

certificated for operation in the United States.

#### Requirements of This AD

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other R-R Dart 511, 511-7E, 514-7, 528, 528-7E, 529-7E, 532-7, 532-7L, 532-7N, 532-7P, 532-7R, 535-7R, 551-7R, and 552-7R turboprop engines of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would require:

- Installation of a feathering probe.
- Installation of a steel retaining ring in the reduction gear housing.
- Replacement of a torqueometer oil pressure transfer bobbin.

The actions would be required to be accomplished at the next shop visit after the effective date of the proposed AD, or by December 31, 2000, whichever occurs first, in accordance with the service bulletin described previously.

#### Cost Impact

There are approximately 1500 engines of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 100 engines installed on aircraft of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 2 work hours per engine to accomplish the proposed actions and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately \$300 per engine. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$42,000.

#### Regulatory Impact

This proposed rule does not have federalism implications, as defined in Executive Order 13132, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Accordingly, the FAA has not consulted with state authorities prior to publication of this proposed rule.

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 adding the following new airworthiness directive:

**Rolls Royce Ltd.:** Docket No. 99-NE-50-AD.

*Applicability:* Rolls-Royce Ltd. (R-R) Dart 511, 511-7E, 514-7, 528, 528-7E, 529-7E, 532-7, 532-7L, 532-7N, 532-7P, 532-7R, 535-7R, 551-7R, and 552-7R turboprop engines, installed on but not limited to Fokker Aircraft B.V. F27 series and Maryland Air Industries (formerly Fairchild) F-27 and FH-227 series airplanes.

**Note 1:** This airworthiness directive (AD) applies to each engine identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For engines 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 (c) 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 a propeller from overspeeding resulting in propeller release after a failure of the annulus gear, which could result in damage to an adjacent engine or to the airplane, accomplish the following:

#### Installation of a Sensor Probe and Retaining Ring

(a) At the next shop visit after the effective date of this AD, or by December 31, 2000, whichever occurs first, do all of the following:

- (1) Install a feathering probe in the front bearing panel of the reduction gearbox in accordance with paragraph 2.A. of service bulletin (SB) Da72-348, revision 13, dated April 13, 1999.

(2) Install a steel retaining ring between the nose casing and the front bearing panel in accordance with paragraph 2.C. of SB Da72-348, revision 13, dated April 13, 1999.

(3) Replace the existing transfer bobbin with an aluminum bobbin in accordance with paragraph 2.C. of SB Da72-348, revision 13, dated April 13, 1999.

#### Definition of a Shop Visit

(b) For the purposes of this AD, a shop visit is defined as any maintenance action that results in the removal or disassembly of the reduction gearbox.

#### Alternative Method of Compliance

(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, Engine Certification Office (ECO). Operators shall submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, ECO.

**Note 2:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the ECO.

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

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on January 5, 2000.

**Thomas A. Boudreau,**

*Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service*  
[FR Doc. 00-722 Filed 1-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 70

[MO 091-1091a; FRL-6519-8]

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Part 70 Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA proposes to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the state of Missouri. This revision updates the state's definitions rule, 10 CSR 10-6.020, Definitions and Common Reference Tables. EPA is also approving the definitions rule under the part 70 program. Approval of this revision will make it Federally enforceable.

In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule

without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no relevant adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Comments on this action must be received in writing by February 11, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to Wayne Kaiser, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Wayne Kaiser at (913) 551-7603.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** See the information provided in the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: December 7, 1999.

**William Rice,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region VII.*  
[FR Doc. 00-356 Filed 1-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-U**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 257 and 258

[FRL-6521-3]

#### Adequacy of State Permit Programs Under RCRA Subtitle D

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing this action to streamline the approval process for specific state permit programs for solid waste disposal facilities other than municipal solid waste landfills (MSWLF) that receive conditionally exempt small quantity generator (CESQG) hazardous waste. States whose Subtitle D MSWLF permit programs or Subtitle C hazardous waste management programs have been reviewed and approved or authorized by the Agency are eligible for this streamlined approval process if their state programs require the disposal of CESQG hazardous waste

in suitable facilities. EPA is issuing an adequacy determination to the state programs for Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska.

Elsewhere in the final rule section of today's **Federal Register**, EPA is issuing a direct final rule that sets forth the Agency's determination of program adequacy. EPA views this as a noncontroversial action that declares that specific state programs for disposal of CESQG waste meet all of the statutory and regulatory needs set up under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Thus, we expect no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for this decision is in the preamble to the final rule of program adequacy. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further Agency action is needed. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and discuss the comments in a later final rule. This is your only chance to comment. If EPA receives relevant adverse comment concerning the adequacy of only certain state programs, the Agency's withdrawal of the direct final rule will only apply to those state programs. Comments on the inclusion or exclusion of one state permit program will not affect the timing of the decision on the other state permit programs.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before February 11, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Send or hand deliver an original and one copy of your comments referencing docket number R7/ARTD/SWPP-00-01 to: Region VII Information Resource Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 901 N. 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. Comments may also be submitted electronically through the Internet to: *r7-library@epa.gov*. Comments in electronic format should also be identified by the docket number listed above. All electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption.

You can view and copy documents pertaining to this regulatory docket in the Region VII Information Resource Center (Library), located on the Plaza Level at the address noted above. The Library is open to the public from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For general information, call (913) 551-7241 or TTY (913) 321-9516. For information on accessing paper and electronic copies of documents or supporting materials relating to the proposed rule, or for information on specific aspects of this rule, contact Wes Bartley, U.S. EPA

Region VII, ARTD/SWPP, 901 N. 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101, phone (913) 551-7632, or by e-mail at *bartley.wes@epa.gov*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The official record for this action will be kept in paper form. Therefore, EPA will transfer all comments received electronically into paper form and place them in the official record, which will also include all comments submitted directly in writing. The official record is the paper record kept at the address in **ADDRESSES** at the beginning of this document.

EPA responses to comments, whether the comments are written or electronic, will be in a document in the **Federal Register** or in a response to comments document placed in the official record for this rulemaking. EPA will not immediately reply to commenters electronically other than to seek clarification of electronic comments that may be garbled in transmission or during conversion to paper form, as discussed above.

#### Background

As set out in detail in the related direct final rule, EPA has decided that specific state permit programs for facilities receiving CESQG waste meet the needs for program approval under RCRA section 4005(c)(1)(C). Today's document applies to the state programs for Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. Programs developed by these states for permitting either hazardous waste facilities or MSWLF have been reviewed and approved or authorized by the Agency. The regulatory programs are more comprehensive and/or more stringent than the federal revised criteria for facilities receiving CESQG hazardous waste. The Agency has found that the above states have already submitted the documentation that would have been needed for the determination of permit program adequacy under RCRA section 4005(c)(1)(C). Further, the Agency has found that the technical review conducted for either approval or authorization can substitute for the technical review of the standards for the federal revised criteria.

#### Additional Information

For more information, see the corresponding direct final rule published elsewhere in the rule section of this **Federal Register**. If you wish to comment, you should review the more detailed discussion in that section of today's **Federal Register**.

**Authority:** This document is issued under the authority of sections 2002 and 4005 of the