

**Note 1:** For the purposes of this AD, a general visual inspection is: “A visual examination of an interior or exterior area, installation, or assembly to detect obvious damage, failure, or irregularity. This level of inspection is made from within touching distance unless otherwise specified. A mirror may be necessary to ensure visual access to

all surfaces in the inspection area. This level of inspection is made under normally available lighting conditions such as daylight, hangar lighting, flashlight, or droplight and may require removal or opening of access panels or doors. Stands, ladders, or platforms may be required to gain proximity to the area being checked.”

**Corrective Actions**

(i) If any crack or corrosion is found during any inspection required by this AD, before further flight, do the applicable corrective action in paragraph (i)(1) through (i)(3) of Table 4 of this AD, except as provided by paragraph (j) of this AD.

**TABLE 4.—CORRECTIVE ACTIONS**

If—	Then—	In accordance with the accomplishment instructions of—
(1) Any crack or corrosion is found during any inspection required by paragraph (f) of this AD.	Repair the cracked or corroded part .....	Airbus Service Bulletin A310–53–2030, Revision 06, dated July 2, 1996.
(2) Any crack or corrosion is found during any repetitive inspection required by paragraph (g) of this AD.	Repair the cracked or corroded part .....	Airbus Service Bulletin A310–53–2041, Revision 02, dated July 2, 1996.
(3) Any crack is found during any inspection required by paragraph (h) of this AD.	Repair the cracked part .....	Airbus Service Bulletin A310–53–2037, Revision 02, dated November 27, 2000.

(j) If any crack or corrosion is found during any inspection required by this AD, and the service bulletin recommends contacting Airbus for appropriate action: Before further flight, repair the cracked or corroded part in accordance with a method approved by either the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate; or the Direction Générale de

l’Aviation Civile (DGAC) (or its delegated agent).

**Terminating Modification for Repetitive Inspection of Corner Doublers, Fail-Safe Ring, and Door Frames**

(k) Modify the passenger/crew door structures in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Airbus

Service Bulletin A310–53–2017, Revision 09, dated May 17, 2004. Do the modification at the applicable time in paragraph (k)(1) or (k)(2) of Table 5 of this AD. Accomplishment of this modification constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspections required by paragraph (h) of this AD. The inspections required by paragraph (f) of this AD must be done before accomplishing this modification.

**TABLE 5.—COMPLIANCE TIME FOR TERMINATING MODIFICATION**

For model—	Compliance time
(1) A310–203, –204, –221, and –222 airplanes .....	Before the accumulation of 40,000 flight cycles since the date of issuance of the original standard Airworthiness Certificate or the date of issuance of the original Export Certificate of Airworthiness, or during the next inspection required by paragraph (h) of this AD, whichever occurs later.
(2) A310–304, –322, –324, and –325 airplanes .....	Before the accumulation of 35,000 flight cycles since the date of issuance of the original standard Airworthiness Certificate or the date of issuance of the original Export Certificate of Airworthiness, or during the next inspection required by paragraph (h) of this AD, whichever occurs later.

**Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)**

(1)(1) The Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested in accordance with the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

(2) Before using any AMOC approved in accordance with § 39.19 on any airplane to which the AMOC applies, notify the appropriate principal inspector in the FAA Flight Standards Certificate Holding District Office.

**Related Information**

(m) French airworthiness directives 1991–132–124(B) R1, issued November 29, 2000, and F–2004–103, issued July 7, 2004, also address the subject of this AD.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 9, 2005.

**Kalene C. Yanamura,**

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

[FR Doc. 05–22971 Filed 11–18–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Coast Guard**

**33 CFR Part 165**

[CGD01–05–094]

**Navigation and Waterways Management Improvements, Providence River Regulated Navigation Area; Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island and Mt. Hope Bay, MA**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice; request for public comments.

**SUMMARY:** The First Coast Guard District announces that it is considering changing, rescinding, or maintaining certain navigation regulations currently in effect for the Providence River, and

is also considering what, if any, navigation safety measures should be implemented within Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island and Mt. Hope Bay, Massachusetts [hereafter "Bays"].

**DATES:** Comments are due on or before December 21, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number CGD01-05-094 to the Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Providence. That office maintains the public dockets for this rulemaking. Comments and documents will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the same address between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m. Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. To avoid duplication, please use only one of the following methods:

(1) Mail or delivery to Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Providence, 20 Risho Avenue, East Providence, RI, 02914-1208.

(2) Fax to 401-435-2399.

(3) Electronically via e-mail at [EleBlanc@msoprov.uscg.mil](mailto:EleBlanc@msoprov.uscg.mil).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this notice, address mail to Mr. Edward G. LeBlanc, c/o Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Providence, 20 Risho Avenue, East Providence, RI 02914-1208, call 401-435-2351, e-mail at [EleBlanc@msoprov.uscg.mil](mailto:EleBlanc@msoprov.uscg.mil), or fax 401-435-2399.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Submitting Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this request for public comments by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this notice (CGD01-05-094), indicate the question to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. You may submit your comments and material by mail, hand delivery, fax, or electronic means to the project officer at the addresses or phone numbers listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, but please submit your comments and material by only one means. If you submit them by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know that they reached U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Providence, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period.

##### **Public Meeting**

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting, but you may submit a request for one to U. S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Providence at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that a public meeting would aid the Coast Guard in determining what type, if any, of rulemaking is appropriate, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

##### **Background and Purpose**

On May 1, 1994, the Coast Guard established a Regulated Navigation Area (RNA) in the Providence River, Providence, Rhode Island. That RNA is described at 33 CFR 165.122. The RNA was designed to protect the maritime community from hazards to navigation associated with the extreme shoaling that had previously occurred in the northern section of the Providence River channel. Generally, the RNA imposed certain navigation restrictions in various segments of the Providence River including, among other requirements, a maximum draft of 35 feet for most vessels, one-way vessel traffic, and a requirement that vessels over 65 feet in length make periodic SECURITE calls via VHF radio. In September 2005, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers ("The USACE") completed a major maintenance dredging of the Providence River to remove most shoaling and restore the channel to a depth of 40' at Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW), and a minimum channel width of 600'. (The USACE "Results of Survey" dated September 16, 2005, is available for review in the docket, CGD 01-05-094.) The restoration of the Providence River Channel to the above described dimensions should permit sufficient depth and width for typical commercial and recreational vessels to navigate within the channel without the special restrictions and reporting requirements currently imposed by the RNA. Consequently, the Coast Guard is considering disestablishing the RNA and restoring the Providence River to normal navigation practices, revising the RNA, or leaving the current RNA in effect.

Concurrently, the Coast Guard seeks public comment and recommendations on what, if any, navigation safety regulations may be appropriate for the waterways that encompass Narragansett Bay and Mt. Hope Bays in their entirety, including the Providence River and Taunton River. On September 7 and September 8, 2004, the Coast Guard sponsored a Ports and Waterways Safety

Assessment (PAWSA) of Narragansett Bay, which was conducted by a cross-section of key waterways users and stakeholders. The report produced by the PAWSA participants identified several issues and areas within the Bays where navigation safety was of particular concern. (A copy of the PAWSA report is available in the docket, CGD01-05-094.) Although the Coast Guard has taken several non-regulatory actions to improve navigation safety, such as public outreach, education and improved aids to navigation, we seek public comment with respect to the need, if any, for additional navigation safety regulations within the Bays.

##### **Questions**

We invite the public to answer the following questions. In responding to each question, please explain your reasoning as fully as possible so that we can carefully weigh the consequences and impacts of any future regulatory actions the Coast Guard may take. In preparing your responses to these questions, please indicate your position in the maritime community, if applicable.

1. Now that the shoaling has been removed subsequent to a major dredging operation by the USACE, should the Providence River RNA as currently defined in 33 CFR 165.122 be maintained? Why, or why not? What specific hazards to navigation would be mitigated by maintaining this RNA? How would navigation safety be enhanced?

2. Should the Providence River RNA be maintained in some form other than as it currently exists? Are there less severe or more severe restrictions that should be implemented? How, specifically, would your recommendations reduce risk, mitigate hazards to navigation, and improve navigation safety?

3. Should the Providence River RNA be expanded to cover any or all other portions of Narragansett Bay, including Mt. Hope Bay and the Taunton River? If so, what type of navigation safety regulations would be beneficial and why? What hazards to navigation would be mitigated? How would risks be reduced? (Comment on such possible restrictions as one-way traffic areas, under keel clearance requirements, security call requirements, equipment carriage requirements, anchorage regulations, etc.)

4. If you recommend the Coast Guard adopt certain regulatory measures, what would be the cost (or savings), if any, to commercial and recreational vessel

owners and operators to comply with your recommendations?

5. If you recommend the Coast Guard adopt certain regulatory measures, what would be the economic impact to small entities, if any? "Small entities" is defined by the Regulatory Flexibility Act [5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*], and generally refers to an enterprise or business that "is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field \* \* \*" 5 U.S.C. 601.

Comments are not limited to the preceding questions and are invited on any aspect of navigation safety within the Bays.

Dated: November 10, 2005.

**Mark J. Campbell,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting  
Commander, First Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 05-22951 Filed 11-18-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 660

[I.D. 111505A]

#### Pacific Fishery Management Council; Notice of Intent

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS); request for comments; preliminary notice of public scoping meetings.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS and the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Pacific Council) announce their intent to prepare an EIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 to analyze proposals to allocate groundfish among various sectors of the non-tribal Pacific Coast groundfish fishery.

**DATES:** Public scoping meetings will be announced in the **Federal Register** at a later date. Written comments will be accepted at the Pacific Council office through February 8, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, on issues and alternatives, identified by 111505A by any of the following methods:

- E-mail:

##GFAllocationEIS.nwr@noaa.gov. Include [111505A] and enter "Scoping Comments" in the subject line of the message.

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>.

- Fax: 503-820-2299.

- Mail: Dr. Donald McIsaac, Pacific Fishery Management Council, 7700 NE Ambassador Pl., Suite 200, Portland, OR, 97220.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. John DeVore, Pacific Fishery Management Council, phone: 503-820-2280, fax: 503-820-2299 and email: [john.devore@noaa.gov](mailto:john.devore@noaa.gov); or Yvonne de Reynier NMFS, Northwest Region, phone: 206-526-6129, fax: 206-526-6426 and email: [yvonne.dereynier@noaa.gov](mailto:yvonne.dereynier@noaa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Electronic Access

This **Federal Register** document is available on the Government Printing Office's website at: [www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index/html](http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index/html).

##### Description of the Proposal

The proposed action, which will be the subject of the EIS and considered by the Pacific Council for recommendation to NMFS, would establish new allocations among sectors of the groundfish fishery. Existing allocations may or may not be revised as part of the proposed action. These allocations are needed to support recent Pacific Council decisions to use sector-specific total catch limits (sector caps) to control bycatch (Bycatch Mitigation Program Final Environmental Impact Statement), would be useful in supporting the Pacific Council's biennial management decisions, and would be needed to support the trawl individual quota program currently under consideration in a separate, but closely related EIS.

##### General Background

The Pacific Council implemented a Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) in 1982. Groundfish stocks are harvested in numerous commercial, recreational, and tribal fisheries in state and Federal waters off the West Coast. The non-tribal commercial seafood fleet taking groundfish is generally regulated as three sectors: Limited entry trawl, limited entry fixed gear, and directed open access. Groundfish are also harvested incidentally in non-groundfish commercial fisheries, most notably fisheries for pink shrimp, spot and ridgeback prawns, Pacific halibut, California halibut, and sea cucumbers (incidental open access fisheries). The recreational fleet also takes groundfish as targeted catch, as well as incidentally in, for example, salmon and halibut fisheries.

The Pacific Council has previously established a number of formal allocations among sectors.

- An allocation of sablefish between the fixed gear and trawl sectors was first established by emergency regulation in 1986. An adjustment was made on April 26, 1989, and the allocation has remained stable since then.

- Amendment 6 to the FMP (fully implemented in 1994 established rules for allocating any groundfish species between the limited entry and open access commercial fisheries based on relative catch histories of the two fleets from July 11, 1984 through August 1, 1988. Numerous groundfish species and species groups are allocated on the basis of this allocation rule.

- An allocation of whiting among domestic segments of the fleet was first established in 1991, when the joint venture fleet was entirely displaced by domestic processors. Several adjustments were made before the current allocation was established. The current allocation is among vessels delivering whiting shoreside, vessels delivering to motherships and catcher processors, and was first implemented for the 1997 fishery.

Other allocations are indirect and result from the preseason planning process. The management measures developed during the preseason process are intended to: achieve, but not exceed, optimum yields (OYs); prevent overfishing; rebuild overfished species; reduce and minimize the bycatch and discard of overfished and depleted stocks; provide equitable harvest opportunity for the recreational and commercial fishing sectors; and, within the commercial fisheries, achieve harvest guidelines and limited entry and open access allocations to the extent practicable. When this preseason process is complete, a table is developed (called the "score card") which summarizes the expected harvest of overfished species for each segment of the fleet. During the year, the catch by each sector is estimated, and adjustments to the score card are made using inseason information. If it appears the OY for an overfished species may be exceeded, the Pacific Council recommends changes to the management measures based on the same criteria used during the preseason process. As part of this inseason process, the expected harvests on the scorecard for each sector may be adjusted upwards or downwards. The explicit allocations that would be established under the proposed action would replace some or all of those that are currently the indirect result of the preseason planning process and management regulations flowing from that process.