

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 a high pressure compressor (HPC) rear shaft fracture, which could result in an uncontained engine failure and/or in-flight engine shutdown, accomplish the following:

(a) Fluorescent-penetrant inspect HPC rear shafts having the part numbers (P/N's) in Table 1 below, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of GE Service Bulletin (SB) No. 72-958, Revision 1, dated October 18, 1990 as follows:

TABLE 1

9127M58P03 9079M63P17 1999M25P02 1999M25P06	9079M63P12 9079M63P18 1999M25P03 1999M25P07	9079M63P15 9079M63P19 1999M25P04	9079M63P16 1999M25P01 1999M25P05
--	--	--	--

(1) For HPC rear shafts currently installed with hook bolts, P/N 9012M99G10, 9114M95G07, and 9114M95G10, inspect in accordance with the following schedule:

(i) For shafts that have not been previously inspected and have 10,000 cycles since new (CSN) or more on the effective date of this AD, inspect within the next 1,500 cycles in service (CIS) after the effective date of this AD.

(ii) For shafts that have not been previously inspected and have fewer than 10,000 CSN on the effective date of this AD, inspect within the next 2,500 CIS from the effective date of this AD, or before accumulating 7,500 CSN, whichever occurs later. However, no shaft may exceed 11,500 CSN before inspection.

(iii) For shafts that have been previously inspected and have 3,000 cycles since last inspection (CSLI) or fewer on the effective date of this AD, inspect within 4,500 CSLI, or before accumulating 7,500 CSN, whichever occurs later.

(iv) For shafts that have been previously inspected and have greater than 3,000 CSLI on the effective date of this AD, inspect within the next 1,500 CIS from the effective date of this AD, or before accumulating 7,500 CSN, whichever occurs later.

(v) Remove from service HPC rear shaft hook bolts identified in (a)(1) of this AD after any inspection performed in accordance with paragraph (a)(1) of this AD and replace with new tapered turn-around bolts, P/N 1375M69P01 or VCD0016.

(2) For HPC rear shafts installed with turn-around bolts, P/N 9249M54P01, or tapered turn-around bolts, P/N 1375M69P01 or VCD0016, inspect in accordance with the following schedule:

(i) For shafts that have not been previously inspected and have 6,500 CSN or more on the effective date of this AD, inspect within the next 2,500 CIS after the effective date of this AD.

(ii) For shafts that have not been previously inspected and have fewer than 6,500 CSN on the effective date of this AD, inspect before accumulating 9,000 CSN.

(iii) For shafts that have been previously inspected and have 3,500 CSLI or fewer on the effective date of this AD, inspect within 6,000 CSLI, or before accumulating 9,000 CSN, whichever occurs later.

(iv) For shafts that have been previously inspected and have more than 3,500 CSLI on the effective date of this AD, inspect within the next 2,500 CIS after the effective date of

this AD, or before accumulating 9,000 CSN, whichever occurs later.

(v) Remove from service HPC rear shaft turn-around bolts identified in paragraph (a)(2) of this AD after any inspection performed in accordance with paragraph (a)(3) of this AD and replace with new tapered turn-around bolts, P/N 1375M69P01 or VCD0016.

**Note 2.** Information concerning the tapered turn-around bolt noted in paragraph (a) of this proposed AD can be found in GE SB No. 72-877.

(b) Remove from service, prior to further flight, any shafts found cracked at inspection.

(c) Thereafter, for shafts that have been inspected in accordance with paragraph (a) of this AD, reinspect in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of GE SB No. 72-958, Revision 1, dated October 18, 1990, at intervals not to exceed 6,000 CSLI.

(d) Compliance with paragraph (a) of AD 91-10-03, Revision 1 satisfies the corresponding requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD. For the purposes of this AD, the inspection cycle interval must be measured from the last HPC rear shaft bolt hole inspection, regardless of any rear shaft rework and re-identifying after inspection.

#### Alternative Methods of Compliance

(e) 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, Engine Certification Office (ECO). Operators shall submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, ECO.

**Note 3:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Manager, ECO.

#### Special Flight Permits

(f) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on October 5, 2000.

**David A. Downey,**

*Assistant Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 00-26141 Filed 10-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99-CE-74-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Models 60, A60, and B60 Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) that would apply to certain Raytheon Aircraft Company (Raytheon) Beech Models 60, A60, and B60 airplanes. The proposed AD would require you to inspect for the existence of any lower forward wing bolts with the Mercury Aerospace trademark, and replace any such bolt with an FAA-approved bolt without this trademark. The proposed AD is the result of a report that wing bolts supplied by Mercury Aerospace may not meet the required Rockwell hardness specifications. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to detect and correct wing bolts that do not meet strength requirements. Continued airplane operation with such bolts could result in fatigue failure of the bolts with consequent separation of the wing from the airplane.

**DATES:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must receive any comments on this rule on or before December 5, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99-CE-74-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted.

Service information that applies to the proposed AD may be obtained from Raytheon Aircraft Company, P.O. Box 85, Wichita, Kansas 67201-0085; telephone: (800) 429-5372 or (316) 676-3140. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. T.N. Baktha, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone: (316) 946-4155; facsimile: (316) 946-4407.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Comments Invited**

*How do I comment on the proposed AD?* The FAA invites comments on this proposed rule. You may submit whatever written data, views, or arguments you choose. You need to include the rule's docket number and submit your comments in triplicate to the address specified under the caption

**ADDRESSES.** The FAA will consider all comments received on or before the closing date. We may amend the proposed rule in light of comments received. Factual information that supports your ideas and suggestions is extremely helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of the proposed AD action and determining whether we need to take additional rulemaking action.

*Are there any specific portions of the proposed AD I should pay attention to?* The FAA specifically invites comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule that might suggest a need to modify the rule. You may examine all comments we receive before

and after the closing date of the rule in the Rules Docket. We will file a report in the Rules Docket that summarizes each FAA contact with the public that concerns the substantive parts of the proposed AD.

The FAA is re-examining the writing style we currently use in regulatory documents, in response to the Presidential memorandum of June 1, 1998. That memorandum requires federal agencies to communicate more clearly with the public. We are interested in your comments on whether the style of this document is clearer, and any other suggestions you might have to improve the clarity of FAA communications that affect you. You can get more information about the Presidential memorandum and the plain language initiative at <http://www.plainlanguage.gov>.

*How can I be sure FAA receives my comment?* If you want us to acknowledge the receipt of your comments, you must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard. On the postcard, write "Comments to Docket No. 99-CE-74-AD." We will date stamp and mail the postcard back to you.

**Discussion**

*What events have caused this AD?* The FAA has received a report indicating that about 70 lower forward wing bolts that Mercury Aerospace supplied for certain Raytheon Models 60, A60, and B60 airplanes may not meet Rockwell hardness specifications. The bolts were distributed between 1995 and 1996. An independent test lab has confirmed that the bolts do not meet the structural requirements for an MS21250-14034 bolt.

Specifically, these wing bolts are required to meet Rockwell hardness specifications of C39-C43. Laboratory tests indicate that bolts from this manufacturing batch are below these specifications.

*What are the consequences if the condition is not corrected?* Continued airplane operation with such bolts could result in fatigue failure of the bolts with

consequent separation of the wing from the airplane.

**Relevant Service Information**

*Is there service information that applies to this subject?* Raytheon has issued Mandatory Service Bulletin No. SB 57-3328, Issued: July, 1999.

*What are the provisions of this service bulletin?* The service bulletin includes procedures for:

- Inspecting all lower forward wing bolts for the Mercury Aerospace trademark; and

- Replacing any of these bolts, along with the nuts and washers.

**The FAA's Determination and an Explanation of the Provisions of the Proposed AD**

*What has FAA decided?* After examining the circumstances and reviewing all available information related to the conditions described above, we have determined that:

- the unsafe condition referenced in this document exists or could develop on Raytheon Beech Models 60, A60, and B60 airplanes of the same type design;

- the actions specified in the previously-referenced service information should be accomplished on the affected airplanes; and

- AD action should be taken in order to correct this unsafe condition.

*What does the proposed AD require?* This proposed AD would require you to inspect for the existence of any lower forward wing bolt with the Mercury Aerospace trademark and replace such bolt with an FAA-approved bolt without this trademark.

**Cost Impact**

*How many airplanes does the proposed AD impact?* We estimate that the proposed AD affects 593 airplanes in the U.S. registry.

*What is the cost impact of the proposed AD on owners/operators of the affected airplanes?* We estimate the following costs to accomplish the proposed inspection:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per airplane	Total cost on U.S. airplane operators
1 workhour × \$60 per hour = \$60 .....	Not applicable .....	\$60 per airplane .....	\$35,580.

We estimate the following costs to accomplish any necessary replacements that would be required based on the

results of the proposed inspection. Based on manufacturer data from its warranty program, 10 bolts were

replaced, which leaves 60 suspect bolts still in the field.

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per airplane
8 workhours × \$60 per hour = \$480 .....	Approximately \$500 per airplane. NOTE: Warranty credit has expired.	\$980 per airplane.

**Regulatory Impact**

*Does this proposed AD impact various entities?* The regulations proposed herein would not have a substantial direct effect 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, it is determined that this proposed rule would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

*Does this proposed AD involve a significant rule or regulatory action?* 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) 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 has been placed 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, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations 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. FAA amends § 39.13 by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD) to read as follows:

**Raytheon Aircraft Company:** Docket No. 99–CE–74–AD

(a) *What airplanes are affected by this AD?* This AD affects Beech Models 60, A60, and B60 airplanes, serial numbers P–4 through P–596, that are certificated in any category.

(b) *Who must comply with this AD?* Anyone who wishes to operate any of the above airplanes on the U.S. Register must comply with this AD.

(c) *What problem does this AD address?* The actions specified by this AD are intended to detect and correct wing bolts that do not meet strength requirements. Continued airplane operation with such bolts could result in fatigue failure of the bolts with consequent separation of the wing from the airplane.

(d) *What actions must I accomplish to address this problem?* To address this problem, you must accomplish the following:

Action	Compliance time	Procedures
(1) Inspect the lower forward wing bolts (left and right) for the Mercury Aerospace trademark.	Within the next 100 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD.	Use the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS section of Raytheon Mandatory Service Bulletin SB 57–3328, Issued: July, 1999.
(2) Replace any lower forward wing bolt that has the Mercury Aerospace trademark with an FAA-approved bolt that does not have this trademark. Replace the associated nuts and washers.	Prior to further flight after the inspection .....	Use the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS section of Raytheon Mandatory Service bulletin SB 57–3328, Issued: July, 1999, and the instructions in the applicable maintenance manual.
(3) Do not install, on any affected airplane, a forward wing bolt that has the Mercury Aerospace trademark.	As of the effective date of this AD .....	Not Applicable.

(e) *Can I comply with this AD in any other way?* You may use an alternative method of compliance or adjust the compliance time if:

(1) Your alternative method of compliance provides an equivalent level of safety; and

(2) The Manager, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), approves your alternative. Submit your request through an FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Wichita ACO.

**Note:** This AD applies to each airplane identified in paragraph (a) of this AD, 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 request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (e) 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 you have not eliminated the unsafe condition, specific actions you propose to address it.

(f) *Where can I get information about any already-approved alternative methods of compliance?* Contact Mr. T.N. Baktha, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone: (316) 946–4155; facsimile: (316) 946–4407.

(g) *What if I need to fly the airplane to another location to comply with this AD?* The FAA can issue a special flight permit under sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate your airplane to a location where you can accomplish the requirements of this AD.

(h) *How do I get copies of the documents referenced in this AD?* You may obtain copies of the documents referenced in this AD from Raytheon Aircraft Company, P.O. Box 85, Wichita, Kansas 67201–0085. You may examine these documents at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on October 5, 2000.

**Marvin R. Nuss,**

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

[FR Doc. 00-26238 Filed 10-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Office of Hearings and Appeals

#### 43 CFR Part 4

RIN 1090-AA74

#### Special Rules Applicable to Surface Coal Mining Hearings and Appeals; Petitions for Award of Costs and Expenses Under Section 525(e) of the SMCRA

**AGENCY:** Office of Hearings and Appeals, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** This action extends the comment period an additional 30 days on the Department of the Interior's Office of Hearings and Appeals' proposal to amend its rules governing who may receive an award of costs and expenses, including attorney fees, under section 525(e) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). The proposed amendment provides that an applicant for a permit may only receive an award from the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), if OSM denies an application in bad faith and for the purpose of harassing or embarrassing the applicant.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** Comments are due to the agency by November 13, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Robert L. Baum, Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Room 1111, Arlington, VA 22203. Phone: 703-235-3750. Comments received will be made available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.) In the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Director's office, 11th floor, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22203. Person wishing to inspect comments are requested to call in advance at 703-235-3810 to make an appointment.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Will A. Irwin, Administrative Judge, Interior Board of Land Appeals, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22203. Phone: 703-235-3750.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On July 28, 2000, the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) published a proposed rule (65 FR 46389) amending 43 CFR 4.1294(b) and (c) to provide that an applicant for a permit from OSM is entitled to an award of costs and expenses from OSM only when circumstances demonstrate that OSM denied an application in bad faith and for the purpose of harassing or embarrassing the applicant. In a letter to the Director of OHA, dated August 15, 2000, the National Mining Association (NMA) requested a 45 day extension of the comment period for this proposed amendment because the existing comment period did not allow adequate opportunity to comment fully. The NMA also requested records related to the proposed amendment under the Freedom of Information Act. The FOIA response letter was issued on September 12, 2000.

The Director of OHA has determined that an extension of time to obtain the comments on the proposed rule is warranted and, therefore, a 30 day extension is granted. This notice announces that 30 day extension of the comment period.

Dated: October 4, 2000.

**John Berry,**

*Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget.*

[FR Doc. 00-26100 Filed 10-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-BK-M**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 73

[DA 00-2230, MM Docket No. 00-186, RM-9970]

#### Radio Broadcasting Services; Rapid City, South Dakota, Gillette, Wyoming

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by Bethesda Christian Broadcasting, Inc. ("petitioner"), licensee of Station KLMP, Rapid City South Dakota, requesting the substitution of Channel 250C for 250C1 at Rapid City, and the modification of Station KLMP's license accordingly, and the substitution of Channel 282A for vacant Channel 249A at Gillette, Wyoming, to accommodate its upgrade. Channel 250C can be allotted at Rapid City, South Dakota, at coordinates 44-19-42 and 103-50-03.

Channel 282A can be allotted at Gillette, Wyoming at coordinates 44-17-36 and 105-30-06.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before November 20, 2000, and reply comments on or before December 5, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room TW-A325, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, or its counsel or consultant, as follows: Bethesda Christian Broadcasting, Inc. P.O. Box 168, Rapid City, SD 57709 (petitioner); J. Dominic Monahan, Luvaas, Cobb, Richards and Fraser, 300 Forum Building, 777 High Street, P.O. Box 10747, Eugene, OR 97401 (Counsel to petitioner).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Victoria M. McCauley, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 00-186, adopted September 20, 2000, and released September 29, 2000. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding. Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

Federal Communications Commission.

**John A. Karousos,**

*Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 00-26191 Filed 10-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712-01-P**