

IV. Voluntary Consensus Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995, Public Law 104–113, requires that Federal agencies use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies unless using such a standard is inconsistent with applicable law or is otherwise impractical. In this rule, the NRC is revising its regulations to reflect statutory mandates contained in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This action does not constitute the establishment of a standard that contains generally applicable requirements.

V. Environmental Impact: Categorical Exclusion

The Commission has determined that this final rule is the type of action described as a categorical exclusion in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(1) and (2). Therefore, neither an environmental impact statement nor an environmental assessment has been prepared for this final rule.

VI. Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

This final rule does not contain information collection requirements and, therefore, is not subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

Public Protection Notification

The NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a request for information or an information collection requirement unless the requesting document displays a currently valid OMB control number.

VII. Regulatory Analysis

A regulatory analysis has not been prepared for this regulation. This rule amends NRC regulations to be consistent with provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. This rule does not involve an exercise of Commission discretion and, therefore, does not necessitate preparation of a regulatory analysis.

VIII. Regulatory Flexibility Certification

As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 605(b), the Commission certifies that this final rule would not have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities.

IX. Plain Writing

The Plain Writing Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111–274) requires Federal agencies to

write documents in a clear, concise, and well-organized manner. The NRC has written this document to be consistent with the Plain Writing Act as well as the Presidential Memorandum, “Plain Language in Government Writing,” published June 10, 1998 (63 FR 31883).

X. Backfit Analysis and Issue Finality

The NRC has determined that the backfit provisions at 10 CFR 50.109, 70.76, 72.62, and 76.76 do not apply to this final rule because the amendments of this final rule are mandated by the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

XI. Congressional Review Act

The Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, has determined that this action is a “major rule” pursuant to the definitions in the Congressional Review Act. However, this rule does not involve an exercise of Commission discretion. The NRC is required by statute to perform ministerial computations and to implement the periodic inflation adjustments, reflecting changes in the Consumer Price Index, as mandated by the AEA.

List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 140

Criminal penalties, Extraordinary nuclear occurrence, Insurance, Intergovernmental relations, Nuclear materials, Nuclear power plants and reactors, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set out in the preamble and under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended; and 5 U.S.C. 552 and 553, the NRC is adopting the following amendment to 10 CFR part 140:

PART 140—FINANCIAL PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS AND INDEMNITY AGREEMENTS

- 1. The authority citation for part 140 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Atomic Energy Act secs. 161, 170, 223, 234 (42 U.S.C. 2201, 2210, 2273, 2282); Energy Reorganization Act secs. 201, as amended, 202 (42 U.S.C. 5841, 5842); Government Paperwork Elimination Act sec. 1704 (44 U.S.C. 3504 note); Energy Policy Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109–58, 119 Stat. 594 (2005).

- 2. In § 140.11, paragraph (a)(4) is revised to read as follows:

§ 140.11 Amounts of financial protection for certain reactors.

(a) * * *

(4) In an amount equal to the sum of \$375,000,000 and the amount available as secondary financial protection (in the form of private liability insurance available under an industry

retrospective rating plan providing for deferred premium charges equal to the pro rata share of the aggregate public liability claims and costs, excluding costs payment of which is not authorized by section 170o.(1)(D) of the Act, in excess of that covered by primary financial protection) for each nuclear reactor which is licensed to operate and which is designed for the production of electrical energy and has a rated capacity of 100,000 electrical kilowatts or more: Provided, however, that under such a plan for deferred premium charges for each nuclear reactor which is licensed to operate, no more than \$121,255,000 with respect to any nuclear incident (plus any surcharge assessed under subsection 170o.(1)(E) of the Act) and no more than \$18,963,000 per incident within one calendar year shall be charged. *Except that*, where a person is authorized to operate a combination of 2 or more nuclear reactors located at a single site, each of which has a rated capacity of 100,000 or more electrical kilowatts but not more than 300,000 electrical kilowatts with a combined rated capacity of not more than 1,300,000 electrical kilowatts, each such combination of reactors shall be considered to be a single nuclear reactor for the sole purpose of assessing the applicable financial protection required under this section.

* * * * *

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of July, 2013.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

R.W. Borchardt,

Executive Director for Operations.

[FR Doc. 2013–16732 Filed 7–11–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2012–1206; Directorate Identifier 2012–SW–021–AD; Amendment 39–17269; AD 2012–23–13]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The FAA is correcting an airworthiness directive (AD) that was published in the **Federal Register**. The

AD applies to all Sikorsky Model S-70, S-70A, and S-70C helicopters, which are restricted category helicopters derived from the military Model UH-60 helicopter. The part number (P/N) for the No. 2 crossfeed breakaway valve listed in the "Required Actions" section is incorrect. This document corrects that error. Also, this document contains a response to a comment received after publication of the Final Rule. In all other respects, the original document remains the same.

DATES: This final rule is effective July 12, 2013. The effective date for AD 2012-23-13 (77 FR 71087, November 29, 2012) remains December 14, 2012.

ADDRESSES: You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The address for the Docket Office (phone: 800-647-5527) is Document Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Davison, Flight Test Engineer, New England Regional Office, FAA, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; phone: (781) 238-7156, email: michael.davison@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Airworthiness Directive 2012-23-13, Amendment 39-17269 (77 FR 71087, November 29, 2012), currently includes the following under paragraph (e)(xiii) in the Required Actions section:

(xiii) For Number 2 crossfeed breakaway valve, P/N 70307-03600-103, establish a life limit of 1,500 hours.

As published, the identification of the P/N as 70307-03600-103 is incorrect. The correct P/N is 70307-03006-103. No other part of the regulatory information has been changed; therefore, only the changed portion of the final rule is being published in the **Federal Register**.

Comments

After we published our Final rule; request for comments (77 FR 71087; November 29, 2012), we received a comment from one commenter.

Request

The one commenter from the manufacturer stated that the document

reduced the life limit for the main and tail rotor blades but does not make any reference to the detailed internal life limited components of the blades. The commenter asked whether the AD applies only to the blade assembly P/Ns and whether the blade components were overlooked.

We do not agree that the AD should include life limits for the internal components of the blade assembly. The life limit of each main and tail rotor blade reflects the life limit of its lowest component in the Sikorsky Airworthiness Limitations technical manual. That manual does not list life limits for individual internal components.

Correction of Regulatory Text

§ 39.13 [Corrected]

In the **Federal Register** of November 29, 2012, on page 71089, in the first column, paragraph (e)(xiii) of AD 2012-23-13 is corrected to read as follows:

* * * * *

(e)(xiii) For Number 2 crossfeed breakaway valve, P/N 70307-03006-103, establish a life limit of 1,500 hours TIS.

* * * * *

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, on July 3, 2013.

Kim Smith,

Directorate Manager, Rotorcraft Directorate,
Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2013-16693 Filed 7-11-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA-2012-1282; Airspace
Docket No. 12-AGL-16]

Establishment of Class E Airspace; Parkston, SD

AGENCY: Federal Aviation
Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action establishes Class E airspace at Parkston, SD. Controlled airspace is necessary to accommodate new Area Navigation (RNAV) Standard Instrument Approach Procedures at Parkston Municipal Airport. The FAA is taking this action to enhance the safety and management of Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) operations at the airport.

DATES: Effective date: 0901 UTC, October 17, 2013. The Director of the Federal Register approves this incorporation by reference action under

1 CFR Part 51, subject to the annual revision of FAA Order 7400.9 and publication of conforming amendments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Scott Enander, Central Service Center, Operations Support Group, Federal Aviation Administration, Southwest Region, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, TX 76137; telephone 817-321-7716.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

On April 30, 2013, the FAA published in the **Federal Register** a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to establish Class E airspace for the Parkston, SD, area, creating controlled airspace at Parkston Municipal Airport (78 FR 25232) Docket No. FAA-2012-1282. Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking effort by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. No comments were received. Class E airspace designations are published in paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9W dated August 8, 2012, and effective September 15, 2012, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E airspace designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

The Rule

This action amends Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 71 by establishing Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6.8-mile radius of Parkston Municipal Airport, Parkston, SD, to ensure that required controlled airspace exists to contain new standard instrument approach procedures at the airport. Controlled airspace enhances the safety and management of IFR operations at the airport.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this regulation: (1) Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that only affects air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule, when promulgated, does not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.