

(4) 0.3 ppm in milk.

Dated: August 20, 2001.

Claire M. Lathers,

Director, Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation, Center for Veterinary Medicine.

[FR Doc. 01-22164 Filed 9-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-S

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 558

New Animal Drugs for Use in Animal Feeds; Lasalocid and Bacitracin Methylene Disalicylate

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 Alpharma, Inc. The NADA provides for use of approved, single-ingredient lasalocid and bacitracin methylene disalicylate Type A medicated articles to make two-way combination drug Type C medicated feeds. These combination medicated feeds are used for the prevention of coccidiosis, and for increased rate of weight gain and improved feed efficiency in growing turkeys.

DATES: This rule is effective September 5, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Charles J. Andres, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV-128), Food and Drug Administration, 7500 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 301-827-1600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Alpharma, Inc., One Executive Dr., P.O. Box 1399, Fort Lee, NJ 07024, filed NADA 141-179 that provides for use of AVATEC® (90.7 grams per pound (g/lb) of lasalocid sodium) and BMD® (50 g/lb of bacitracin methylene disalicylate) Type A medicated articles to make combination drug Type C medicated turkey feeds. The combination Type C medicated feeds are used for prevention of coccidiosis caused by *Eimeria meleagriditis*, *E. gallopavonis*, *E. adenoides*, and for increased rate of weight gain and improved feed efficiency in growing turkeys. The NADA is approved as of July 11, 2001, and the regulations are amended in 21 CFR 558.311 to reflect the approval. The basis of approval is discussed in the freedom of information summary.

In accordance with the freedom of information provisions of 21 CFR part 20 and 514.11(e)(2)(ii), a summary of safety and effectiveness data and information submitted to support approval of this application may be seen in the Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

The agency has determined under 21 CFR 25.33(a)(2) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

This rule does not meet the definition of “rule” in 5 U.S.C. 804(3)(A) because it is a rule of “particular applicability.” Therefore, it is not subject to the congressional review requirements in 5 U.S.C. 801-808.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 558

Animal drugs, Animal feeds.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and redelegated to the Center for Veterinary Medicine, 21 CFR part 558 is amended as follows:

PART 558—NEW ANIMAL DRUGS FOR USE IN ANIMAL FEEDS

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 558 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 360b, 371.

2. Section 558.311 is amended in the table in paragraph (e)(1) by alphabetically adding an item under entry (xv) following “Bacitracin 4 to 50” to read as follows:

§ 558.311	Lasalocid.
*	* * * * *
(e)	* * *
(1)	* * *

Lasalocid sodium activity in grams per ton	Combination in grams per ton	Indications for use	Limitations	Sponsor
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
(xv) 68 (0.0075 pct) to 113 (0.0125 pct)	Bacitracin 4 to 50 Bacitracin methylene disalicylate 4 to 50	Growing turkeys; for prevention of coccidiosis caused by <i>E. meleagriditis</i> , <i>E. gallopavonis</i> , and <i>E. adenoides</i> ; for increased rate of weight gain and improved feed efficiency.	Feed continuously as sole ration. Bacitracin methylene disalicylate as provided by No. 046573 in § 510.600(c) of this chapter.	046573
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *

* * * * *

Dated: August 21, 2001.

Stephen F. Sundlof,*Director, Center for Veterinary Medicine.*

[FR Doc. 01-22163 Filed 9-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**Office of the Secretary****32 CFR Parts 230 and 231a****RIN 0790-AG73****Financial Institutions on DoD Installations****AGENCY:** Department of Defense.**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule removes regulations on "Procedures governing Banking Offices on DoD Installations" and revises regulations on "Financial Institutions on DoD Installations." This rule is being promulgated to provide administrative guidelines for the operation of banks and credit unions on domestic and overseas installations of the Department of Defense and addresses areas such as the solicitation for such services, the types of services and the logistics support provided.

DATES: This rule is effective June 1, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: T. Summers, 703-602-0299.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Background**

Stateside military banking began in 1941 when the Department realized that financial services were urgently needed by military and civilian personnel on domestic installations. To address this need, the Department permitted installation commanders to negotiate with nearby local banks to establish branches on their installation. Today, there are over 230 domestic installations that have either a bank or credit union or both. To ensure consistency between installations in the level, cost and types of financial services offered, the Department established regulations in parts 230 and 231 to govern the operation and oversight of these institutions. These regulations limit the number of financial institutions that may operate on an installation to one bank and one credit union (with a grandfather provision). The regulations require full and open competition for a full spectrum of banking services (to include electronic banking services). Policy guidance relating to the military

banking program, by regulation, is the responsibility of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) while operational guidance rests with the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS). To ensure financial services are available on our overseas installations, the Department operates the overseas military banking program. The DFAS has been assigned the program office responsibilities for this effort, which is provided under contract by a domestic financial institution. In FY 2000, the overseas military banking program contractor operated 110 banking offices and over 250 automated teller machines in 10 foreign countries. Overseas military banks support DoD personnel and their families, disbursing officers, appropriated fund activities (such as the Defense Commissary Agency) and nonappropriated fund activities (such as the Army and Air Force Exchange Service).

II. Comments, and Changes to, the Proposed Rule

The Department of Defense published the proposed rule on August 11, 1999 (64 FR 43856). Over 240 comments from 55 entities were received in response to the publication of the previously published proposed rule. The majority of the comments on Part 230 of the proposed rule focused on two areas: (1) Prohibiting the assessment of automated teller machine (ATM) surcharging and (2) the establishment of a ceiling for other fees and charges. These comments and their disposition are specifically addressed below. The remainder of the comments were either administrative in nature or suggested that additional clarification was needed in certain areas. None of these resulted in any significant changes to the proposed rule.

A. Section 230.4(a)(7)(i)

This section of the previously published proposed rule would have required that on-base ATM service offered by financial institutions operating on domestic installations and domestic credit unions operating on DoD installations overseas be provided without surcharge. Forty-nine of the fifty-five entities providing comments objected to this limitation. While being sympathetic to the Department's interest in shielding lower income military members and civilian employees from ATM fees, the comments essentially reflected the belief that the freedom from any regulatory constraints relating to a surcharge fee structure should be permitted to create an environment by which the "economics of the marketplace" determine the level of any surcharges that an institution might

consider levying. In this regard, such factors as operational expense structures, ATM usage factors and the convenience factor should be the litmus test of the extent to which surcharges, if any, should be imposed by the financial institution installing the ATM. It was also noted that ATM surcharges typically are incurred by noncustomers, i.e., by persons who have chosen to use a particular financial institution's ATM, but have chosen not to establish an account relationship with that institution. Thus, the incurring of ATM surcharges is voluntary and an individual can readily avoid surcharges by either establishing a deposit account with that institution or by only using the ATMs of the individual's existing depository institution. Those entities providing comments on this section made a number of compelling arguments to retain the existing requirement that requires the banking liaison officer (BLO) and credit union liaison officer (CULO) annually review service charges and fees (to include surcharges on ATM transactions). As a result, this section has been deleted in its entirety.

B. Section 230.4(a)(3)(iv)

This section of the previously published proposed rule would have required that retail fees and services for products (to include related minimum balance requirements for noninterest checking, Negotiable Order of Withdrawal (NOW) and savings accounts) offered by financial institutions operating on DoD installations shall not exceed 110 percent of the industry-wide averages for banks in the "Annual Report to Congress on Retail Fees and Services of Depository Institutions," published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In its comments, the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU) took exception to the 110 percent limitation citing that a credit union's fee structure is designed to allow credit unions to provide members with convenient and efficient services, as well as, a good return on their ownership interest. The Department has reviewed the concerns expressed and, based on its review, has removed the 110 percent ceiling requirement.

III. Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review

It has been determined that 32 CFR part 230 is not a significant regulatory action. The rule does not:

(1) Have an annual effect to the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the