

(3) Although Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–53A1234, Revision 2, dated November 24, 2010, specifies reporting certain information to Boeing, this AD does not require that action.

(w) Post-Repair Inspections

The post-repair inspection specified in Table 7 of paragraph 1.E., “Compliance,” of Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–53A1234, Revision 2, dated November 24, 2010, is not required by this AD.

Note 2: The damage tolerance inspections specified in Table 7 of paragraph 1.E., Compliance, of Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–53A1234, Revision 2, dated November 24, 2010, may be used in support of compliance with section 121.1109(c)(2) or 129.109(c)(2) of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 121.1109(c)(2) or 14 CFR 129.109(c)(2)). The corresponding actions specified in the Accomplishment Instructions and Figures 40 and 41 of Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 737–53A1234, Revision 2, dated November 24, 2010, are not required in this AD.

(x) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

(1) The Manager, Seattle ACO, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or local Flight Standards District Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the ACO, send it to the attention of the person identified in the Related Information section of this AD. Information may be emailed to: 9-ANM-Seattle-ACO-AMOC-Requests@faa.gov.

(2) Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the local flight standards district office/certificate holding district office.

(3) An AMOC that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used for any repair required by this AD if it is approved by the Boeing Commercial Airplanes Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) that has been authorized by the Manager, Seattle ACO to make those findings. For a repair method to be approved, the repair must meet the certification basis of the airplane, and the approval must specifically refer to this AD.

(4) AMOCs approved for AD 2005–13–27, Amendment 39–14164 (70 FR 36821, June 27, 2005), are approved as AMOCs for the corresponding requirements in this AD.

(y) Related Information

(1) For more information about this AD, contact Wayne Lockett, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98057–3356; telephone (425) 917–6447; fax (425) 917–6590; email: wayne.lockett@faa.gov.

(2) For service information identified in this AD, contact Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Attention: Data & Services Management, P.O. Box 3707, MC 2H–65, Seattle, Washington 98124–2207; telephone (206) 544–5000, extension 1; fax (206) 766–5680; email me.boecom@boeing.com; Internet

<https://www.myboeingfleet.com>. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (425) 227–1221.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on January 6, 2012.

Ali Bahrami,

Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2012–859 Filed 1–18–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2012–0046; Directorate Identifier 2011–CE–040–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Glasflugel Gliders

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for Glasflugel Models Standard Libelle-201B, Club Libelle 205, Mosquito, and Kestrel gliders. This proposed AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) originated by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as corrosion damage to the elevator control rod that could lead to failure of the elevator control rod, possibly resulting in loss of control of the glider. We are issuing this proposed AD to require actions to address the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by March 5, 2012.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments by any of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- **Fax:** (202) 493–2251.

- **Mail:** U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.

- **Hand Delivery:** U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor,

Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this proposed AD, contact Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service Hansjörg Streifeneder GmbH, D–72582 Grabenstetten, Germany; phone: +49(0)73821032, fax: +49(0)73821629; email: info@streifly.de; Internet: www.streifly.de. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (816) 329–4148.

Examining the AD Docket

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 proposed AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Office (telephone (800) 647–5527) is in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jim Rutherford, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4165; fax: (816) 329–4090; email: jim.rutherford@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposed AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include “Docket No. FAA–2012–0046; Directorate Identifier 2011–CE–040–AD” at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD because of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this proposed AD.

Discussion

The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), which is the Technical Agent

for the Member States of the European Community, has issued EASA AD No.: 2011-0213R1, dated November 8, 2011 (referred to after this as “the MCAI”), to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

A broken elevator control rod in the vertical fin on a Kestrel sailplane has been reported. The technical investigation revealed that water had soaked into the elevator control rod through a control bore hole and resulted in corrosion damage. The investigation concluded as well that the corrosion cannot be detected from outside the elevator control rod.

This condition, if not detected and corrected, could lead to failure of the elevator control rod, possibly resulting in loss of control of the sailplane.

To address this unsafe condition, Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service GmbH have developed and published Technical Note (TN) TN 201-40, TN 205-27, TN 206-26, TN 303-25, TN 304-12, TN 401-30, TN 501-10, TN 604-11, which provides instructions for elevator control rod inspection and replacement.

For the reasons described above, EASA issued AD 2011-0213 to require a one-time inspection and replacement of the affected elevator control rod with an improved part.

You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the AD docket.

Relevant Service Information

Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service GmbH has issued Technical Note TN 201-40, TN 205-27, TN 206-26, TN 303-25, TN 304-12, TN 401-30, TN 501-10, and TN 604-11, Revision 1, dated July 14, 2011 (EASA translation approval dated September 9, 2011). The actions described in this service information are intended to correct the unsafe condition identified in the MCAI.

FAA’s Determination and Requirements of the Proposed AD

This product has been approved by the aviation authority of another country, and is approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to our bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, they have notified us of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI and service information referenced above. We are proposing this AD because we evaluated all information and determined the unsafe condition exists and is likely to exist or develop on other products of the same type design.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this proposed AD will affect 54 products of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it would take about 6 work-hours per product to comply with the basic requirements of this proposed AD. The average labor rate is \$85 per work-hour. Required

parts would cost about \$333 per product.

Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of the proposed AD on U.S. operators to be \$45,522, or \$843 per product.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA’s authority to issue rules on aviation safety. 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.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in “Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements.” Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We determined that this proposed AD would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This proposed AD would not have a substantial direct effect 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.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify 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),
- (3) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and
- (4) 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.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA proposes to amend 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), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new AD:

Glasflugel: Docket No. FAA-2012-0046; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-040-AD.

(a) Comments Due Date

We must receive comments by March 5, 2012.

(b) Affected ADs

None.

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to the following Glasflugel models and serial number (S/N) gliders, certificated in any category:

- (1) Club Libelle 205, all S/Ns
- (2) Kestrel, all S/Ns, except S/N 85, 110, and 125
- (3) Mosquito, all S/Ns
- (4) Standard Libelle-201B, S/N 169

(d) Subject

Air Transport Association of America (ATA) Code 27: Flight Controls.

(e) Reason

This AD was prompted by mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) originated by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as corrosion damage to the elevator control rod that could lead to failure of the elevator control rod, possibly resulting in loss of control of the glider. We are issuing this proposed AD to require actions to address the unsafe condition on these products.

(f) Actions and Compliance

Unless already done, do the following actions:

(1) Within 30 days after the effective date of this AD, inspect the elevator control rod in the vertical fin following Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service GmbH Technical Note TN 201-40, TN 205-27, TN 206-26, TN 303-25, TN 304-12, TN 401-30, TN 501-10, and TN 604-11, Revision 1, dated July 14, 2011 (EASA translation approval dated September 9, 2011), as applicable to glider model.

(2) If you find any discrepancy in the inspection required by paragraph (f)(1) of this AD, before further flight, replace the elevator control rod with an elevator control rod that does not have a control bore hole, following Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service GmbH Technical Note TN 201-40, TN 205-27, TN 206-26, TN 303-25, TN 304-12, TN 401-30, TN 501-10, and TN 604-11, Revision 1, dated July 14, 2011 (EASA translation approval dated September 9, 2011), as applicable to glider model.

(3) Within 9 months after the effective date of this AD, unless already done as required by paragraph (f)(2) of this AD, replace the elevator control rod in the vertical fin with

an elevator control rod that does not have a control bore hole, following Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service GmbH Technical Note TN 201-40, TN 205-27, TN 206-26, TN 303-25, TN 304-12, TN 401-30, TN 501-10, and TN 604-11, Revision 1, dated July 14, 2011 (EASA translation approval dated September 9, 2011), as applicable to glider model.

(4) As of the effective date of this AD, do not install an elevator control rod with a control bore hole on the side.

(g) Other FAA AD Provisions

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)*: The Manager, Standards Office, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. Send information to ATTN: Jim Rutherford, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4165; fax: (816) 329-4090; email: jim.rutherford@faa.gov. Before using any approved AMOC on any airplane to which the AMOC applies, notify your appropriate principal inspector (PI) in the FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO), or lacking a PI, your local FSDO.

(2) *Airworthy Product*: For any requirement in this AD to obtain corrective actions from a manufacturer or other source, use these actions if they are FAA-approved. Corrective actions are considered FAA-approved if they are approved by the State of Design Authority (or their delegated agent). You are required to assure the product is airworthy before it is returned to service.

(3) *Reporting Requirements*: For any reporting requirement in this AD, a Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a current valid OMB Control Number. The OMB Control Number for this information collection is 2120-0056. Public reporting for this collection of information is estimated to be approximately 5 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, completing and reviewing the collection of information. All responses to this collection of information are mandatory. Comments concerning the accuracy of this burden and suggestions for reducing the burden should be directed to the FAA at: 800 Independence Ave. SW., Washington, DC 20591, Attn: Information Collection Clearance Officer, AES-200.

(h) Related Information

Refer to MCAI European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD No.: 2011-0213R1, dated November 8, 2011; and Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service GmbH Technical Note TN 201-40, TN 205-27, TN 206-26, TN 303-25, TN 304-12, TN 401-30, TN 501-10, and TN 604-11, Revision 1, dated July 14, 2011 (EASA translation approval dated September 9, 2011), for related information. For service information related to this AD, contact Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service Hansjörg

Streifeneder GmbH, D-72582 Grabenstetten, Germany; phone: +49(0)73821032, fax: +49(0)73821629; email: info@streifly.de; Internet: www.streifly.de/. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (816) 329-4148.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on January 11, 2012.

John Colomy,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2012-928 Filed 1-18-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

39 CFR Part 3015

[Docket No. RM2012-3; Order No. 1108]

Competitive Postal Products

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Commission is initiating a review to determine whether competitive products provide the appropriate minimum contribution to the Postal Service's institutional costs. This document invites comments to facilitate examination of this question.

DATES: *Comments are due:* March 5, 2012. *Reply comments are due:* April 2, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by telephone for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, at stephen.sharfman@prc.gov or (202) 789-6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Invitation To Comment
- III. Ordering Paragraphs

I. Introduction

The Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (PAEA), Public Law 109-435, 120 Stat. 3218 (2006), directs the Commission to promulgate regulations to ensure that competitive products, collectively, bear an "appropriate share" of the Postal Service's institutional costs. See 39 U.S.C. 3633(a)(3).

The initial Commission review of this issue determined that competitive products, collectively, annually should contribute a minimum of 5.5 percent of the institutional costs of the Postal Service. Order No. 43, October 29, 2007, paras. 3040-47. The PAEA further directs the Commission to revisit this question every 5 years. See 39 U.S.C. 3633(b).¹

Five years has passed since enactment of the PAEA. The Commission initiates Docket No. RM2012-3 to evaluate how to ensure that the appropriate minimum contribution to the Postal Service's institutional costs is provided by competitive products. The Commission will decide whether its rule 3015.7(c), established in Order No. 43, which sets the 5.5 percent minimum contribution, should be retained in its current form, modified, or eliminated.

When establishing the initial level of appropriate contribution from competitive products, the Commission tried to balance the risk of setting the contribution level too high with the risk of setting it too low. Given a very competitive marketplace where the Postal Service's market share is relatively small, setting the contribution level too high could adversely affect the Postal Service's ability to compete. On the other hand, establishing a markup that is too low could give the Postal Service an artificial competitive advantage. The Commission gave considerable weight to the historical contribution made by items categorized as competitive products by the PAEA. The Commission set the minimum contribution level at 5.5 percent of total institutional costs, in line with the competitive products' estimated contribution to institutional costs of 5.4 percent in FY 2005 and 5.7 percent in FY 2006.

Since rule 3015.7(c) has been in place, the Postal Service's competitive products collectively have covered more than 5.5 percent of the Postal Service's institutional costs. For FY 2007, the revenue from competitive products minus their attributable costs equaled 5.66 percent of total institutional costs.² For FY 2008, the contribution from

¹ REVIEW OF MINIMUM CONTRIBUTION.—Five years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 5 years thereafter, the Postal Regulatory Commission shall conduct a review to determine whether the institutional costs contribution requirement under subsection (a)(3) should be retained in its current form, modified, or eliminated. In making its determination, the Commission shall consider all relevant circumstances, including the prevailing competitive conditions in the market, and the degree to which any costs are uniquely or disproportionately associated with any competitive products.

² FY 2007 Annual Compliance Determination, March 28, 2008, at 113.