

Southwest, A4A, and the NBAA are concerned that other OSHA standards, regulations, or the OSH Act's general duty clause, 29 U.S.C. 654 (a)(1), could apply and requested clarification.

In contrast, other commenters argued that OSHA should have authority to protect crewmembers from additional hazards. For example, the IBT commented that OSHA should enforce its general duty clause to protect employees from cosmic radiation, contaminated bleed air ventilation systems, heat stress, ergonomic hazards, hazardous agents, pinch points, and slip and fall hazards.

There were also comments from the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health that cited several studies it conducted for FAA on reproductive issues for flight attendants, cosmic radiation, circadian rhythm disruption, cabin air quality, and infectious diseases.

The Aerospace Medical Association (AsMA) said it assumed that new regulations will be drafted to comply with the aircraft environment and that those should include aerospace medicine assessment and opinion. The new FAA policy statement only applies to OSHA standards for noise, bloodborne pathogens, and hazard communication. These standards were selected because they were identified in the agencies' 2000 MOU. The agencies examined the potential application of these three standards to aircraft cabin crewmembers in detail in the year 2000. The joint FAA/OSHA Occupational Safety and Health Team determined that application of these OSHA standards to aircraft cabin crewmembers should not compromise aviation safety. These standards also address the hazards of greatest concern to aircraft cabin crewmembers.

F. Procedural Issues

A number of commenters suggested that a full rulemaking process should be utilized before applying any OSHA standards to cabin crewmembers. According to NATA, for example, the change creates new compliance obligations because OSHA promulgated rules after the FAA's 1975 Policy Statement with the understanding that those rules would not apply to aircraft cabins. NATA also claimed that OSHA and FAA need to engage in a cost-benefit analysis, a regulatory flexibility determination, and a small business impact assessment.

A few other commenters also asserted that the agencies had not adequately considered the effect of the policy change on small and medium-sized businesses, citing the Regulatory

Flexibility Act and Executive Order 12866. Avjet, for example, noted that part 121 airlines have resources to implement the changes while these changes will be extremely onerous to small-business part 135 air charter operators of business jets. And according to NATA, operators will have to test interior noise levels of every aircraft in its fleet since some identical aircraft types may exhibit different cabin noise levels. NATA also asserted that operators who are not required to have a flight attendant onboard but elect to place a cabin attendant in the aircraft for added service and safety, may no longer employ these workers. NATA urged for rulemaking to determine how OSHA rules can be adapted for environments not previously considered.

We do not agree with these comments. In any event, we have provided the public and regulated community with notice and an opportunity to be heard on this policy change and plan to continue to do so should any further policy changes be considered. We have also met with most groups affected by this policy. After years of consideration of the application of these OSHA standards, FAA has decided that these standards should not compromise aviation safety. FAA and OSHA agree with the suggestions of some commenters that, to ease implementation of the policy, OSHA has expanded its existing industry alliances to develop training and job-aids for the safety of aircraft cabin crewmembers, as well as aviation personnel and vendors in ground-support activities, such as fueling, catering and cargo/baggage handling.

G. Practical Implementation

Several comments expressed concerns about how the policy change would be implemented in practice. For example, AsMA suggested that OSHA and FAA form a coordination group to review the operation of regulations and oversee responsibility.

ALPA also expressed concern about coordination between the two agencies. It favors an FAA preemption of OSHA requirements if those requirements interfere with aviation safety.

NATA questioned how the FAA and OSHA will determine which OSHA standards have safety implications and whether these determinations will include industry representatives. NATA asserted that the FAA should apply OSHA standards onboard rather than having OSHA consult with FAA on aviation safety implications.

Others questioned how OSHA will inspect aircraft in operation to ensure

compliance and how it will respond to complaints. Southwest and RAA asked how OSHA would investigate complaints, so as not to interfere with flight duties and delay flight operations, consequences which could have a substantial economic impact on carriers. Southwest also asked about coordination among FAA, OSHA, and the Transportation Security Administration to provide access to secure areas, and what resources would be required of the carriers (e.g., escorts/seating).

Although some commenters (IBT, IAM, and APA) recommended that OSHA conduct worksite inspections just as FAA inspectors do, others (e.g., NATA and RAA) are concerned that OSHA is not precluded from conducting inspections of aircraft in operation. APA stated that the FAA should require manufacturers and operators to sample the environment on aircraft for known hazards. As stated in the draft and final policy statements, the FAA and OSHA do not anticipate that OSHA will have to conduct inspections onboard aircraft to ensure compliance with the three OSHA standards. All three standards require employers to develop and implement their own programs. OSHA can examine the programs and verify compliance without being onboard aircraft. If there is a specific instance in the future where it is determined that compliance with one of the standards will have an adverse effect on aviation safety, both agencies understand that FAA will take precedence.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 21, 2013.

John S. Duncan,

Acting Director, Flight Standards Service.

[FR Doc. 2013-20841 Filed 8-26-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

18 CFR Part 284

[Docket No. RM12-17-000; Order No. 781]

Revisions to Procedural Regulations Governing Transportation by Intrastate Pipelines; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, DOE.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document contains corrections to the final rule (RM12-17-000) which was published in the **Federal Register** on Tuesday, July 30,

2013 (78 FR 45850). The regulations amends its regulations to provide optional notice procedures for processing rate filings by those natural gas pipelines that fall under the Commission's jurisdiction pursuant to the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 or the Natural Gas Act. The rule results in regulatory certainty and a reduction of regulatory burdens.

DATES: Effective September 30, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Tishman (Legal Information), Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502-8515, David.Tishman@ferc.gov.

James Sarikas (Technical Information), Office of Energy Market Regulation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502-6831, James.Sarikas@ferc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Need for Correction

On July 18, 2013, the Commission issued a "Final Rule, Order No. 781" in the above-captioned proceeding, *Revisions to Procedural Regulations Governing Transportation by Intrastate Pipelines*, 144 FERC ¶ 61,034 (2013).

This document serves to correct the table in Paragraph 82. Specifically, the last figure in the "total Annual Burden Hours" column is changed from "854" to "852".

Accordingly, in rule FR Doc. No. 2013-17822 published in the July 30, 2013 (78 FR 45850), on page 45861, in the table in paragraph 82, the entry in the "Total annual burden hours (a x b)" column for the entry "FERC-549 Total,"

the figure "854" is corrected to read "852".

Dated: August 21, 2013.
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.
 [FR Doc. 2013-20865 Filed 8-26-13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Parts 510, 520, 524, 556, and 558

[Docket No. FDA-2013-N-0002]

New Animal Drugs; Carprofen; Enrofloxacin; Florfenicol; Tildipirosin; Zilpaterol

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule; technical amendment.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the animal drug regulations to reflect approval actions for new animal drug applications (NADAs) and abbreviated new animal drug applications (ANADAs) during June 2013. FDA is also informing the public of the availability of summaries of the basis of approval and of environmental review documents, where applicable.

DATES: This rule is effective August 27, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George K. Haibel, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV-6), Food and Drug Administration, 7519 Standish Pl.,

Rockville, MD 20855, 240-276-9019, george.haibel@fda.hhs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: FDA is amending the animal drug regulations to reflect approval actions for NADAs and ANADAs during June 2013, as listed in table 1. In addition, FDA is informing the public of the availability, where applicable, of documentation of environmental review required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and, for actions requiring review of safety or effectiveness data, summaries of the basis of approval (Freedom of Information Summaries) under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). These public documents may be seen in the Division of Dockets Management (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. Persons with access to the Internet may obtain these documents at the Center for Veterinary Medicine FOIA Electronic Reading Room: <http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/CentersOffices/OfficeofFoods/CVM/OfficeofFoods/CVMFOIAElectronicReadingRoom/default.htm>.

In addition, the animal drug regulations are being amended at 21 CFR 510.600 to correct a sponsor's name and at 21 CFR 556.733 to correct the acceptable daily intake of total residues of tildipirosin. This is being done to improve the accuracy of the regulations.

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.

TABLE 1—ORIGINAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL NADAS AND ANADAS APPROVED DURING JUNE 2013

NADA/ANADA	Sponsor	New animal drug product name	Action	21 CFR section	FOIA summary	NEPA review
200-524	Putney, Inc., 400 Congress St., suite 200, Portland, ME 04101.	Mupirocin Ointment 2%	Original approval as a generic copy of NADA 140-839.	524.1465	yes	CE. ¹
200-517	Novartis Animal Health US, Inc., 3200 Northline Ave., suite 300, Greensboro, NC 27408.	ZOBUXA (enrofloxacin) Flavored Antibacterial Tablets.	Original approval as a generic copy of NADA 140-441.	520.812	yes	CE. ¹
200-519	Novartis Animal Health US, Inc., 3200 Northline Ave., suite 300, Greensboro, NC 27408.	FLORVIO (florfenicol) 2.3% Concentrate Solution.	Original approval as a generic copy of NADA 141-206.	520.995	yes	CE. ¹
200-547	Huvepharma AD, 5th Floor, 3A Nikolay Haytov Str., 1113 Sophia, Bulgaria.	ZILMAX (zilpaterol hydrochloride) plus RUMENSIN (monensin USP) plus TYLOVET 100 (tylosin phosphate) Type A medicated articles.	Original approval as a generic copy of NADA 141-276.	558.665	yes	CE. ¹