www.regulations.gov by searching for and locating it in Docket No. FAA–2013–1003.

(3) Turbomeca S.A. Arrius 2F Technical Instruction No. 319 79 4831, Revision No. 01, dated May 30, 2011, which is not incorporated by reference in this AD, pertains to the subject of this AD and can be obtained from Turbomeca S.A. using the contact information in paragraph (i)(3) of this AD.

(i) Material Incorporated by Reference

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference (IBR) of the service information listed in this paragraph under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

(2) You must use this service information as applicable to do the actions required by this AD, unless this AD specifies otherwise.

(i) Turbomeca S.A. Mandatory Service Bulletin No. 319 79 4835, Version A, dated May 22, 2013.

(ii) Reserved.

(3) For Turbomeca service information identified in this AD, contact Turbomeca, S.A., 40220 Tarnos, France; phone: 33 (0)5 59 74 40 00; telex: 570 042; fax: 33 (0)5 59 74 45 15.

(4) You may view this service information at FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 781–238–7125.

(5) You may view this service information at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: *http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html.*

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on January 2, 2014.

Colleen M. D'Alessandro,

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

[FR Doc. 2014–01090 Filed 1–21–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

18 CFR Part 292

Regulations Under Sections 201 and 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 With Regard to Small Power Production and Cogeneration

CFR Correction

■ In Title 18 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 1 to 399, revised as of April 1, 2013, on page 862, in § 292.303, in paragraph (c)(1), the word ''costs'' is removed from the first sentence and added to the last sentence after ''interconnection''.

[FR Doc. 2014–01293 Filed 1–21–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

26 CFR Parts 57 and 602

[TD 9643]

RIN 1545–BL20

Health Insurance Providers Fee

Correction

In rule document 2013–28412 appearing on pages 71476–71493 in the issue of November 29, 2013, make the following correction:

On page 71481, in the second column, in the first full paragraph, in the last line ''§ 1.414(c)–(5)'' should read ''§ 1.414(c)–5)''.

[FR Doc. C1–2013–28412 Filed 1–21–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

29 CFR Parts 101 and 102

RIN 3142–AA08

Representation—Case Procedures

AGENCY: National Labor Relations Board.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule rescinds the amendments to the National Labor Relations Board's (the Board's) representation case procedures adopted by the Board's final rule of December 22, 2011, consistent with the district court's decision in *Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.* v. *NLRB* setting aside that rule. On December 9, 2013, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit dismissed the Board's appeal of the district court's decision, pursuant to the parties' stipulation. Now that the district court's decision is no longer subject to appellate review, this final rule restores the relevant language in the CFR to that which existed before the Board issued the December 22, 2011 final rule.

DATES: *Effective Date:* January 22, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gary Shinners, Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20570, (202) 273–3737 (this is not a toll-free number), 1–866–315–6572 (TTY/TDD).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

On December 22, 2011, the National Labor Relations Board (Board or NLRB) published a final rule amending its regulations governing representation case procedures. 76 FR 80138. The final rule was immediately challenged in Federal district court. See *Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.* v. *NLRB,* 879 F. Supp. 2d 18, 21, 24 (D.D.C. 2012). On May 14, 2012, the court struck down the rule on only one ground: that the Board lacked a quorum when it issued the final rule because Member Hayes (one of the Board's three Members at the time of the rule's publication) was ''absent'' from the vote—rather than ''abstaining'' from the vote, as the Board asserted. *Id.* at 28–30. On July 27, 2012, the court denied the Board's motion for reconsideration of its opinion. *Id.* at 30–35.

The Board appealed to the D.C. Circuit. On December 9, 2013, the D.C. Circuit dismissed the Board's appeal of the district court's decision pursuant to a joint stipulation of the parties. As there is no longer a possibility that the district court's opinion will be overturned on appeal, there is no basis for the language in the CFR to continue to reflect the amendments made by the Board's December 22, 2011 final rule.

II. Changes to the CFR

Pursuant to the Board's December 22, 2011 final rule, the CFR was changed in the following ways. In part 101, subpart C, consisting of §§ 101.17 through 101.21, was removed and reserved. In part 101, subpart D, §§ 101.23 and 101.25 were amended. In part 101, subpart E, §§ 101.28, 101.29 and 101.30 were amended. In part 102, subpart C, §§ 102.62, 102.63, 102.64, 102.65, 102.66, 102.67 and 102.69 were amended. In part 102, subpart D, § 102.77 was amended. In part 102, subpart E, §§ 102.85 and 102.86 were amended.

To implement the district court's decision, this rule makes some changes to the regulatory text. Specifically, the changes detailed in this rule restore the language of each of those subparts to that which existed prior to the December 22, 2011 amendments, with the exception of certain non-substantive changes required for publication by the Office of the Federal Register, such as spelling corrections and formatting changes.

The Board finds that notice and comment are unnecessary for these changes because they implement the final decision of the District Court of the District of Columbia, which set aside the