effective for Federal investment if the Federal building is—

* * * * *

(2) Occupied under a lease which includes the cost of utilities in the rent and does not provide a pass-through of energy or water savings to the government; or

* * * * *

8. Section 436.14, is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(1), (c), introductory text to paragraph (d)(2), (e) and (g) as follows:

§ 436.14 Methodological assumptions.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) If the Federal agency is using component prices under § 436.14(c), that agency may use corresponding component escalation rates provided by the energy or water supplier.

* * * * *

(c) Each Federal agency shall assume that the price of energy or water in the base year is the actual price charged for energy or water delivered to the Federal building and may use actual component prices as provided by the energy or water supplier.

(d) * * *

(2) For determining the life cycle costs or net savings of mutually exclusive alternatives for a given building energy system or building water system (e.g., alternative designs for a particular system or size of a new or retrofit building energy system or building water system), a uniform study period for all alternatives shall be assumed which is equal to—

* * * * *

(e) Each Federal agency shall assume that the expected life of any building energy system or building water system is the period of service without major renewal or overhaul, as estimated by a qualified engineer or architect, as appropriate, or any other reliable source except that the period of service of a building energy or water system shall not be deemed to exceed the expected life of the owned building, or the effective remaining term of the leased building (taking into account renewal options likely to be exercised).

* * * * *

(g) Each Federal agency may assume that energy or water costs and non-fuel or non-water operation and maintenance costs begin to accrue at the beginning of the base year or when actually projected to occur.

* * * * *

8. Section 436.16 is amended by revising the section heading, redesignating paragraphs (b) and (c) as paragraphs (c) and (d), and by adding a new paragraph (b) as follows:

§ 436.16 Establishing non-fuel and non-water cost categories.

* * * * *

(b) The relevant non-water cost categories are—

(1) Investment costs;

(2) Non-water operation and maintenance cost;

(3) Replacement cost; and

(4) Salvage value.

* * * * *

9. Section 436.17 is amended by revising the section heading and by adding paragraphs (c) and (d) to read as follows:

§ 436.17 Establishing energy or water cost data.

* * * * *

(c) Each Federal agency shall establish water costs in the base year by multiplying the total units of water used in the base year by the price per unit of water in the base year as determined in accordance with § 436.14(c).

(d) When water costs begin to accrue in the base year, the present value of water costs over the study period is the product of water costs in the base year as established under § 436.17(a), or as calculated by computer software provided or approved by DOE and used with the official discount rate and assumptions under § 436.14. When water costs begin to accrue at a later time, subtract the present value of water costs over the delay, calculated using the uniform present worth factor for the period of delay, from the present value of water costs over the study period or, if using computer software, indicate a delayed beneficial occupancy date.

10. Section 436.18 is amended by revising the introductory text to paragraph (c), paragraph (d), the first sentence of paragraph (e) and paragraph (f) to read as follows:

§ 436.18 Measuring cost-effectiveness.

* * * * *

(c) Replacement of a building energy or water system with an energy or water conservation measure by retrofit to an existing Federal building or by substitution in the design for a new Federal building shall be deemed cost-effective if—

* * * * *

(d) As a rough measure, each Federal agency may determine estimated simple payback time under § 436.23, which indicates whether a retrofit is likely to be cost effective under one of the four calculation methods referenced in § 436.18(c). An energy or water conservation measure alternative is likely to be cost-effective if estimated payback time is significantly less than the useful life of that system, and of the Federal building in which it is to be installed.

(e) Mutually exclusive alternatives for a given building energy or water system, considered in determining such matters as the optimal size of a solar energy system, the optimal thickness of insulation, or the best choice of double-glazing or triple-glazing for windows, shall be compared and evaluated on the basis of life cycle costs or net savings over equivalent study periods. * * *

(f) When available appropriations will not permit all cost-effective energy or water conservation measures to be undertaken, they shall be ranked in descending order of their savings-to-investment ratios, or their adjusted internal rate of return, to establish priority. If available appropriations cannot be fully exhausted for a fiscal year by taking all budgeted energy or water conservation measures according to their rank, the set of energy or water conservation measures that will maximize net savings for available appropriations should be selected.

* * * * *

11. Section 436.19 is amended by revising paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 436.19 Life cycle costs.

* * * * *

(d) Energy and/or water costs.

12. Section 436.21 is revised to read as follows:

§ 436.21 Savings-to-investment ratio.

The savings-to-investment ratio is the ratio of the present value savings to the present value costs of an energy or water conservation measure. The numerator of the ratio is the present value of net savings in energy or water and non-fuel or non-water operation and maintenance costs attributable to the proposed energy or water conservation measure. The denominator of the ratio is the present value of the net increase in investment and replacement costs less salvage value attributable to the proposed energy or water conservation measure.

13. Section 436.22 is revised to read as follows:

§ 436.22 Adjusted internal rate of return.

The adjusted internal rate of return is the overall rate of return on an energy or water conservation measure. It is calculated by subtracting 1 from the nth root of the ratio of the terminal value of savings to the present value of costs, where n is the number of years in the study period. The numerator of the ratio is calculated by using the discount rate to compound forward to the end of the study period the yearly net savings in energy or water and non-fuel or non-water operation and maintenance costs attributable to the proposed energy or water conservation measure. The denominator of the ratio is the present value of the net increase in investment and replacement costs less salvage value attributable to the proposed energy or water conservation measure.

14. Section 436.23 is revised to read as follows:

§ 436.23 Estimated simple payback time.

The estimated simple payback time is the number of years required for the cumulative value of energy or water cost savings less future non-fuel or non-water costs to equal the investment costs of the building energy or water system, without consideration of discount rates.

15. Section 436.24 is amended by revising the last sentence in the section as follows:

§ 436.24 Uncertainty analyses.

* * * If additional analysis casts substantial doubt on the life cycle cost analysis results, a Federal agency should consider obtaining more reliable data or eliminating the building energy or water system alternative.

[FR Doc. 96–16120 Filed 6–24–96;8:45am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 95–AGL–20]

Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bigfork, MN; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This action corrects an error in the airspace description of the Bigfork, MN, Class E airspace published in a final rule on May 2, 1996 (61 FR 19541), Airspace Docket Number 95–AGL–20.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 0901 UTC, August 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John A. Clayborn, Air Traffic Division, Operations Branch, AGL–530, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018, telephone (847) 294–7568.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

Federal Register Document 96–10972, Airspace Docket 95–AGL–20, published on May 2, 1996 (61 FR 19541), established the Class E airspace at Bigfork, MN. Errors were discovered in the legal description. This action corrects the spelling of Bigfork and adds the airport name, city and state in the title of the legal description.

Correction to Final Rule

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, the airspace legal description, as published in the Federal Register on May 2, 1996 (61 FR 19541), (Federal Register Document 96–10972; page 19542, column 1), is corrected in the legal description to the incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 as follows:

§ 71.1 [Corrected]

* * * * *

AGL MN E5 Bigfork, MN [Corrected]

Bigfork Municipal Airport, MN
(Lat. 47°46′45″N, long, 93°39′01″W)

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

* * * * *

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on June 3, 1996.

Maureen Woods,

Manager, Air Traffic Division.

[FR Doc. 96–16111 Filed 6–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 558

New Animal Drugs for Use in Animal Feeds; Ivermectin and Lincomycin

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the animal drug regulations to reflect approval of a new animal drug application (NADA) filed by Merck Research Laboratories, Division of Merck & Co., Inc. The NADA provides for use of single ingredient ivermectin and lincomycin Type A medicated articles to make combination drug Type B and C medicated swine feeds used for treatment and control of certain helminth, lice, and mite infections, increased rate of weight gain, treatment and control of swine dysentery, and reduction of severity of swine mycoplasma pneumonia in growing-finishing swine.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 25, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Melanie R. Berson, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV–135), Food and Drug Administration, 7500 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 301–594–1643.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Merck Research Laboratories, Division of Merck & Co., Inc., P.O. Box 2000, Rahway, NJ 07065, is sponsor of NADA 141–054, which provides for the use of Ivomec® (ivermectin 0.6 percent) Type A medicated article and Lincomix® (lincomycin 20 and 50 grams (g)/pound) Type A medicated articles to make ivermectin/ lincomycin Type B and C medicated swine feeds. The Type C medicated swine feeds containing 1.8 g ivermectin/ton with 20, 40, 100, or 200 g lincomycin/ton are fed to growing-finishing swine for treatment and control of gastrointestinal roundworms, kidney worms, lungworms, lice, mites, swine dysentery; reduction of severity of mycoplasmal pneumonia; and to increase rate of weight gain. The NADA is approved as of June 25, 1996, and the regulations are amended in 21 CFR 558.300 and 558.325 to reflect the