not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

The FAA has determined that this regulation is an emergency regulation that must be issued immediately to correct an unsafe condition in aircraft, and that it is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866. It has been determined further that this action involves an emergency regulation under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979). If it is determined that this emergency regulation otherwise would be significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures, a final regulatory evaluation will be prepared and placed in the Rules Docket. A copy of it, if filed, may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 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 USC 106(g), 40101, 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

95–24–14 De Havilland, Inc.: Amendment 39–9444. Docket 95–NM–219–AD.

Applicability: Model DHC–8 series airplanes, serial numbers 003 through 403 inclusive; and Model DHC–8 series airplanes on which a drag strut having serial numbers DEC 001/83 through DCL 432/94 inclusive is installed; as listed in Bombardier Service Bulletin S.B. 8–32–131, dated September 8, 1995; 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 (d) of this AD 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 failure of the pivot tube in the drag strut of the nose landing gear (NLG) and a subsequent nose gear-up landing, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 13,400 total landings on the drag strut assembly, or within 30 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later: Perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the pivot tube, part number (P/N) 8225–3, located in the drag strut of the NLG, in accordance with Bombardier Service Bulletin S.B. 8–32–131, dated September 8, 1995.

Note 2: The Bombardier service bulletin includes (as an attachment) Messier- Dowty Service Bulletin M-DT DHC8–32–77, dated July 5, 1995. The Messier-Dowty service bulletin details the specific procedures for accomplishment of the requirements of this AD.

(1) If no cracking is found, repeat the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed 2,000 landings.

(2) If any cracking is found that can be removed completely by reworking the pivot tube in accordance with the service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair the pivot tube in accordance with the service bulletin. Thereafter, repeat the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD at intervals not to exceed 1,000 landings.

(3) If any cracking is found that cannot be removed completely by reworking the pivot tube in accordance with the service bulletin, prior to further flight, accomplish paragraph (a)(3)(i) or (a)(3)(ii) of this AD in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) Replace the cracked pivot tube with a serviceable tube having P/N 8225–3. Thereafter, perform the repetitive inspections required by paragraph (a) of this AD. Or

(ii) Replace the cracked pivot tube with a new strengthened tube having P/N 8225–5. No further action is required by this AD.

(b) Replacement of a pivot tube having P/N 8225–3 with a pivot tube having P/N 8225–5 (de Havilland Modification 8/2266), in accordance with Bombardier Service Bulletin S.B. 8–32–131, dated September 8, 1995, constitutes terminating action for the inspection requirements of this AD.

(c) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install a drag strut assembly having serial numbers DEC 001/83 through DCL 432/94 inclusive on any airplane unless that assembly has been inspected and found to be crack-free, or unless that assembly has been inspected and repaired, in accordance with the requirements of this AD.

(d) 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, New York Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, New York ACO.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the New York ACO.

(e) 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.

(f) The actions shall be done in accordance with Bombardier Service Bulletin S.B. 8–32–131, dated September 8, 1995. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Bombardier, Inc., Bombardier Regional Aircraft Division, Garratt Boulevard, Downsview, Ontario M3K 1Y5, Canada. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, New York Aircraft Certification Office, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 10 Fifth Street, Third Floor, Valley Stream, New York; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(g) This amendment becomes effective on December 18, 1995.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 22, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–29329 Filed 11–30–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94–NM–244–AD; Amendment 39–9429; AD 95–23–09]

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10 Series Airplanes and KC–10A (Military) Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment supersedes an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10 series airplanes and KC–10A (military) airplanes, that currently requires the implementation of a program of structural inspections to detect and correct fatigue cracking in order to ensure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes as they approach the manufacturer's original fatigue design life goal. This amendment requires clarification of some Principle Structural Elements (PSE) and some

non-destructive inspection (NDI) procedures. This amendment is prompted by new data submitted by the manufacturer indicating that certain revisions to the program are necessary in order to clarify some PSE's and some NDI procedures. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent fatigue cracking that could compromise the structural integrity of these airplanes.

DATES: Effective January 2, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' Volume I, Revision 5, dated October 1994; Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994; and Volume III–94, dated November 1994, as listed in the regulations, is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of January 2, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' Volume I, Revision 3, dated December 1992, Volume II, Revision 3, dated December 1992, and Volume III–92, dated October 1992, as listed in the regulations, was approved previously by the Director of the Federal Register as of November 24, 1993 (58 FR 54949, October 25, 1993).

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, P.O. Box 1771, Long Beach, California 90846–1771, Attention: Business Unit Manager, Contract Data Management C1–255 (35–22). This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, Transport Airplane Directorate, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maureen Moreland, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627–5238; fax (310) 627–5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) by superseding AD 93–17–09, amendment 39–8680 (58 FR 54949, October 25, 1993), which is applicable to McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10 series airplanes and KC–10A (military) airplanes, was published as a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking in the Federal Register on September 7, 1995 (60 FR 46544). The action proposed to require the implementation of a program of structural inspections to detect and correct fatigue cracking in order to ensure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes as they approach the manufacturer's original fatigue design life goal.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

Several commenters support the proposed rule.

One commenter notes that Volume III–94 of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' dated November 1994 (referenced in the proposal as the appropriate source of service information) changed 18 Principle Structural Elements (PSE) from Fleet Leader Operator Sample (FLOS) inspections to Fleet Leader Sample (FLS) inspections. The commenter states that these changes were made because operators submitted an insufficient number of results from FLOS inspections. The commenter requests that, in future revisions of the document, these FLS inspections be changed to 100 percent inspections, which would simplify scheduling and be more cost effective.

The FAA does not concur with the commenter's request to change FLS inspections to 100 percent inspections. The FAA finds that Volume III–94 of the SID changed eight PSE's from FLOS inspections to FLS inspections because of a decrease in the sample size (i.e., fewer Model DC–10 series airplanes in the SID program). The inspections in the McDonnell Douglas SID programs were established using specific criteria for determining whether a PSE should be defined as FLOS, FLS, or 100 percent. The manufacturer established these criteria only after extensive and detailed consultations with large numbers of operators and with the FAA. Because of the decrease in sample size, these PSE's meet the criteria of FLS, but not that of FLOS or 100 percent. The 100 percent inspection is only applicable if an insufficient number of samples exists in the sample size to utilize sampling concepts.

One operator requests that the proposed rule be revised to include provisions for operators that combine fleets with other operators under the same maintenance program. The FAA does not concur. The FAA does not consider it appropriate to include various provisions in an AD applicable to a single operator's unique use of its airplanes. Paragraph (d) of this AD provides for the approval of alternative methods of compliance to address these types of unique circumstances. Further, this commenter does not compile sufficient data for each of its airplanes so that an individual airplane's age and inspection requirements can be adequately evaluated.

One commenter requests that the reporting requirement in proposed paragraph (b)(4) be revised to clarify that ''all inspection results (negative or positive)'' includes reporting the results of findings of discrepancies. The FAA does not concur. Section 2 of Volume III–94 of the SID provides detailed instructions for reporting the results of all inspection findings, including findings of discrepancies.

After careful review of the available data, including the comments noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

There are approximately 419 Model DC–10 series airplanes and KC–10A (military) airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 249 airplanes of U.S. registry and 13 U.S. operators will be affected by this AD.

The incorporation of the SID program into an operator's maintenance program, as required by AD 93–17–09, takes approximately 1,270 work hours (per operator), at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost to the 13 affected U.S. operators to incorporate the SID program is estimated to be $990,600.

The incorporation of the revised procedures in this AD action will take approximately 20 additional work hours per operator to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost to the 13 affected U.S. operators to incorporate these revised procedures into the SID program into an operator's maintenance program is estimated to be $15,600, or $1,200 per operator.

The recurring inspection costs, as required by AD 93–17–09, are estimated to be 365 work hours per airplane per year, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the recurring inspection costs required by AD 93–17–09 are estimated to be $21,900 per airplane, or $5,453,100 for the affected U.S. fleet.

Since no new recurring inspection procedures have been added to the program by this new AD action, there is no additional economic burden on affected operators to perform any additional recurrent inspections.

Based on the above figures, the cost impact of this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $5,468,700 for the first year, and $5,453,100 for each year thereafter. These ''cost impact'' figures assume that no operator has yet accomplished any of the requirements of this AD. However, it can be reasonably assumed that a majority of the affected operators have already initiated the SID program (as required by AD 93–17–09).

Additionally, the number of required work hours for each inspection (and the SID program), as indicated above, is presented as if the accomplishment of those actions were to be conducted as ''stand alone'' actions. However, in actual practice, these actions for the most part will be accomplished coincidentally or in combination with normally scheduled airplane inspections and other maintenance program tasks. Therefore, the actual number of necessary additional work hours will be minimal in many instances. Further, any costs associated with special airplane scheduling can be expected to be minimal.

The regulations adopted herein will 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 final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) 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 final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 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 USC 106(g), 40101, 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39–8680 (58 FR 54949, October 25, 1993), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), amendment 39–9429, to read as follows:

95–23–09 McDonnell Douglas: Amendment 39–9429. Docket 94–NM–244–AD. Supersedes AD 93–17–09, Amendment 39–8680.

Applicability: Model DC–10 series airplanes and KC–10A (military) airplanes, certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To ensure the continuing structural integrity of these airplanes, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 6 months after November 24, 1993 (the effective date of AD 93–17–09, amendment 39–8680), incorporate a revision into the FAA-approved maintenance inspection program which provides for inspection(s) of the Principal Structural Elements (PSE's) defined in Section 2 of Volume I of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' Revision 3, dated December 1992, in accordance with Section 2 of Volume III–92, dated October 1992, of the SID. The non-destructive inspection (NDI) techniques set forth in Section 2 and Section 4 of Volume II, Revision 3, dated December 1992, of the SID provide acceptable methods for accomplishing the inspections required by this paragraph. All inspection results (negative or positive) must be reported to McDonnell Douglas, in accordance with the instructions contained in Section 2 of Volume III–92, dated October 1992, of the SID. Information collection requirements contained in this regulation have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120–0056.

(1) For those Fleet Leader Operator Sampling (FLOS) PSE's that do not have a Normal Maintenance Visual Inspection specified in Section 4 of Volume II, Revision 3, dated December 1992, of the SID, the procedure for general visual inspection is as follows: Perform an inspection of the general PSE area for cleanliness, presence of foreign objects, security of parts, cracks, corrosion, and damage.

(2) For PSE's 53.10.031E/.032E, 53.10.047E/.048E, and 57.10.029E/.030E: The ENDDATE for these PSE's is October 1993. (For these PSE's, disregard the June 1993 ENDDATE specified in Section 2 of Volume III–92, dated October 1992, of the SID.)

(b) Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the revision of the FAA-approved maintenance inspection program required by paragraph (a) of this AD with a revision that provides for inspection(s) of the PSE's defined in Section 2 of Volume I of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' Revision 5, dated October 1994, in accordance with Section 2 of Volume III–94, dated November 1994, of the SID. The NDI techniques set forth in Section 2 of Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994, of the SID provide acceptable methods for accomplishing the inspections required by this paragraph.

(1) Prior to reaching the threshold (N_{th}), but no earlier than one-half of the threshold (N_{th}/2), specified for all PSE's listed in Volume III–94, dated November 1994, of the SID, inspect each PSE sample in accordance with the NDI procedures set forth in Section 2 of Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994. Thereafter, repeat the inspection for that PSE at intervals not to exceed DNDI/2 of the NDI procedure that is specified in Volume III–94, dated November 1994, of the SID.

(2) This AD does not require visual inspections of FLOS PSE's on airplanes listed in Volume III–94, dated November 1994, of the SID planning data at least once during the specified inspection interval, in accordance with Section 2 of Volume III–94, dated November 1994, of the SID.

(3) For PSE's 53.10.055/.056E, 55.10.013/.014B, 53.10.005/.006E, 53.10.031/.032E, 53.10.047/.048E, 57.10.029/.030E: The EDATE for these PSE's is June 1998. (For these PSE's, disregard the June 1996 EDATE specified in Section 2, of Volume III–94, dated November 1994, of the SID.)

(4) All inspection results (negative or positive) must be reported to McDonnell Douglas in accordance with the instructions contained in Section 2 of Volume III–94, dated November 1994, of the SID. Information collection requirements contained in this regulation have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120–0056.

(c) Any cracked structure detected during the inspections required by paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD must be repaired before further flight, in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

Note 1: Requests for approval of any PSE repair that would affect the FAA-approved maintenance inspection program required by this AD should include a damage tolerance assessment for that PSE repair.

(d) (1) 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, Los Angeles ACO. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of

compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(2) Alternative methods of compliance previously granted for AD 93–17–09, amendment 39–8680, continue to be considered as acceptable alternative methods of compliance with this amendment.

(e) 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.

(f) The actions shall be done in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' Volume I, Revision 5, dated October 1994, Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994, and Volume III–94, dated November 1994; and McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' Volume I, Revision 3, dated December 1992, Volume II, Revision 3, dated December 1992, and Volume III–92, dated October 1992. The incorporation by reference of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' Volume I, Revision 5, dated October 1994, Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994, and Volume III–94, dated November 1994; which contains the following list of effective pages:

Volume number referenced and date	Page No.	Revision level shown on page	Date shown on page
I—All Series, Revision 5, October 1994	List of Effective Pages A, B, C, D, E, and F.	5	October 1994.
II—All Series, Revision 5, October 1994	List of Effective Pages A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J, K, L, M, N, O, and P.	5	October 1994.
III–94—All Series, Original November 1994	Entire Document	Original	November 1994.

The incorporation by reference of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' Volume I, Revision 5, dated October 1994, Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994, and Volume III–94, dated November 1994; is approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. The incorporation by reference of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26–012, ''DC–10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID),'' Volume I, Revision 3, dated December 1992, Volume II, Revision 3, dated December 1992, and Volume III–92, dated October 1992, was approved previously by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51 as of November 24, 1993 (58 FR 54949, October 25, 1993). Copies may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, P.O. Box 1771, Long Beach, California 90846–1771, Attention: Business Unit Manager, Contract Data Management C1–255 (35–22). Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(g) This amendment becomes effective on January 2, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 6, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–29328 Filed 11–30–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 95–AWP–23]

Establishment of Class E Airspace; Springerville, AZ

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action establishes a Class E airspace area at Springerville, AZ. The development of a Global Positioning System (GPS) Standard Instrument Approach Procedure (SIAP) to Runway (RWY) 21 has made this action necessary. The intended effect of this action is to provide adequate controlled airspace for Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) operations at Springerville/Babbitt Field Airport, Springerville, AZ.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 0901 UTC, February 29, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Speer, Airspace Specialist, System Management Branch, AWP 530, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region, Federal Aviation Administration, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California 90261, telephone (310) 725–6533.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

On October 10, 1995, the FAA proposed to amend part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) by establishing a Class E airspace area at Springerville, AZ (60 FR 52637). The development of a GPS SIAP at Springerville/Babbitt Field Airport has made this action necessary.

Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking proceeding by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. No comments to the proposal were received. Class E airspace designations are published in paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9C, dated August 17, 1995, and effective September 16, 1995, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. Class E airspace designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in this Order.

The Rule

This amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) establishes a Class E airspace area at Springerville, AZ. The development of a GPS SIAP at Springerville/Babbitt Field Airport has made this action necessary. The intended effect of this action is to provide adequate Class E airspace for aircraft executing the GPS RWY 21 SIAP at Springerville/Babbitt Field Airport, AZ.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this regulation (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 10034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a Regulatory Evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.