

## List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

## The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA proposes to amend 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. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

**Airbus SAS:** Docket No. FAA–2022–0522; Project Identifier MCAI–2022–00340–T.

#### (a) Comments Due Date

The FAA must receive comments on this airworthiness directive (AD) by July 5, 2022.

#### (b) Affected ADs

None.

#### (c) Applicability

This AD applies to Airbus SAS airplanes specified in paragraphs (c)(1) and (2) of this AD, certificated in any category, as identified in European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2022–0039, dated March 8, 2022 (EASA AD 2022–0039).

(1) Model A330–201, –202, –203, –223, –223F, –243, –243F, –301, –302, –303, –321, –322, –323, –341, –342, –343, and –941 airplanes.

(2) Model A340–211, –212, –213, –311, –312, and –313 airplanes.

#### (d) Subject

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 27, Flight Controls.

#### (e) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by recent tests that demonstrated that when the upper secondary load path (SLP) of the trimmable horizontal stabilizer actuator (THSA) is engaged, the THSA might not stall, with consequently no indication of SLP engagement. The FAA is issuing this AD to prevent damage on the upper THSA SLP attachment, with consequent mechanical disconnection of the THSA, possibly resulting in loss of control of the airplane.

#### (f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

#### (g) Requirements

Except as specified in paragraph (h) of this AD: Comply with all required actions and compliance times specified in, and in accordance with, EASA AD 2022–0039.

#### (h) Exceptions to EASA AD 2022–0039

(1) Where EASA AD 2022–0039 refers to its effective date, this AD requires using the effective date of this AD.

(2) The “Remarks” section of EASA AD 2022–0039 does not apply to this AD.

#### (i) Additional AD Provisions

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, Large Aircraft Section, International Validation Branch, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or responsible Flight Standards Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the Large Aircraft Section, International Validation Branch, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (j)(2) of this AD. Information may be emailed to: [9-AVS-AIR-730-AMOC@faa.gov](mailto:9-AVS-AIR-730-AMOC@faa.gov). Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the responsible Flight Standards Office.

(2) *Contacting the Manufacturer:* For any requirement in this AD to obtain instructions from a manufacturer, the instructions must be accomplished using a method approved by the Manager, Large Aircraft Section, International Validation Branch, FAA; or EASA; or Airbus SAS’s EASA Design Organization Approval (DOA). If approved by the DOA, the approval must include the DOA-authorized signature.

(3) *Required for Compliance (RC):* Except as required by paragraph (i)(2) of this AD, if any service information contains procedures or tests that are identified as RC, those procedures and tests must be done to comply with this AD; any procedures or tests that are not identified as RC are recommended. Those procedures and tests that are not identified as RC may be deviated from using accepted methods in accordance with the operator’s maintenance or inspection program without obtaining approval of an AMOC, provided the procedures and tests identified as RC can be done and the airplane can be put back in an airworthy condition. Any substitutions or changes to procedures or tests identified as RC require approval of an AMOC.

#### (j) Related Information

(1) For EASA AD 2022–0039, contact EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +49 221 8999 000; email [ADs@easa.europa.eu](mailto:ADs@easa.europa.eu); internet [www.easa.europa.eu](http://www.easa.europa.eu). You may find this EASA AD on the EASA website at <https://ad.easa.europa.eu>. You may view this material at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195. This material may be found in the AD docket at <https://www.regulations.gov> by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2022–0522.

(2) For more information about this AD, contact Vladimir Ulyanov, Aerospace Engineer, Large Aircraft Section,

International Validation Branch, FAA, 2200 South 216th Street, Des Moines, WA 98198; telephone and fax 206–231–3229; email [Vladimir.Ulyanov@faa.gov](mailto:Vladimir.Ulyanov@faa.gov).

Issued on May 13, 2022.

**Gaetano A. Sciortino,**

*Deputy Director for Strategic Initiatives, Compliance & Airworthiness Division, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 2022–10722 Filed 5–18–22; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

### 16 CFR Chapter II

[Docket No. CPSC–2022–0015]

### Petitions Requesting Rulemaking To Amend the Safety Standard for Play Yards To Require a Minimum Thickness for Play Yard Mattresses, and To Standardize the Size of Play Yards and Play Yard Mattresses; Request for Comments

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of petitions for rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (Commission or CPSC) received two petitions regarding play yards and play yard mattresses. The Commission invites written comments concerning these petitions.

**DATES:** Submit comments by July 18, 2022.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by Docket No. CPSC–2022–0015, by any of the following methods:

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

*Mail/hand delivery/courier Written Submissions:* Submit comments by mail/hand delivery/courier to: Division of the Secretariat, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone: (301) 504–7479. Alternatively, as a temporary option during the COVID–19 pandemic, you can email such submissions to: [cpsc-os@cpsc.gov](mailto:cpsc-os@cpsc.gov).

*Instructions:* All submissions must include the agency name and docket

number for this notice. CPSC may post all comments without change, including any personal identifiers, contact information, or other personal information provided, to: <https://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 mail/hand delivery/courier written submissions.

**Docket:** For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to: <https://www.regulations.gov>, and insert the docket number, CPSC–2022–0015, into the “Search” box, and follow the prompts.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Alberta E. Mills, Division of the Secretariat, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone: 301–504–7479 (office) and 240–863–8938 (work cell); [cpsc-os@cpsc.gov](mailto:cpsc-os@cpsc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On November 29, 2021, Carol Pollack-Nelson, Ph.D. of Independent Safety Consulting, LLC, Sarah B. Newens, M.S. of Safety and Systems Solutions, M.S., and Alan H. Schoem, Esq. (collectively “Petitioners”) submitted two documents to the Commission through the Division of the Secretariat, titled: (1) Petition to Require Minimum Thickness for Play Yard Mattresses (“Mattress Thickness Petition”), and (2) Petition to Standardize the Size of Play Yards and Play Yard Mattresses (“Play Yard Size Petition”) (collectively “petitions”).<sup>1</sup> The petitions seek a rulemaking to amend the Commission’s regulation, Safety Standard for Play Yards, 16 CFR part 1221, to address the hazard of infants becoming entrapped between the edge of a play yard and the play yard mattress and suffocating (“gap entrapment hazard”). CPSC docketed the Mattress Thickness Petition as petition CP 22–1 and docketed the Play Yard Size Petition as CP 22–2.

The Mattress Thickness Petition states that to reduce consumer perception that a play yard floor is too hard, and the notion that soft bedding should be added for the comfort of an infant, the Commission should require a minimum play yard mattress thickness of 1.5 inches with a minimal tolerance allowed. Additionally, Petitioners seek a maximum 0.5-inch gap requirement between a play yard mattress and the

mesh side of the play yard wall, and to allow a maximum play yard mattress thickness of 3 inches.

The Play Yard Size Petition seeks to “mitigate the risk posed by an undersized mattress in a play yard” by standardizing the size of play yards and play yard mattresses “to one size for each given perimeter shape,” meaning “one size for square play yards, one size for rectangular play yards, one size for oval play yards and one size for round play yards.” Petitioners assert that this change also would reduce hazardous gaps between play yard mattresses and play yard walls.

By this notice, the Commission seeks comments concerning the two petitions. In particular, the Commission seeks comments on the following:

- The Commission considered the gap-entrapment hazard in granting petition CP 15–2, Petition Requesting Rulemaking on Supplemental Mattresses for Play Yards with Non-Rigid Sides, in establishing a Safety Standard for Crib Mattresses, and in continuing to work on play yard mattress requirements with the ASTM F15.18 Subcommittee on Play Yards and Non-Full-Size Cribs. What effect would these new petitions have on the Commission’s work on this issue?

- Are any of the issues raised in the Mattress Thickness Petition supported, mooted, or rendered superfluous by the continuing work on the gap-entrapment hazard in the ASTM F15.18 Subcommittee on Play Yards and Non-Full-Size Cribs?

- The Commission, by statute, will consider any revised ASTM voluntary standard for play yards if ASTM notifies the Commission of a revised standard. 15 U.S.C. 2056a(b)(4). Based on the new petitions, should the Commission commit additional resources to the gap-entrapment issue, beyond staff’s current work on mattress fit and thickness with the ASTM F15.18 Subcommittee on Play Yards and Non-Full-Size Cribs? Why or why not?

- The Commission’s rules are typically stated in terms of performance requirements, and/or requirements for labeling and instructions. *See, e.g.*, 15 U.S.C. 2056(a). Is the proposal in the Play Yard Size Petition to limit the sizes of play yards and play yard mattresses consistent with this practice? If not, is the departure justified?

- Can the safety objective identified in the Play Yard Size Petition, *i.e.*, assisting consumers to purchase play yard mattresses that properly fit into a play yard, be addressed by a performance requirement different from that proposed in the Play Yard Size Petition? If so, are there reasons to favor

or disfavor the requirement proposed in the Play Yard Size Petition? Does the existing requirement for play yard mattresses in the Safety Standard for Play Yards adequately address this hazard?

The petitions are available at: <http://www.regulations.gov>, under Docket No. CPSC–2022–0015, Supporting and Related Materials. Alternatively, interested parties may obtain a copy of the petitions by writing or calling the Division of the Secretariat, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone: 301–504–7479 or 240–863–8938; [cpsc-os@cpsc.gov](mailto:cpsc-os@cpsc.gov).

**Brenda Rouse,**

*Acting Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2022–10293 Filed 5–18–22; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6355–01–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R07–OAR–2022–0419; FRL–9830–01–R7]

### Air Plan Approval; Missouri; St. Louis Area Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve, through parallel processing, revisions to the Missouri State Implementation Plan (SIP) relating to the St. Louis area’s vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) Program received on November 12, 2019, and March 2, 2022. In the submissions, Missouri requests EPA approval of revisions to a regulation and related plan that implement the St. Louis area’s Inspection and Maintenance program called, Gateway Vehicle Inspection Program (GVIP). We propose to approve Missouri’s removal of vehicles registered in Franklin County, unless the vehicle is primarily operated in the rest of the area, from the Gateway Vehicle Inspection program. The revisions to this rule include amending the rule exemption section for vehicles subject to the rule, removing unnecessary words, amending definitions specific to the rule, updates due to technology changes, and other minor edits. These revisions do not impact the attainment of any National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) nor delay the timely attainment of 2015

<sup>1</sup> On May 3, 2022, the Commission voted 3–1 to publish this Notice of Petitions for Rulemaking in the **Federal Register**.