

on which Airbus Modification 10702S20752 (reference Airbus Service Bulletin A300-27-0184, dated August 19, 1996, or Revision 01, dated December 4, 1998) has been accomplished; certificated in any category.

**Note 1:** This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been otherwise modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (b) 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 prevent the electrical connections of the actuators of the green and yellow hydraulic systems for the pitch artificial feel unit from being cross connected due to the design of the wire harness routing, which could result in a stiff elevator control at takeoff, and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane, accomplish the following:

#### Replacement and Removal

(a) Within 24 months after the effective date of this AD, perform the actions specified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300-27-0184, Revision 01, dated December 4, 1998.

(1) Replace the wire harness routing with a new, improved wire harness routing.

(2) Remove the green and yellow colors from the connectors specified in the service bulletin.

**Note 2:** Accomplishment of the actions in paragraph (a) of this AD in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300-27-0184, dated August 19, 1996, is considered acceptable for compliance with this AD.

#### 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 Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116.

**Note 3:** 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 4:** The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 98-447-264(B), dated November 18, 1998.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 9, 1999.

**D.L. Riggins,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 99-29827 Filed 11-15-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 93

[Docket No. 28902; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking No. 97-6]

#### Establishing of Corridors in the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rules Area

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Disposition of comments.

**SUMMARY:** This document summarizes and disposes of comments to a notice of proposed rulemaking (Notice 97-6), published May 15, 1997, which proposed a National Canyon corridor for an air tour route through the central portion of Grand Canyon National Park (GCNP). The FAA withdrew Notice 97-6 because it was considering alternatives to this route. This action summarizes and responds to the comments concerning the National Canyon corridor.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alberta Brown, Air Transportation Division, Flight Standards Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267-3724.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On May 15, 1997, the FAA issued Notice No. 97-6, which proposed a modification to the National Canyon corridor that was originally proposed in December 1996 in the Notice of Proposing Rulemaking (NPMR) addressing the use of quiet technology aircraft in GCNP (61 FR 69334; December 31, 1996). Notice No. 97-6 proposed two quiet technology corridors: (1) the National Canyon corridor through the central portion of the Park; and (2) the Bright Angel corridor in the eastern portion of the Park. The FAA received a total of 143 comments on this proposal from associations, the air tour industry, and individuals. A summary of comments

and FAA's response to those comments follows:

#### Comments

Clark County comments that the proposed National Canyon route “\* \* \* still fails to provide a sufficient scenic view to support a viable air tour.” Specifically, this commenter finds that air visitors would lose the extremely scenic views of the Grand Canyon, Havasu Canyon, and Mt. Sinyala that are seen on the current Blue 1. Further, the commenter claims that the lack of a viable Blue 1/1A will result in a dangerous diversion of traffic to the Blue 2 route, economic injury to the air tour industry, and a shift of noise to the Hualapai reservation. It also suggests that, given the lack of a scenic air tour, some visitors will opt for ground tours by bus, train or car. Clark County believes that the Blue 1 route, proposed in above-referenced December 1996 proposal for quiet technology aircraft, is the best option for viable air tour. Clark County continues to endorse the use of quiet technology as providing the best opportunity to promote long-term noise reduction at the least cost to the air tour industry.

In a related economic comment, Clark County notes that the current Blue 1 generates \$97.5 million in operating revenues. This commenter finds the FAA's economic analysis flawed in that it assumes that all air visitors would take the ‘unscenic’ proposed route, and because it assumes that the only loss of revenue from the loss of the scenic portions of Blue 1 would be a tiny diminution in ticket prices. Finally, Clark County comments that, together, the proposed quiet technology route and quiet aircraft will more than meet the Overflight Act's mandate to substantially restore natural quiet in the Park. Clark County also raises a number of rulemaking issues for GCNP not directly related to this rulemaking proposal.

Lake Mead Air urges the FAA to retain the Blue 1 route as it is less offensive to the Native Americans than the proposed route. This commenter believes that the FAA should cease all rulemaking until an Environmental Impact Statement is completed.

Eagle Canyon Airlines believes that there is a potential for increasing unsafe operating conditions if there is no viable air tour route through the National Canyon area. Moreover, this commenter finds it appropriate to return to the route structure as it existed before December 31, 1996. Rather than change the structure of the National Canyon route to accommodate the Havasupai, Eagle Canyon Airlines finds that it

would be more beneficial for the air tour operations if the FAA shifted the route slightly to the north. Eagle reiterates that an air tour must have at least 40 miles of canyon overflight to justify an air tour sold as such.

Southwest Safaris comments that the FAA has failed to consider air tour operations approaching from the south and east and suggests some modifications of routes to avoid congestion and possible safety problems. In a second comment, Southwest Safaris comments that the FAA should not allow any operator to use the Bright Angel corridor until all operators have had the opportunity to convert to quiet technology aircraft; 3 years should be sufficient for this conversion. This commenter also cites competition problems since other companies are unwilling to lease quiet technology aircraft to small operators who might compete with them for tour business.

Airstar Helicopters commends the FAA for responding to the safety concerns generated by Notice 96-15 (Noise Limitations for Aircraft Operations in the Vicinity of Grand Canyon National Park) with a recommendation that the FAA convene a panel of affected parties to reach a consensus on the GCNP.

Scenic Airlines encourages the FAA to adopt the December 1996 proposal for quiet technology aircraft and finds that the proposal in notice 97-6 contains no incentives for operators to convert to quieter aircraft. Scenic finds that the National Canyon route as proposed does not provide a 'quality aerial tour experience' and instead proposes a corridor that would run north of Havasupai tribal lands while remaining south of the Colorado river. This commenter also suggested other route options.

Air Vegas commends the FAA for the reasoned decision to amend two of the flight-free zones with corridors, but finds that the National Canyon route does not provide a viable air tour. Air Vegas believes that Special Federal Aviation Regulation 50-2 has been successful in meeting the goals of substantially restoring the natural quiet in GCNP. The commenter also suggests a slight alternate to the National Canyon route.

The Sierra Club comments that the proposal to establish two routes through flight-free zones is a move away from the goal of Public Law 100-91 to restore the natural quiet in GCNP. While it supports the use of quiet technology aircraft, this commenter believes that methods such as creating corridors through flight-free zones are

counterproductive. Sierra Club finds that the National Canyon route provides some relief for the Havasupai reservation; however, it does not provide enough protection for the river corridor. It also finds that a 4-mile width is excessive; if safety is a concern, the number of flights should be reduced. Sierra Club believes that a cap on operations is the only solution to the noise problem in GCNP.

Friends of Grand Canyon states that the proposed routes will actually make noise levels worse in the eastern portion of the Canyon. This commenter finds that the proposed National Canyon modification would bring little relief to the Havasupai, while providing continuous noise to the central portion of the GCNP. In addition, unlimited noise would continue to permeate the entire park since there is no restriction on non-tour aircraft at elevations of 1300 to 9500 feet. This association finds that the NPS and FAA have failed in their responsibility to restore natural quiet to the park.

The General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA) supports the two corridors, saying that they will harm no entity and will have a positive benefit for air tour operators. However, GAMA states that limiting the use of one corridor to Category C aircraft is arbitrary and subjective. Additionally, GAMA comments that the December 31, 2001 date does not provide sufficient time for industry to have new noise reduction technologies available.

The Navajo Nation reminds the FAA of its Section 106 responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act and its position that no flights be conducted over the "salt trail" and "Blue Springs" area. The FAA notes that these two areas are not affected by the Notice 97-6 proposal.

Grand Canyon Air Tour Council (CGATC) comments that the National Canyon route, as proposed, is not a viable air tour route. The Council believes that the two goals of SFAR 50-2 have been met: to increase safety and to substantially restore the natural quiet. AGATC notes that visitor complaints constitute only .0001% of all visitors.

Twin Otter International (TOIL) comments that the FAA has exceeded its statutory authority with the new GCNP rules and that it has incorrectly applied the intent of Congress. Moreover, it has applied a flawed NPS noise model to justify the rules. TOIL finds that there is insufficient incentive for converting to the new technology. Moreover, limiting west-bound traffic to quiet technology after December 2201 is only symbolic since only 2-3% of the air tours from Las Vegas to Tusayan are

flown in reverse. In addition, this proposal reduces the viewing time by about 40%. TOIL recommends maintaining a 40-minute canyon viewing experience and further urges the FAA to limit it to quiet technology only.

Grand Canyon Airlines (GCA) comments that there should be more incentive routes for quiet technology aircraft. GCA urges FAA and NPS to work together in a common sense approach, adding that the value in knowing that there is quiet though no one is there is 'elitist hogwash'. GCA believes that FAA discriminated in favor of helicopters by giving them the lowest altitudes and preferred routes.

Sierra Club—Grand Canyon Chapter comments that NPS modeling shows that eliminating all aircraft from National Canyon corridor is an important step in restoring natural quiet to GCNP. Likewise, the Sierra Club—Los Angeles Chapter opposes the proposal to allow a National Canyon route through a flight free zone.

Grand Canyon River Guides comments that there should be no flights through flight free zones. This commenter notes that the Havasupai also want these flights removed. The Guides believe that this is a non-essential route and that people will still book tours, regardless of the location of the route.

The Havasupai Indian Tribe comments that only through government to government negotiations should any aircraft be able to fly over their reservation. They suggest a route through the Sanup flight-free zone that could avoid their reservation. The Havasupai also find the Environmental Assessment insufficient.

More than 100 comments were received from individuals who enjoy the GCNP as ground visitors. The majority of these comments state that routes through flight-free zones defeated the purpose of the final rule. Many of these commenters want no flights over GCNP, even by quiet technology aircraft.

#### The FAA's response

As stated in the withdrawal of Notice No. 97-6, the FAA, in consultation with the NPS, had determined to not proceed with the proposals set forth in that notice. Following the withdrawal, the FAA continued to search for a route through the GCNP that would provide a viable air tour while at the same time contributing to the restoration of natural quiet in the Park.

The focus of this search for a new air tour route changed significantly with the publication in the **Federal Register** of NPS's policy dressing a dual noise

standard for GCNP (64 FR 38006; July 14, 1999). NPS's policy revised the noise evaluation methodology and established a dual noise level mapping of GCNP. The methodology effectively devised a two zone system for assessing the impacts related to the substantial restoration of natural quiet in GCNP. Zone One is based on the standard of noticeability, which was used previously for noise assessments in GCNP and is determined to be three decibels above the A-weighted natural ambient level. Zone Two is based on the standard of audibility, which is determined to be eight decibels below the average A-weighted natural ambient level. The National Canyon corridor proposed in Notice 97-6 would have passed through Zone 2. Consequently, application of the audibility standard to the National Canyon area precludes this area from consideration as a possible air tour route. The FAA recently has proposed two air tour routes through the central portion of the GCNP, which do not infringe on Zone Two. Notice No. 99-11, Modification of the Dimensions of the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rules Area and Flight Free Zones (64 FR 37296; July 9, 1999) and a companion Notice of availability on routes in Grand Canyon National Park (64 FR 37191; July 9, 1999) both had a 60-day comment period that closed on September 7, 1999.

The FAA appreciates the comments that the public provided on the proposals in Notice 97-6. Commenters provided valuable insights into what constitutes a viable air tour route. Other commenters expressed the value of restoring natural quiet in GCNP. Native American tribes took this opportunity to express their concerns for any air tour route that could affect their sacred properties. These comments assist the FAA and NPS in their continuing efforts to develop air tour routes in GCNP.

Issued in Washington, DC on November 5, 1999.

**L. Nicholas Lacey,**

*Director, Flight Standards Service.*

[FR Doc. 99-29901 Filed 11-15-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Customs Service

#### 19 CFR Part 141

RIN 1515-AC15

#### Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act: Customs Entry Documentation

**AGENCY:** Customs Service, Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** This document provides an additional 30 days for interested members of the public to submit comments on the proposal to amend the Customs Regulations to implement section 12 of the Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act of 1996 (ACPA). Section 12 of the ACPA concerns the content of entry documentation required by Customs to determine whether imported merchandise or its packaging bears an infringing trademark. The proposed regulatory provision requires importers to provide on the invoice a listing of all trademarks appearing on the imported merchandise and its packaging. The proposal was published in the **Federal Register** on September 13, 1999, and the comment period was scheduled to expire on November 12, 1999.

**DATES:** Comments on the proposal must be received on or before December 13, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments (preferably in triplicate) may be addressed to the Regulations Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs Service, Ronald Reagan Building, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20229. All comments submitted will be available for public inspection in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552), § 1.4, Treasury Department Regulations (31 CFR 1.4), and § 103.11(b), Customs Regulations (19 CFR 103.11(b)) between 9:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. on normal business days at the Regulations Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs Service, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, 3rd Floor, Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lou Alfano, Commercial Enforcement, Office of Field Operations (202) 927-0005.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Customs published a document in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 49423) on September 13, 1999, proposing to implement section 12 of the

Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act of 1996 (ACPA). Section 12 of the ACPA concerns the content of entry documentation required by Customs to determine whether imported merchandise or its packaging bears an infringing trademark. The proposed regulatory provision requires importers to provide on the invoice a listing of all trademarks appearing on the imported merchandise and its packaging.

The document invited the public to comment on the proposal. Comments on the proposed rule were requested on or before November 12, 1999.

On November 8, 1999, Customs received a request from the Customs and International Trade Bar Association to extend the comment period an additional 30 days.

Customs has determined to grant the request for the extension. Accordingly, the period of time for the submission of comments is being extended 30 days. Comments are now due on or before December 13, 1999.

Dated: November 9, 1999.

**Stuart P. Seidel,**

*Assistant Commissioner, Office of Regulations and Rulings.*

[FR Doc. 99-29793 Filed 11-15-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-02-P

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

### 20 CFR Part 322

RIN 3220-AB38

#### Remuneration

**AGENCY:** Railroad Retirement Board.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Railroad Retirement Board (Board) proposes to amend its regulations defining remuneration and how that term is applied to claims for benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (RUIA) to reflect changes in that statute and to reflect administrative rulings not readily available to the public.

**DATES:** Comments should be submitted on or before January 18, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Any comments should be addressed to the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas W. Sadler, Senior Attorney, Railroad Retirement Board, (312) 751-4513, FAX (312) 751-7102, TDD (312) 751-4701.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** As administrator of the RUIA, the Railroad Retirement Board pays benefits to