

■ 28. In § 147.54, paragraphs (a)(1), (3), and (4) are revised to read as follows:

§ 147.54 Approval of diagnostic test kits not licensed by the Service.

(a) * * *

(1) The sensitivity of the kit will be evaluated in at least three NPIP authorized laboratories by testing known positive samples, as determined by the official NPIP procedures found in the NPIP Program Standards or through other procedures approved by the Administrator. Field samples, for which the presence or absence of the target organism or analyte has been determined by the current NPIP test, are the preferred samples and should be used when possible. Samples from a variety of field cases representing a range of low, medium, and high analyte concentrations should be used. In some cases it may be necessary to utilize samples from experimentally infected animals. Spiked samples (clinical sample matrix with a known amount of pure culture added) should only be used in the event that no other sample types are available. When the use of spiked samples may be necessary, prior approval from the NPIP Technical Committee is required. Pure cultures should never be used. Additionally, laboratories should be selected for their experience with testing for the target organism or analyte with the current NPIP approved test. (e.g., a Salmonella test should be evaluated by NPIP authorized laboratories that test for Salmonella routinely). If certain conditions or interfering substances are known to affect the performance of the kit, appropriate samples will be included so that the magnitude and significance of the effect(s) can be evaluated.

* * * * *

(3) The kit will be provided to the cooperating laboratories in its final form and include the instructions for use. The cooperating laboratories must perform the assay exactly as stated in the supplied instructions. Each laboratory must test a panel of at least 25 known positive samples. In addition, each laboratory must test at least 50 known negative samples obtained from several sources, to provide a representative sampling of the general population. The cooperating laboratories must perform a current NPIP procedure or NPIP approved test on the samples alongside the test kit for comparison and must provide an outline of the method on the worksheet for diagnostic test evaluation. Reproducibility and robustness data should also be included.

(4) Cooperating laboratories will submit to the kit manufacturer all compiled output data regarding the assay response. Each sample tested will be reported as positive or negative, and the official NPIP procedure used to classify the sample must be submitted in addition to the assay response value. A completed worksheet for diagnostic test evaluation is required to be submitted with the compiled output data and may be obtained by contacting the NPIP Senior Coordinator. Data and the completed worksheet for diagnostic test evaluation must be submitted to the NPIP Senior Coordinator 4 months prior to the next scheduled General Conference Committee meeting, which is when approval will be sought.

* * * * *

Done in Washington, DC, this 13th day of June 2018.

Kevin Shea,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2018–13128 Filed 6–18–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA–2017–1061; **Airspace Docket No. 17–AEA–20**]

RIN 2120–AA66

Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace, and Removal of Class E Airspace; Binghamton, NY

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action amends Class D airspace, Class E surface airspace, and Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface; and removes Class E airspace designated as an extension to a Class D surface area; at Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field (formerly Binghamton Regional Airport/Edwin A. Link Field), Binghamton, NY. This action accommodates airspace reconfiguration due to the decommissioning of the Binghamton VHF omni-directional radio range tactical air navigation aid (VORTAC), and cancellation of the VOR approaches. Controlled airspace is necessary for the safety and management of instrument flight rules (IFR) operations at the airport. This action also updates the geographic coordinates of the airport, and corrects the airport's name. Additionally, this

action replaces the outdated term “Airport/Facility Directory” with the term “Chart Supplement” in Class D and E surface airspace descriptions.

DATES: Effective 0901 UTC, September 13, 2018. The Director of the Federal Register approves this incorporation by reference action under Title 1 Code of Federal Regulations, part 51, subject to the annual revision of FAA Order 7400.11 and publication of conforming amendments.

ADDRESSES: FAA Order 7400.11B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, and subsequent amendments can be viewed online at http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/publications/. For further information, you can contact the Airspace Policy Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–8783. The Order is also available for inspection at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of FAA Order 7400.11B at NARA, call (202) 741–6030, or go to <https://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html>.

FAA Order 7400.11, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, is published yearly and effective on September 15.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Fornito, Operations Support Group, Eastern Service Center, Federal Aviation Administration, 1701 Columbia Ave., College Park, GA 30337; telephone (404) 305–6364.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority for This Rulemaking

The FAA's authority to issue rules regarding aviation safety is found in Title 49 of the United States Code. Subtitle I, Section 106 describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII, Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the agency's authority. This rulemaking is promulgated under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart I, Section 40103. Under that section, the FAA is charged with prescribing regulations to assign the use of airspace necessary to ensure the safety of aircraft and the efficient use of airspace. This regulation is within the scope of that authority as it amends Class D and Class E airspace at Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field, Binghamton, NY, to support IFR operations at the airport.

History

The FAA published a notice of proposed rulemaking in the **Federal**

Register (83 FR 5750, February 9, 2018) for Docket No. FAA–2017–1061 to amend Class D airspace and Class E surface airspace, and Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface at Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field, Binghamton, NY (formerly Binghamton Regional Airport/Edwin A. Link Field).

Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking effort by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. One comment was received requesting a graphic on the airspace proposal. The FAA has since posted a graphic to the docket.

Class D and E airspace designations are published in paragraph 5000, 6002, 6004, and 6005, respectively, of FAA Order 7400.11B dated August 3, 2017, and effective September 15, 2017, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR part 71.1. The Class D and E airspace designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

Availability and Summary of Documents for Incorporation by Reference

This document proposes to amend FAA Order 7400.11B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 3, 2017, and effective September 15, 2016. FAA Order 7400.11B is publicly available as listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document. FAA Order 7400.11B lists Class A, B, C, D, and E airspace areas, air traffic service routes, and reporting points.

The Rule

This amendment to Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 71 amends Class D airspace, Class E surface airspace, and Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface at Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field, Binghamton, NY (formerly Binghamton Regional Airport/Edwin A. Link Field), due to the decommissioning of the Binghamton VORTAC, and cancellation of the VOR approaches. These changes enhance the safety and management of IFR operations at the airport.

The Class D airspace area is amended to within a 4.4-mile radius (from a 4.3-mile radius) of Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field.

The Class E surface area airspace is amended to within a 4.4-mile radius (increased from a 4.3-mile radius) of Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field. The Binghamton VORTAC is removed as it is being decommissioned. The SMITE LOM, and ILS Runway 34

Localizer navigation aids are no longer needed in the airspace redesign.

The Class E airspace designated as an extension to a Class D surface area is removed as this airspace was only necessary for the cancelled approaches.

Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface is amended to within a 7-mile radius (initially from a boundary line formed by the geographic coordinates) of the airport. The exclusionary language contained in the legal description is removed to comply with FAA Order 7400.2L, Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters. Also, an editorial change is made by adding the airport's geographic coordinates to the airspace designation.

The geographic coordinates of the airport also are adjusted in the classes of airspace listed above to coincide with the FAA's aeronautical database, and the airport name is updated to Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field, formerly Binghamton Regional Airport/Edwin A. Link Field.

Regulatory Notices and Analyses

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. It, therefore: (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.

Environmental Review

The FAA has determined that this action qualifies for categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, "Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures," paragraph 5–6.5a. This airspace action is not expected to cause any potentially significant environmental impacts, and no extraordinary circumstances exist that warrant preparation of an environmental assessment.

Lists of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

Adoption of the Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, B, C, D, AND E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 106(g); 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

■ 2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.11B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 3, 2017, effective September 15, 2017, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 5000 Class D Airspace.
* * * * *

AEA NY D Binghamton, NY [Amended]

Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field, NY

(Lat. 42°12'30" N, long. 75°58'47" W)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 4,100 feet MSL within a 4.4-mile radius of Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field. This Class D airspace area is effective during the specific days and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective days and times will thereafter be continuously published in the Chart Supplement.

Paragraph 6002 Class E Surface Area Airspace.
* * * * *

AEA NY E2 Binghamton, NY [Amended]

Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field, NY

(Lat. 42°12'30" N, long. 75°58'47" W)

That airspace extending upward from the surface within a 4.4-mile radius of Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field. This Class E airspace area is effective during the specific days and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective days and times will thereafter be continuously published in the Chart Supplement.

Paragraph 6004 Class E Airspace Designated as an Extension to a Class D Surface Area.
* * * * *

AEA NY E4 Binghamton, NY [Removed]

Paragraph 6005 Class E Airspace Areas Extending Upward From 700 Feet or More Above the Surface of the Earth.
* * * * *

AEA NY E5 Binghamton, NY [Amended]
Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link
Field, NY
(Lat. 42°12'30" N, long. 75°58'47" W)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 7-mile radius of Greater Binghamton Airport/Edwin A. Link Field.

Issued in College Park, Georgia, on June 6, 2018.

Ryan W. Almasy,

Manager, Operations Support Group, Eastern Service Center, Air Traffic Organization.

[FR Doc. 2018–13050 Filed 6–18–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

16 CFR Parts 1112 and 1231

[Docket No. CPSC–2015–0031]

Safety Standard for High Chairs

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (CPSIA) directs the Commission to issue standards for durable infant or toddler products. To comply with section 104 of the CPSIA, CPSC is issuing a safety standard for high chairs. This rule incorporates by reference ASTM F404–18, *Standard Consumer Safety Specification for High Chairs* (ASTM F404–18). In addition, this rule amends the regulations regarding third party conformity assessment bodies to include the safety standard for high chairs in the list of Notices of Requirements (NORs).

DATES: The rule will become effective on June 19, 2019. The incorporation by reference of the publication listed in this rule is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of June 19, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Keysha Walker, Office of Compliance and Field Operations, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission; 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; email: KWalker@cpsc.gov; telephone: (301) 504–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background and Statutory Authority

Congress enacted the CPSIA (Pub. L. 110–314, 122 Stat. 3016), as part of the Danny Keysar Child Product Safety Notification Act, on August 14, 2008. Section 104(b) of the CPSIA requires CPSC to: (1) Examine and assess the effectiveness of voluntary consumer product safety standards for durable infant or toddler products, in

consultation with representatives of consumer groups, juvenile product manufacturers, and independent child product engineers and experts; and (2) promulgate consumer product safety standards for durable infant or toddler products. Any standard CPSC adopts under this mandate must be substantially the same as the applicable voluntary standard, or more stringent than the voluntary standard if CPSC determines that more stringent requirements would further reduce the risk of injury associated with the product. Section 104(f)(1) of the CPSIA defines the term “durable infant or toddler product” as “a durable product intended for use, or that may be reasonably expected to be used, by children under the age of 5 years,” and section 104(f)(2)(C) specifically identifies high chairs as a durable infant or toddler product.

On November 9, 2015, the Commission issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPR), proposing to incorporate by reference the then-current voluntary standard for high chairs, ASTM F404–15, with more stringent requirements for rearward stability and warnings on labels and in instructional literature. 80 FR 69144; 81 FR 3354 (January 21, 2016) (correcting an error in the NPR). After the Commission issued the NPR, ASTM revised the voluntary standard several times, as discussed in section V of this preamble, and published the current version of the standard, ASTM F404–18, in March 2018.

In this final rule, the Commission is incorporating by reference ASTM F404–18, with no modifications, as the mandatory safety standard for high chairs. As section 104(b)(1)(A) of the CPSIA requires, CPSC staff consulted with manufacturers, retailers, trade organizations, laboratories, consumer advocacy groups, consultants, and the public to develop this standard, largely through the ASTM standard-development process. In addition, this final rule amends the list of NORs in 16 CFR part 1112 to include the standard for high chairs.

II. Product Description

ASTM F404–18 defines a “high chair” as “a free standing chair for a child up to 3 years of age which has a seating surface more than 15 in. above the floor and elevates the child normally for the purposes of feeding or eating.” The ASTM standard further specifies that a high chair may be sold with or without

a tray, have adjustable heights, or recline for infants.¹

High chairs are available in various designs, including four-legged A-frame styles, single-leg pedestals, Z-frame styles, and restaurant-style. Construction materials often include a plastic, wood, or metal frame, and a padded fabric seat. Some designs include a tray or mounted toy accessories, fold for storage and transport, or convert for continued use as a child grows. ASTM F404–18 requires high chairs to have a passive crotch restraint (*i.e.*, two separate bounded openings for the occupant’s legs) and a three-point restraint system; some designs also include a rigid front torso support or a five-point restraint system with shoulder harnesses.

III. Market Description

CPSC staff has identified 59 domestic firms that currently supply high chairs to the U.S. market. Thirty-three of these firms manufacture high chairs and the remaining 26 firms are importers. Forty-three of the firms (26 manufacturers and 17 importers) are small, according to the U.S. Small Business Administration’s (SBA) standards,² and the remaining 16 (7 manufacturers and 9 importers) are large. Of the 59 domestic firms, 43 market their high chairs only to consumers, and 4 sell their high chairs to both consumers and restaurants. In addition, staff identified 9 foreign firms that supply high chairs to the U.S. market, including 8 manufacturers and 1 importer. Staff also identified numerous high chairs that are manufactured outside the United States and bought domestically through online sales.

At the time CPSC staff assessed the high chairs market, 13 of the 26 small domestic manufacturers, and 9 of the 17 small domestic importers, reported that they complied with the ASTM standard for high chairs.

IV. Incident Data

CPSC receives data regarding product-related injuries from several sources.

¹ After the Commission issued the NPR, staff learned of a reclined infant seat accessory for a high chair product that is intended for young infants. The product consists of a high chair base that is sold separately from, but accommodates, several seat accessories that are appropriate for different ages and sizes of children. One of the seat accessories is a reclined seat that, when placed on the high chair base, allows infants to be raised to the height of a dining table. Based on the characteristics of the infant seat accessory, its intended use, and marketing materials, CPSC staff believes that these products also meet the definition of a high chair.

² Under SBA size standards, a high chair manufacturer is “small” if it has 500 or fewer employees, and an importer is “small” if it has 100 or fewer employees.