certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of § 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.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

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 require accomplishment of the actions specified in the AOT described previously.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 94 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 2 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspection, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $11,280, or $120 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: Docket 97–NM–337–AD.

Applicability: Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes on which any of the following Airbus service bulletins (or earlier versions) has been accomplished: A310–24–2067, Revision 1, dated March 18, 1997; A310–24–2072, Revision 1, dated February 4, 1997; A300–24–6058, Revision 1, dated January 23, 1997; or A300–24–6064, Revision 1, dated February 4, 1997; 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 and consequent damage to the electrical generation wires in the 101VU panel, which could result in a loss of electrical generation channels, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 400 flight hours or 60 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, perform a one-time, detailed visual inspection of the 101VU panel electrical bundles installation for any discrepancy, in accordance with Airbus All Operator Telex (AOT) 24–08, dated April 17, 1997. If any discrepancy is found, prior to further flight, correct the discrepancy in accordance with the AOT.

(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, International Branch, ANM–116, 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, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

(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.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 97–152–225(B), dated July 16, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on February 2, 1998.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–3128 Filed 2–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 167

[USCG–98–3385]

Port Access Routes; Prince William Sound via Cape Hinchinbrook Entrance and Passages Within the Sound Between Port Valdez and Cape Hinchinbrook

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Port Access Route study; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is conducting a port access route study to evaluate the need for modifications to current vessel routing and traffic management measures in the approaches to and departures from Prince William Sound and within Prince William Sound. This study is being conducted because of comments received from commercial vessels which operate in the area and the results of the Prince William Sound Risk Assessment. This port access route study will determine what, if any, changes to the existing traffic separation scheme (TSS) in the approaches to Prince William

Sound are needed. As a result of this study, a new or modified TSS and/or precautionary areas, or other vessel operating requirements may be proposed in the **Federal Register**.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 11, 1998.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments to the Docket Management Facility, (USCG 98–3385), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001, or deliver them to room PL–401, located on the Plaza Level of the Nassif Building at the same address between 10 a.m. and 5 pm., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Comments may also be hand delivered to this address.

The Docket Management Facility maintains the public docket for this notice. Comments, and documents as indicated in this preamble, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room PL–401, located on the Plaza Level of the Nassif Building at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also electronically access the public docket for this notice on the Internet at http://dms.dot.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information on the public docket, contact Carol Kelley, Coast Guard Dockets team Leader or Paulette Twine, Chief, Documentary Services Division, U.S. Department of Transportation, telephone 202–366–9329; for information concerning the notice of study, contact Commander K. Hamblett, Seventeenth Coast Guard District (907) 463–2264, Commander R. Morris, Project Officer, Captain of the Port, Valdez (907) 835–7210, Lieutenant C. Holmes, VTS Valdez (907) 835–7209, or Ms. M. Hegy, Project Manager, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, Waterways Management Staff (G–M–2), (202) 267–0415.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this study by submitting written data, views, or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this notice (USCG–98–3385) and the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit one copy of all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing to the DOT Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES**. If you want acknowledgment of receipt of your comment, enclose a stamped, self-addressed post card or envelope.

The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period. The comments will be considered in the study and in developing any regulatory proposals.

The Coast Guard intends to hold at least one public meeting to listen to the commercial and recreational users of the waters in the study area. Our goal is to reduce the risk of collisions and groundings both within Prince William Sound and outside Cape Hinchinbrook. Details of the meeting will be announced in a separate notice in the **Federal Register** as well as locally.

The Coast Guard's Marine Safety Office, Valdez, AK, in consultation with the Seventeenth Coast Guard District Juneau, AK, will conduct the study and develop recommendations. Commander R.J. Morris, Captain of the Port, Valdez, AK (907) 835–7209 is the project officer responsible for the study.

Background and Purpose

The 1978 amendments to the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (PWSA), 33 U.S.C. 1223(c), require that a port access route study be conducted prior to establishing or adjusting fairways or TSS's. The Coast Guard is undertaking a port access route study to determine the effect of amending the TSS on vessel traffic safety in the study area.

The approaches to/and areas within Prince William Sound were last studied in 1981, and the results were published on December 14, 1981 (46 FR61049). The current TSS stems from that study.

This study continues the effort to evaluate navigation risk in the study area. On December 15, 1996, the Prince William Sound Risk Assessment was completed. An addendum to the study found that removal of the southern dogleg in the existing TSS would result in a minor overall reduction in risk, due to less transit time required by participating vessels. In addition, improved traffic management will be realized.

Definitions

The following definitions are provided to assist reviewers and commenters in reviewing docket materials and making recommendations.

An internationally recognized vessel routing system is one or more routes or routing measures aimed at reducing the risk of casualties. A system may include TSS's, two-way routes, recommended tracks, areas to be avoided, inshore traffic zones, roundabouts, precautionary areas, and deep-water routes.

A TSS is a routing measure that minimizes the risk of collision by separating vessels into opposing streams of traffic through the establishment of traffic lanes.

A two-way route is a route within defined limits inside which two-way traffic is established, aimed at providing safe passage of ships through waters where navigation is difficult or dangerous.

A recommended track is a route which has been specially examined to ensure so far as possible that it is free of dangers and along which ships are advised to navigate.

An area to be avoided is a routing measure comprising an area within defined limits in which either navigation is particularly hazardous or it is exceptionally important to avoid casualties and should be avoided by all ships, or certain classes of ships.

An inshore traffic zone comprises a designated area between the landward boundary of a TSS and the adjacent coast and is used in accordance with rule 10(d) of the 72 COLREGS.

A roundabout is a routing measure compromising a separation point or circular separation zone and a circular traffic lane within defined limits. Traffic moves in a counterclockwise direction around the separation point or zone in a roundabout.

A precautionary area is a defined area where ships must navigate with particular caution and within which the direction of traffic flow may be recommended.

A deep-water route is a route within defined limits, which has been accurately surveyed for clearance of sea bottom and submerged obstacles as indicated on nautical charts.

Study Area

The study area is defined as navigable waters of the U.S., north of a line drawn from Cape Hinchinbrook Light to Schooner Rock Light, comprising that portion of Prince William Sound between 146–30′W, 147–20′W and includes Valdez Arm, Valdez Narrows, and Port Valdez. The offshore area is bounded by a line connecting the following geographic positions:

Latitude	*Longitude*
60°03′N	147°20′W
59°40′N	147°20′W
59°40′N	146°00′W
60°23′N	146°00′W

The study area includes a Traffic Separation Scheme (TSS), shipping safety fairway and a regulated navigation area (RNA).

Issues

The goal of this study is to reduce maritime risk within Prince William Sound while allowing for increased efficiency of traffic management. The study may result in a finding that no changes are needed, or if warranted, one of the following or some other change: (1) Modify the TSS to allow vessels less restrictive access to the center of the channel (ie. reduce or eliminate the separation zone; (2) establish a precautionary area at the Pilot Station abeam of Bligh Reef; (3) remove the southern dogleg to provide a straight traffic lane between the Pilot Station and Cape Hinchinbrook; (4) establish a TSS in place of the safety fairway from Cape Hinchinbrook; or (5) establish a precautionary area and traffic lane in the vicinity of Cape Hinchinbrook.

Procedural Requirements

In order to provide safe access routes for movement of vessel traffic proceeding to and from U.S. ports, the PWSA directs that the Secretary designate necessary fairways and TSS's in which the paramount right of navigation over all other uses shall be recognized. Before a designation can be made, the Coast Guard is required to undertake a study of potential traffic density and the need for safe access routes.

During the study, the Coast Guard is directed to consult with federal and state agencies and to consider the views of representatives of the maritime community, port and harbor authorities or association, environmental groups, and other parties who may be affected by the proposed action.

In accordance with 33 U.S.C. 1223(c), the Coast Guard will, to the extent practicable, reconcile the need for safe access routes with the needs of all other reasonable uses of the area involved. The Coast Guard will also consider previous studies and experience in the areas of vessel traffic management, navigation, shiphandling, the affects of weather, and prior analysis of the traffic density in certain regions.

The results of this study will be published in the **Federal Register**. If the Coast Guard determines that new routing measures or other regulatory action is needed, a notice of proposed rulemaking will be published. It is anticipated that the study will be completed by early Fall.

Dated: February 2, 1998.

R.C. North,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 98–3188 Filed 2–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CT7–1–5298b; A–1–FRL–5949–5]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Volatile Organic Compounds at Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation in Stratford

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Connecticut. This revision establishes and requires reasonably available control technology (RACT) for volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions which are not subject to control technology guideline-based regulations (i.e., non-CTG VOC emission sources) at Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation in Stratford, Connecticut. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this proposal. Any parties interested in commenting on this proposal should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 11, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Susan Studlien, Deputy Director, Office of Ecosystem Protection (mail code CAA), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, JFK Federal Bldg., Boston, MA 02203. Copies of the State submittal and EPA's technical support document are available for public inspection during normal business hours, by appointment at the Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress Street, 11th floor, Boston, MA and, the Bureau of Air Management, Department of Environmental Protection, State Office Building, 79 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106–1630.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven A. Rapp, Environmental Engineer, Air Quality Planning Unit (CAQ), U.S. EPA, Region I, JFK Federal Building, Boston, MA 02203–2211; (617) 565–2773; or by E-mail at: Rapp.Steve@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401—7671q.

Dated: December 29, 1997.

John P. DeVillars,

Regional Administrator, Region I.

[FR Doc. 98–3024 Filed 2–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[TX–85–1–7334b; FRL–5956–1]

Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans, Texas; Alternate Reasonably Available Control Technology Demonstration for Raytheon TI Systems, Inc.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing approval of a site-specific revision to the Texas State Implementation Plan for Raytheon TI Sysytems, Incorporated (RTIS) of Dallas. This revision was submitted by the Governor on January 9, 1997, to establish an alternate reasonably available control technology demonstration to control volatile organic compounds for the surface coating processes at the RTIS Lemmon Avenue facility. Please see the direct final rule of this action located elsewhere in today's **Federal Register** for a detailed discussion of this rulemaking.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be postmarked by March 11, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to Thomas H. Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), EPA Region