

The FAA estimates that 14 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 8 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Required parts would be provided by the manufacturer at no cost to operators. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$6,720, or \$480 per airplane.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

The regulations proposed herein would 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. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

#### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

#### The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

#### **PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES**

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40101, 40113, 44701.

#### **§ 39.13 [Amended]**

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

De Havilland, Inc.: Docket 95-NM-110-AD.

*Applicability:* Model DHC-7 series airplanes, serial numbers 3 through 27 inclusive, on which de Havilland Modification No. 7/1697 has not been installed; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been otherwise modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (c) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

*Compliance:* Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent failure of the emergency lighting system due to voltage spikes from other equipment or due to inadvertent override of the emergency lighting switches, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, modify the emergency lights circuitry by accomplishing de Havilland Modification No. 7/1697 (Emergency Lights—Revised Switching Logic), in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of de Havilland Service Bulletin No. 7-33-7, dated October 17, 1980.

(b) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install an emergency light switch, part number MS24659-21A, on any airplane subject to this AD.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on January 3, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,  
*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*  
[FR Doc. 96-261 Filed 1-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

#### **14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 94-NM-195-AD]

#### **Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking; reopening of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** This document revises an earlier proposed airworthiness directive (AD), which would have superseded an existing AD that is applicable to McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and C-9 (military) series airplanes. The existing AD currently requires the implementation of a program of structural inspections to detect and correct fatigue cracking in order to ensure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes as they approach the manufacturer's original fatigue design life goal. The previously proposed action would have required, among other things, revision of the existing program to require additional visual inspections of additional structure. The previously proposed action was prompted by new data submitted by the manufacturer indicating that certain revisions to the program are necessary in order to increase the confidence level of the statistical program to ensure timely detection of cracks in various airplane structures. This action revises the proposed rule by deleting the requirement to perform certain visual inspections of Fleet Leader Operator Sampling (FLOS) Principal Structural Elements (PSE). The actions specified by this proposed AD are intended to prevent fatigue cracking that could compromise the structural integrity of these airplanes.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by January 29, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94-NM-195-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00

p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, P.O. Box 1771, Long Beach, California 90846-1771, Attention: Business Unit Manager, Contract Data Management, C1-255 (35-22). This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sol Davis or David Hsu, Aerospace Engineers, Airframe Branch, ANM-120L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712-4137; telephone (310) 627-5233 for Mr. Davis, or (310) 627-5323 for Mr. Hsu; fax (310) 627-5210.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Comments Invited**

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket Number 94-NM-195-AD." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

**Availability of NPRMs**

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the

FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94-NM-195-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

**Discussion**

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to add an airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and C-9 (military) series airplanes, was published as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the Federal Register on May 16, 1995 (60 FR 26007). That NPRM would have required implementation of a program of structural inspections to detect and correct fatigue cracking in order to ensure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes as they approach the manufacturer's original fatigue design life goal. That NPRM was prompted by new data submitted by the manufacturer indicating that certain revisions to the program were necessary in order to increase the confidence level of the statistical program to ensure timely detection of cracks in various airplane structures. That condition, if not corrected, could result in fatigue cracking that could compromise the structural integrity of these airplanes.

Since the issuance of that NPRM, the FAA has received a comment from the manufacturer that has caused the FAA to reconsider its position on certain aspects of the proposed rule.

McDonnell Douglas requests a revision of paragraph (b)(1) of the proposal for clarification purposes. The manufacturer notes that the proposal states that operators are required to inspect airplanes before the threshold ( $N_{th}$ ); however, the proposal does not clearly indicate that operators do not receive credit for these inspections in the Supplemental Inspection Document (SID) program, unless the aircraft has exceeded one-half of that threshold ( $N_{th}/2$ ). The FAA concurs. The FAA has revised proposed paragraph (b)(1) to indicate that the inspections are to be performed prior to reaching the threshold ( $N_{th}$ ), but no earlier than  $N_{th}/2$ .

McDonnell Douglas also requests the deletion of the requirement to visually inspect the Fleet Leader Operator Sampling (FLOS) Principal Structural Elements (PSE) that are proposed in paragraph (b)(3). The manufacturer states that these requirements are redundant to those required by AD 92-22-08 R1, amendment 39-8591 (58 FR 32281, June 9, 1993), which requires the implementation of a corrosion prevention and control program to inspect all primary structure, including all PSE's.

The FAA concurs. Paragraph (b)(3) from the original NPRM has been deleted, and a new NOTE 3 has been added to this supplemental NPRM to indicate that these visual inspections are not required. However, the visual inspections that are part of the Non Destructive Inspection (NDI) procedures specified in Section 2 of Volume II of the SID would still be required by this AD action. Additionally, paragraph (b)(4) from the originally proposed rule, which would have required certain general visual inspections, has been deleted from this supplemental NPRM since the requirement to perform visual inspections of FLOS PSE's are no longer required by this AD action.

Also, since issuance of the original NPRM, the FAA has reviewed and approved Volume III-95 of the SID, dated September 1995, which eliminates the visual FLOS inspections that were contained in Volume III-94 of the SID, dated July 1994. Volume III-94 was referenced in the original NPRM as the appropriate source of service information for performing visual inspections of PSE's. Therefore, paragraph (b) of this supplemental NPRM has been revised to reference Volume III-95 as the appropriate source of service information.

Since these changes significantly revise the originally proposed rule, the FAA has determined that it is necessary to reopen the comment period to provide additional opportunity for public comment.

Although other comments were received in response to the original NPRM, those comments, as well as any other received in response to this supplemental NPRM, will be addressed in the final rule.

There are approximately 889 Model DC-9 and C-9 (military) series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 568 airplanes of U.S. registry and 38 U.S. operators would be affected by this proposed AD.

Incorporation of the SID program into an operator's maintenance program, as required by AD 94-03-01, is estimated to necessitate 1,062 work hours (per operator), at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost to the 38 affected U.S. operators to incorporate the SID program is estimated to be \$2,421,360.

The incorporation of the revised procedures proposed in this AD action would require approximately 20 additional work hours per operator to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost to the 38 affected U.S. operators to incorporate these revised

procedures into the SID program into an operator's maintenance program is estimated to be \$45,600.

The recurring inspection costs, as required by AD 94-03-01, are estimated to be 362 work hours per airplane per year, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the recurring inspection costs required by AD 94-01-03 are estimated to be \$21,720 per airplane, or \$12,336,960 for the affected U.S. fleet.

The recurring inspection procedures added to the program by this proposed AD action would not add any new additional economic burden on affected operators since certain inspections would be added while others would be deleted.

Based on the figures discussed above, the cost impact of this AD is estimated to be \$12,382,560 for the first year, and \$12,336,960 for each year thereafter. These cost impact figures discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the proposed requirements of this AD action. However, it can be reasonably be assumed that the majority of the affected operators have already initiated the SID program (as required by AD 94-03-01).

Additionally, the number of required work hours for each proposed inspection (and for the SID program), as indicated above, is presented as if the accomplishment of those actions were to be conducted as "stand alone" actions. However, in actual practice, these actions for the most part will be accomplished coincidentally or in combination with normally scheduled airplane inspections and other maintenance program tasks. Therefore, the actual number of necessary additional work hours will be minimal in many instances. Further, any cost associated with special airplane scheduling can be expected to be minimal.

The regulations proposed herein would 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. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant

economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

**PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES**

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 USC 106(g), 40101, 40113, 44701.

**§ 39.13 [Amended]**

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39-8807 (59 FR 6538, February 11, 1994), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 94-NM-195-AD. Supersedes AD 94-03-01, Amendment 39-8807.

*Applicability:* Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, -50, and C-9 (military) series airplanes; certificated in any category.

*Compliance:* Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To ensure the continuing structural integrity of these airplanes, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 6 months after March 14, 1994 (the effective date of AD 94-03-01, amendment 39-8807), incorporate a revision into the FAA-approved maintenance inspection program which provides for inspection(s) of the Principal Structural Elements (PSE) defined in McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26-008, "DC-9 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID)," Section 2 of Volume I of Revision 3, dated April 1991, in accordance with Section 2 of Volume III-92, dated July 1992, of the SID.

(1) Visual inspections of all PSE's on airplanes listed in Volume III-92, dated July 1992, of the SID planning data, are required by the fleet leader-operator sampling (FLOS) program at least once during the interval between the start date (SDATE) and the end date (EDATE) established for each PSE. These visual inspections are defined in Section 3 of Volume II, dated April 1991, of the SID, and are required only for those airplanes that have not been inspected previously in accordance with Section 2 of Volume II, dated April 1991, of the SID.

(2) The Non Destructive Inspection (NDI) techniques set forth in Section 2 of Volume II, dated April 1991, of the SID provide acceptable methods for accomplishing the inspections required by this paragraph.

(3) All inspection results (negative or positive) must be reported to McDonnell Douglas, in accordance with the instructions contained in Section 2 of Volume III-92, dated July 1992, of the SID. Information collection requirements contained in this regulation have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120-0056.

Note 1: Volume II, dated April 1991, of the SID is comprised of the following:

Volume designation	Revision level shown on volume
Volume II-10/20 .....	3
Volume II-20/30 .....	4
Volume II-40 .....	3
Volume II-50 .....	3

Note 2: NDI inspections accomplished in accordance with the following Volume II of the SID provide acceptable methods for accomplishing the inspections required by this paragraph:

Volume designation	Revision level	Date of revision
Volume II-10/20 ....	3 .....	Apr. 1991.
Volume II-10/20 ....	2 .....	Apr. 1990.
Volume II-10/20 ....	1 .....	June 1989.
Volume II/20 .....	Original ....	Nov. 1987.
Volume II-20/30 ....	4 .....	Apr. 1991.
Volume II-20/30 ....	3 .....	Apr. 1990.
Volume II-20/30 ....	2 .....	June 1989.
Volume II-20/30 ....	1 .....	Nov. 1987.
Volume II-40 .....	3 .....	Apr. 1991.
Volume II-40 .....	2 .....	Apr. 1990.
Volume II-40 .....	1 .....	June 1989.
Volume II-40 .....	Original ....	Nov. 1987.
Volume II-50 .....	3 .....	Apr. 1991.
Volume II-50 .....	2 .....	Apr. 1990.
Volume II-50 .....	1 .....	June 1989.
Volume II-50 .....	Original ....	Nov. 1987.

(b) Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the revision of the FAA-approved maintenance inspection program required by paragraph (a) of this AD, with a revision that provides for inspection(s) of the PSE's defined in McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26-008, "DC-9 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID)," Section 2 of Volume I of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26-008, "DC-9 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID)," Revision 4, dated July 1993, in accordance with Section 2 of Volume III-95, dated September 1995, of the SID.

Note 3: Operators should note that certain visual inspections of FLOS PSE's that were previously specified in earlier revisions of Volume III of the SID are no longer specified in Volume III-95 of the SID.

(1) Prior to reaching the threshold ( $N_{th}$ ), but no earlier than one-half of the threshold ( $N_{th}/2$ ), specified for all PSE's listed in Volume

III-95, dated September 1995, of the SID, inspect each PSE sample in accordance with the NDI procedures set forth in Section 2 of Volume II, dated July 1993. Thereafter, repeat the inspection for that PSE at intervals not to exceed DNDI/2 of the NDI procedure that is specified in Volume III-95, dated September 1995, of the SID.

(2) The NDI techniques set forth in Section 2 of Volume II, dated July 1993, of the SID provide acceptable methods for accomplishing the inspections required by this paragraph.

(3) All inspection results (negative or positive) must be reported to McDonnell Douglas, in accordance with the instructions contained in Section 2 of Volume III-95, dated September 1995, of the SID. Information collection requirements contained in this regulation have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120-0056.

Note 4: Volume II, dated July 1993, of the SID is comprised of the following:

Volume designation	Revision level shown on volume
Volume II-10/20 .....	4
Volume II-20/30 .....	5
Volume II-40 .....	4
Volume II-50 .....	4

Note 5: NDI inspections accomplished in accordance with the following Volume II of the SID provide acceptable methods for accomplishing the inspections required by this paragraph:

Volume designation	Revision level	Date of revision
Volume II-10/20 ....	4 .....	July 1993.
Volume II-10/20 ....	3 .....	Apr. 1991.
Volume II-10/20 ....	2 .....	Apr. 1990.
Volume II-10/20 ....	1 .....	June 1989.
Volume II/20 .....	Original ....	Nov. 1987.
Volume II-20/30 ....	5 .....	July 1993.
Volume II-20/30 ....	4 .....	Apr. 1991.
Volume II-20/30 ....	3 .....	Apr. 1990.
Volume II-20/30 ....	2 .....	June 1989.
Volume II-20/30 ....	1 .....	Nov. 1987.
Volume II-40 .....	4 .....	July 1993.
Volume II-40 .....	3 .....	Apr. 1991.
Volume II-40 .....	2 .....	Apr. 1990.
Volume II-40 .....	1 .....	June 1989.
Volume II-40 .....	Original ....	Nov. 1987.
Volume II-50 .....	4 .....	July 1993.
Volume II-50 .....	3 .....	Apr. 1991.
Volume II-50 .....	2 .....	Apr. 1990.
Volume II-50 .....	1 .....	June 1989.
Volume II-50 .....	Original ....	Nov. 1987.

(c) Any cracked structure detected during the inspections required by either paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD must be repaired before further flight, in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

Note 6: Requests for approval of any PSE repair that would affect the FAA-approved

maintenance inspection program that is required by this AD should include a damage tolerance assessment for that PSE.

(d) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO. Alternative methods of compliance previously granted for AD 94-03-01, amendment 39-8807, continue to be considered as acceptable alternative methods of compliance with this amendment.

Note 7: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

(e) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on January 3, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,  
*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*  
 [FR Doc. 96-262 Filed 1-08-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

**14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 95-NM-121-AD]

**Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B series airplanes. This proposal would require visual and dye penetrant inspection(s) to detect cracks of the nose rib of the rudder, and stop drilling and blending of minor cracks. The proposal would also require replacement of the nose rib with a new nose rib and reinforcement of the nose rib, if extensive cracking is detected or if an operator elects to terminate the repetitive inspections. This proposal is prompted by the result of an inspection that revealed a cracked nose rib on the front spar of the rudder due to vibration-related stress. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such stress and cracking, which could result in the deformation of the nose rib; this condition may lead to

friction and jamming between the fin and the rudder and subsequent reduced controllability of the airplane.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by February 20, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95-NM-121-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from SAAB Aircraft AB, SAAB Aircraft Product Support, S-581.88, Linköping, Sweden. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ruth Harder, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (206) 227-1721; fax (206) 227-1149

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket Number 95-NM-121-AD." The