

Issued in Washington, DC on December 8, 1995.

Christine A. Ervin,
Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and
Renewable Energy.

10 CFR Part 440—Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons

Under the authority of 42 U.S.C. 6861–6871 and 42 U.S.C. 7191, the interim final rule amending 10 CFR Part 440, which was published on June 5, 1995 (60 FR 29469), is adopted as a final rule without change.

[FR Doc. 95–30591 Filed 12–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 25

[Docket No. NM–112; Special Conditions
No. 25–ANM–108]]

Special Conditions: Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation, Model Gulfstream V, High Altitude Operations

AGENCY: Federal Aviation
Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final special conditions;
correction.

SUMMARY: In the October 17, 1995, issue of the Federal Register, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) published final special conditions No. 25–ANM–108 for the Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation, Model Gulfstream V airplane (High Altitude Operations). The special conditions as published contain two errors; an incorrect paragraph reference, and a mistype made by the Federal Register. This document corrects those errors.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 16, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gerald Lakin, FAA, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056, telephone (206) 227–1187.

Adoption of the Correction

Special Conditions No 25–ANM–108, published in the Federal Register on October 17, 1995 (60 FR 53691) is corrected as follows:

On page 53691, column 3, under “Novel or Unusual Design Features,” paragraph 4, second sentence, remove “grown” and substitute “growth” in its place.

On page 53693, column 3, under “4 Pressurization,” subparagraph (c),

remove the reference to “paragraphs d.1. and d.2.” and substitute “paragraph 4(a) and 4(b)” in its place.

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

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane
Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service,
ANM–100.

[FR Doc. 95–30552 Filed 12–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–NM–75–AD; Amendment
39–9450; AD 95–25–05]

Airworthiness Directives; Beech Model 400A Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation
Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Beech Model 400A airplanes, that requires an inspection to verify if the securing rivet is installed on the rod end of the control push rods of the spoiler flight control system, an inspection to verify if the jam nut is secure on the opposite end of the rod end, and repair of any discrepancy. This amendment is prompted by a report of loss of roll control on the co-pilot’s control wheel shortly after takeoff due to a rivet missing from the control push rod. The actions specified by this AD are intended to ensure that the push rod rivets are installed. Missing control push rod rivets could result in the disengagement of the push rod end from the push rod tube; this could lead to loss of roll control and subsequent reduced controllability of the airplane after takeoff.

DATES: Effective January 16, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of January 16, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Beech Aircraft Corporation, Commercial Service Department, P.O. Box 85, Wichita, Kansas 67201–0085. 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, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, Small Airplane Directorate, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North

Capitol Street, NW., suite 700,
Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Larry Engler, Aerospace Engineer,
Airframe Branch, ACE–118W, FAA,
Wichita Aircraft Certification Office,
Small Airplane Directorate, 1801
Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent
Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209;
telephone (316) 946–4122; fax (316)
946–4407.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A

proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Beech Model 400A airplanes was published in the Federal Register on August 10, 1995 (60 FR 40782). That action proposed to require a one-time detailed visual inspection to verify if the securing rivet is installed on the push rods of the spoiler flight control system. That action also proposed to require an inspection to verify if the jam nut is secure on the opposite rod end, and repair of any discrepancy.

No comments were submitted in response to the proposal or the FAA’s determination of the cost to the public. The FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

There are approximately 96 Model 400A airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 73 airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 8 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$35,040, or \$480 per airplane.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

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