modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (b) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent failure of certain latch assemblies on the ceiling panels, which could cause the ceiling panels to fall into the cabin area, and consequent injury to the crew and passengers, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 24 months after the effective date of this AD, install strap assemblies on the ceiling panels and rails that support the video monitors, in accordance with Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 747–25A3142, dated October 16, 1997, or Revision 1, dated August 6, 1998.

(b) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Seattle ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Seattle ACO.

(c) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 2, 1998.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–29866 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–CE–52–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Schempp-Hirth K.G. Models Standard-Cirrus, Nimbus-2, JANUS, and Mini-Nimbus HS–7 Sailplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM); Reopening of the comment period.

SUMMARY: This document proposes to revise an earlier proposed airworthiness directive (AD) that would have required installing a safety device for the tailplane locking hook on certain Schempp-Hirth K.G. (Schempp-Hirth) Models Standard-Cirrus, Nimbus-2, JANUS, and Mini-Nimbus HS–7 sailplanes. The proposed AD was the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Germany. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent the locking hook on the tailplane attachment bracket from disengaging, which could result in the horizontal tailplane coming loose from the fin with possible loss of longitudinal control of the sailplane. Since issuing the NPRM, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) realized that it inadvertently omitted serial number 176 of the Schempp-Hirth Model Nimbus-2 sailplanes from the NPRM. The FAA has determined that this sailplane should be incorporated into the proposed AD, and that the comment period for the proposal should be reopened and the public should have additional time to comment.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 11, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–CE–52–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted.

Service information that applies to the proposed AD may be obtained from Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH, Postbox 14 43, D–73222 Kirchheim unter Teck, Federal Republic of Germany. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Mike Kiesov, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 1201 Walnut, suite 900, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 426–6934; facsimile: (816) 426–2169.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this supplemental notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report that summarizes each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this supplemental notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. 98–CE–52–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of Supplemental NPRM's

Any person may obtain a copy of this supplemental NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–CE–52–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Discussion

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would apply to certain Schempp-Hirth Models Standard-Cirrus, Nimbus-2, JANUS, and Mini-Nimbus HS–7 sailplanes was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on June 17, 1998 (63 FR 33014). The NPRM proposed to require installing a safety device for the tailplane locking hook. Accomplishment of the proposed action as specified in the NPRM would be in accordance with Schempp-Hirth Appendix to Technical Note No. 278–36, 286–33, 295–26, 328–11, 798–3, dated November 11, 1994.

The NPRM was the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Germany.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. No comments were received on the proposed rule or the FAA's determination of the cost to the public.

Events Since Issuance of the NPRM

Since issuance of the NPRM, the FAA realized that it inadvertently omitted serial number 176 of the Schempp-Hirth Model Nimbus-2 sailplanes from the NPRM.

The FAA's Determination

After examining all information related to the subject described in this document, the FAA has determined that:

—Serial number 176 of the Schempp-Hirth Model Nimbus-2 sailplanes should be added to the AD; and

—AD action should be taken to incorporate these changes to continue to prevent the locking hook on the tailplane attachment bracket from disengaging, which could result in the horizontal tailplane coming loose from the fin with possible loss of longitudinal control of the sailplane.

The Supplemental NPRM

Since adding this additional serial number sailplane to the NPRM proposes actions that go beyond the scope of what was already proposed, the FAA is reopening the comment period to allow the public additional time to comment on this proposed action.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 91 sailplanes in the U.S. registry would be affected by the proposed AD, that it would take approximately 3 workhours per sailplane to accomplish the proposed action, and that the average labor rate is approximately $60 an hour. Parts cost approximately $35 per sailplane. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $19,565, or $215 per sailplane.

The only cost difference between this proposal and the original NPRM is the addition of 1 sailplane, or $215.

Compliance Time of the Proposed AD

Although the unsafe condition identified in this proposed AD occurs during flight and is a direct result of sailplane operation, the FAA has no way of determining how much time will elapse before the tailplane is not securely attached to the fin. For example, the condition could exist on a sailplane with 200 hours time-in-service (TIS), but could be developing on a sailplane with 50 hours TIS and not actually exist on this sailplane until 300 hours TIS. For this reason, the FAA has determined that a compliance based on calendar time should be utilized in the proposed AD in order to assure that the unsafe condition is addressed on all sailplanes in a reasonable time period.

Differences Between the Technical Note, German AD, and This Proposed AD

Both Schempp-Hirth Technical Note No. 278–36, 286–33, 295–26, 328–11, 798–3, dated November 11, 1994, and German AD 95–015, dated December 15, 1994, apply to the Model Nimbus-2M sailplanes. This sailplane model is not type certificated for operation in the United States and therefore is not covered by the applicability of the proposed AD.

The Model Nimbus-2M sailplanes could be operating in the United States with an experimental certificate. The FAA is including a NOTE in the proposed AD to recommend that any person operating a Model Nimbus-2M sailplane in the United States with an experimental certificate accomplish the actions specified in the technical note.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects 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, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this 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, pursuant to 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. Section 39.13 is amended by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD) to read as follows:

Schempp-Hirth K.G.: Docket No. 98–CE–52–AD.

Applicability: The following sailplane models and serial numbers, certificated in any category:

Models	Serial Nos.
Standard Cirrus.	573, 586, 593, 595, 597 through 599, 601 through 701.
Nimbus-2 ...	86, 93, and 96 through 116, 118 through 129, 131, and 176.
JANUS	1 through 55, and 59.
Mini-Nimbus HS–7.	1 through 60, and 65.

Note 1: Both Schempp-Hirth Technical Note No. 278–36, 286–33, 295–26, 328–11, 798–3, dated November 11, 1994, and German AD 95–015, dated December 15, 1994, apply to the Model Nimbus-2M sailplanes. This sailplane model is not type certificated for operation in the United States, and therefore is not covered by the applicability of this AD. The Model Nimbus-2M sailplanes could be operating in the United States with an experimental certificate. The FAA recommends that any person operating a Model Nimbus-2M sailplane in the United States with an experimental certificate accomplish the actions specified in the technical note.

Note 2: This AD applies to each sailplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For sailplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required within the next 6 calendar months after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.

To prevent the locking hook on the tailplane attachment bracket from disengaging, which could result in the horizontal tailplane coming loose from the fin with possible loss of longitudinal control of the sailplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Install a safety device for the tailplane locking hook in accordance with Schempp-Hirth Appendix to Technical Note No. 278–

36, 286–33, 295–26, 328–11, 798–3, dated November 11, 1994.

(b) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the sailplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, FAA, 1201 Walnut, suite 900, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Small Airplane Directorate.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Aircraft Certification Office.

(d) Questions or technical information related to the service information referenced in this document should be directed to Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH, Postbox 14 43, D–73222 Kirchheim unter Teck, Federal Republic of Germany. This service information may be examined at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Note 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in German AD 95–015, dated December 15, 1994.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on October 30, 1998.

Michael Gallagher,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–29865 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07–98–054]

RIN 2115–AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Suwannee River, Florida

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to amend the regulations governing the operation of the CSX Railroad drawbridge (formerly owned by the Seaboard System Railroad) across the Suwannee River, mile 35.0, at Old Town, Dixie/Levy Counties, Florida, to allow the bridge to remain permanently closed. The railroad Right of Way was sold to the State of Florida in 1997 for development of the Nature Coast Trail, a public facility for non-motorized recreational activities. The bridge has not received an opening request since 1981. This action should accommodate the needs of recreational land traffic and still provide for the reasonable needs of navigation.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before January 8, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Commander (oan) Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 SE 1st Avenue, Miami, Florida 33131–3050, or may be delivered to room 406 at the above address between 7:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. The telephone number is (305) 536–4103.

The District Commander maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Walt Paskowsky, Project Manager, Bridge Section, (305) 536–4103.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written data, views or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify the rulemaking [CGD7 98–054] and the specific section of this proposal to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Persons wanting acknowledgement of receipt of comments should enclose stamped, self-addressed postcards or envelopes.

The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period. It may change this proposal in view of the comments received. The Coast Guard plans no public hearing. Persons may request a public hearing by writing to the address listed in **ADDRESSES**. The request should include the reasons why a hearing would be beneficial. If it determines that the opportunity for oral presentations will aid this rulemaking, the Coast Guard will hold a public hearing at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

The CSX Railroad bridge is currently governed by 33 CFR 117.333 approved July 20, 1948, which provides for an opening if 5 days advance notice is given. The State of Florida purchased the rail corridor from CSX Transportation, Inc. in December 1997. The bridge was included in this purchase. CSX maintained written records for five years prior to the sale. There is no written evidence of the bridge being opened during this period. Conversations with CSX staff by the State of Florida indicate the bridge has not opened for more than 12 years. Conversations with nearby residents indicate it was last opened in 1981. The State of Florida has requested permission to permanently close the swing bridge due to a continued lack of navigation requiring an opening. Therefore, the Coast Guard has agreed to propose amending the regulations to allow the bridge to remain closed.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of executive order 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that order. It has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget under that order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation. (DOT) (44 FR 11040; February 26, 1979). The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this proposal to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary as there has not been a demand for an opening in the last 17 years.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard must consider whether this proposal, if adopted, will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. ''Small entities'' may include, small businesses and not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

Because it expects the impact of the proposal to be minimal, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule, if adopted, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because the absence of any vessel traffic in the area of the bridge will not require the bridge to be opened in the future.

Collection of Information

This rule contains no collection-of-information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act. (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

Federalism

The Coast Guard has analyzed the rule under the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612,