a petition to delete the burn compound (burn ointment) from the first aid kits required to be carried on each aircraft operated under part 121 of the Federal Aviation Regulations. In the petition ATA noted that the application of ice or cold water is the preferred treatment for minor burns. As part of the supporting data, the petition included a request from Western Airlines to delete the burn ointment from their first aid kits and instructions from other carriers' flight manuals advising flight attendants not to use the burn ointment unless requested to do so by passengers. ATA stated that the burn ointment normally has an expiration date, which requires replacement, inspection, and record-keeping. Later, ATA submitted a letter to the docket from the American Red Cross that supported their position that burn ointment retains heat, causing the burn to worsen in some cases. Additional information submitted by ATA noted that the March 1987 meeting of the ATA Cabin Safety Panel each member present stated that cold water or ice, rather that the burn ointment, was the preferred method of treatment for burns.

A summary of ATA's petition was published in the Federal Register on February 20, 1987, [52 FR 5309]; the comment period closed April 20, 1987. The only comments received were those cited above.

In issuing a final rule removing the burn ointment from the first aid kits, the FAA agreed with industry practice. It stated that in the limited situation of treating minor burns aboard aircraft, cold water is the preferred treatment. Therefore, the requirement for burn ointment should be eliminated to spare air carriers the unnecessary expense of having to maintain an unneeded item. Further, because that final rule action was a minor amendment in which there was not expected to be any public disagreement, the FAA found that public notice and comment were unnecessary. Because it was relieving, the rule was made effective upon publication.

Discussion of Comments Received

Two comments were received on the final rule. Water Jel Technologies (Water Jel) comments that the revisions to the regulations were timely; however, the recommendation is flawed and should be amended to reflect the current protocol for the care of minor burns. Water Jel believes that burns occur so frequently that some burn preparations are necessary. This commenter urges the FAA to require instead a water-based burn product for the first aid kit.

Industrial Safety Equipment Association (ISEA) comments that the removal of burn compound from first aid kits is not justified by the record, which cites the burden of maintaining the kits and the protocol of treating minor burns. ISEA believes that the majority of burn ointments and compounds sold in FAA kits are water-soluble products that have no expiration dates. ISEA states that the pain-relieving benefits of water soluble burn ointments clearly outweigh the cost of maintaining them in first aid kits used on aircraft. ISEA recommends that 14 CFR parts 121, 125, and 135 be amended to add the words 'water soluble' to the description of the burn ointment.

FAA Response to Comments

The FAA agrees with commenters that a water-based compound may provide additional, longer lasting treatment for a burn until medical attention is provided. The incidence of burns aboard aircraft, however, does not support such a requirement. With the elimination of smoking aboard aircraft, the vast majority of burns occur when hot beverages are spilled. These are usually minor burns, and cold water provides sufficient relief to passengers. Therefore, the FAA finds that the final rule should be retained, as amended.

Issued in Washington, DC on February 13, 1996.

Thomas C. Accardi,

Director, Flight Standards Service.

[FR Doc. 96–3977 Filed 2–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 175

[Docket No. 88F–0316]

Indirect Food Additives; Adhesives and Components of Coatings

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the food additive regulations to provide for the safe use of 3–iodo–2–propynyl-*N*-butylcarbamate as an antifungal preservative in adhesives for food contact applications. This action responds to a petition filed by the Troy Chemical Corp.

DATES: Effective February 23, 1996; written objections and requests for a hearing by March 25, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit written objections to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 12420 Parklawn Dr., rm. 1–23, Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel N. Harrison, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–216) Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202–418–3080.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a notice published in the Federal Register of October 25, 1988 (53 FR 43043), FDA announced that a food additive petition (FAP 8B4088) had been filed by the Troy Chemical Corp., 72 Eagle Rock Ave., P.O. Box 366, East Hanover, NJ, 07936–0366 (formerly One Avenue L, Newark, NJ 07105–3895), proposing that the food additive regulations be amended to provide for the safe use of 3–iodo–2–propynyl butyl carbamate as an antifungal preservative in adhesives for food contact applications.

FDA has evaluated data in the petition and other relevant material. The agency concludes that the more accurate name for the additive is 3–iodo–2–propynyl-*N*-butylcarbamate (CAS Reg. No. 55406–53–6), that the proposed food additive use is safe, that the additive will achieve its intended technical effect, and that § 175.105 *Adhesives* (21 CFR 175.105) of the food additive regulations should be amended as set forth below.

In accordance with § 171.1(h) (21 CFR 171.1(h)), the petition and the documents that FDA considered and relied upon in reaching its decision to approve the petition are available for inspection at the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition by appointment with the information contact person listed above. As provided in 21 CFR 171.1(h), the agency will delete from the documents any materials that are not available for public disclosure before making the documents available for inspection.

The agency has carefully considered the potential environmental effects of this action. FDA has concluded that the action will not have a significant impact on the human environment, and that an environmental impact statement is not required. The agency's finding of no significant impact and the evidence supporting that finding, contained in an environmental assessment, may be seen in the Dockets Management Branch (address above) between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Any person who will be adversely affected by this regulation may at any time on or before March 25, 1996, file with the Dockets Management Branch

(address above) written objections thereto. Each objection shall be separately numbered, and each numbered objection shall specify with particularity the provisions of the regulation to which objection is made and the grounds for the objection. Each numbered objection on which a hearing is requested shall specifically so state. Failure to request a hearing for any particular objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing on that objection. Each numbered objection for which a hearing is requested shall include a detailed description and analysis of the specific factual information intended to be presented in support of the objection in the event that a hearing is held. Failure to include such a description and analysis for any particular objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing on the objection. Three copies of all documents shall be submitted and shall be identified with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document. Any objections received in response to the regulation may be seen in the Dockets Management Branch between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 175

Adhesives, Food additives, Food packaging.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and redelegated to the Director of the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, 21 CFR part 175 is amended as follows:

PART 175—INDIRECT FOOD ADDITIVES: ADHESIVES AND COMPONENTS OF COATINGS

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 175 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 201, 402, 409, 721 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321, 342, 348, 379e).

2. Section 175.105 is amended in paragraph (c)(5) by alphabetically adding the following new entry to the table to read as follows.

§ 175.105 Adhesives.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(5) * * *

Substances	Limitations
* * * * * * *	
3–Iodo–2–propynyl-N-butyl carbamate (CAS Reg. No. 55406–53–6)	For use only as an antifungal preservative.
* * * * * * *	

Dated: February 8, 1996.

Fred R. Shank,

Director, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition.

[FR Doc. 96–4068 Filed 2–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–F

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

29 CFR Part 102

Modifications to Role of National Labor Relations Board's Administrative Law Judges Including: Assignment of Administrative Law Judges as Settlement Judges; Discretion of Administrative Law Judges to Dispense With Briefs, to Hear Oral Argument in Lieu of Briefs, and to Issue Bench Decisions

AGENCY: National Labor Relations Board.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) issues a final rule permanently implementing its recent experimental modification to its rules authorizing the use of settlement judges and providing administrative law judges (ALJs) with the discretion to dispense with briefs, to hear oral argument in lieu of briefs, and to issue bench decisions.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 1, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John J. Toner, Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street, NW., Room 11600, Washington, D.C. 20570. Telephone: (202) 273–1940.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 8, 1994, the Board issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR) which proposed certain modifications to the Board's rules to permit the assignment of ALJs to serve as settlement judges, and to provide ALJs with the discretion to dispense with briefs, to hear oral argument in lieu of briefs, and to issue bench decisions (59 FR 46375). The NPR provided for a comment period ending October 7, 1994.

On December 22, 1994, following consideration of the comments received to the NPR, the Board [1] issued a notice implementing, on a one-year experimental basis, the proposed modifications (59 FR 65942). The notice provided that the modifications would become effective on February 1, 1995, and would expire at the end of the one-year experimental period on January 31, 1996, absent renewal by the Board.

On December 1, 1995, following a review of the experience to date with the modifications and the views of the NLRB's Advisory Committee on Agency Procedure, the Board issued a notice proposing to make the modifications permanent upon expiration of the one-year experimental period on January 31, 1996 (60 FR 61679). The notice provided for a period of public comment on this proposal, until December 29, 1995.

Thereafter, in light of the shutdown of Agency operations due to the lack of appropriated funds, on January 19, 1996, the Board extended from December 29, 1995, until January 25, 1996, the deadline for filing comments (61 FR 1314). The same day, the Board also extended the experimental period from January 31, 1996, until March 1, 1996, to provide the Board time to consider any comments that were filed (61 FR 1281).

The Board received only one comment in response to its December 1, 1995 notice, from William K. Harvey of Jackson, Shields, Yeiser & Cantrell, Cordova, Tennessee. The comment recommended that the Board make the modification regarding settlement judges permanent and that settlement judges be used in more cases. The comment recommended, however, that the Board modify the requirement that all parties consent to the procedure by requiring any party who objects to the appointment of a settlement judge to show good cause for such objection and allowing the chief or associate chief

[1] Chairman Gould and Members Devaney and Browning; Members Stephens and Cohen dissenting in part.