regional voting. Pursuant to section 4.15 of the Act, there would continue to be only one nominating committee for an association, who would ''endeavor to assure representation to all sections of the association territory and as nearly as possible to all types of agriculture practiced within the area.'' Both association nominating committees and BCs must assure that there are at least two nominees for each elective office to be filled. Nominations for association directors will continue to be accepted from the floor and may be made by any eligible voting shareholder, whether or not he or she resides in the nominee's region, unless the bylaws provide otherwise. In addition, each director would continue to owe a fiduciary duty to all the shareholders of the association, not just to the shareholders in his/her region.

Finally, the FCA has received a request from one System association to propose amendments to the regulations that would extend regional voting to elections of Farm Credit Bank directors and make changes regarding the cumulative voting requirement. The FCA is considering this request and seeks comment on whether other System institutions, shareholders, or members of the public share the requester's same interest.

It is the FCA's view that this proposed regulation is consistent with the FCA Board's Policy Statement on Regulatory Philosophy and achieves the statement's objectives of: (1) Addressing specifically identified risks in a way that causes the least burden for institutions; (2) formulating regulations that are clear and easy to understand; and (3) providing flexibility to institutions in their election procedures.

**List of Subjects**

*12 CFR Part 615*

Accounting, Agriculture, Banks, banking, Government securities, Investments, Rural areas.

*12 CFR Part 620*

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

For the reasons stated in the preamble, parts 615 and 620 of chapter VI, title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations are proposed to be amended to read as follows:

## PART 615—FUNDING AND FISCAL AFFAIRS, LOAN POLICIES AND OPERATIONS, AND FUNDING OPERATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 615 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** Secs. 1.5, 1.7, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.12, 3.1, 3.7, 3.11, 3.25, 4.3, 4.9, 4.14B, 4.25, 5.9, 5.17, 6.20, 6.26, 8.0, 8.4, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8, 8.10, 8.12 of the Farm Credit Act (12 U.S.C. 2013, 2015, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2093, 2122, 2128, 2132, 2146, 2154, 2160, 2202b, 2211, 2243, 2252, 2278b, 2278b-6, 2279aa, 2279aa-4, 2279aa-6, 2279aa-7, 2279aa-8, 2279aa-10, 2279aa-12); sec. 301(a) of Pub. L. 100–233, 101 Stat. 1568, 1608.

### Subpart I—Issuance of Equities

2. Section 615.5230 is amended by adding a new paragraph (a)(1)(iii) and revising paragraphs (a)(1)(ii) and (a)(3) to read as follows:

**§ 615.5230 Implementation of cooperative principles.**

(a) * * *

(1) * * *

(i) * * *

(ii) Unless regional election of directors is provided for in the bylaws pursuant to § 615.5230(a)(3), be accorded the right to vote in the election of each director (except for a director that is elected by the other directors);

(iii) Unless regional election of directors is provided for in the bylaws, or unless otherwise provided in the bylaws, be allowed to cumulate such votes and distribute them among the candidates in the shareholder's discretion.

(2) * * *

(3) Regional election of directors is permitted under the following conditions:

(i) A bylaw establishing regional elections is approved by a majority of voting shareholders, voting in person or by proxy;

(ii) The bylaw provides for the apportionment of the institution's territory into voting regions with an approximately equal number of voting shareholders and ensures equitable representation from each voting region by means of an annual evaluation by the institution's board of directors; and

(iii) If there is a bylaw providing for shareholder removal of directors, it provides that all voting shareholders of the institution, whether or not they reside in the director's region, have the right to vote to remove each director.

* * * * *

## PART 620—DISCLOSURE TO SHAREHOLDERS

3. 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

**§ 620.21 [Amended]**

4. Section 620.21 is amended by adding the words ''or elected'' after the word ''nominated'' in the first sentence of paragraph (d)(1).

Dated: June 6, 1995.

**Floyd Fithian,**

*Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.*

[FR Doc. 95–14217 Filed 6–8–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6705–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Federal Aviation Administration

## 14 CFR Part 39

**[Docket No. 94–NM–243–AD]**

## Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 and A300–600 Series Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes the supersedure of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to all Airbus Model A300 series airplanes, that currently requires repetitive inspections for cracking of the No. 2 flap beams, and replacement of the flap beams, if necessary. That AD was prompted by reports of cracking of the No. 2 flap beams. This action would provide optional modifications for extending certain inspection thresholds, and an optional terminating modification for certain inspections. This action also would expand the applicability of the existing AD to include Model A300–600 series airplanes. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent asymmetry of the flaps due to cracking of the No. 2 flap beams.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by July 21, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94–NM–243–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:** Tim Backman, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120S, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2776; fax (206) 227–1181.

**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 94–NM–243–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. 94–NM–243–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

## Discussion

On March 25, 1985, the FAA issued AD 85–07–04, amendment 39–5027 (49 FR 45755, April 2, 1985), applicable to all Airbus A300 series airplanes, to require repetitive inspections for cracking of the No. 2 flap beams, and replacement of the flap beams, if necessary. That action was prompted by reports of cracking detected in the No. 2 flap beams. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent asymmetry of the flaps due to cracking in the No. 2 flap beams.

Since the issuance of that AD, Airbus has issued the following service bulletin revisions for Model A300 series airplanes:

1. Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–116, Revision 6, dated July 16, 1993, which describes procedures for repetitive ultrasonic inspections for cracking in the base member and side members of the No. 2 flap beams, and replacement of the beams, if necessary. (Revision 1 of this service bulletin was referenced in the existing AD.)

2. Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–128, Revision 3, dated January 26, 1990, which describes procedures for optional modification of the No. 2 flap beams (Modification 4740). This modification entails performing an eddy current inspection of the bolt holes of the flap beam and oversizing these holes. Accomplishment of this modification will provide a new flight cycle threshold before the next inspection is necessary. (The original issue of this service bulletin was referenced in the existing AD.)

3. Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–141, Revision 7, dated July 16, 1993, which describes a second optional modification (Modification 5815). This modification will extend the fatigue life of the flap beams. The modification involves cold working and increasing the size of the bolt holes, and installing interference fit bolts. As with Modification 4740, accomplishment of Modification 5815 will provide a new flight cycle threshold before the next inspection is necessary.

Since Model A300–600 series airplanes are similar in design to Model A300 series airplanes in the subject area, the Model A300–600 is subject to the same addressed unsafe condition. Accordingly, Airbus has issued the following service bulletins that apply to Model A300–600 series airplanes:

1. Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–6005, Revision 2, dated December 16, 1993, which describes procedures for repetitive ultrasonic inspections for cracking in the base member and side members of the No. 2 flap beams. (These inspections are identical to the inspections specified for Model A300 series airplanes in Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–116.)

2. Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–6006, Revision 4, dated July 25, 1994, which describes procedures for installing Modification 5815. This modification entails increasing the size of and cold working certain holes in the No. 2 flap beams. Once accomplished, this modification increases the life of the flap beam and eliminates the need for repetitive inspections, if it is accomplished after 15,000 total landings have been accumulated and if no cracking is detected while performing the inspections described in Airbus Service Bulletin No. A300–57–6005, Revision 2, dated December 16, 1993.

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, has approved these service bulletins, and has issued French airworthiness directive 86–187–076(B)R3, dated March 2, 1994, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

These airplane models are manufactured in France and are type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 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.

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 85–07–04 to continue to require repetitive inspections for cracking of the No. 2 flap beams of Model A300 series airplanes, and replacement of the flap beams, if necessary. The proposed AD would require identical inspections of Model A300–600 series airplanes. The proposed AD also would provide an optional terminating modification for the repetitive inspections on the Model 300–600 series airplanes, and optional modifications for extending certain inspection thresholds for Model A300 series airplanes. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously.

As a result of recent communications with the Air Transport Association (ATA) of America, the FAA has learned that, in general, some operators may misunderstand the legal effect of AD's on airplanes that are identified in the applicability provision of the AD, but that have been altered or repaired in the area addressed by the AD. The FAA points out that all airplanes identified in the applicability provision of an AD are legally subject to the AD. If an airplane

has been altered or repaired in the affected area in such a way as to affect compliance with the AD, the owner or operator is required to obtain FAA approval for an alternative method of compliance with the AD, in accordance with the paragraph of each AD that provides for such approvals. A note has been included in this notice to clarify this long-standing requirement.

The FAA estimates that 68 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 6 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $24,480, or $360 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The total cost impact figure discussed above is 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.

Should an operator of a Model A300–600 series airplane elect to accomplish the optional terminating action rather than continue the repetitive inspections, it would take approximately 55 work hours to accomplish it, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the optional terminating action would be $3,300 per airplane.

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. 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 removing amendment 39–5027 (49 FR 45755, April 2, 1985), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

**Airbus Industrie:** Docket 94–NM–243–AD. Supersedes AD 85–07–04, Amendment 39–5027.

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

**Note 1:** This AD applies to each airplane 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 airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (f) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

*Compliance:* Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent asymmetry of the No. 2 flaps, accomplish the following:

**Note 2:** Paragraph (a) of this AD restates the requirement for an initial and repetitive inspections contained in paragraph A. of AD 85–07–04. Therefore, for operators who have previously accomplished at least the initial inspection in accordance with AD 85–07–04, paragraph (a) of this AD requires that the next scheduled inspection be performed within the intervals specified in (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3), as applicable, after the last inspection performed in accordance with paragraph A. of AD 85–07–04.

**Note 3:** Measurement of crack length is performed by measurement of the probe displacement (perpendicular to symmetry plane of beam) between defect indication appearance and its complete disappearance. The bolt hole indication should not be interpreted as an indication of a defect. These two indications appear very close together because the defects originate from the bolt holes.

(a) For Model A300 series airplanes: Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 total landings, or within the next 120 days after May 9, 1985 (the effective date of AD 85–07–04, amendment 39–5027), whichever occurs later, inspect for cracking of the base steel member and light alloy side members of the No. 2 flap beams, left hand and right hand, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–116, Revision No. 6, dated July 16, 1993.

**Note 4:** Inspections required by paragraph (a) of this AD that have been accomplished prior to the effective date of this AD in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–116, Revision 1, dated August 27, 1983; Revision 2, dated April 24, 1984; Revision 3, dated July 20, 1984; Revision 4, dated August 13, 1986; or Revision 5, dated July 10, 1989; as applicable; are considered acceptable for compliance with the applicable action specified in this amendment.

(1) If no cracking is detected: Except as provided by paragraph (c) of this AD, repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 1,700 landings until the requirements of paragraph (b) of this AD are accomplished.

(2) If any crack is detected that is less than or equal to 4 mm: Repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 250 landings, until the requirements of paragraph (b) of this AD are accomplished.

(3) If any crack is detected that exceeds 4 mm: Prior to further flight, replace the flap beam in accordance with the service bulletin, and prior to the accumulation of 15,000 flight cycles on the replaced flap beam, perform the ultrasonic inspection as required by paragraph (b) of this AD.

(b) For Model A300 series airplanes: Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 total landings, or within the next 1,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform an ultrasonic inspection to detect cracking of the No. 2 flap beams, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin No. A300–57–116, Revision 6, dated July 16, 1993. Accomplishment of this inspection terminates the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD.

(1) If no cracking is detected: Except as provided by paragraph (c) of this AD, repeat the ultrasonic inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 1,700 landings.

(2) If any crack is detected beyond the bolt hole, and that crack that is less than or equal to 4 mm in length: Repeat the ultrasonic inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 250 landings.

(3) If any crack is detected beyond the bolt hole and that crack is greater than 4 mm in length: Prior to further flight, replace the flap beam in accordance with the service bulletin, and prior to the accumulation of 15,000 flight cycles on the replaced flap beam, perform the ultrasonic inspection as required by this paragraph.

(c) For Model A300 series airplanes: After accomplishing the initial inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD, accomplishment of either paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) of this AD extends the fatigue life of the No. 2 flap track beam as specified in those paragraphs, provided that no cracking is detected during any inspection required by paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD.

(1) Removal of any damage and the installation of larger diameter bolts on the No. 2 flap track beam (Modification No. 4740), in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin No. A300–57–128, Revision 3, dated January 26, 1990, extends the interval for the first repetitive inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD from 1,700 landings to 12,000 landings, provided that Modification No. 4740 is accomplished prior to the accumulation of 16,700 total landings on the flap beams. Following accomplishment of the first repetitive inspection, subsequent repetitive inspections shall be performed at intervals not to exceed 1,700 landings. Or

(2) Cold working of the bolt holes and the installation of larger diameter bolts on the No. 2 flap track beam (Modification No. 5815), in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin No. A300–57–141, Revision 7, dated July 16, 1993, extends the interval for the first repetitive inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD from 1,700 landings to the interval specified in paragraph (c)(2)(i) or (c)(2)(ii) of this AD.

(i) If interference fit bolts that are 15/32-inch in diameter are fitted, the interval for the first repetitive inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD is extended to 22,000 landings, provided that Modification 5815 is accomplished prior to the accumulation of 16,700 total landings on the flap beam. Following accomplishment of the first repetitive inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD, subsequent repetitive inspections shall be performed at intervals not to exceed 1,700 landings. Or

(ii) If interference fit bolts that are 7/16- or 3/8-inch in diameter are fitted, the interval for the first repetitive inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD is extended to 33,000 landings, provided that Modification 5815 is accomplished prior to the accumulation of 16,700 total landings on the flap beam. Following accomplishment of the first repetitive inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD, subsequent repetitive inspections shall be performed at intervals not to exceed 1,700 landings.

(d) For Model A300–600 series airplanes: Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 total landings, or within the next 1,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform an ultrasonic inspection to detect cracking of the No. 2 flap track beams, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin No. A300–57–6005, Revision 2, dated December 16, 1993.

(1) If no cracking is detected, repeat the ultrasonic inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 1,700 landings.

(2) If any crack is detected beyond the bolt hole and that crack that is less than or equal to 4 mm in length: Repeat the ultrasonic inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 250 landings.

(3) If any crack is detected beyond the bolt hole and that crack is greater than 4 mm in length: Prior to further flight, replace the flap beam in accordance with the service bulletin, and prior to the accumulation of 15,000 landings on the replaced flap beam, perform the ultrasonic inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD.

(e) For Model A300–600 series airplanes: Installation of oversized transition fit bolts in cold-worked holes, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin No. A300–57–6006 (Modification 5815), Revision 4, dated July 25, 1994, constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of paragraph (d) of this AD, provided that no cracking is detected during any inspection required by paragraph (d) of this AD, and provided that the installation is accomplished prior to the accumulation of 15,000 total landings. If any bolt requires oversizing above 7/16-inch diameter during accomplishment of this installation, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

**Note 5**: If Airbus Service Bulletin No. A300–57–6005, Revision 2, dated December 16, 1993, is accomplished concurrently with Airbus Service Bulletin No. A300–57–6006 , Revision 3, dated December 16, 1993 (Modification 5815), the ultrasonic inspection for cracking required by paragraph (d) of this AD need not be performed since the eddy current inspection detailed for Modification 5815 is more comprehensive.

(f) 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 6:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM–113.

(g) 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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on June 5, 1995.

**Darrell M. Pederson,**

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

[FR Doc. 95–14168 Filed 6–8–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

## 14 CFR Part 39

**[Docket No. 94–NM–184–AD]**

## Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAC 1–11 200 and 400 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 British Aerospace Model BAC 1–11 200 and 400 series airplanes. This proposal would require various repetitive inspections to detect cracks in certain panels of the lower skin of the wing, and in certain fixed ribs of the leading edge of the wing. This proposal would also require repair or replacement of cracked parts, which would terminate certain repetitive inspections. This proposal is prompted by reports of cracking in certain panels of the lower skin of the wing, and in certain fixed ribs of the leading edge of the wing due to fatigue-related stress. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to ensure the structural integrity of the wing by detecting fatigue-related cracking in a timely manner in the panels of the lower skin of the wing or in the fixed ribs of the leading edge of the wing.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by July 21, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94–NM–184–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 British Aerospace, Airbus Limited, P.O. Box 77, Bristol BS99 7AR, England. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William Schroeder, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2148; fax (206) 227–1149.