for actuation of ''any ESF.'' The event reporting guidelines would, once again, indicate that reporting should include those systems identified as ESF's for each particular plant (e.g., in the Final Safety Analysis Report).

(3) The NRC is developing revisions to the process for oversight of operating reactors, including inspection, assessment and enforcement processes. In connection with this effort, the NRC has considered the kinds of event reports that would be eliminated by the proposed rules and believes that the changes would not have a deleterious effect on the oversight process. Public comment is invited on whether or not this is the case. In particular, it is requested that if any examples to the contrary are known they be identified.

(4) The proposed amendments would add provisions to sections 50.73(a)(2)(i)(B) and 50.73(a)(2)(v) to eliminate reporting of a condition or event that did not occur within three years of the date of discovery. Public comment is invited on whether such historical events and conditions should be reported (rather than being excluded from reporting, as proposed). Public comment is also invited on whether the three year exclusion of such historical events and conditions should be extended to all written reports required by section 50.73(a) (rather than being limited to these two specific reporting criteria, as proposed).

(5) The proposed amendments would add a new reporting criterion to require reporting if a component is in a degraded or non-conforming condition such that: (a) The ability of the component to perform its specified safety function is significantly degraded; and (b) the condition could reasonably be expected to apply to other similar components in the plant. Public comment is invited on whether this proposed new criterion would accomplish its stated purpose—to ensure that design basis or other discrepancies would continue to be reported if the capability to perform a specified safety function is significantly degraded and the condition has generic implications. Public comment is also invited on whether the proposed new criterion would be subject to varying interpretations by licensees and inspectors.

(6) Many States (Agreement States and Non-Agreement States) have agreements with power reactors to inform the States of plant issues. State reporting requirements are frequently triggered by NRC reporting requirements. Accordingly, the NRC seeks State comment on issues related to the proposed amendments to power reactor reporting requirements.

(7) The President's Memorandum dated June 1, 1998, entitled, ''Plain Language in Government Writing,'' directed that the Federal government's writing be in plain language. The NRC requests comments on this proposed rule specifically with respect to the clarity and effectiveness of the language used.

(8) The Commission has prepared a draft regulatory analysis on this proposed rule. The analysis examines the costs and benefits of the alternatives considered by the Commission. It is available as discussed above under the heading ''Background.'' The Commission requests public comment on this draft analysis.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of July, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Cynthia A. Carpenter,

Chief, Generic Issues, Environmental, Financial and Rulemaking Branch, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–18722 Filed 7–21–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–325–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Falcon 10 and Model Mystere-Falcon 50 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 certain Dassault Model Falcon 10 and Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes. For certain airplanes, this proposal would require modification of the aircraft wiring to illuminate the ''T/O CONFIG'' red warning light on the cockpit warning panel. For certain other airplanes, this proposal would require installation of a ''NO TAKEOFF'' red light on each pilot's instrument panel; modification of the associated aircraft wiring to activate the lights whenever the aircraft is not in the proper configuration for take-off; and a revision to the Airplane Flight Manual to check that the ''NO TAKEOFF'' lights are out prior to take-off. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent take-off with the parking brake engaged, which could result in an extended take-off roll or a rejected take-off, and consequent runway overrun.

DATES: Comments must be received by August 23, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–325–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 Dassault Falcon Jet, P.O. Box 2000, South Hackensack, New Jersey 07606. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2110; fax (425) 227–1149.

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 98–NM–325–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–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–325–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on certain Dassault Model Falcon 10 and Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that, during take-off of a Model Mystere-Falcon 50 airplane, the pilot reported that the engine parameters were correct, but longitudinal acceleration displayed on the electronic flight instrumentation system (EFIS) was lower than usual. The pilot chose to reject the take-off attempt. The DGAC also advises that several similar occurrences have been reported on Model Falcon 10 series airplanes. The slow acceleration is thought to have been caused by the pilot attempting to take-off with the parking brake engaged. The existing design for both models provides appropriate indication to the crew when the parking brake handle is not released during the takeoff; however, the indication is not readily visible. Due to its location in the lower part of the pilot's instrument panel, it is outside of the pilot's direct line of sight and the indication may be unnoticed. This condition, if not corrected, could result in an extended take-off roll or a rejected take-off, and consequent runway overrun.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Dassault has issued Service Bulletin F50–240, Revision 1, dated October 7, 1998 for Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes), which describes procedures for modification of the aircraft wiring to add the ''park brake handle not pushed forward'' condition in the illumination conditions of the ''T/O CONFIG'' red warning light on the cockpit warning panel.

Dassault also has issued Service Bulletin F10–280, Revision 1, dated February 10, 1999 (for Model Falcon 10 series airplanes), which describes procedures for installation of a ''NO TAKEOFF'' red light on each pilot's instrument panel. The service bulletin also describes procedures for modification of the associated aircraft wiring to activate the lights whenever the aircraft is not in the proper configuration for take-off; and a revision to the Normal Procedures Section of the Falcon 10 Airplane Flight Manual to check that the ''NO TAKEOFF'' lights are out prior to take-off.

Accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletins is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition. The DGAC classified these service bulletins as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directives 98–300–022(B), dated July 29, 1998, and 98–547–022(B), dated December 30, 1998, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

FAA's Conclusions

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.

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 service bulletins described previously.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 36 Dassault Model Falcon 10 series airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

It would take approximately 50 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed installation, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $2,280 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the installation proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $190,080, or $5,280 per airplane.

It would take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the proposed revision to the AFM, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AFM revision proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $2,160, or $60 per airplane.

The FAA estimates that 115 Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 8 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed modification, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $6,000 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the modification proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $745,200, or $6,480 per airplane.

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:

Dassault Aviation: Docket 98–NM–325–AD.

Applicability: Model Falcon 10 series airplanes, serial numbers 1 through 152 inclusive, on which Dassault Modification M801 (reference Dassault Service Bulletin F10–280, Revision 1, dated February 10, 1999) has not been accomplished; and Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes, serial numbers 2 through 250 inclusive and 252, on which Dassault Modification M1850 (reference Dassault Service Bulletin F50–240, Revision 1, dated October 7, 1998) has not been accomplished; 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 (c) 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 take-off with the parking brake engaged, which could result in an extended take-off roll or a rejected take-off, and consequent runway overrun, accomplish the following:

Model Mystere-Falcon 50 Series Airplanes: Modification

(a) For Model Mystere-Falcon 50 series airplanes, within 9 months after the effective date of this AD, modify the aircraft wiring to add the ''park brake handle not pushed forward'' condition in the illumination conditions of the ''T/O CONFIG'' red warning light on the cockpit warning panel in accordance with Dassault Service Bulletin F50–240, Revision 1, dated October 7, 1998.

Model Falcon 10 Series Airplanes: Modification and AFM Revision

(b) For Dassault Falcon 10 series airplanes, within 9 months after the effective date of this AD, accomplish the requirements of paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this AD in accordance with Dassault Service Bulletin F10–280, Revision 1, dated February 10, 1999.

(1) Install a ''NO TAKEOFF'' red light on each pilot's instrument panel and modify the associated aircraft wiring to activate the lights whenever the aircraft is not in the proper configuration for take-off.

(2) Revise the Normal Procedures Section of the FAA-approved Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) to include the information specified in Falcon 10 AFM DTM722 Temporary Change No. 17, dated March 31, 1995, which introduces procedures for checking that the ''NO TAKEOFF'' lights are out prior to take-off; and operate the airplane in accordance with those limitations and procedures.

Note 2: This may be accomplished by inserting a copy of Falcon 10 AFM DTM722 Temporary Change No. 17 in the AFM. When these temporary revisions have been incorporated into general revisions of the AFM, the general revisions may be inserted in the AFM, provided the information contained in the general revision is identical to that specified in Temporary Change No. 17.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(c) 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 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

Special Flight Permits

(d) 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 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directives 98–300–022(B), dated July 29, 1998, and 98–547–022(B), dated December 30, 1998.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on July 16, 1999.

D.L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–18734 Filed 7–21–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99–NM–131–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF–340 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 certain Saab Model SAAB SF–340 series airplanes. This proposal would require operators to replace the existing pneumatic de-icing boot pressure indicator switch with a newly designed switch. This proposal is prompted by an occurrence on a similar model airplane in which the pneumatic de-icing boot indication light may have provided the flightcrew with misleading information as to the proper functioning of the de-icing boots. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent ice accumulation on the airplane leading edges, which could reduce controllability of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by August 23, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99–NM–131–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.

Information concerning this proposal may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2110; fax (425) 227–1149.

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