900), desire to enter into this marketing agreement and do hereby agree that the provisions referred to in paragraph I hereof as augmented by the provisions specified in paragraph II hereof, shall be and are the provisions of this marketing agreement as if set out in full herein.

I. The findings and determinations, order relative to handling, and the provisions of §§_____[1] to _____, all inclusive, of the order regulating the handling of milk in the (____Name of order _____) marketing area (7 CFR PART __[2]) which is annexed hereto; and

II. The following provisions: §_____[3] Record of milk handled and authorization to correct typographical errors.

(a) Record of milk handled. The undersigned certifies that he/she handled during the month of _____[4] 2002, _____[5] hundredweight of milk covered by this marketing agreement.

(b) Authorization to correct typographical errors. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Deputy Administrator, or Acting Deputy Administrator, Dairy Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, to correct any typographical errors which may have been made in this marketing agreement.

§_____[6] Effective date. This marketing agreement shall become effective upon the execution of a counterpart hereof by the Secretary in accordance with Section 900.14(a) of the aforesaid rules of practice and procedure.

In Witness Whereof, The contracting handlers, acting under the provisions of the Act, for the purposes and subject to the limitations herein contained and not otherwise, have hereunto set their respective hands and seals.

Signature By (Name) _____

(Title) _____

(Address) _____

(Seal)

Attest

[FR Doc. 03–20689 Filed 8–15–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2003–CE–21–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; AeroSpace Technologies of Australia Pty Ltd. Models N22B and N24A 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 all AeroSpace Technologies of Australia Pty Ltd. (ASTA) Models N22B and N24A airplanes. This proposed AD would require you to visually inspect the ailerons for damage and replace if necessary; adjust the engine power levers aural warning microswitches; set flap extension and flap down operation limitations; and fabricate and install cockpit flap extension and flap down operation restriction placards. This proposed AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Australia. The actions specified by this proposed AD are intended to prevent damage to the aileron due to airplane operation and pre-existing and undetected damage, which could result in failure of the aileron. Such failure could lead to reduced or loss of control of the airplane.

DATES: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must receive any comments on this proposed rule on or before September 19, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments to FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2003–CE–21–AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. You may view any comments at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also send comments electronically to the following address: *9–ACE–7–Docket@faa.gov.* Comments sent electronically must contain ''Docket No. 2003–CE–21–AD'' in the subject line. If you send comments electronically as attached electronic files, the files must be formatted in Microsoft Word 97 for Windows or ASCII text.

You may get service information that applies to this proposed AD from Nomad Operations, Aerospace Support Division, Boeing Australia, PO Box 767, Brisbane, QLD 4000 Australia; telephone 61 7 3306 3366; facsimile 61 7 3306 3111. You may also view this information at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ron Atmur, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (562) 627–5224; facsimile (562) 627–5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

How do I comment on this 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 proposed rule's docket number and submit your comments to the address specified under the caption **ADDRESSES.** We will consider all comments received on or before the closing date. We may amend this proposed rule in light of comments received. Factual information that supports your ideas and suggestions is extremely helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of this proposed AD action and determining whether we need to take additional rulemaking action.

Are there any specific portions of this proposed AD I should pay attention to? The FAA specifically invites comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed rule that might suggest a need to modify the rule. You may view 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 contact we have with the public that concerns the substantive parts of this proposed AD.

How can I be sure FAA receives my comment? If you want FAA to acknowledge the receipt of your mailed comments, you must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard. On the postcard, write ''Comments to Docket No. 2003–CE–21–AD.'' We will date stamp and mail the postcard back to you.

Discussion

What events have caused this proposed AD? The Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA), which is the airworthiness authority for Australia, recently notified FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all ASTA Models N22B and N24A airplanes. The CASA reports several incidents of ailerons incurring damage during flight. Extensive tests and analysis revealed that the cause of the damage to the ailerons is a result of operation outside approved limits and undetected pre-existing damage. This condition causes the aileron to flutter as well as damage and failure.

The CASA lowered the operational limits of the affected airplanes in order to prevent damage from occurring. Additional reports of aileron flutter have been received even when operating within these lower approved limits.

As a precautionary measure, the CASA is further restricting flight operations.

[1] First and last sections of applicable order.

[2] Appropriate part number.

[3] Applicable section number.

[4] Appropriate representative period for the order.

[5] Hundredweight poundage of milk.

[6] Applicable section number.

What are the consequences if the condition is not corrected? If this condition is not corrected, it could result in aileron failure. Such failure could lead to reduced or loss of control of the airplane.

Is there service information that applies to this subject? ASTA has issued Nomad Alert Service Bulletin ANMD–57–18, dated December 19, 2002.

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

—Adjusting the engine power levers aural warning microswitches;
—Setting flap extension and flap down operation limitations; and
—Fabricating and installing cockpit flap extension and flap down operation restriction placards.

What action did the CASA take? The CASA classified this service bulletin as mandatory and issued Australian AD/GAF–N22/69, Amendment 4, dated February 27, 2003, in order to ensure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in Australia.

Was this in accordance with the bilateral airworthiness agreement? These airplane models are manufactured in Australia 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 CASA has kept FAA informed of the situation described above.

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

What has FAA decided? The FAA has examined the findings of the CASA; reviewed all available information, including the service information referenced above; and determined that:

—The unsafe condition referenced in this document exists or could develop on other ASTA Models N22B and N24A airplanes of the same type design that are on the U.S. registry;
—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 would this proposed AD require? This proposed AD would require you to visually inspect the ailerons for damage and replace if necessary, and incorporate the actions in the previously-referenced service bulletin.

How does the revision to 14 CFR part 39 affect this proposed AD? On July 10, 2002, FAA published a new version of 14 CFR part 39 (67 FR 47997, July 22, 2002), which governs FAA's AD system. This regulation now includes material that relates to special flight permits, alternative methods of compliance, and altered products. This material previously was included in each individual AD. Since this material is included in 14 CFR part 39, we will not include it in future AD actions.

Cost Impact

How many airplanes would this proposed AD impact? We estimate that this proposed AD affects 10 airplanes in the U.S. registry.

What would be the cost impact of this 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. operators
1 workhours × $60 per hour = $60	Not applicable	$60	10 × $60 = $600

We estimate the following costs to accomplish any necessary replacements that would be required based on the results of this proposed inspection. We have no way of determining the number of airplanes that may need such repair/replacement:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per airplane
10 workhours × $60 per hour = $600	$1,250	$600 + $1,250 = $1,850

We estimate the following costs to accomplish the proposed modifications:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per airplane	Total cost on U.S. operators
10 workhours × $60 per hour = $600	$100	$700	$700 × 10 = $7,000

Regulatory Impact

Would 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.

Would this proposed AD involve a significant rule or regulatory action? For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed 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 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. FAA amends § 39.13 by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD) to read as follows:

Aerospace Technologies of Australia PTY LTD.: Docket No. 2003–CE–21–AD

(a) *What airplanes are affected by this AD?* This AD affects Models N22B and N24A airplanes, all serial numbers, that are certificated in any category.

(b) *Who must comply with this AD?* Anyone who wishes to operate any of the airplanes identified in paragraph (a) of this AD must comply with this AD.

(c) *What problem does this AD address?* The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent damage to the aileron due to airplane operation and pre-existing and undetected damage, which could result in failure of the aileron. Such failure could lead to reduced or loss of control of the airplane.

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

Actions	Compliance	Procedures
(1) Visually inspect the left-hand (LH) and right-hand (RH) ailerons for damage (*i.e.*, distortion, bending, impact marks). Repair or replace any damaged aileron found..	Inspect within the next 50 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished. Repair or replace prior to further flight after the inspection.	In accordance with the applicable maintenance manual.
(2) Adjust the engine power lever actuated landing gear ''up'' aural warning microswitches and then perform a ground test.	Within the next 50 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.	In accordance with Nomad Alert Service Bulletin ANMD–57–18, dated December 19, 2002.
(3) For Model N22B airplanes: (i) Fabricate placards that incorporate the following words (using at least 1/8-inch letters) and install these placards on the instrument panel within the pilot's clear view: (A) ''RECOMMENDED APPROACH FLAPS 10 OR 20 DEG AT 90 KIAS''; (B) ''USE 10° or 20° FLAP FOR TAKE-OFF AND LANDING—**WARNING**—DO NOT EXCEED 20° FLAP EXTENSION DURING FLIGHT, LANDING GEAR UP WARNING WILL INITIATE FOR A TORQUE PRESSURE OF LESS THAN 30 PSI''; and (ii) Incorporate the following information into the limitation section of the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM); (A) Limit the maximum flap extension to 20 degrees; and (B) Limit flaps down operations landing for 10° flap.	Within the next 50 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.	In accordance with Nomad Alert Service Bulletin ANMD–57–18, dated December 19, 2002. Accomplish the limitations of paragraph (d)(4)(ii)(A) and (d)(4)(ii)(B) of this AD by inserting a copy of the AD into the Limitations Section of the flight manual. The owner/operator holding at least a private pilot certificate as authorized by section 43.7 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7) may accomplish this flight manual insertion and the placard requirements of paragraph (d)(4)(i)(A) and (d)(4)(i)(B) of this AD. Make an entry into the aircraft records showing compliance wit these portions of the AD in accordance with section 43.9 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.9).
(4) For Model N24A airplanes: (i) Fabricate a placard that incorporates the following words (using at least 1/8-inch letters) and install this placard on the instrument panel within the pilot's clear view: (A) ''USE 10° FLAP FOR TAKE-OFF AND LANDING—**WARNING**—DO NOT EXCEED 10° FLAP EXTENSION DURING FLIGHT, LANDING GEAR UP WARNING WILL INITIATE FOR A TORQUE PRESSURE OF LESS THAN 30 PSI''; and (ii) Incorporate the following information into the limitation section of the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM): (A) Limit the maximum flap extension to 10 degrees; and (B) Limit flaps down operations for landing to 10° flap.	Within the next 50 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.	In accordance with Nomad Alert Service bulletin ANMD–57–18, dated December 19, 2002. Accomplish the limitations of paragraphs (d)(5)(ii)(A) and (d)(5)(ii)(B) of this AD by inserting a copy of the AD into the Limitations Section of the flight manual. the owner/operator holding at least a private pilot certificate as authorized by section 43.7 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7) may accomplish this flight manual insertion and the placard requirement of paragraph (d)(5)(i)(A) of this AD. Make an entry into the aircraft records showing compliance with these portions of the AD in accordance with section 43.9 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.9).

(e) *Can I comply with this AD in any other way?* To use an alternative method of compliance or adjust the compliance time, follow the procedures in 14 CFR 39.19. Send these requests to the Manager, Standards Office, Small Airplane Directorate. For information on any already approved alternative methods of compliance, contact Ron Atmur, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (562) 627–5224; facsimile (562) 627–5210.

(f) *How do I get copies of the documents referenced in this AD?* You may get copies of the documents referenced in this AD from Nomad Operations, Aerospace Support Division, Boeing Australia, PO Box 767, Brisbane, QLD 4000 Australia; telephone 61 7 3306 3366; facsimile 61 7 3306 3111. You

may view these documents at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Note: The subject of this AD is addressed in Australian AD/GAF–N22/69, Amendment 4, dated February 27, 2003.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on August 12, 2003.

Diane K. Malone,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 03–20984 Filed 8–15–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD08–03–030]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, New Orleans, LA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to change the regulation governing the operation of the SR 46 (St. Claude Avenue) bridge, mile 0.5 (Gulf Intracoastal Water Way (GIWW) mile 6.2 East of Harvey Lock), the SR 39 (Judge Seeber/Claiborne Avenue) bridge, mile 0.9 (GIWW mile 6.7 East of Harvey Lock), and the Florida Avenue bridge, mile 1.7 (GIWW mile 7.5 East of Harvey Lock), across the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal in New Orleans, Orleans Parish, Louisiana. New traffic studies indicate that rush hour vehicular traffic has increased congestion across all three bridges. This proposed regulation change would increase the time that the bridges would be open to vehicular traffic (closed to vessel traffic) by 15 minutes in the morning and afternoon and begin the afternoon closure one hour and 15 minutes earlier.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 17, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (obc), Eighth Coast Guard District, 501 Magazine Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130–3396. The Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District, Bridge Administration Branch maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the Bridge Administration office between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Kay Wade, Bridge Administration Branch, 504–589–2965.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking [CGD08–03–030], indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. You may submit a request for a meeting by writing to Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District, Bridge Administration Branch at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

The U.S. Coast Guard, at the request of a state representative and the owner of two of the three bridges crossing the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal in New Orleans, Orleans Parish, Louisiana, proposes to change the times of the existing drawbridge operation regulation. Currently, all three bridges remain closed to navigation and open to vehicular traffic during the morning and afternoon commuter rush hours. The SR 46 (St. Claude Avenue) bascule span highway bridge at mile 0.5, the SR 39 (Judge Seeber/Claiborne Avenue) vertical lift span highway bridge at mile 0.9, and the Florida Avenue bascule span highway and railroad bridge at mile 1.7 are governed by 33 CFR 117.458, which states that the draw of these three bridges shall open on signal; except that, from 6:45 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. and from 4:45 p.m. to 6:45 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, the draws need not open for the passage of vessels. The draws shall open at any time for a vessel in distress.

In an effort to reassess and accurately determine the needs of the commuters who cross these three bridges in the morning and afternoon en route to and from work in the Lower Ninth Ward area of New Orleans and in St. Bernard Parish, the Port of New Orleans hired Urban Systems to perform a new traffic study. The March 2003 traffic study revealed the average peak periods for vehicular traffic crossing the SR 46 (St. Claude Avenue) and the Florida Avenue bridges are from 6:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. and from 3:30 p.m. to 5:45 p.m. This marks a shift from the peak traffic times currently reflected in the regulation that was based on a traffic study completed in October 1999.

Traffic counts for the SR 39 (Judge Seeber/Claiborne Avenue) bridge were not conducted. However, the Claiborne Avenue bridge is located in close proximity to the other two bridges and is expected to exhibit similar traffic patterns. The Claiborne Avenue bridge provides a vertical clearance of 40 feet above Mean High Water in the closed to navigation position and is therefore expected to have less impact on vessel traffic than the other two bridges.

A review of the bridge tender logs revealed that adjusting the marine traffic closures to coordinate with vehicular rush hour traffic should not significantly impact the flow of marine traffic.

Allowing the bridges to remain closed to marine traffic during times that coincide with the heaviest vehicular traffic counts would help to relieve the morning and afternoon rush hour commuter traffic congestion across the bridges while having minimal impact on vessel traffic.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The proposed rule change to 33 CFR 117.458 would allow the bridges across the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal in New Orleans, Louisiana, at mile 0.5, 0.9, and 1.7 to remain closed to navigation beginning at 6:30 a.m. instead of 6:45 a.m. and remain closed until 8:30 a.m. In the afternoon, the closure time would begin earlier at 3:30 p.m. and end at 5:45 p.m. instead of 6:45 p.m. These changes would more closely coincide with peak rush hour traffic.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed rule is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of