

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), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

Fokker: Docket 98–NM–364–AD.

Applicability: Model F27 series airplanes, as listed in Fokker F27 Service Bulletin F27/61–40, Revision 1, dated August 1, 1997; certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent overspeed and burnout of the engines during flight by ensuring that the high pressure cock (HPC) levers are in a permanent lockout position, accomplish the following:

AFM Revision

(a) Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD: Revise the Emergency, Normal, and Abnormal Procedures Sections, as applicable, of the FAA-approved Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) by incorporation of Fokker F27 Service Bulletin F27/61–40, Revision 1, dated August 1, 1997; including Fokker F27 Manual Change Notification (MCNO) F27–001, dated June 30, 1997. [MCNO F27–001 specifies procedures for placing the HPC levers in a permanent lockout position (with the cruise lock withdrawal system disabled) during operation of the airplane.] This action may be accomplished by inserting a copy of the MCNO into the AFM.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(b) 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, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Operations Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 1: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

Special Flight Permits

(c) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 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.

Note 2: The subject of this AD is addressed in Dutch airworthiness directive 1996–130 (A), dated October 31, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 19, 1999.

D.L. Riggins,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–10184 Filed 4–22–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–62–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Industrie Model A300–600 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the superseding of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Airbus Industrie Model A300–600 series airplanes, that currently requires repetitive high frequency eddy current inspections to detect cracks in bolt holes where parts of the main landing gear are attached to the rear spar, and repair, if necessary. This action would require repetitive ultrasonic inspections to detect cracking in certain bolt holes of the rear spar, and repair, if necessary. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness

information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to detect and correct cracking of the rear spar of the wing, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 24, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–62–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 Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point 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: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2110; fax (425) 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 98-NM-62-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-114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98-NM-62-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

On September 20, 1995, the FAA issued AD 95-20-02, amendment 39-9380 (60 FR 52618, October 10, 1995), applicable to certain Airbus Industrie Model A300-600 series airplanes, to require repetitive high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspections to detect cracks in bolt holes where parts of the main landing gear are attached to the rear spar, and repair, if necessary. That action was prompted by a report that cracks emanating from bolt holes in the rear spar were found during full-scale fatigue testing. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent unnecessary degradation of the structural integrity of the airframe due to cracks in the rear spar.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Since the issuance of AD 95-20-02, Airbus Industrie has issued Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, Revision 2, dated January 14, 1997, and Revision 3, dated November 19, 1997. Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, Revision 2, describes procedures for an ultrasonic inspection to be performed in lieu of the HFEC inspection that was described in Revision 1, dated July 25, 1994. The ultrasonic inspection method allows the inspection to be performed without removing bolts in the area to be inspected, which is necessary for accomplishment of the HFEC inspection described in Revision 1. Revision 3 of the service bulletin adds new procedures for airplanes that have been inspected previously in accordance with the original issue, dated November 22, 1993, or Revision 1 of the service bulletin. Accomplishment of the actions specified in Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, Revision 3, is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition. The

Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, classified Revision 2 of this service bulletin as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 94-031-155(B)R1, dated May 7, 1997, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France. The DGAC also approved Revision 3 of this service bulletin.

Airbus Industrie also has issued Service Bulletin A300-57-6073, dated September 30, 1997. That service bulletin describes procedures for modification of certain bolt holes of the rear spar by oversizing and cold working the bolt holes, and installing oversize studs. For airplanes on which no cracks are found during the ultrasonic inspections proposed by this AD, and on which Airbus Modification 07716 (reference Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6020, dated November 22, 1993) has not been accomplished, accomplishment of the modification described in service bulletin A300-57-6073 would eliminate the need for the inspections described previously.

FAA's Conclusions

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 (14 CFR 21.29) 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.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

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 supersede AD 95-20-02 to require repetitive ultrasonic inspections to detect cracking in certain bolt holes of the rear spar, and repair, if necessary. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with Revision 3 of Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, described previously. This proposed AD also would provide for optional terminating action for the repetitive inspections.

Clarification of Repetitive Inspection Interval for Certain Airplanes

The FAA finds that paragraph (c)(1) of the existing AD may be misleading to operators in terms of specifying the applicable repetitive inspection interval. Paragraph (c)(1) of the existing AD states (for airplanes on which a crack was detected but on which Airbus Industrie Modification 07716 has not been accomplished), "After accomplishing the oversizing and HFEC inspection, repeat the inspection as required by paragraph (b) of this AD at the applicable schedule specified in that paragraph." The FAA finds that the repair procedures specified in Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin 300-57-6017, Revision 1, are substantially similar to those described in Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6020, dated November 22, 1993 (which is the service bulletin associated with Airbus Industrie Modification 07716). Therefore, the FAA has determined that airplanes on which Airbus Industrie Modification 07716 has not been accomplished, but on which cracks were detected and repaired in accordance with Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin 300-57-6017, Revision 1, should be subject to repetitive inspections at the same interval as those airplanes on which Airbus Industrie Modification 07716 has been accomplished. Note 4 has been included in this proposal to clarify the intent of paragraph (c)(1) of this AD.

Differences Between the Proposed Rule and the French Airworthiness Directive

The proposed AD would differ from the parallel French airworthiness directive in that the proposed AD would require accomplishment of the repetitive ultrasonic inspections in accordance with Revision 3 of the service bulletin. The French airworthiness directive specifies accomplishment of the repetitive ultrasonic inspections in accordance with Revision 2 of the service bulletin. The FAA's determination is based on the fact that Revision 3 of the service bulletin includes appropriate inspection thresholds and repetitive intervals for airplanes inspected previously in accordance with Revision 1 of the service bulletin. Because the existing AD requires accomplishment of HFEC inspections in accordance with Revision 1 of the service bulletin, the FAA finds that Revision 3 is the appropriate source of service information for the inspections proposed by this AD.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 54 airplanes of U.S. registry that would be affected by this proposed AD.

The new inspections that are proposed in this AD action would take approximately 226 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed requirements of this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$732,240, or \$13,560 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The cost impact figures discussed above are 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.

Regulatory Impact

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), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39-9380 (60 FR 52618, October 10, 1995), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

Airbus Industrie: Docket 98-NM-62-AD. Supersedes AD 95-20-02, Amendment 39-9380.

Applicability: Model A300-600 series airplanes, having manufacturer's serial numbers (MSN) 252 through 553 inclusive, certificated in any category; except those airplanes on which Airbus Industrie Production Modification No. 07601 has been accomplished prior to delivery.

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 request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (h) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To detect and correct cracking of the rear spar of the wing, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane, accomplish the following:

Restatement of Requirements of AD 95-20-02

Note 2: Accomplishment of the inspections and repair of cracking in accordance with Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, dated November 22, 1993, prior to November 9, 1995 (the effective date of AD 95-20-02, amendment 39-9380), is acceptable for compliance with the applicable action specified in this amendment.

(a) Perform a high frequency eddy current (HFEC) rototest inspection to detect cracks in certain bolt holes where the main landing gear (MLG) forward pick-up fitting and MLG rib 5 aft are attached to the rear spar, in accordance with Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, Revision 1 (includes Appendix 1), dated July 25, 1994.

Note 3: This service bulletin also references Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6020, dated November 22, 1993, as an additional source of service information.

(1) For airplanes that have accumulated 17,300 total landings or less as of November 9, 1995: Inspect prior to the accumulation of 17,300 total landings, or within 1,500

landings after November 9, 1995, whichever occurs later.

(2) For airplanes that have accumulated 17,301 or more total landings, but less than 19,300 total landings as of November 9, 1995: Inspect within 1,500 landings after November 9, 1995.

(3) For airplanes that have accumulated 19,300 or more total landings as of November 9, 1995: Inspect within 750 landings after November 9, 1995.

(b) If no crack is found during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, repeat that inspection thereafter at the time specified in either paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For airplanes on which Airbus Industrie Modification 07716 (as described in Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6020) has not been accomplished, inspect at the time specified in paragraph (b)(1)(i) or (b)(1)(ii) of this AD, as applicable.

(i) For airplanes having MSN 465 through 553 inclusive: Repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 13,000 landings, until the inspection required by paragraph (d)(2)(i)(A) has been accomplished.

(ii) For airplanes having MSN 252 through 464 inclusive: Repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 8,400 landings, until the inspection required by paragraph (d)(2)(i)(B) has been accomplished.

(2) For airplanes on which Airbus Industrie Modification 07716 has been accomplished, inspect at the time specified in either paragraph (b)(2)(i) or (b)(2)(ii) of this AD, as applicable.

(i) For airplanes having MSN 465 through 553 inclusive: Repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 11,800 landings, until the inspection required by paragraph (d)(2)(ii)(A) has been accomplished.

(ii) For airplanes having MSN 252 through 464 inclusive: Repeat the inspection within 10,700 landings following the initial inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 7,500 landings, until the inspection required by paragraph (d)(2)(ii)(B) has been accomplished.

(c) If any crack is found during the inspection required by either paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD, prior to further flight, accomplish the requirements of either paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For airplanes on which Airbus Industrie Modification 07716 has not been accomplished: Oversize the bolt hole by 1/32 inch and repeat the HFEC inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, in accordance with Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin 300-57-6017, Revision 1, dated July 25, 1994. After accomplishing the oversizing and HFEC inspection, repeat the inspection as required by paragraph (b) of this AD at the applicable schedule specified in that paragraph, until the inspection required by paragraph (d)(2)(ii)(A) has been accomplished.

Note 4: For the purposes of this AD, airplanes that are repaired in accordance with Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin 300-57-6017, Revision 1, are considered to be subject to repetitive inspections at the same interval as those airplanes on which Airbus

Industrie Modification 07716 has been accomplished.

(i) If no cracking is detected, install the second oversize bolt in accordance with the service bulletin.

(ii) If any cracking is detected, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(2) For airplanes on which Airbus Industrie Modification 07716 has been accomplished: Repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116. After repair, repeat the inspections as required by paragraph (b) of this AD at the applicable schedule specified in that paragraph, until the inspection required by paragraph (d)(2)(ii)(B) has been accomplished.

New Requirements of This AD:

New Initial and Repetitive Inspections

(d) Perform an ultrasonic inspection to detect cracks in certain bolt holes where the MLG forward pick-up fitting and MLG rib 5 aft are attached to the rear spar, in accordance with Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, Revision 3, dated November 19, 1997; at the time specified in paragraph (d)(1) or (d)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

Note 5: Inspections accomplished prior to the effective date of this AD in accordance with Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, Revision 2, dated January 14, 1997, are considered acceptable for compliance with paragraph (d) of this AD.

(1) For airplanes not inspected prior to the effective date of this AD in accordance with Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, dated November 22, 1993, or Revision 1 (includes Appendix 1), dated July 25, 1994: Inspect at the time specified in paragraph (d)(1)(i), (d)(1)(ii), or (d)(1)(iii) of this AD, as applicable. Accomplishment of this inspection terminates the requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD.

(i) For airplanes that have accumulated 17,300 total landings or fewer as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect prior to the accumulation of 17,300 total landings, or within 1,500 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(ii) For airplanes that have accumulated 17,301 total landings or more but fewer than 19,300 total landings as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect within 1,500 landings after the effective date of this AD.

(iii) For airplanes that have accumulated 19,300 total landings or more as of the effective date of this AD: Inspect within 750 landings after the effective date of this AD.

(2) For airplanes on which an HFEC inspection was performed prior to the effective date of this AD in accordance with paragraph (a) of AD 95-20-02, or in accordance with Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6017, dated November 22, 1993: Inspect at the time specified in paragraph (d)(2)(i) or (d)(2)(ii), as applicable.

(i) If no cracking was detected during any HFEC inspection accomplished prior to the effective date of this AD, and if Airbus Industrie Modification 07716 has *not* been accomplished: Inspect at the time specified

in paragraph (d)(2)(i)(A) or (d)(2)(i)(B) of this AD, as applicable.

(A) For airplanes having MSN 465 through 553 inclusive: Inspect within 13,000 landings after the most recent HFEC inspection, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 8,900 landings. Accomplishment of this inspection constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirement of paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this AD.

(B) For airplanes having MSN 252 through 464 inclusive: Inspect within 8,400 landings after the most recent HFEC inspection, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 5,500 landings. Accomplishment of this inspection constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirement of paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this AD.

(ii) If any cracking was detected during any HFEC inspection performed prior to the effective date of this AD, regardless of the method of repair, or if Airbus Industrie Modification 07716 has been accomplished: Inspect at the time specified in paragraph (d)(2)(ii)(A) or (d)(2)(ii)(B) of this AD, as applicable.

(A) For airplanes having MSN 465 through 553 inclusive: Inspect within 11,800 landings after the most recent HFEC inspection, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 8,200 landings. Accomplishment of this inspection constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirement of paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(B) For airplanes having MSN 252 through 464 inclusive: Inspect within 10,700 landings after the initial inspection in accordance with paragraph (a) of AD 95-20-02, or within 7,500 landings after the most recent HFEC inspection, whichever occurs later, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 4,900 landings. Accomplishment of this inspection constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirement of paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(e) If no cracking is detected during the ultrasonic inspection required by paragraph (d)(1) of this AD, repeat that inspection thereafter at the time specified in paragraph (e)(1) or (e)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For airplanes having MSN 465 through 553 inclusive: Repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 8,900 landings.

(2) For airplanes having MSN 232 through 464 inclusive: Repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 5,500 landings.

Repair

(f) If any cracking is detected during any inspection performed in accordance with paragraph (d) or (e) of this AD: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116; or the Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (or its delegated agent).

Terminating Action

(g) Accomplishment of Airbus Industrie Modification 11440 (Airbus Industrie Service Bulletin A300-57-6073, dated September 30, 1997) constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of paragraphs (d) and (e) of this AD, as applicable.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(h) 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, International Branch, ANM-116. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116.

Note 6: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM-116.

Special Flight Permits

(i) 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.

Note 7: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 94-031-155(B)R1, dated May 7, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 19, 1999.

D. L. Riggins,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99-10182 Filed 4-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

15 CFR Part 922

[Docket No. 970626156-9077-02]

RIN No. 0648-AK01

Regulation of the Operation of Motorized Personal Watercraft in the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary

AGENCY: Marine Sanctuaries Division (MSD), Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce (DOC).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration proposes to amend the regulations governing the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary (GFNMS or Sanctuary) to prohibit the operation of motorized personal watercraft (MPWC) in the nearshore waters of the Sanctuary. Specifically, the operation of MPWC would be prohibited from the mean high-tide line seaward to 1,000 yards