

(i) Related Information

(1) For more information about this AD, contact Kirk Gustafson, Aerospace Engineer, Boston ACO Branch, FAA, 1200 District Avenue, Burlington, MA, 01803; phone: 781-238-7190; fax: 781-238-7199; email: kirk.gustafson@faa.gov.

(2) Refer to European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD No. 2019-0004, dated January 11, 2019 (corrected on January 17, 2019), for more information. You may examine the EASA AD in the AD docket on the internet at <https://www.regulations.gov> by searching for and locating it in Docket No. FAA-2019-0760.

(3) For service information identified in this AD, contact Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation, Customer Service Engineering, 124 Quarry Road, Trumbull, CT 06611; telephone 1-800-Winged-S or 203-416-4299; email: wcs_cust_service_eng.gr-sik@lmco.com; Thales AVS France SAS, 75-77 Avenue Marcel Dassault, 33700 Mérignac—France, Tel: +33 (0)5 24 44 77 40, www.thalesgroup.com; or ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Régional, 1, Allée Pierre Nadot, 31712 Blagnac Cedex, France; telephone +33 (0) 5 62 21 62 21; fax +33 (0) 5 62 21 67 18; email continued.airworthiness@atr-aircraft.com. You may view this referenced service information at the FAA, Engine and Propeller Standards Branch, 1200 District Avenue, Burlington, MA, 01803. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 781-238-7759.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on January 27, 2020.

Robert J. Ganley,

Manager, Engine and Propeller Standards Branch, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2020-01706 Filed 1-30-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

16 CFR Parts 1219, 1220

[Docket No. CPSC-2010-0075]

Review of the Safety Standards for Full-Size Baby Cribs and Non-Full-Size Baby Cribs

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Section 610 review and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Consumer Product Safety Commission (Commission or CPSC) is conducting a review of the safety standards for full-size baby cribs and non-full-size baby cribs under section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA). That section requires the CPSC to review, within 10 years after their issuance, mandatory standards that have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The CPSC seeks comment to determine

whether, consistent with the CPSC's statutory obligations, these standards should be maintained without change or modified to minimize significant impact of the rule on a substantial number of small entities.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted by March 31, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. CPSC-2010-0075, by any of the following methods:

Electronic Submissions: Submit electronic comments to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments. CPSC does not accept comments submitted by electronic mail (email), except through www.regulations.gov. CPSC encourages you to submit electronic comments by using the Federal eRulemaking Portal, as described above.

Mail/hand delivery/courier Submissions: Submit comments by mail/hand delivery/courier to: Division of the Secretariat, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Room 820, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504-7923.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this notice. All comments received may be posted without change, including any personal identifiers, contact information, or other personal information provided, to: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Do not submit electronically confidential business information, trade secret information, or other sensitive or protected information that you do not want to be available to the public. If you wish to submit such information, please submit it according to the instructions for written submissions.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to: <http://www.regulations.gov>, and insert the docket number CPSC-2010-0075, into the "Search" box, and follow the prompts.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Proper, Directorate for Economic Analysis, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone: (301) 504-7628; email: sproper@cpsc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Section 104 of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act

On December 28, 2010, the CPSC issued the Safety Standards for Full-Size Baby Cribs (16 CFR part 1219) and Non-Full-Size Baby Cribs (16 CFR part 1220) under section 104(c) of the Consumer

Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (CPSIA), Public Law 110-314 (75 FR 81766). Section 104(c) of the CPSIA stated that the crib standards would apply to certain persons (such as those owning or operating child care facilities and places of public accommodation), in addition to persons usually subject to consumer product safety rules.¹ In the initial rule, the Commission determined that both crib standards would have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities, including manufacturers, importers, small retailers, and child care centers (75 FR 81782-86).

On August 12, 2011, in Public Law 112-28, Congress amended section 104 and specifically addressed potential revisions of the crib standards, stating that any revision after their initial promulgation "shall apply only to a person that manufactures or imports cribs," unless the Commission determines that application to any others covered by the initial crib standards is "necessary to protect against an unreasonable risk to health or safety." If the Commission applies a revised crib standard to additional persons, the statute requires the Commission to provide at least 12 months for those persons to come into compliance. The Commission has not expanded the applicability of the crib standards to any additional persons in subsequent revisions to the standards.²

B. The Crib Standards

The full-size baby crib standard currently incorporates ASTM F1169-19, *Standard Consumer Safety Specification for Full-Size Baby Cribs*, approved on March 15, 2019, as the mandatory CPSC standard. ASTM F1169-19 specifies performance requirements and test procedures to determine the structural integrity of full-size cribs. It also contains design requirements addressing entanglement on crib corner post extensions, and

¹ Under section 104(c) of the CPSIA, the initial crib standards applied to any person that

(A) Manufactures, distributes in commerce, or contracts to sell cribs;

(B) Based on the person's occupation, holds itself out as having knowledge of skill peculiar to cribs, including child care facilities and family child care homes;

(C) Is in the business of contracting to sell or resell, lease, sublet, or otherwise place cribs in the stream of commerce; or

(D) Owns or operates a place of accommodation affecting commerce.

² The full-size crib standard was revised on July 31, 2012 (77 FR 45242), December 9, 2013 (78 FR 73692), and July 23, 2019 (84 FR 35293); the non-full-size crib standard was revised on June 6, 2018 (83 FR 26206) and October 23, 2019 (84 FR 56684).

requirements for warning labels and instructional material.

The non-full-size baby crib standard currently incorporates ASTM F406–17, *Standard Consumer Safety Specification for Non-Full-Size Baby Cribs/Play Yards*, approved on December 1, 2017, as the mandatory CPSC standard. ASTM 406–17 specifies the testing requirements for structural integrity and performance requirements for non-full-size cribs/play yards. It also provides requirements for labeling and instructional material.

C. Review Under Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act

Section 610(a) of the RFA requires agencies to review regulations that have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities within 10 years of the date of their publication. 5 U.S.C. 610(a). Because the crib standards were promulgated in 2010, the Commission is now commencing its section 610 review. The purpose of the review is to determine whether such rule should be continued without change, or should be amended, consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes to minimize any significant impact of the rules on a substantial number of small entities. The RFA lists several factors that the agency shall consider when reviewing rules under section 610. These factors are:

- The continued need for the rule;
- The nature of complaints or comments received concerning the rule from the public;
- The complexity of the rule;
- The extent to which the rule overlaps, duplicates or conflicts with other Federal rules, and, to the extent feasible, with State and local governmental rules; and
- The length of time since the rule has been evaluated or the degree to which technology, economic conditions, or other factors have changed in the area affected by the rule.

5 U.S.C. 610(b)

The need for the safety standards for full-size baby cribs and non-full-size baby cribs has been established by statutory mandate under section 104 of the CPSIA. However, the Commission seeks comment to evaluate the other factors and to determine whether the ongoing impact of the rules is significant for a substantial number of small entities. An important step in the review process involves gathering and analyzing information from affected persons about their experience with the rules and any material changes in circumstances since issuance of the rules. The Commission requests written

comments on the adequacy or inadequacy of the rules, their small business impacts, and other relevant issues. In addition to the specific questions below, the Commission welcomes comments on any other issues raised by section 610 of the RFA.

Safety and Effectiveness

1. Are there any recent technological developments that would improve the effectiveness of the full-size or non-full-size crib standards? Would any of these potential improvements have an impact on suppliers, and if so, would the impact be different for small suppliers and large suppliers?

2. Are there any sections of the full-size and/or non-full-size crib standards that could be improved without reducing the stringency of the standards or reducing the safety of the resulting cribs? How would these changes affect suppliers, particularly small suppliers? Explain your response, and provide supporting data, if possible.

Costs and Impacts—Suppliers

1. Are there any requirements of the full-size or non-full size crib standards that are especially or unnecessarily costly and/or burdensome, particularly to small suppliers? Which ones? Are any of the requirements disproportionately burdensome for small entities? How might the requirements of either standard be modified to reduce the costs or burdens on small suppliers without reducing the safety provided by the standards or making the standards less stringent? Please explain your response, and provide supporting data.

2. What percent of the time and cost of crib construction does complying with the full-size and/or non-full-size crib standards represent? Do these percentages vary significantly depending on the geographical location, size of firm, or other factors? Which requirements in the full-size or non-full-size crib standards have the greatest impact on cost of production? The lowest impact on cost of production? We are primarily interested in small firms, but understanding how impact varies based on firm size would be helpful. Please explain your response, and provide supporting data, if possible.

3. What modifications did manufacturers or others have to make to full-size and/or non-full-size crib models to comply with the requirements of CPSC's crib standards? What was the cost of these modifications in terms of labor, materials, and research and development? Are these costs ongoing, or were they one-time expenditures? Please explain, and provide supporting

data, if possible. Are the costs comparable for large and small firms?

4. Have any manufacturers or importers entered the market for full-size and/or non-full-size cribs since the standards went into effect? Did the standards present any specific challenges for new entrants, particularly small suppliers?

5. Have any manufacturers or importers reduced the number of models in their full-size and/or non-full-size crib product lines or dropped the product lines entirely because of the requirements of the crib rules? If so, which requirements were the most burdensome, and were they more, less, or equally burdensome for small firms? Why?

6. Did the longer effective date for childcare facilities significantly reduce the impact? Please explain why or why not.

7. Do the full-size and non-full-size crib standards affect any small entities not mentioned in the questions above? If so, what entities are affected and how? Please explain your response, and provide supporting data, if possible.

Recordkeeping and Third Party Testing

1. What percent of the time and cost of complying with the full-size and non-full-size crib standards does testing represent? How much of that testing is conducted by third parties, and how much is additional, internal testing? Do these percentages vary significantly depending on the type of crib, geographical location, size of firm, or other factors? Which requirements in the full-size and non-full-size crib standards have the greatest impact on testing costs? Which requirements have the lowest impact on testing costs? We are especially interested in any differential impact of the testing requirements on small businesses. Explain your response, and provide supporting data, if possible.

2. Are the recordkeeping requirements associated with third party testing for conforming to the crib standards adequate, inadequate, or overly burdensome? If they are overly burdensome, are they more or less burdensome for small firms? Are there recordkeeping requirements that could be applied to cribs as a product class that would reduce the recordkeeping cost on suppliers, in particular small suppliers, without reducing safety? Please explain your response.

3. How frequently do suppliers submit samples of their full-size and non-full-size cribs to third party conformity assessment bodies for testing to compliance with the full-size or non-full-size crib standards or other crib

standards? Do small suppliers submit them more, less, or with equal frequency as large suppliers? How many samples of each model are submitted for testing to maintain certification? Do the number of samples submitted vary depending on the size of the submitting supplier? What is the cost of the testing, and to what extent, if any, does cost vary, based on the size of the submitting firm? Did the cost of testing for conformance with standards (whether third party, internal, or both) increase after the rules became mandatory? If so, by how much, and did that increase vary, based on firm size?

4. To what extent have the third party testing requirements replaced other testing that suppliers, particularly small suppliers, conducted, thereby not imposing any additional burden? Please explain your response.

5. Have suppliers, particularly small suppliers, been able to make use of the flexibilities provided in the component part rule (16 CFR part 1109) to reduce their third party testing costs (e.g., relying upon third party testing provided by a supplier to certify products or relying on third party testing of a component used in more than one model for certification purposes)? If so, in what way? Can you provide estimates of the cost savings provided by the component part testing rule?

6. Could changes be made in the third party testing procedures or the third party testing rules that would reduce the burden on crib suppliers, particularly small crib suppliers, and still be consistent with assuring compliance with the crib standards? If so, how?

Clarity and Duplication

1. Is there any aspect of the full-size and/or non-full-size crib standards that is unclear, needlessly complex, or duplicative?

2. Do any portions of the standards overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other federal, state, or local government rules?

Outreach and Advocacy

1. Are the requirements in CPSC's full-size and non-full-size crib standards known to firms that manufacture or import cribs for the United States, particularly small firms and firms that build or import cribs infrequently or in small lots? How could the requirements of the standard be communicated more effectively to such firms?

2. Are there any cribs at small child care facilities or places of public accommodation that do not meet the full-size or non-full-size crib standard? What can CPSC do to improve awareness of the standards?

requirements among owners of these businesses? Please explain.

Alberta E. Mills,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2020-01832 Filed 1-30-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

24 CFR Parts 3280, 3282, and 3285

[Docket No. FR-6149-P-01]

RIN 2502-AJ49

Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would amend the Federal Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards (the Construction and Safety Standards) by adopting recommendations made to HUD by the Manufactured Housing Consensus Committee (MHCC). The National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (the Act) requires HUD to publish in the **Federal Register** any proposed revised Construction and Safety Standard submitted by the MHCC. The MHCC has prepared and submitted to HUD its third group of recommendations to improve various aspects of the Construction and Safety Standards. HUD has reviewed those proposals and has made editorial revisions to several and HUD proposes correlating additions for several of the proposals. HUD has decided not to go forward in this proposed rule with certain revisions recommended by the MHCC due to pending regulations for improving energy efficiency in manufactured homes currently being prepared by the Department of Energy. In addition, HUD has decided not to move forward with a new proposal to add requirements for draftstopping to the Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards.

As agreed, these recommendations are being published to provide notice of the proposed revisions and an opportunity for public comment.

DATES: *Comment Due Date:* March 31, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments responsive to this proposed rule to the Office of General Counsel, Regulations Division,

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW, Room 10276, Washington, DC 20410-0001. All submissions should refer to the above docket number and title. Submission of public comments may be carried out by hard copy or electronic submission.

1. *Submission of Hard Copy*

Comments. Comments may be submitted by mail or hand delivery. Each commenter submitting hard copy comments, by mail or hand delivery, should submit comments to the above address to the attention of the Regulations Division. Due to security measures at all Federal agencies, submission of comments by mail often results in delayed delivery. To ensure timely receipt of comments, HUD recommends that any comments submitted by mail be submitted at least 2 weeks in advance of the public comment deadline. All hard copy comments received by mail or hand delivery are a part of the public record and will be posted to <http://www.regulations.gov> without change.

2. *Electronic Submission of*

Comments. Interested persons may submit comments electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. HUD strongly encourages commenters to submit comments electronically. Electronic submission of comments allows the commenter maximum time to prepare and submit a comment, ensures timely receipt by HUD, and enables HUD to make comments immediately available to the public. Comments submitted electronically through the <http://www.regulations.gov> website can be viewed by other commenters and interested members of the public. Commenters should follow instructions provided on that site to submit comments electronically.

No Facsimile Comments. Facsimile (fax) comments are not acceptable.

Public Inspection of Comments. All comments submitted to HUD regarding this rule will be available, without charge, for public inspection and copying between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. weekdays, at the above address. Due to security measures at the HUD Headquarters building, an advance appointment to review the public comments must be scheduled by calling the Regulations Division at 202-708-3055 (this is not a toll-free number). Individuals with speech or hearing impairments may access this number through TTY by calling the Federal Relay Service at 800-877-8339 (this is a toll-free number). Copies of all comments submitted are available for inspection and downloading at <http://www.regulations.gov>.