

extended. OSC carefully considered both responses received.

CRE advised OSC that its response (entitled "Proposed CRE Generic Comments to all Federal Agencies Related to Data Quality Guidelines") consisted of generic comments, provided to all Federal agencies on cross-cutting issues that might apply to draft guidelines of only some agencies. OSC reviewed the CRE comments, and identified two that might apply to its proposed guidelines.¹

Under comment (1), CRE asserted that neither OMB nor Federal agencies have the authority to exempt types and categories of information from their guidelines. CRE maintained that the OMB guidelines improperly limited the relevant statutory language requiring that guidelines apply to "information...disseminated by Federal agencies," by including certain exemptions in the definition of "dissemination."² CRE stated that "any information that an agency has in fact made public" must be covered. OSC's proposed guidelines incorporated the OMB definition of "dissemination" with the included exemptions. OSC believes that no change should be made in its guidelines until such time as OMB may revise its guidelines to amend the definition and exemptions in question.³

Under comment (6), CRE stated that in determining who may file an administrative complaint requesting correction of disseminated information, agencies should use a broad definition

¹ Six of CRE's 16 numbered comments (nos. 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16) addressed matters not applicable to information disseminated by OSC and, therefore, not addressed by its guidelines. Other comments (nos. 7, 8, and 9), critical of guidelines issued by some agencies, did not apply to OSC because its guidelines met or exceeded the standard(s) suggested by CRE. Several comments (nos. 2, 10, and 13, and discussion referring to no. 1) indicated dissatisfaction with definitions used in the OMB guidelines issued to agencies. OSC has decided to keep any definitions taken from the OMB guidelines, until such time as OMB may revise its guidelines to amend the definitions in question. As noted by CRE in its comments, "[a]ll agency guidelines are required to comply with the requirements set forth by OMB in their interagency February 22nd Final Guidelines. (statutory citations omitted)."

² "Dissemination does not include distribution limited to government employees or agency contractors or grantees; intra- or inter-agency use or sharing of government information; and responses to requests for agency records under the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, the Federal Advisory Committee Act or other similar law. This definition also does not include distribution limited to correspondence with individuals or persons, press releases, archival records, public filings, subpoenas or adjudicative processes." 67 FR 8452, 8460 (Feb. 22, 2002).

³ See last sentence of *fn.* 1, above. OSC's proposed guidelines did not add exemptions to those defined by OMB. Those parts of CRE comments (1), (3), and (4) that addressed agency guidelines defining other exemptions did not apply to OSC.

of "affected persons," noting with favor the definition OMB used in its guidelines to agencies.⁴ While the draft report to OMB described specific target audiences for information disseminated by OSC,⁵ a description of "affected persons" was not included in the agency's proposed guidelines. OSC agrees that such a description should appear in the guidelines. Part IV.C. of OSC's guidelines, therefore, now describes, by reference to the target audiences described in its initial report to OMB and in OMB's guidelines for Federal agencies, affected persons who can file an administrative request for correction.

The comment received from CSS also consisted of generic, non-agency specific comments. OSC reviewed all the comments and determined that no changes to its proposed guidelines were needed. One or more of the following factors applied to each comment: (1) OSC guidelines met or exceeded the standards suggested by CSS; (2) the comment concerned a type of information not disseminated by OSC; or (3) the proposed OSC guidelines adopted or mirrored provisions in OMB's guidance to Federal agencies.

After review of the public responses received, OSC sent its report and proposed information quality guidelines for OMB review and comment on August 1, 2002, and for final review on September 17, 2002. Pursuant to OMB's review and further guidance to Federal agencies, OSC revised its proposed guidelines to: (1) clarify that OSC press releases typically contain information about matters not covered under OMB's guidelines, and (2) conform times for responses to requestors seeking corrections of information, and appealing OSC decisions on those requests, from 30 to 60 days.

OSC's final information quality guidelines and September 17, 2002, report to OMB are available, upon publication of this notice, on the agency's Web site, (<http://www.osc.gov> at the "Reading Room" link).

Dated: September 26, 2002.

Elaine D. Kaplan,
Special Counsel.

[FR Doc. 02-25041 Filed 10-1-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7405-01-M

⁴ OMB defined affected persons as "people who may benefit or be harmed by the disseminated information ... includ[ing] persons who are seeking to address information about themselves as well as persons who use information. (citation omitted)."

⁵ "Primary target audiences ... are current and former federal government employees, applicants for federal employment, employee representatives, and state and local government employees (*i.e.*, persons affected by or interested in the laws and regulations enforced by OSC)." 67 FR 21317.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Proposed Advisory Circular; Continued Airworthiness Assessments of Powerplant and Auxiliary Power Unit Installations on Transport Category Airlanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of availability of proposed advisory circular and request for comments.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of proposed Advisory Circular (AC) No. 39.XX, Continued Airworthiness Assessments of Powerplant and Auxiliary Power Unit Installations on Transport Category Airlanes.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 1, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Send all comments on the proposed AC to the Federal Aviation Administration, Attn: Engine and Propeller Standards Staff, ANE-110, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA, 01803-5299.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ann Azevedo, Engine and Propeller Standards Staff, ANE-110, at the above address, telephone (781) 238-7117, fax (781) 238-7199. A copy of the subject AC may also be obtained electronically by writing to the following Internet address: ann.azevedo@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

A copy of the subject AC may be obtained by contacting the person named under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** or by downloading the proposed AC from the following Internet website: <http://www.airweb.faa.gov/rgl>. The FAA invites interested parties to comment on the proposed AC. Comments should identify the subject of the AC and be submitted to the individual identified under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. The FAA will consider all communications received by the closing date before issuing the final AC.

Background

The proposed Advisory Circular (AC) describes the Continued Airworthiness Assessment Methodologies (CAAM). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Engine and Propeller Directorate (EPD) and the Transport Airplane Directorate (TAD) may use CAAM to identify unsafe conditions and

determine when an "unsafe condition is likely to exist or develop in other products of the same type design" before prescribing corrective action in accordance with Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 39. CAAM is used for products associated with the Powerplant or Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Installations on Transport Category Airplanes.

Continued airworthiness requires that safety concerns within the existing fleet be addressed, and the knowledge gained applied for the benefit of future fleets as well. This proposed AC also provides CAAM guidance for estimating the risks associated with identified unsafe conditions; defining prioritizing, and selecting suitable corrective actions for all identified unsafe conditions; and verifying that the corrective actions were effective. This proposed AC is intended to present a tangible means of logically assessing and responding to the safety risks posed by unsafe conditions.

This proposed AC does not establish any requirement that the FAA must perform a risk assessment before issuing an AD, or that the FAA must wait to issue an AD until the design approval holder performs a risk assessment, or that the FAA must accept the findings of a risk assessment performed by the design approval holder. CAAM, as described in this proposed AC, assists the FAA in making decisions concerning the priority in which unsafe conditions should be addressed. The FAA may issue an AD for a particular unsafe condition before a risk assessment is performed, or without having an assessment performed at all.

In this regard, CAAM does not define "unsafe condition" in a powerplant or APU installation. Rather, CAAM is a tool that the FAA usually will use to make the kinds of decisions described above.

Note that the descriptive level of the CAAM process contained in this AC is aimed at the individual, whether from the FAA or the manufacturer, who is without extensive risk analysis experience. Some of the material within this AC will therefore seem very basic to the experienced analyst.

Additionally, this proposed AC recognizes that an analysis must sometimes be performed without the benefit of readily-available information from the manufacturer. Typically, it is expected that more specific information will be available to the analyst, thus eliminating the need for some of the process steps that are described.

While information may be provided by and the assessment performed by the applicant, decisions as to whether an

unsafe condition exists, and the appropriate responses to that unsafe condition, are exclusively the responsibility of the Administrator.

This proposed advisory circular, published under the authority granted to the Administrator by 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701-44702, 44704, provides guidance for the use of CAAM.

Dated: Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on September 24, 2002.

Francis Favara,

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

[FR Doc. 02-25053 Filed 10-1-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M s

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE-2002-57]

Petitions for Exemption; Summary of Petitions Received

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of petitions for exemption received, extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: This action extends the comment period for a petition for exemption that was published in the **Federal Register** on September 10, 2002. The FAA has determined that the summary was general in nature. To offer the public more information on the petition, the FAA has revised the summary. In addition, the FAA is extending the comment period to allow interested parties sufficient time to submit comments.

DATES: Comments about petitions received must identify the petition docket number involved and must be received on or before October 14, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on any petition to the Docket Management System, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room Plaza 401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. You must identify the docket number FAA-2002-12501 at the beginning of your comment. If you wish to receive confirmation that FAA received your comments, include a self-addressed, stamped postcard.

You may also submit comments through the Internet to <http://dms.dot.gov>. You may review the public docket containing the petition, any comments received, and any final disposition in person in the Dockets Office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Dockets Office (telephone

1-800-647-5527) is on the plaza level of the NASSIF Building at the Department of Transportation at the above address. Also, you may review public dockets on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Denise Emrick (202) 267-5174, Office of Rulemaking (ARM-1), Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

Extension of Comment Period

Pursuant to FAA's rulemaking provisions governing the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for exemption part 11 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR), this notice contains a summary of certain petitions seeking relief from specified requirements of 14 CFR. The purpose of this notice is to improve the public's awareness of, and participation in, this aspect of FAA's regulatory activities. Neither publication of this notice nor the inclusion or omission of information in the summary is intended to affect the legal status of any petition or its final disposition.

The original summary of the petition was published in the **Federal Register** on September 10, 2002 (67 FR 57478). The FAA has determined that the summary was general in nature; therefore, the FAA is offering the public more information on this petition to allow the public a chance to offer comments more specific to the situation. The FAA has determined that an extension of the comment period is consistent with the public interest, and that good cause exists for taking this action. Accordingly, the comment period for Docket No. FAA-2002-12501 is extended until October 14, 2002.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 25, 2002.

Donald P. Byrne,

Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Petitions for Exemption

Docket No.: FAA-2002-12501.

Petitioner: Mr. Anthony P.X.

Bothwell, Attorney for ten petitioners.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 121.383(c).

Description of Relief Sought: To permit the petitioners to act as pilots in operations conducted under part 121 after reaching their 60th birthdays. The petitioners submit no medical information to support this petition, instead, the petitioners allege that the Age 60 rule has no safety basis and was originally adopted as an act of favoritism and continues to be supported by the FAA as an economic favor to the airline industry. The