

This proposed AD would require the checking of the transmissible torque between the LP pump impeller and the HP pump shaft within 550 engine flight hours from the effective date of the proposed AD.

Costs of Compliance

Based on the service information, we estimate that this proposed AD would affect about 414 engines installed on helicopters of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it would take about 2.5 work-hours per engine to comply with this proposed AD. The average labor rate is \$80 per work-hour. Replacement HMUs would cost about \$12,000 per engine. Based on these figures, if all of the HMUs were to fail the check, we estimate the cost of the proposed AD on U.S. operators to be \$5,050,800.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. "Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs," describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in "Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements." Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We determined that this proposed AD would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This proposed AD would not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify this proposed regulation:

1. Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866;
2. Is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and
3. Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities

under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with this proposed AD and placed it in the AD docket.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA proposes to amend 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new AD:

Turbomeca: Docket No. FAA-2009-0889; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-35-AD.

Comments Due Date

- (a) We must receive comments by December 7, 2009.

Affected Airworthiness Directives (ADs)

- (b) None.

Applicability

- (c) This AD applies to Turbomeca Arriel 2B and 2B1 turboshaft engines that have not incorporated Modification TU 147. These engines are installed on, but not limited to, Eurocopter AS 350 B3 and EC 130 B4, and Chaughe Z11, helicopters.

Reason

- (d) This AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. We are issuing this AD to prevent forced autorotation landing, or an accident.

Actions and Compliance

- (e) Unless already done, do the following actions.

- (1) Within 550 engine flight hours from the effective date of this AD, check the transmissible torque between the low-pressure (LP) pump impeller and the high-pressure (HP) pump shaft of the HP/LP pump metering unit (HMU). Use paragraph 2 of the Instructions to be Incorporated of Turbomeca Alert Service Bulletin No. A292 73 2830, Version B, dated July 10, 2009, to do the check.

- (2) If the check is compliant, apply the nominal tightening torque to the screw of the LP pump impeller.

- (3) If the check is not compliant, replace the HP/LP pump metering unit with a unit that has not incorporated Modification TU

147 but has passed the check, or with a unit that has incorporated Modification TU 147.

FAA AD Differences

(f) This AD differs from the MCAI and/or service information as follows:

- (1) The MCAI requires the checking of the transmissible torque between the LP pump impeller and the HP pump shaft within 550 engine flight hours from the effective date of the AD, but no later than June 30, 2010.

- (2) This AD requires the checking of the transmissible torque between the LP pump impeller and the HP pump shaft within 550 engine flight hours from the effective date of this AD.

Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

(g) The Manager, Engine Certification Office, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

Related Information

(h) Refer to MCAI European Aviation Safety Agency Airworthiness Directive 2009-0184, dated August 14, 2009, and Turbomeca Mandatory Service Bulletin No. A292 73 2830, Version B, dated July 10, 2009, for related information. Contact Turbomeca, 40220 Tarnos, France; telephone (33) 05 59 74 40 00, fax (33) 05 59 74 45 15, for a copy of this service information.

(i) Contact James Lawrence, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; e-mail: james.lawrence@faa.gov; telephone (781) 238-7176; fax (781) 238-7199, for more information about this AD.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on October 27, 2009.

Peter A. White,

Assistant Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E9-26730 Filed 11-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

29 CFR Part 1910, 1915 and 1926

[Docket No. OSHA-H022K-2006-0062 (formerly Docket No. H022K)]

RIN 1218-AC20

Hazard Communication; Correction

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), DOL.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects the OSHA Hazard Communication standard proposed rule and request for comment, published in the **Federal Register** of September 30, 2009. This notice corrects eight errors, four in the preamble and

four that appear in Appendix A: Table A.1.1, Table A.1.2, Table A.2.3, and Table A7.1.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information and press inquiries, contact Jennifer Ashley, Office of Communications, Room N-3647, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone (202) 693-1999. For technical information, contact Maureen Ruskin, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Room N-3718, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone (202) 693-1950.

Correction

1. In the preamble of OSHA's Hazard Communication standard, published in

the **Federal Register** of September 30, 2009, (74 FR 50279) on page 50280, in the first column, correct the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to read as follows:

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information and press inquiries, contact Jennifer Ashley, Office of Communications, Room N-3647, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone (202) 693-1999. For technical information, contact Maureen Ruskin, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Room N-3718, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone (202) 693-1950.

2. On page 50335, in column one, in the fifth full paragraph from the top of

the page, in the third line from the bottom of that paragraph, the dollar amount of "\$500 million" is corrected to read "\$700 million".

3. On page 50372, in column two, in the second full paragraph under Item 4, in the fifth line from the bottom of that paragraph, the quantity "4,215,404" is corrected to read "3,877,457".

4. On page 50378, in column one, in the last line of text in that column above footnote 17, the dollar amount of "\$610 million" is corrected to read "\$621 million".

5. In Appendix A to § 1910.1200 on page 50445, correct Table A.1.1: Acute toxicity hazard categories and acute toxicity estimate (ATE) values defining the respective categories, to read as follows:

Exposure route	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4
Oral (mg/kg bodyweight) See: Notes (a), (b)	≤ 5	> 5 and ≤ 50	> 50 and ≤ 300	> 300 and ≤ 2000.
Dermal (mg/kg bodyweight) See: Notes (a), (b).	≤ 50	> 50 and ≤ 200	> 200 and ≤ 1000	> 1000 and ≤ 2000.
Inhalation—Gases (ppmV) See: Note (a), Note (b), Note (c).	≤ 100	> 100 and ≤ 500	> 500 and ≤ 2500	> 2500 and ≤ 20000.
Inhalation—Vapors (mg/l) See: Note (a), Note (b), Note (c), Note (d).	≤ 0.5	> 0.5 and ≤ 2.0	> 2.0 and ≤ 10.0	> 10.0 and ≤ 20.0.
Inhalation—Dusts and Mists (mg/l) See: Note (a), Note (b), Note (c).	≤ 0.05	> 0.05 and ≤ 0.5	> 0.5 and ≤ 1.0	> 1.0 and ≤ 5.0.

Note: Gases concentration are expressed in parts per million per volume (ppmV).

Notes to Table A.1.1:

- (a) The acute toxicity estimate (ATE) for the classification of a substance is derived using the LD₅₀/LC₅₀ where available ;
 - (b) The acute toxicity estimate (ATE) for the classification of a substance or ingredient in a mixture is derived using:
 - (i) the LD₅₀/LC₅₀ where available. Otherwise,
 - (ii) the appropriate conversion value from Table 1.2 that relates to the results of a range test, or
 - (iii) the appropriate conversion value from Table 1.2 that relates to a classification category;
 - (c) Inhalation cut-off values in the table are based on 4 hour testing exposures. Conversion of existing inhalation toxicity data which has been generated according to 1 hour exposure is achieved by dividing by a factor of 2 for gases and vapors and 4 for dusts and mists;
 - (d) For some chemicals the test atmosphere may consist of a vapor which is near the gaseous phase. In these cases, classification is based on ppmV as follows: Category 1 (100 ppmV), Category 2 (500 ppmV), Category 3 (2500 ppmV), Category 4 (20000 ppmV).
- The terms "dust," "mist," and "vapor" are defined as follows:
- (i) *Dust*: solid particles of a substance or mixture suspended in a gas (usually air);
 - (ii) *Mist*: liquid droplets of a substance or mixture suspended in a gas (usually air);
 - (iii) *Vapor*: the gaseous form of a substance or mixture released from its liquid or solid state.

6. In Appendix A on page 50447, correct Table A.1.2: Conversion from experimentally obtained acute toxicity

range values (or acute toxicity hazard categories) to acute toxicity point estimates for use in the formulas for the

classification of mixtures, to read as follows:

Exposure routes	Classification category or experimentally obtained acute toxicity range estimate	Converted acute toxicity point estimate
Oral (mg/kg bodyweight)	0 < Category 1 ≤ 5	0.5
	5 < Category 2 ≤ 50	5
	50 < Category 3 ≤ 300	100
	300 < Category 4 ≤ 2000	500
Dermal (mg/kg bodyweight)	0 < Category 1 ≤ 50	5
	50 < Category 2 ≤ 200	50
	200 < Category 3 ≤ 1000	300
	1000 < Category 4 ≤ 2000	1100
Gases (ppmV)	0 < Category 1 ≤ 100	10
	100 < Category 2 ≤ 500	100
	500 < Category 3 ≤ 2500	700
	2500 < Category 4 ≤ 20000	4500
Vapors (mg/l)	0 < Category 1 ≤ 0.5	0.05
	0.5 < Category 2 ≤ 2.0	0.5
	2.0 < Category 3 ≤ 10.0	3
	10.0 < Category 4 ≤ 20.0	11
Dust/mist (mg/l)	0 < Category 1 ≤ 0.5	0.005

Exposure routes	Classification category or experimentally obtained acute toxicity range estimate	Converted acute toxicity point estimate
	0.05 < Category 2 ≤ 2.0	0.05
	0.5 < Category 3 ≤ 10.0	0.5
	1.0 < Category 4 ≤ 20.0	1.5

Note: Gases concentration are expressed in parts per million per volume (ppmV).

7. In Appendix A on page 50450, correct Table A.2.3: Concentration of ingredients of a mixture classified as skin Category 1 or 2 that would trigger classification of the mixture as hazardous to skin (Category 1 or 2), to read as follows:

Sum of ingredients classified as:	Concentration triggering classification of a mixture as:	
	Skin corrosive Category 1	Skin irritant Category 2
Skin Category 1	≥ 5%	≥ 1% but < 5%.
Skin Category 2	≥10%.
(10 × Skin Category 1) + Skin Category 2	≥10%.

8. In Appendix A, on page 50467, correct Table A.7.1: Cut-off values/ concentration limits of ingredients of a mixture classified as reproductive toxicants or for effects on or via lactation that trigger classification of the mixture, to read as follows:

Ingredients classified as:	Cut-off values/concentration limits triggering classification of a mixture as:		
	Category 1 reproductive toxicant	Category 2 reproductive toxicant	Additional category for effects on or via lactation
Category 1 reproductive toxicant	≥ 0.1%
Category 2 reproductive toxicant	≥ 0.1%
Additional category for effects on or via lactation	≥ 0.1%

Authority

This document was prepared under the direction of Jordan Barab, Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 29th day of October 2009.

Jordan Barab,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. E9-26579 Filed 11-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-26-P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

39 CFR Part 3050

[Docket No. RM2010-4; Order No. 327]

Periodic Reporting Rules

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; availability of rulemaking petition.

SUMMARY: Under a new law, the Postal Service must file an annual compliance report on costs, revenues, rates, and

quality of service associated with its products. It recently filed documents with the Commission to change some of the methods it uses to compile the fiscal year 2008 report. In the Commission's view, these documents constitute a rulemaking petition. Therefore, this document provides notice of the Postal Service's filing and an opportunity for public comment.

DATES: 1. Initial comments on Proposals Twenty-Three through Twenty-Five are due November 16, 2009. 2. Initial comments on Proposal Twenty-Two are due November 30, 2009.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by telephone for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, 202-789-6820 or stephen.sharfman@prc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory History, 74 FR 55504 (October 2, 2009).

On October 23, 2009, the Postal Service filed a petition to initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider changes in the analytical methods approved for use in periodic reporting.¹ Proposal Twenty-Two proposes to calculate incremental costs for competitive products using the incremental cost model developed by witness Bradley and implemented by witness Kay in Docket No. R2000-1. In the attachment addressing Proposal Twenty-Two that accompanies the Petition, the Postal Service explains this methodology and how it applies to the current product structure.

Proposal Twenty-Three would remove an inconsistency between domestic and international mail with respect to the treatment of window service costs. Proposal Twenty-Four would change the format, but not the methodology, used to prepare the unit cost detail chart

¹ Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytic Principles (Proposals Twenty-two-Twenty-five), October 23, 2009 (Petition).