

States, the proposed AD would require modification of the wiring for certain hydraulic fire shutoff valves to the right engine to prevent chafing. This modification entails the installation of protective conduits for wire bundles 626VB and 628VB; re-routing these wire bundles and wire bundle 632VB; and changing the arrangement of the clamps that attach all of these wire bundles to the airplane structure. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously.

#### Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 20 Airbus Model A310 series airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

It is estimated that it would take approximately 4 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Required parts would be provided by the manufacturer at no cost to operators. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$4,800, or \$240 per airplane.

The 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.

#### Regulatory Impact

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. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

#### **§ 39.13 [Amended]**

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

Airbus Industrie: Docket 96-NM-169-AD.

*Applicability:* Model A310 series airplanes as listed in Airbus Service Bulletin A310-24-2065, November 30, 1995, and Revision 1, dated April 19, 1996; 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 chafing of wire bundles for the hydraulic fire shutoff valves to the right engine, which could lead to short circuiting of this wiring and the consequent inability to close these valves in the event of fire, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 60 days after the effective date of this AD, modify the wiring for the hydraulic fire shutoff valves in wire bundles 626VB and 628VB, and modify wire bundle 632VB, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A310-24-2065, dated November 30, 1995, or Revision 1, dated April 19, 1996, as applicable.

(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, 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 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

(c) 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 January 16, 1997.

S.R. Miller,

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

[FR Doc. 97-1619 Filed 1-24-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

#### **14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 96-NM-244-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### **Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series Airplanes and C-9 (Military) 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 certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and C-9 (military) series airplanes. This proposal would require eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the frame-to-longeron attachment area, the frame-to-skin shear clips at certain fuselage stations, and the fuselage bulkhead at the front spar of the engine pylon in the aft fuselage; and repair, if necessary. This proposal also would require certain modifications, which, when accomplished, would terminate the requirement for inspections. This proposal is prompted by reports indicating that fatigue cracking has occurred at those areas. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such fatigue cracking, which could cause damage to adjacent structure and result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by February 24, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96-NM-244-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 McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Department C1-L51 (2-60). This information may be examined 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.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Wahib Mina, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM-120L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627-5324; fax (310) 627-5210.

**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 96-NM-244-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.

96-NM-244-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

**Discussion**

On May 8, 1996, the FAA issued AD 96-10-11, amendment 39-9618 (61 FR 24675, May 16, 1996), which requires, among other actions, a one-time visual inspection to detect fatigue cracking of the frame-to-longeron attachment area and frame-to-skin shear clips in the aft fuselage. It also requires an eventual modification (within 86,000 total landings) that entails installing formers, plates, doublers, and angles at certain fuselage stations, and installation of a doubler, splice, filler, and strap on the fuselage bulkhead at the front spar of the engine pylon of the aft fuselage. Those actions are required to be accomplished in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletins DC9-53-140, Revision 03, dated March 12, 1986; and DC9 53-150, Revision 2, dated February 27, 1991. That AD was prompted by reports indicating that fatigue cracking had occurred in the frame-to-longeron attachment area, the frame-to-skin shear clips of certain fuselage stations, and the fuselage bulkhead at the front spar of the engine pylon of the aft fuselage. That AD was issued to prevent degradation in the structural capabilities of the airplane.

However, after the release of McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletins DC9-53-140, Revision 03, and DC9 53-150, Revision 2, the manufacturer conducted additional fatigue analyses of the same frame-to-longeron attachment area, the frame-to-skin shear clips at certain fuselage locations, and the fuselage bulkhead at the front spar of the engine pylon of the aft fuselage. The analyses revealed that a one-time visual inspection is not an effective method of detecting fatigue cracking in this case, and that repetitive inspections using a more comprehensive inspection method are necessary. Subsequently, the manufacturer developed eddy current inspection procedures to ensure that such fatigue cracking is identified and corrected before it reaches critical lengths.

Upon consideration of these new data, the FAA finds that the one-time visual inspection required by AD 96-10-11 is not adequate to detect fatigue cracking in a timely manner. Such fatigue cracking, if not detected and corrected in a timely manner, could cause damage to the adjacent structure, and, consequently, result in loss of the capability of the engine pylon to support engine loads and possible separation of the engine from the airplane.

**Explanation of Relevant Service Information**

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140, Revision 05, dated February 15, 1996, which describes procedures for repetitive eddy current inspections to detect fatigue cracking in the longeron-to-frame attachment area and frame-to-skin shear clips of certain fuselage stations, and repair, if necessary. That service bulletin also describes procedures for a modification that entails installing formers, plates, doublers, and angles at certain fuselage stations.

Additionally, the FAA previously reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9 53-150, Revision 2, dated February 27, 1991, which describes procedures for visual and eddy current inspections to detect cracks in the fuselage bulkhead at the front spar of the engine pylon of the aft fuselage, and repair, if necessary. That service bulletin also describes procedures for a modification that entails installing a doubler, splice, filler, and strap on the fuselage bulkhead of the front spar of the engine pylon.

Accomplishment of the described modifications eliminates the need to repeat the visual and eddy current inspections.

(McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletins DC9-53-140, Revision 03, and DC9 53-150, Revision 2, were referenced in AD 96-10-11 as appropriate sources of service information.)

**Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule**

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would require repetitive visual and eddy current inspections to detect fatigue cracking of the frame-to-longeron attachment area and frame-to-skin shear clips and the fuselage bulkhead of the front spar of the engine pylon, and repair, if necessary. The eddy current inspections described in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140, Revision 05, must be accomplished prior to or in conjunction with the visual and eddy current inspections described in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin 53-150, Revision 2, for all airplanes that are specified in the effectivity listing of both of these service bulletins.

This proposed AD also would require eventual modifications that entail installing formers, plates, doublers, and angles at certain fuselage stations; and

installing a doubler, splice, filler, and a strap on the fuselage bulkhead of the front spar of the engine pylon. These modifications would constitute terminating action for the required repetitive inspections.

The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously.

#### Cost Impact

There are approximately 569 McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 403 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 inspections, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of these inspections on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$145,080, or \$360 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The FAA estimates that it would take approximately 174 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed modification of longeron-to-frame attachment area and the frame-to-skin shear clips of the aft fuselage. The cost of required parts would differ, depending on whether the airplane is categorized as a Group 1 airplane or a Group 2 airplane, as defined in the applicable service bulletin. Required parts would cost approximately \$13,669 per airplane for Group 1 airplanes, and \$10,285 per airplane for Group 2 airplanes. Based on these figures, the cost impact of this modification on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$24,109 per airplane for Group 1 airplanes, and \$20,725 per airplane for Group 2 airplanes.

The FAA estimates that it would take approximately 229 work hours per airplane for Group 1 airplanes, and 137 work hours per airplane for Group 2 airplanes, to accomplish the proposed modification of the fuselage bulkhead at the front spar of the engine pylon of the aft fuselage. Required parts would cost approximately \$5,871 per airplane for Group 1 airplanes, and \$5,014 per airplane for Group 2 airplanes. Based on these figures, the cost impact of this modification on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$19,611 per airplane for Group 1 airplanes, and \$13,234 per airplane for Group 2 airplanes.

The cost impact figures discussed above are 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.

#### Regulatory Impact

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. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

#### **§ 39.13 [Amended]**

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

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 96-NM-244-AD.

*Applicability:* Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, -50 series airplanes, and C-9 (military) 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 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 (g) 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 ensure that fatigue cracking of the frame-to-longeron attachment area and the frame-to-skin shear clips in the aft fuselage is detected and corrected in a timely manner so as to prevent damage to adjacent structure, which could result in loss of the capability of the engine pylon to support engine loads and possible separation of the engine from the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) For airplanes that are specified in both McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140, Revision 05, dated February 15, 1996, and McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-150, Revision 2, dated February 27, 1991: Prior to the accumulation of 30,000 total landings or within 4,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, accomplish the requirements of paragraph (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD. The requirements of paragraph (a)(1) of this AD must be accomplished prior to or in conjunction with the requirements of paragraph (a)(2) of this AD.

(1) Perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the longeron-to-frame attachment area and frame-to-skin shear clips of the aft fuselage, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140, Revision 05, dated February 15, 1996. If no cracking is detected, repeat these inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 12,500 landings, until the modification specified in paragraph (f)(1) of this AD is accomplished.

(2) Perform a visual and eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the fuselage bulkhead at the front spar of the engine pylon of the aft fuselage, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9 53-150, Revision 2, dated February 27, 1991. If no cracking is detected, repeat these inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 4,000 landings, until the modification specified in paragraph (f)(2) of this AD is accomplished.

(b) For airplanes listed in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140 that have been previously inspected using visual inspection techniques in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Corrosion Prevention Control Program (CPCP), Document MDC-K4606, Revision 1, dated December 1990: Within 8,500 landings after the previous visual inspection or within 4,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, accomplish the requirements of paragraph (a)(1) of this AD.

(c) For airplanes that are specified in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140, Revision 05, dated February 15, 1996, and not subject to paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD: Prior to the accumulation of 30,000 total landings or within 4,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform an eddy

current inspection to detect cracking of the longeron-to-frame attachment area and frame-to-skin shear clips of the aft fuselage, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140, Revision 05, dated February 15, 1996. If no cracking is detected, repeat these inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 12,500 landings, until the modification specified in paragraph (f)(1) of this AD is accomplished.

(d) For airplanes that are specified in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-150, Revision 2, dated February 27, 1991, and not subject to paragraph (a) of this AD: Prior to the accumulation of 30,000 total landings or within 4,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a visual and eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the fuselage bulkhead at the front spar of the engine pylon of the aft fuselage, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9 53-150, Revision 2, dated February 27, 1991. If no cracking is detected, repeat these inspections thereafter at intervals not to exceed 4,000 landings, until the modifications required by paragraph (f)(2) of this AD is accomplished.

(e) If any cracking is detected during any inspection required by this AD: Prior to further flight, repair the cracking in accordance with either McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140, Revision 05, dated February 15, 1996; or McDonnell Douglas DC-9 Service Bulletin 53-150, Revision 2, dated February 27, 1991; as applicable. Thereafter, perform the inspections required by paragraph (a) of this AD.

(f) Prior to the accumulation of 86,000 total landings, or within 4 years after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, accomplish the requirements of paragraphs (f)(1) and paragraph (f)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For airplanes that are subject to the requirements of paragraph (a), (b), or (c) of this AD: Accomplish the modification of the longeron-to-frame attachment area and frame-to-skin shear clips, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140, Revision 05, dated February 15, 1996. Accomplishment of this modification constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of paragraphs (a)(1), (b), and (c) of this AD.

(2) For airplanes that are subject to the requirements of paragraph (a)(2) or (d) of this AD: Accomplish the modification of the fuselage bulkhead at the front spar of the engine pylon of the aft fuselage, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9 53-150, Revision 2, dated February 27, 1991. Accomplishment of this modification constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of paragraphs (a)(2) and (d) of this AD.

(g) Accomplishment of the requirements of this AD constitutes terminating action for the requirements of AD 96-10-11, amendment 39-9618, which requires modifications as specified in McDonnell Douglas Report No. MDC K1572, "DC-9/MD-80 Aging Aircraft Service Action Requirements Document" (SARD), Revision B, dated January 15, 1993.

(Both McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-53-140, Revision 03, dated March 12, 1986; and McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9 53-150, Revision 2, dated February 27, 1991; are specified in that Douglas report.)

(h) 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 Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), 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, 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.

(i) 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 January 16, 1997.

S.R. Miller,

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*  
[FR Doc. 97-1620 Filed 1-24-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

#### 14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 97-AGL-2]

#### Removal of Class D Airspace; Glenview, IL

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This notice proposes to remove Class D airspace at Glenview, IL. This airspace is removed due to the closing of the Air Traffic Control Tower at Glenview CGAF, Glenview, IL. The airspace reverts to Class E5 Chicago, IL. The intended affect of this proposal is to provide an accurate description of controlled airspace for Glenview, IL.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before March 27, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, AGL-7, Rules Docket No. 97-AGL-2, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018.

The official docket may be examined in the Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois. An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the Air Traffic Division, Operations Branch,

Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John A. Clayborn, Air Traffic Division, Operations Branch, AGL-530, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018, telephone (847) 294-7558.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal.

Communications should identify the airspace docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Airspace Docket No. 97-AGL-2." The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter. All communications received on or before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available for examination in the Rules Docket, FAA, Great Lakes Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois, both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

##### Availability of NPRM's

Any person may obtain a copy of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Public Affairs, Attention: Public Inquiry Center, APA-230, 800 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20591, or by calling (202) 267-3484.

Communications must identify the notice number of this NPRM. Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRM's should also