

TABLE 1.—ROTATING PARTS REQUIRING CYCLIC LIFE CORRECTION—Continued

P/N	SN	Part name	Required cycle correction	Required hour correction
9061M26P20	PMOA0508	Shaft, LPT Rear	+2,429	+15,936

(3) After correcting the cycles and hours, remove from service any rotating parts listed in Table 1 of this AD that exceed their LCF life limit, within 100 cycles-in-service after the effective date of this AD.

(g) After the effective date of this AD, do not install any part listed in Table 1 of this AD into any engine, unless the cycles and hours have been corrected as specified in paragraph (f) of this AD.

(h) After the effective date of this AD, do not install any engine unless the records check specified in paragraph (f) of this AD has been performed.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(i) The Manager, Engine Certification Office, has the authority to approve alternative methods of compliance for this AD if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

Related Information

(j) General Electric Company Alert Service Bulletin No. CF6–50 S/B 72–A1275, dated March 24, 2005, pertains to the subject of this AD.

Material Incorporated by Reference

(k) None.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on April 7, 2005.

Jay J. Pardee,

Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate,
Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 05–7387 Filed 4–12–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 520

Oral Dosage Form New Animal Drugs; Dichlorophene and Toluene Capsules

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the animal drug regulations that reflect approval of a new animal drug application (NADA) for dichlorophene and toluene capsules used in dogs and cats for removal of certain intestinal parasites. In a notice published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**, FDA is withdrawing approval of the NADA.

DATES: This rule is effective April 25, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Pamela K. Esposito, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV–212), Food and Drug Administration, 7519 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 301–827–7818; e-mail: pesposit@cvm.fda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Natchez Animal Supply Co., 201 John R. Junkin Dr., Natchez, MS 39120, has requested that FDA withdraw approval of NADA 121–557 for THR Worm (dichlorophene and toluene) Capsules used in dogs and cats for removal of certain intestinal parasites. This action is requested because the product is no longer manufactured or marketed. The animal drug regulations are amended to reflect the withdrawal of approval.

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 520

Animal drugs.

■ 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 520 is amended as follows:

PART 520—ORAL DOSAGE FORM NEW ANIMAL DRUGS

■ 1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 520 continues to read as follows:

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

§ 520.580 [Amended]

■ 2. Section 520.580 is amended in paragraph (b)(1) by removing “049968,”.

Dated: March 31, 2005.

Catherine P. Beck,

Acting Director, Center for Veterinary Medicine.

[FR Doc. 05–7337 Filed 4–12–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–S

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 520

Oral Dosage Form New Animal Drugs; Ivermectin Meal; Change of Sponsor

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the animal drug regulations to reflect a change of sponsor for a new animal drug application (NADA) from Merial Ltd. to Farnam Companies, Inc.

DATES: This rule is effective April 13, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David R. Newkirk, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV–100), Food and Drug Administration, 7500 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 301–827–6967, e-mail: david.newkirk@fda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Merial Ltd., 3239 Satellite Blvd., Bldg. 500, Duluth, GA 30096–4640, has informed FDA that it has transferred ownership of, and all rights and interest in, NADA 141–241 for ZIMECTERIN–EZ (ivermectin) 0.6% w/w for Horses to Farnam Companies, Inc., 301 West Osborn, Phoenix, AZ 85013–3928.

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 520

Animal drugs.

■ 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 520 is amended as follows:

PART 520—ORAL DOSAGE FORM NEW ANIMAL DRUGS

■ 1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 520 continues to read as follows:

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

§ 520.1194 [Amended]

■ 2. Section 520.1194 is amended in paragraph (b) by removing “050604” and by adding in its place “017135”.

Dated: March 31, 2005.

Bernadette A. Dunham,

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

[FR Doc. 05-7344 Filed 4-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-S

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**Parole Commission****28 CFR Part 2**

Paroling, Recommitting, and Supervising Federal Prisoners: Prisoners Serving Sentences Under the United States and District of Columbia Codes

AGENCY: United States Parole Commission, Justice.

ACTION: Interim rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: During 2004 the Parole Commission carried out a pilot project to study the feasibility of conducting parole release hearings through videoconferences between an examiner at the Commission's office and prisoners at selected institutions of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. In order to give notice of this project, the Commission promulgated an interim rule that provided that a parole release hearing may be conducted through a videoconference with the prisoner. The pilot project has been a success and the Commission is now amending the interim rule to include institutional revocation hearings as hearings that may be conducted by videoconference. The Commission is taking this action to further conserve personnel resources and reduce the costs associated with travel by the agency's hearing examiners.

DATES: Effective Date: May 13, 2005. Comments must be received by June 13, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Office of General Counsel, U.S. Parole Commission, 5550 Friendship Blvd., Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Office of General Counsel, U.S. Parole Commission, 5550 Friendship Blvd., Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815, telephone (301) 492-5959. Questions about this publication are welcome, but inquiries concerning individual cases cannot be answered over the telephone.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Parole Commission's hearing examiners travel to more than 60 locations of Federal correctional facilities to conduct parole release and revocation hearings. In order to reduce travel costs and to conserve the time and effort of its hearing examiners, in 2004 the Commission initiated a pilot project in which examiners conducted some parole release hearings by videoconference between the Commission's office in Maryland and the prisoner's Federal institution. The Commission published an interim rule that provided notice that the Commission would be using the videoconference procedure. 69 FR 5273 (Feb. 4, 2004).

By the end of 2004, the Commission conducted 102 hearings via videoconference at 11 institutions. The videoconference technology has worked well. Video and audio transmissions are clear and the hearings are seldom interrupted by technical difficulties. The Commission's experience is that the prisoner's ability to effectively participate in the hearing has not been diminished by the use of the videoconference procedure.

The Commission's pilot project only included parole release hearings. Now the Commission is extending the use of the videoconference procedure to institutional revocation hearings. A revocation hearing is held at a Federal institution when the releasee admits to the violation charge, is convicted of a new crime, or waives a local revocation hearing, *i.e.*, a hearing at the place of the alleged violation or arrest. Adverse witnesses are not produced at institutional revocation hearings for confrontation and cross-examination. On rare occasions, the releasee has a witness testify on his behalf at the hearing. Because the violation charge is either not contested by the releasee or is conclusively established by the new conviction, an institutional revocation hearing primarily focuses on the decisions regarding the appropriate prison term for the releasee's violation and whether the releasee should be returned to the community on supervision. Therefore, an institutional revocation hearing bears considerable similarity to a parole determination proceeding. Given this similarity and the additional cost savings and conservation of resources that may be gained from use of the videoconference procedure, the Commission is adding institutional revocation hearings to those hearings an examiner may conduct by videoconference.

Extending the videoconference procedure to institutional revocation hearings will provide additional

flexibility for both the Commission and the Bureau of Prisons in the disposition of accused release violators and the use of personnel. For example, if the releasee is serving a new prison term at an institution where the Commission conducts parole hearings via videoconference, the Bureau will be able to designate that same institution as the site of the releasee's institutional revocation hearing. This saves either the cost of transporting the releasee to FTC Oklahoma or FDC Philadelphia, the institutions where the Commission conducts the majority of institutional revocation hearings, or the cost of sending a hearing examiner to travel to the institution to conduct one institutional revocation hearing when all other hearings at that same institution are conducted via videoconference. Moreover, conducting institutional revocation hearings by videoconference may avoid some violations of the 90-day time period for holding such hearings in situations where transportation difficulties or other problems have delayed the scheduling of the hearing.

The Commission is promulgating this rule as an interim rule in order to promptly take full advantage of the cost savings and other benefits in the deployment of examiner personnel that result from the extension of the videoconference procedure to institutional revocation hearings. The Commission is providing a 60-day period for the public to comment on the use of the videoconference procedure for such revocation hearings.

Implementation

The amended rule will take effect May 13, 2005, and will apply to institutional revocation hearings for Federal parolees and District of Columbia parolees and supervised releasees held on or after the effective date.

Executive Order 12866

The U.S. Parole Commission has determined that this interim rule does not constitute a significant rule within the meaning of Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 13132

This regulation will not have substantial direct effects 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. Under Executive Order 13132, this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications requiring a federalism Assessment.