VOR Federal Airways are published in Paragraph 6010(a) of FAA Order 7400.9A dated June 17, 1993, and effective September 16, 1993, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 as of September 16, 1993 (58 FR 36298; July 6, 1993). The airway listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

The Rule

This amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations modifies the description for Federal Airway V–162 by extending the airway from the intersection of Martinsburg, WV, 058° and Harrisburg, PA 191° radials to the Martinsburg, WV, Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range/Tactical Air Navigation facility. This action will accommodate flights inbound to Washington-Dulles International Airport. Modifying this rule will facilitate air traffic operations and reduce the controller workload.

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 "major rule" under Executive Order 12291; (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 will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List 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 in effect as of September 16, 1993, as follows:

PART 71—[AMENDED]

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

Authority: 49 U.S.C. app. 1348(a), 1354(a), 1510; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 14 CFR 11.69.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9A, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated June 17, 1993, and effective September 16, 1993, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 6010(a) Domestic VOR Federal Airways

* * * * *

V–162 [Revised]

From Martinsburg, WV; INT Martinsburg 058° and Harrisburg, PA, 191° radials; Harrisburg; INT Harrisburg 092° and East Texas, PA, 251° radials; East Texas; Allentown, PA; to Huguenot, NY.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 2, 1993.

Harold W. Becker,

Manager, Airspace-Rules and Aeronautical Information Division.

[FR Doc. 93–22281 Filed 9–10–93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

---

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 92–AEA–1]

Alteration of VOR Federal Airway V–312; NJ

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action alters the description for VOR Federal Airway V–312 by removing an unused segment of that airway at the northern end in New Jersey. This action will reduce chart clutter.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 0901 u.t.c., November 11, 1993.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia P. Crawford, Airspace and Obstruction Evaluation Branch (ATP–240), Airspace-Rules and Aeronautical Information Division, Air Traffic Rules and Procedures Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–9255.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

On May 15, 1992, the FAA proposed to amend part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) to alter the description for V–312 by removing a segment at the northern end of that airway located in New Jersey (57 FR 20801).

Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. No comments objecting to the proposal were received. Except for editorial changes, this amendment is the same as that proposed in the notice. Domestic VOR Federal airways are published in paragraph 6010(a) of FAA Order 7400.9A dated June 17, 1993, and effective September 16, 1993, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 in effect as of September 16, 1993 (58 FR 36298; July 6, 1993). The Airway listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

The Rule

This amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations alters the description for Federal Airway V–312 located in New Jersey. Altering the airway by removing an unused segment in the northern end will reduce chart clutter.

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 "major rule" under Executive Order 12291; (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 will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List 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 in effect as of September 16, 1993, as follows:

PART 71—[AMENDED]

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

Authority: 49 U.S.C. app. 1348(a), 1354(a), 1510(a), 1510; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 14 CFR 11.69.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9A, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated June 17, 1993, and effective September 16, 1993, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 6010(a) Domestic VOR Federal Airways

* * * * *

V–312 [Revised]

From INT Andrews, MD, 060° and Baltimore, MD, 165° radials, via INT Andrews 060° and Woodstown, NJ, 230° radials; Woodstown; INT Woodstown 065° and Coyle, NJ, 264° radials; Coyle; INT Coyle 090° and Kennedy, NY, 154° radials. The airspace within R–5002D, the airspace below 2,000 feet MSL outside the United States, and the airspace above 8,000 feet MSL between Woodstown and Coyle is excluded.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 2, 1993.

Harold W. Becker,

Manager, Airspace-Rules and Aeronautical Information Division.

[FR Doc. 93–22280 Filed 9–10–93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms

27 CFR Part 47

[T.D. ATF–349]

Importation of Arms, Ammunition and Implements of War [No. 93–01]

AGENCY: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule (Treasury Decision).

SUMMARY: On October 1, 1992, the Department of State recommended that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) formally remove Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania from the list in 27 CFR 47.52(a), of countries from which the import of defense articles into the United States is proscribed.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 13, 1993.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pearl E. Baylor, Specialist, Firearms and Explosives Imports Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, 650 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20226 (202) 927–8320.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Arms Export Control Act of 1976, 22 U.S.C. 2778, gives the President of the United States the authority to control the import and export of defense articles and defense services.

Executive Order 11958 of January 18, 1977, as amended (42 FR 4311 (1977)), delegated authority to control exports of defense articles and defense services to the Secretary of State.

The Executive Order also delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to control the import of such articles and services. However, as stated in 27 CFR 47.55, ATF is guided by the views of the Departments of State and Defense on matters affecting world peace and the external security and foreign policy of the United States. After consulting these Departments, ATF is revising the provisions of 27 CFR part 47 to conform to the recommendation of the State Department.

On October 1, 1992, the Department of State recommended that ATF formally remove Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania from the list in 27 CFR part 47.52(a) of countries from which the import of defense articles into the United States is proscribed.

Executive Order 12291

Because the amendment to 27 CFR part 47 involves a foreign affairs function, Executive Order 12291 does not apply.

Administrative Procedure Act

Under 27 CFR 47.54, the amendment made to 27 CFR part 47 is excluded from the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553 because this regulation involves a foreign affairs function of the United States. Accordingly, it is unnecessary to issue this Treasury Decision with notice and public procedure thereon under 5 U.S.C. 553(b) or subject to the effective date limitation in 5 U.S.C. 553(d).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act relating to an initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis are not applicable to this final rule because the agency was not required to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking under 5 U.S.C. 553 or any other law.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Public Law 96–511, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35, and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR part 1320, do not apply to this final rule because there are no reporting or recordkeeping requirements.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this Treasury decision is Pearl E. Baylor, Specialist, Firearms and Explosives Imports Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 47

Administrative practice and procedure, Arms control, Arms and munitions, Authority delegations, Chemicals, Customs duties and inspection, Imports, Penalties, Reporting requirements, Scientific equipment, Seizures and forfeitures.

Authority and Issuance

27 CFR Part 47—Importation of Arms, Ammunition and Implements of War, is amended as follows:

PART 47—[AMENDED]

Paragraph 1. The authority citation for 27 CFR Part 47 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 22 U.S.C. 2778.

Par. 2. Section 47.52 is amended by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 47.52 Import restrictions applicable to certain countries.

(a) It is the policy of the United States to deny licenses and other approvals with respect to defense articles and defense services originating in certain countries or areas. This policy also applies to imports from these countries or areas. This policy applies to Albania, Bulgaria, Cuba, Kampuchea, North Korea, Outer Mongolia, Rumania, Vietnam and the States that comprise the former Soviet Union (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan). This policy applies to countries or areas with respect to which the United States maintains an arms embargo. It also applies when an import would not be in furtherance of world peace and the security and foreign policy of the United States.

* * * * *

Signed: August 3, 1993.

Stephen E. Higgins,

Director.

Approved: August 16, 1993.

Ronald K. Noble,

Assistant Secretary (Enforcement).

[FR Doc. 93–22216 Filed 9–10–93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–31–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA–12–16–5759; FRL–4701–3]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; San Diego County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of final rulemaking (NFR).

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing the approval of revisions to the California State

Implementation Plan (SIP) proposed in the **Federal Register** on September 17, 1992. The revisions concern a rule from the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDCAPCD). This approval action will incorporate this rule into the federally approved SIP. The intended effect of approving this rule is to regulate emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). The revised rule provides general definitions pertaining to the storage and handling of organic compounds. Thus, EPA is finalizing the approval of these revisions into the California SIP under provisions of the CAA regarding EPA action on SIP submittals, SIPs for national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards and plan requirements for nonattainment areas.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action is effective on October 13, 1993.

ADDRESSEES: Copies of the rule revisions and EPA's evaluation report for the rule are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule revisions are available for inspection at the following locations:

Rulemaking Section II (Mail Code: A–5–3), Air and Toxics Division U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX,75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

Environmental Protection Agency, John Kurtzweg ANR–443,401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation, 2020 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District,County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highway,Room 335, San Diego CA 9210.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chris Stamos, Rulemaking Section II (A–5–3), Air and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. Telephone: (415) 744–1187.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 17, 1992 in 57 FR 42911, EPA proposed to approve the following rule into the California SIP: SDCAPCD Rule 61.0, Definitions Pertaining to the Storage and Handling of Organic Compounds. Rule 61.0 was adopted by SDCAPCD on November 16, 1990 and was submitted by CARB to EPA on April 5, 1991. This rule was submitted in response to EPA's 1988 SIP-Call and the CAA section 182(a)(2)(A) requirement that nonattainment areas to fix their reasonably available control technology (RACT) rules for ozone in accordance with EPA guidance that interpreted the requirements of the pre-amendment Act. A detailed discussion of the background for the above rule and nonattainment area is provided in the NPR cited above.

EPA has evaluated the above rule for consistency with the requirements of the CAA and EPA regulations and EPA interpretation of these requirements as expressed in the various EPA policy guidance documents referenced in the NPR cited above. EPA has found that the rule meets the applicable EPA requirements. A detailed discussion of the rule provisions and evaluations has been provided in 57 FR 42911 and in technical support documents (TSDs) available at EPA's Region IX office (Technical Support Document for EPA's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for the California SIP, SDCAPCD, Rule 61.0 dated July 22, 1992).

Response to Comments

A 30-day public comment period was provided in 57 FR 42911. EPA received no comments on Rule 61.0.

EPA Action

EPA is finalizing action to approve the above rules for inclusion into the California SIP. EPA is approving the submittal under section 110(k)(3) as meeting the requirements of section 110(a) and Part D of the CAA. This approval action will incorporate this rule into the federally approved SIP. The intended effect of approving this rule is to regulate emissions of VOCs in accordance with the requirements of the CAA.

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting or allowing or establishing a precedent for any future request for revision to any state implementation plan. Each request for revision to the state implementation plan shall be considered separately in light of specific technical, economic, and environmental factors and in relation to relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

Regulatory Process

This action has been classified as a Table 2 action by the Regional Administrator under the procedures published in the **Federal Register** on January 19, 1989 (54 FR 2214–2225). EPA has submitted a request for a permanent waiver for Table 2 and Table 3 SIP revisions. OMB has agreed to continue the temporary waiver until such time as it rules on EPA's request.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by November 12, 1993. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Environmental protection, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Note: Incorporation by reference of the State Implementation Plan for the State of California was approved by the Director of the **Federal Register** on July 1, 1982.

Dated: August 18, 1993.

John C. Wise,

Acting Regional Administrator.

Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 52, is amended to read as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Subpart F—California

2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraph (c) (183)(i)(A)(*6*) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(183) * * *

(i) * * *

(A) * * *

(*6*) Amended Rule 61.0, adopted on September 16, 1990.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 93–22219 Filed 9–10–93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 675

[Docket No. 921185–3021; I.D. 090793A]

Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Prohibition of fishing; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS is prohibiting directed fishing for groundfish in part of the Bering Sea subarea (BS) of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands management area (BSAI). This action is necessary to prevent overfishing Pacific ocean perch in the BS.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 12 noon, Alaska local time (A.l.t.), September 7, 1993, through 12 midnight, A.l.t., December 31, 1993. Comments must be received at the following address no later than 4:30 p.m., A.l.t., September 28, 1993.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew N. Smoker, Resource Management specialist, Fisheries Management Division, Alaska Region, NMFS, 907 586–7228.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be sent to Ronald J. Berg, Chief, Fisheries Management Division, Alaska Region, NMFS, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802 (Attn: Lori Gravel), or be delivered to the fourth floor of the Federal Building, 709 West 9th Street, Juneau, AK.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The groundfish fishery in the BSAI exclusive economic zone (EEZ) is managed by the Secretary of Commerce according to the Fishery Management Plan for the Groundfish Fishery of the BSAI (FMP) prepared by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) under authority of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Fishing by U.S. vessels is governed by regulations implementing the FMP at 50 CFR parts 620 and 675.

Overfishing is defined at § 602.11(c)(1) to be a level or rate of fishing mortality that jeopardizes the long-term capacity of a stock or stock complex to produce maximum sustainable yield on a continuing basis. The 1993 overfishing level for Pacific ocean perch in the BS is established by the Scientific and Statistical Committee of the Council as 3,750 metric tons (mt). The directed fishery for Pacific ocean perch in the BS was closed on April 26, 1993 (58 FR 25952, April 29, 1993). Retention of Pacific ocean perch in the BS was prohibited effective June 7, 1993 (58 FR 32615, June 11, 1993). Since that date, 241 mt of Pacific ocean perch has been taken, including 220 mt since August 15, 1993. The total harvest as of September 1, 1993 is estimated as 3,815 mt, which exceeds the established overfishing level.

NMFS has determined, in accordance with § 675.20(e), that an inseason adjustment is necessary to prevent overfishing of Pacific ocean perch, and that closing that closing all directed fisheries for groundfish in part of the BS is the least restrictive measure that will prevent overfishing of Pacific ocean perch. Therefore, NMFS is prohibiting directed fishing for groundfish in that portion of the BS that is bounded by straight lines connecting the following coordinates in the order listed:

Latitude	Longitude
59°25′ N	179°20′ W
58°45′ N	177°35′ W
58°45′ N	174°30′ W
57°00′ N	173°00′ W
56°24′ N	171°00′ W
55°00′ N	171°00′ W
55°00′ N	180°00′ W

then continuing directly north to the boundary of the EEZ and following the boundary of the EEZ to 59°25′ N latitude, 179°20′ W longitude.

This closure is effective from 12 noon, A.l.t., September 7, 1993, through 12 midnight, A.l.t., December 31, 1993.

Classification

This action is taken under 50 CFR 675.20 and is in compliance with E.O. 12291.

The Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NOAA, finds for good cause that providing prior notice and public comment or delaying the effective date of this notice is impracticable and contrary to the public interest. Without this prohibition of fishing, Pacific ocean perch in the BS will be overfished, jeopardizing the long-term capacity of that stock. Under § 675.20(b)(2), interested persons are invited to submit written comments on this action to the above address until September 28, 1993.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 675

Fisheries, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: September 7, 1993.

David S. Crestin,

Acting Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 93–22223 Filed 9–7–93; 5:01 p.m.]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–M

Proposed Rules

Federal Register
Vol. 58, No. 175
Monday, September 13, 1993

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 94

[Docket No. 93–103–1]

Change in Disease Status of Belgium Because of Rinderpest and Foot-and-Mouth Disease

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: We are proposing to declare Belgium free of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease (FMD). There have been no outbreaks of FMD in Belgium since 1976, and we have determined that rinderpest has not existed there since 1920. We are also proposing to add Belgium to a list of countries that, although declared free of rinderpest and FMD, are subject to special restrictions on the importation of their meat and other animal products into the United States. This proposed revision would remove the prohibition on the importation into the United States, from Belgium, of ruminants and fresh, chilled, and frozen meat from ruminants, and would relieve restrictions on the importation, from Belgium, of milk and milk products from ruminants.

Belgium is not declared to be free of hog cholera and swine vesicular disease. Therefore, even if this proposal is adopted, the importation from Belgium of swine and fresh, chilled, and frozen meat from swine would continue to be restricted because of these diseases. We are also proposing to add Belgium to the list of countries from which the importation into the United States of llamas and alpacas is restricted.

DATES: Consideration will be given only to comments received on or before October 13, 1993.

ADDRESSES: Please send an original and three copies of your comments to Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, USDA, room 804, Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, MD 20782. Please state that your comments refer to Docket No. 93–103–1. Comments received may be inspected at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Persons wishing to inspect comments are encouraged to call ahead (202–690–2817) to facilitate entry into the comment reading room.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Marolo Garcia, Senior Staff Veterinarian, National Center for Import and Export, VS, APHIS, USDA, room 757, Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, MD 20782, (301) 436–7830.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulations in 9 CFR part 94 (referred to below as "the regulations") govern the importation into the United States of specified animals and animal products in order to prevent the introduction into the United States of various diseases, including rinderpest, foot-and-mouth disease (FMD), bovine spongiform encephalopathy, African swine fever, hog cholera, and swine vesicular disease (SVD). These are dangerous and destructive communicable diseases of ruminants and swine.

Section 94.1(a)(1) of the regulations provides that rinderpest or FMD exists in all countries of the world except those listed in § 94.1(a)(2), which are declared to be free of both diseases. We are proposing to add Belgium to that list.

We will consider declaring a country to be free of rinderpest and FMD if there have been no reported cases of the diseases in that country for at least the previous 1-year period and no vaccinations for rinderpest or FMD have been administered to swine or ruminants in that country for at least the previous 1-year period. In the case of Belgium, rinderpest has not occurred since 1920, there have been no outbreaks of FMD since 1976, and vaccinations for FMD were discontinued in 1991.

Belgium has applied to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to be recognized as free of rinderpest and FMD. The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) has reviewed the documentation submitted by the government of Belgium in support of its request. In addition, a team of APHIS officials recently conducted an on-site evaluation of the animal health program in Belgium in regard to the FMD situation in that country. The evaluation consisted of a review of the capability of Belgium's veterinary services, laboratory and diagnostic procedures, vaccination practices, and the administration of laws and regulations to ensure against the introduction of FMD into Belgium through the importation of animals, meat, animal products, and garbage. The APHIS officials conducting the on-site evaluation concluded that Belgium is free of FMD. Details concerning the on-site evaluation are available upon written request from the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

Based on the information discussed above, we believe that Belgium qualifies for listing in § 94.1(a)(2) of the regulations as a country declared free of rinderpest and FMD. This action would remove the prohibition on the importation, from Belgium, of ruminants and fresh, chilled, and frozen meat from ruminants, and would relieve restrictions on the importation, from Belgium, of milk and milk products from ruminants. Importations, from Belgium, of swine and fresh, chilled, or frozen meat from swine would continue to be restricted under 9 CFR part 94 because Belgium has not been declared free of hog cholera and SVD.

Special Restrictions

We also propose to add Belgium to the list in § 94.11(a) of countries declared to be free of rinderpest and FMD that are subject to special restrictions on the importation of their meat and other animal products into the United States. The countries listed in § 94.11(a) are subject to these special restrictions because they:

1. Supplement their national meat supply by importing fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of ruminants or swine from countries that are designated in § 94.1(a) as infected with rinderpest or FMD;
2. Have a common land border with countries designated as infected with rinderpest or FMD; or
3. Import ruminants or swine from countries designated as infected with

rinderpest or FMD under conditions less restrictive than would be acceptable for importation into the United States.

Belgium supplements its national meat supply by the importation of fresh, chilled, and frozen meat of ruminants and swine from countries designated in § 94.1(a)(1) as countries in which rinderpest or FMD exists. As a result, even though Belgium appears to qualify for designation as a country free of rinderpest and FMD, the meat and other animal products produced in Belgium may be commingled with the fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of animals from a country in which rinderpest and FMD exists, resulting in an undue risk of introducing rinderpest or FMD into the United States. Additionally, Belgium has common land borders with Germany and Luxembourg, which are designated in § 94.1(a)(1) as countries in which rinderpest or FMD exists.

Therefore, we are proposing that meat and other animal products of ruminants and swine, and the ship stores, airplane meals, and baggage containing these meat or animal products imported into the United States from Belgium be subject to the restrictions specified in § 94.11 of the regulations, in addition to other applicable requirements of title 9, chapter III. The special restrictions placed on meat and meat products of ruminants and swine in § 94.11 generally require that the meat be:

1. Prepared in an inspected establishment that is eligible to have its products imported into the United States under the Federal Meat Inspection Act; and

2. Accompanied by an additional certificate, issued by an animal health official of the national government of the country declared free of the disease, assuring that the meat and meat products have not been commingled with or exposed to meat or other meat products originating in, imported from, or transported through a country infected with rinderpest or FMD, and are otherwise handled in accordance with the requirements of § 94.11.

We also propose to add Belgium to the list in § 94.1(d)(1) of countries in which rinderpest or FMD has been known to exist and that were declared free of rinderpest and FMD on or after September 28, 1990. All countries in which rinderpest or FMD has been known to exist and that were declared free of rinderpest and FMD on or after September 28, 1990, must be added to this list. Adding Belgium to this list would restrict the importation or entry of llamas and alpacas from Belgium into the United States, unless in accordance with 9 CFR 92.435.

Executive Order 12291 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

We are issuing this proposed rule in conformance with Executive Order 12291, and we have determined that it is not a "major rule." Based on information compiled by the Department, we have determined that this proposed rule, if adopted, would have an effect on the economy of less than $100 million; would not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; and would not cause a significant adverse effect on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

For this action, the Office of Management and Budget has waived its review process required by Executive Order 12291.

This proposed rule, if adopted, would add Belgium to the list in part 94 of countries declared to be free of rinderpest and FMD. This action would remove the prohibition on the importation into the United States, from Belgium, of ruminants and fresh, chilled, and frozen meat from ruminants, and would relieve restrictions on the importation, from Belgium, of milk and milk products from ruminants. This action would not relieve restrictions on the importation of live swine and fresh, chilled, and frozen meat of swine from Belgium because Belgium is still considered to be affected with hog cholera and SVD.

Based on available information, the Department does not anticipate a major increase in exports of ruminants and fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of ruminants from Belgium into the United States as a result of this proposed rule.

The value of total U.S. imports of cattle in 1991 was $951.6 million, and the value of total U.S. imports of sheep in 1991 was about $1.6 million. The United States did not import any cattle or sheep from Belgium during 1991. In fact, no cattle or sheep were imported into the United States from any country in Western Europe during 1991 (USDA, Economic Research Service [ERS], "Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States: Calendar Year 1991 Supplement," 1992). Western Europe is not a source of ruminants for the United States; any increase in the import of ruminants from Belgium as a result of this rule would have a negligible impact on existing trade patterns.

Currently, due to APHIS restrictions, the United States does not import uncooked meat or meat products from Belgium. In 1991, total meat production in the United States (excluding pork) was just under 10.7 million metric tons, while total meat production in Belgium (excluding pork) was 385,000 metric tons, less than four percent of United States production. It is improbable that Belgium would begin to export any significant portion of its meat products to the United States as a result of this rule. Therefore, we estimate that the effect of this rule on domestic meat prices or supplies would be insignificant.

Similarly, we do not anticipate a major increase in exports of milk and milk products from Belgium into the United States as a result of this proposed rule. Importation into the United States of all dairy products, except for casein and other caseinates, is restricted by quotas. Furthermore, while the United States imports more than half of the casein produced in the world and the regulations allow casein and other caseinates to be imported from countries where rinderpest or FMD exists (if the importer has applied for and obtained written permission from the Administrator), Belgium does not currently export casein to the United States. Consequently, we believe that declaring Belgium free of rinderpest and FMD will have no significant effect on the amount of casein imported into the United States.

The effect of declaring Belgium free of rinderpest and FMD on the trade in bovine embryos and semen would also be minimal. The United States is a net exporter of bovine embryos and semen; in 1991, the value of bovine embryo and semen exports totalled to $46.5 million and 10.2 million, respectively, while imports amounted to only $2.7 million and $89,000, respectively. Though similar trade data was not available for Belgium, we believe that due to the relatively small size of the Belgium market, any increase in the export of bovine embryos and semen from Belgium would have a minimal impact on the United States market.

Five United States importers, all of whom are considered small entities by Small Business Administration standards (they have fewer than 100 employees), have expressed interest in importing bovine embryos and semen from Belgium. APHIS expects the value of the anticipated imports to be minimal in comparison to the domestic production of these entities.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12778

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. If this proposed rule is adopted: (1) All State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule will be preempted; (2) no retroactive effect will be given to this rule; and (3) administrative proceedings will not be required before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the information collection or recordkeeping requirements included in this proposed rule have been submitted and approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and there are no new requirements. The assigned OMB control number is 0579–0015.

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 94

Animal diseases, Imports, Livestock, Meat and meat products, Milk, Poultry and poultry products, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, we propose to amend 9 CFR part 94 as follows:

PART 94—RINDERPEST, FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, FOWL PEST (FOWL PLAGUE), VELOGENIC VISCEROTROPIC NEWCASTLE DISEASE, AFRICAN SWINE FEVER, HOG CHOLERA, AND BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY: PROHIBITED AND RESTRICTED IMPORTATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 94 would be revised to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 147a, 150ee, 161, 162, and 450; 19 U.S.C. 1306; 21 U.S.C. 111, 114a, 134a, 134b, 134c, and 134f, 136, and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 42 U.S.C. 4331, 4332; 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(d).

§ 94.1 [Amended]

2. Section 94.1, paragraph (a)(2), would be amended by adding "Belgium," immediately after "Barbados,".

3. Section 94.1, paragraph (d)(1), would be amended by adding "Belgium," immediately before "Chile,".

§ 94.11 [Amended]

4. In § 94.11, paragraph (a), the first sentence would be amended by adding "Belgium," immediately after "The Bahamas,".

Done in Washington, DC, this 7th day of September 1993.

Patricia A. Jensen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Marketing and Inspection Services.

[FR Doc. 93–22300 Filed 9–10–93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

12 CFR Part 620

RIN 3052–AB37

Disclosure to Shareholders

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Farm Credit Administration (FCA), by the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board), proposes to amend the regulation regarding the association annual meeting information statement and the process for nominating candidates for association director positions. The FCA Board is proposing to amend the regulation in order to clarify disclosure requirements for floor nominees, including the procedure to be followed when annual meetings are held in more than one session, or when shareholders vote by mail. The proposed regulation permits nominations from the floor at any session of the annual meeting if mail balloting is utilized. If the director election is to be conducted by mail balloting, the proposed regulation permits persons nominated from the floor to provide the required written disclosures for mailing with the ballot.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before October 13, 1993.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed or delivered (in triplicate) to Patricia W. DiMuzio, Division Director, Regulation Development Division, Office of Examination, Farm Credit Administration, McLean, VA 22102–5090. Copies of all comments will be available for examination by interested parties in the Regulation Development Division, Farm Credit Administration.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Eric Howard, Policy Analyst, Office of Examination, Farm Credit Administration, McLean, VA 22102–5090, (703) 883–4498, or

James M. Morris, Senior Attorney, Office of General Counsel, Farm Credit Administration, McLean, VA 22102–5090, (703) 883–4020, TDD (703) 883–4444.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 620.21 describes the required contents of the association annual meeting information statement and identifies the information that candidates for the director positions must disclose. Section 620.21(d)(3) requires that the information statement state that nominations from the floor must be made at the first sectional meeting if an association's annual meeting is held in consecutive sectional meetings. Sections 620.21 (d)(5) and (d)(6) require that persons nominated from the floor provide certain written disclosure at the meeting(s) at which the nominations are considered.

The FCA Board is proposing to amend the regulation in order to clarify the process and the disclosure requirements for floor nominees, including the procedure to be followed when annual meetings are held in more than one session or when shareholders vote by mail. The FCA believes that changing the regulation to allow nominations at any session of an association annual meeting when mail balloting is utilized will provide more opportunity for members to nominate candidates from the floor without any significant inconvenience to management or other nominees. The proposed regulation would require that a floor nominee provide, prior to the balloting, the written disclosure that would be required if the nominee were an incumbent director. If shareholders vote by mail ballot, the proposed regulation would permit persons nominated from the floor to provide this written disclosure with the ballot mailing to members. Section 620.21(d)(1) would be revised to eliminate ambiguity and to make it clear that any nominee from the floor must meet the same eligibility criteria as any other nominee.

Comments are sought on § 620.21 (d)(1), (d)(3), (d)(5), and (d)(6).

List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 620

Accounting, Agriculture, Banks, banking, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Rural areas.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, part 620 of chapter VI, title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations is proposed to be amended to read as follows:

PART 620—DISCLOSURE TO SHAREHOLDERS

1. The authority citation for part 620 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 5.17, 5.19, 8.11 of the Farm Credit Act; 12 U.S.C. 2252, 2254, 2279aa–11; sec. 424 of Pub. L. 100–233, 101 Stat. 1568, 1656.

Subpart D—Association Annual Meeting Information Statement

2. Section 620.21 is amended by revising the heading and paragraphs (d)(1), (d)(3), (d)(5), and (d)(6) to read as follows:

§ 620.21 Contents of the information statement and other information to be furnished in connection with the annual meeting.

(d) * * *

(1) If directors are nominated by region, describe the regions and state the number of voting shareholders entitled to vote in each region. Any nominee from the floor must be an eligible candidate for the director position for which the person has been nominated.

* * * * *

(3) If the annual meeting is to be held in sessions and mail balloting will be conducted upon the conclusion of all sessions, state that nominations from the floor may be made at any session. If shareholders will not vote by mail ballot upon conclusion of all sessions, state that nominations from the floor must be made at the first session.

* * * * *

(5) For each nominee who is not an incumbent director, except a nominee from the floor, provide the information referred to in § 620.5 (j) and (k) and § 620.21(d)(4). If shareholders will vote by mail ballot upon conclusion of all sessions, each floor nominee must provide the information referred to in § 620.5 (j) and (k) and § 620.21(d)(4) in writing to the association within 10 days of the nomination. The association shall ensure that the information is distributed to the voting shareholders with the mailing of the ballots for the election of directors in the same format as the comparable information contained in the association's annual meeting information statement. If shareholders will not vote by mail ballot, each floor nominee must provide the information referred to in § 620.5 (j) and (k) and § 620.21(d)(4) in writing at the first session at which voting is held.

(6) No person may be a nominee for director who does not make the disclosures required by this subpart.

* * * * *

Dated: September 8, 1993.

Curtis M. Anderson,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 93-22333 Filed 9-10-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6705-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 93-NM-133-AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Industrie Model A300, A310, and A300-600 Series Airplanes

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 all Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300-600 series airplanes. This proposal would require inspections to detect missing fasteners, cracked fitting angles, and elongated fastener holes in certain frames, and correction of discrepancies. This proposal is prompted by discrepancies found at the fitting angles on the frame at which a certain electronic rack is attached. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent damage propagation that could lead to failure of the rack-to-structure attachment points, which could subsequently result in loss of airplane systems, structural damage, and possible electrical arcing.

DATES: Comments must be received by November 8, 1993.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 93-NM-133-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Pont Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Slotte, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (206) 227-2797; fax (206) 227-1320.

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 93-NM-133-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. 93-NM-133-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300-600 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that, during routine maintenance, various discrepancies were found on three airplanes at the fitting angles on frame 16 at the lower attachments of electric rack 101VU. These discrepancies included missing fasteners, elongated fastener holes, and cracks. The cause of these discrepancies is unknown at this time. Discrepancies such as those found in the subject area, if not detected and corrected in a timely manner, could lead to failure of the attachment points to secure the electric rack to the adjacent structure. This condition could result in loss of airplane systems, structural damage, and possible electrical arcing.

Airbus Industrie has issued All Operator Telex (AOT) 53-03, Revision 3, dated December 23, 1992, that describes procedures for a conducting detailed visual inspections of the right- and left-hand lower attachments of electric rack 101VU, including the crossbeams at frames 15A and 16, to detect any missing fasteners, cracked fitting angles, or elongated fastener holes. This AOT also describes procedures and recommends a schedule for replacing any discrepant parts identified during the inspection. The DGAC classified this AOT (and its previous versions) as mandatory and issued French Airworthiness Directive 92–253–138(B), dated November 25, 1992, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

This airplane model is manufactured in France and is type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of § 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the DGAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would require repetitive detailed visual inspections of the right- and left-hand lower attachments of electric rack 101VU, including the crossbeams at frames 15A and 16, to detect any missing fasteners, cracked fitting angles, or elongated fastener holes. Any discrepancies detected, would be required to be corrected. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the AOT described previously.

This is considered to be interim action. Airbus Industrie currently is developing a modification that is intended to eliminate the type of damage problems that have occurred in the subject area. When this modification is developed, approved, and available, the FAA may consider further rulemaking.

The FAA estimates that 78 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $55 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $4,290, or $55 per airplane, per inspection cycle. This total cost figure assumes that no operator has yet accomplished the proposed requirements of this AD action.

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 "major rule" under Executive Order 12291; (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 14 CFR part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

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

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

Airbus Industrie: Docket 93–NM–133–AD.

Applicability: All Model A300, A310, and A300–600 series airplanes, certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent failure of the rack-to-structure attachment points, which could subsequently result in loss of airplane systems, structural damage, and possible electrical arcing, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 8,000 total flight cycles, or within 50 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later; and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 850 flight cycles; perform a detailed visual inspection of the right- and left-hand lower attachments of electronic rack 101VU, including the crossbeams at frames 15A and 16, to detect missing fasteners, cracked fitting angles, or elongated fastener holes, in accordance with Airbus Industrie All Operator Telex (AOT) 53–03, Revision 3, dated December 23, 1992.

(b) If any missing fasteners, cracked fitting angles, or elongated fastener holes are found during any inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, correct the discrepancy in accordance with the procedure specified in paragraph A., B., C., or D., as applicable, of Airbus AOT 53–03, Revision 3, dated December 23, 1992. After replacement of any discrepant part, continue to inspect in accordance with paragraph (a) of this AD at intervals not to exceed 850 flight cycles.

(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: 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 FAR 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 September 7, 1993.

David G. Hmiel,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 93–22258 Filed 9–10–93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 93–NM–136–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Beech Model 400A and 400T Airplanes

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 Beech Model 400A and 400T airplanes. This proposal would require inspection of the rivets in the escape hatch substructure to verify that the proper rivets are installed, and replacement of the incorrect rivets with new rivets or fasteners. This proposal is prompted by the discovery that, during production, incorrect rivets may have been installed in the escape hatch substructure. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent reduced structural capability of the airframe.

DATES: Comments must be received by November 8, 1993.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 93–NM–136–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Beech Aircraft Corporation, P.O. Box 85, Wichita, Kansas 67201–0085. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Larry Engler, Aerospace Engineer, Propulsion Branch, ACE–140W, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone (316) 946–4122; fax (316) 946–4407.

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 93–NM–136–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. 93–NM–136–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The manufacturer has discovered that, during production of certain Beech Model 400A and 400T airplanes, eight incorrect rivets, part number (P/N) MS20470AD5, may have been installed in the escape hatch substructure of these airplanes. Structural analysis of the incorrect rivets indicates that their use may impair the adjacent aircraft structure from sustaining the required ultimate loads. This condition, if not corrected, could result in reduced structural capability of the airframe. Such reduced structural capability may lead to fatigue of the substructure, structural failure of the airframe, and subsequent decompression of the airplane.

The FAA has reviewed and approved Beechcraft Service Bulletin 2509, dated July 1993, that describes procedures for a one-time inspection of the rivets in the escape hatch substructure to verify that the proper rivets are installed, and replacement of the incorrect rivets with new rivets or fasteners.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would require a one-time inspection of the rivets in the escape hatch substructure to verify that the proper fasteners are installed, and replacement of the incorrect rivets with new rivets or fasteners. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously.

There are approximately 94 Beech Model 400A and 400T airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 78 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 $55 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $400 per airplane. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $65,520, or $840 per airplane. This total cost figure assumes that no operator has yet accomplished the proposed requirements of this AD action.

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 "major rule" under Executive Order 12291; (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 14 CFR part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

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

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

Beech Aircraft Corporation: Docket 93–NM–136–AD.

Applicability: Model 400A airplanes having serial numbers RK–1 through RK–57 inclusive, RK–59, RK–60, and RK–62 through RK–66 inclusive; and Model 400T airplanes having serial numbers TT–02 through TT–30 inclusive, and TT–32; certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent reduced structural capability of the airframe, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 200 hours time-in-service after the effective date of this AD, inspect the rivets in the escape hatch substructure to verify that the proper rivets are installed in accordance with Beechcraft Service Bulletin 2509, dated July 1993.

(1) If the rivet has part number (P/N) MS20470E6, no further action is required by this AD.

(2) If the rivet does not have P/N MS20470E6, prior to further flight, replace the rivet with a new Cherry Max rivet or a HI–LOK fastener, in accordance with Beechcraft Service Bulletin 2509, dated July 1993.

(b) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install rivet, P/N MS20470AD5, in the location shown in Figure 1 of Beechcraft Service Bulletin 2509, dated July 1993, on any airplane.

(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, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Small 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, Wichita ACO.

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

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with FAR 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 September 7, 1993.

David G. Hmiel,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 93–22259 Filed 9–10–93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MN12–1–5557; FRL–4728–3]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Minnesota

AGENCY: United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: On May 29, 1992, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) submitted proposed revisions to its State Implementation Plan for sulfur dioxide (SO_2). In the proposed revisions, MPCA is attempting to demonstrate attainment and maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for SO_2 as required by sections 110 and 172 of the Clean Air Act. The submittal consists of Administrative Orders representing five facilities in Air Quality Control Region 131. This region contains the Minneapolis/St. Paul Metropolitan area. The facilities are FMC Corporation and U.S. Navy; Federal Hoffman, Incorporated; GAF Building Materials Corporation; Minneapolis Energy Center, Incorporated; and Northern States Power Company. In today's action, USEPA is proposing to disapprove the State's submittal based on enforceability and attainment demonstration concerns. Assuming no other substantive, adverse public comments are received, the USEPA will proceed with a final approval of the submittal when the MPCA addresses the concerns detailed in this document and submits the Administrative Orders to USEPA before the end of the 30-day comment period. If the concerns are not adequately addressed before that time, USEPA will finalize the disapproval.

DATES: Comments on this requested revision and on the proposed USEPA action must be received by Ocotber 13, 1993.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the SIP revision request and USEPA's analysis are available for inspection at the following address: (It is recommended that you telephone Randy Robinson at (312) 353–6713, before visiting the Region 5 Office.) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Written comments should be sent to: William L. MacDowell, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Enforcement Branch (AE–17J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randy Robinson, Regulation Development Section, Air Enforcement Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353–6713.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Summary of State Submittal

On May 29, 1992, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) submitted to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) revisions to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for sulfur dioxide (SO_2) in Air Quality Control Region (AQCR) 131. The seven county metropolitan area (AQCR 131) has been designated, by the USEPA, as nonattainment for SO_2 (40 CFR 81.324). The submittal is intended to demonstrate attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for SO_2 in AQCR 131, excluding an area surrounding the SO_2 emission sources at Ashland Petroleum Company, and an area surrounding the SO_2 emission sources at Koch Refining Company, Koch's Sulfuric Acid Unit Plant, Northern States Power Company-Inver Hills, and Continental Nitrogen and Resources Corporation (hereinafter "Ashland and Pine Bend" areas). These areas will be addressed in separate **Federal Register** (FR) notices. The demonstration consists of Administrative Orders, including modeling analyses, for the following facilities: Federal-Hoffman, Incorporated, Minneapolis Energy Center, Inc., Northern States Power Company, FMC Corporation and U.S. Navy, and GAF Building Materials Corporation.

Background

The USEPA published the designation of AQCR 131 as a primary nonattainment area for SO_2 on March 3, 1978 (43 FR 8962). The MPCA submitted a final SO_2 plan on August 4, 1980. USEPA published its final rule approving and promulgating the Minnesota Part D SIP for SO_2 for AQCR 131 on April 8, 1981 (46 FR 20997). The MPCA submitted a request for the redesignation to attainment of AQCR 131, except for the Pine Bend area of Dakota County, on September 2, 1983. The redesignation request was based in part on permits. Following the MPCA's request for redesignation to attainment, the USEPA requested revisions be made to the permits. Also, the Stack Height Rule, promulgated by USEPA on July 8, 1985, required further State analysis of