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: Upon the accumulation of 3,000 hours time-in-service (TIS), or within the next 100 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, unless already accomplished.

Note 2: The paragraph structure of this AD is as follows:

Level 1: (a), (b), (c), etc.
Level 2: (1), (2), (3), etc.
Level 3: (i), (ii), (iii), etc.

Level 2 and Level 3 structures are designations of the Level 1 paragraph they immediately follow.

To prevent structural failure of the aileron caused by cracks in the area of the inboard aileron hinge bracket, which, if not detected and corrected, could result in loss of control of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Inspect (using dye penetrant methods) the area beneath and in the area of the inboard aileron hinge bracket on the aileron spar for cracks in accordance with the INSTRUCTIONS section of Piper Service Bulletin (SB) No. 967, dated January 24, 1994, or Piper SB No. 974, dated October 19, 1994, whichever service bulletin applies to the particular model and serial number.

(1) If cracks are found on the aileron spar:

(i) Prior to further flight, inspect the corresponding aileron rib at the inboard aileron hinge bracket location;

(ii) Prior to further flight, replace any cracked spar assembly and any cracked aileron rib in accordance with the applicable Maintenance Manual;

(iii) Prior to further flight, replace the inboard aileron hinge brackets with an inboard aileron hinge bracket of improved design, part number (P/N) 74461–02 (left) and P/N 74461–03 (right), in accordance with the INSTRUCTIONS section of Piper SB No. 967, dated January 24, 1994, or Piper SB No. 974, dated October 19, 1994, as applicable.

(2) If no cracks are found, prior to further flight, replace the inboard aileron hinge brackets with a part of improved design P/N 74461–02 (left) and P/N 74461–03 (right), in accordance with the INSTRUCTIONS section of Piper SB No. 967, dated January 24, 1994, or Piper SB No. 974, dated October 19, 1994, as applicable.

(b) If the inboard aileron hinge brackets, P/N 74461–02 (left) or P/N 74461–03 (right) have been ordered from the manufacturer but are not available, prior to further flight, and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 100 hours TIS, dye penetrant inspect beneath and in the vicinity of the inboard aileron hinge bracket for cracks in accordance with the INSTRUCTIONS section of Piper SB No. 967, dated January 24, 1994, or Piper SB No. 974, dated October 19, 1994, as applicable.

(c) If any one of the following occurs, prior to further flight, terminate the above repetitive inspections, replace any cracked aileron rib and any cracked spar assembly (if applicable), and replace the inboard aileron hinge bracket as specified in paragraph (a)(1)(iii) of this AD:

(1) Parts become available;

(2) An inboard aileron bracket hinge, aileron spar or aileron rib is found cracked; or

(3) 1,000 hours TIS are accumulated after the initial inspection required by this AD.

(d) 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.

(e) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance times that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, FAA, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, suite 2–160, College Park, Georgia 30337–2748. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office.

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

(f) All persons affected by this directive may obtain copies of the document referred to herein upon request to The New Piper Aircraft, Inc., Attn: Customer Service, 2926 Piper Dr., Vero Beach, Florida, 32960; or may examine this document at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on March 20, 1996.

James E. Jackson,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–7329 Filed 3–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

Coast Guard

33 CFR Parts 62 and 66

[CGD 94–091]

RIN 2115–AF14

Conformance of the Uniform State Waterways Marking System and the Western Rivers Marking System With the United States Aids to Navigation System

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: As part of the President's Regulatory Reinvention Initiative, the Coast Guard proposes to eliminate the Uniform State Waterway Marking System (USWMS), which is not widely used and may be confusing to the mariner. The Coast Guard also proposes to replace the solid-color crossing dayboards in the Western Rivers Marking System (WRMS) with the checkered non-lateral dayboards used in the United States Aids to Navigation System (USATONS); the latter dayboards would have the same meaning and be the same size and shape as the former, but would be easier to see. These changes would help mariners avoid misinterpreting navigational markers they might see when transiting different bodies of water now subject to different marking systems.

DATES: Comments are requested by April 26, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to the Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council (G–LRA/3406) (CGD 94–091), U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001, or may be delivered to room 3406 at the same address between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (202) 267–1477.

The Executive Secretary maintains the public docket for this request for comments. Comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room 3406, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LTJG Chad Asplund, Short Range Aids to Navigation Division, Telephone: (202) 267–1386.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this request for comments by submitting written data, views, or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this notice (CGD 94–091) and the specific section of this notice to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit two copies of all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. Persons wanting acknowledgment 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.

The brevity of the comment period owes to three facts. First, an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) has already sounded public opinion. Second, that opinion holds the two changes proposed here to be minor and non-controversial. Third, this rulemaking constitutes part of the President's Regulatory Reinvention Initiative.

The Coast Guard plans no public hearing. Persons may request a public hearing by writing to the Marine Safety Council at the address under **ADDRESSES**. The request should include the reason 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 later notice in the Federal Register.

Regulatory History

On December 29, 1995, the Coast Guard published an ANPRM in the Federal Register (60 FR 67345). It gave interested persons until February 9, 1996, to submit comments. The Coast Guard received two comments on that notice. One came from a trade association and the other from an independent consultant.

The ANPRM intended to gauge public opinion towards eliminating the USWMS, replacing the crossing dayboards in the WRMS, and allowing the aids to navigation in the WRMS a larger selection of flash characteristics from which to chose. The first two items were non-controversial; therefore, the Coast Guard here proposes eliminating the USWMS and replacing the crossing dayboards in the WRMS.

The issue of flash characteristics may be more important that the Coast Guard thought it would be. The Coast Guard has determined that more time is necessary to study this issue and may address it in a future rulemaking.

Background and Purpose

The USWMS was created in 1966 to adequately mark State waters. It offers two types of aids to navigation, a system of regulatory markers as well as a system to supplement the USATONS. It features red and black buoys to mark lateral hazards. But 33 CFR 66.10–1(b) already allows the USATONS on all waterways in the United States. Many states already use the USATONS instead of the USWMS. The Coast Guard proposes eliminating the USWMS to move towards a unitary lateral aids to navigation system. This change would make the waterways less confusing for the mariner.

The WRMS was created to adequately mark the dynamic waterways of the Mississippi River and its Western counterparts. Some deviations from the USATONS were necessary for this. One of these is the use of crossing dayboards. These dayboards indicate where the river channel (''sailing line'') crosses from one bank to the other. The dayboards currently used in the WRMS are either solid green or solid red. They are important aids, but can be difficult to see, especially the green dayboards against the overgrowth of trees that line the Western Rivers. The Coast Guard proposes replacing the (red or green) solid-color crossing dayboards used in the WRMS with the checkered (green-and-white or red-and-white) non-lateral dayboards used in the USATONS. The checkered non-lateral dayboards would retain the same meaning as the sold-color crossing dayboards, yet would be easier to see.

The purpose of these two proposed changes is to adequately mark the Uniform State Waterways and Western Rivers and reduce the number of systems of aids to navigation.

Consultation With Advisory Committee

The Coast Guard has consulted with the National Association of State Boating-Law Administrators (NASBLA) concerning elimination of the USWMS. NASBLA indicates this would be a minor, non-controversial change.

Discussion of Comments

1. Should crossing dayboards used in the WRMS be replaced by the non-lateral dayboards used in the USATONS?

The comments generally indicated that this change would entail a massive reeducation. The Coast Guard believes, with an adequate phase-in period and increased boaters' awareness, this change would not be problematic. The benefits gained from the increased visibility would far outweigh the possible confusion.

2. What is the best way to mark obstructions in the USWMS? Should the meaning of the red-and-white striped buoys in the USWMS be changed so such buoys mark safe water as in the USATONS?

The comments generally supported this change. They did express some concern towards boaters' reeducation. The Coast Guard has consulted with NASBLA, which believes this would be a minor, insignificant change. Very few states, if any, use the USWMS.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard has weighed the needs of the mariner against the conflicts cited in the comments and has decided to propose eliminating the USWMS and replacing the solid-color crossing dayboards used in the WRMS with the checkered non-lateral dayboards used in the USATONS. Therefore, the Coast Guard is proposing the following changes to 33 CFR Parts 62 and 66:

Revise § 62.45(d)(6) to include mooring buoys and their light characteristics. The elimination of the USWMS, § 66.10, also removes the reference to the lighting characteristics on mooring buoys. § 62.45(d)(6) will be revised to place the requirements for lighting characteristics on mooring buoys in the regulatory text for the USATONS.

Revise § 62.51(b)(3) to replace diamond-shaped crossing dayboards, solid red or solid green as appropriate, with diamond-shaped crossing dayboards, checkered red-and-white or green-and-white, non-lateral dayboards similar to those used in the USATONS as appropriate.

Revise Part 66 to eliminate the USWMS by deleting Subpart 66.10. The USWMS is not used and is obsolete.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposal 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 regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11010; February 26, 1979).

The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this proposal to be minimal enough that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. Eliminating the USWMS would ultimately save money for states still using this system. States could purchase the aids to navigation used in the USATONS, which are manufactured in bulk and should cost less than the aids peculiar to the USWMS. Replacing the solid-color crossing dayboards of the WRMS would cost the Federal government little additional money, since new ones would cost essentially the same as the current ones. The Coast Guard proposes to replace the current ones with the new ones when it would otherwise replace them in kind, so the cost will be similar to that of regular maintenance.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Cost Guard must consider whether this proposal, if adopted, would have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. ''Small entities'' may include (1) small businesses and not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields and (2)

government jurisdictions with populations less than 50,000.

This proposal would have minimal impact on small entities. Eliminating the USWMS would not affect small entities; the USWMS is a system run by the State governments. Replacing the crossing dayboards on the WRMS would only affect the Federal government. Because it expects the impact of this proposal to be minimal, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposal, if adopted, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. If, however, you think that your business or organization qualifies as a small entity and that this proposal would have a significant economic impact on your business or organization, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and in what way and to what degree this proposal would economically affect it.

Collection of Information

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

Federalism

The Coast Guard has analyzed this proposal under the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612 and has determined that this proposal does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Environment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this proposal and concluded that, under paragraph 2.B.2.e(34)(a) of Commandant Instruction M164475.1B, this proposal is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. Eliminating the USWMS and replacing the solid-color crossing dayboards in the WRMS would have no environmental implications. A Categorical Exclusion Determination is available in the rulemaking docket for inspection or copying where indicated under **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects

33 CFR Part 62

Navigation (water)

33 CFR Part 66

Intergovernmental relations, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR Parts 62 and 66 as follows:

PART 62—UNITED STATES AIDS TO NAVIGATION SYSTEM

1. The authority citation for part 62 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 14 U.S.C. 85; 33 U.S.C. 1233; 43 U.S.C. 1333; 49 CFR 1.46.

§ 62.45 [Amended]

2. In § 62.45, paragraph (d)(6) is revised to read as follows:

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(6) Information and Regulatory Marks, and mooring buoys, display white lights of various rhythms.

* * * * *

§ 62.51 [Amended]

3. In § 62.51, paragraph (b)(3) is revised to read as follows:

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) Diamond-shaped non-lateral dayboards, checkered red-and-white or green-and-white, similar to those used in the USATONS, as appropriate, are used as crossing dayboards where the river channel crosses from one bank to the other.

* * * * *

PART 66—PRIVATE AIDS TO NAVIGATION

4. The authority citation for part 66 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 14 U.S.C. 83, 85; 43 U.S.C. 1333; 49 CFR 1.46.

Subpart 66.10—[Removed]

5. Subpart 66.10 is removed.

Dated: March 21, 1996.

Rudy K. Peschel,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Office of Navigation Safety and Waterway Services.

[FR Doc. 96–7333 Filed 3–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

---

33 CFR Part 67

[CGD 95–052]

RIN 2115–AF15

Testing of Obstruction Lights and Fog Signals on Offshore Facilities.

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: In keeping with the National Performance Review, the Coast Guard proposes to amend its testing procedures for obstruction lights and fog signals on Outer Continental Shelf facilities. Presently, manufacturers of lighting equipment must forward an application to each of the ten Coast Guard districts for approval. Fog signal equipment manufacturers must schedule and pay for Coast Guard representatives to observe their tests. This proposal would allow independent laboratories to conduct the tests using Coast Guard approved procedures. This would improve the quality control of the tests, reduce the administrative burden on the pubic, and minimize the cost to the Coast Guard.

DATES: Comments are requested by April 26, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to the Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council (G–LRA/3406) (CGD 95–052), U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001, or may be delivered to room 3406 at the same address between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (202) 267–1477.

The Executive Secretary maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room 3406, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LTJG Chad Asplund, Short Range Aids to Navigation Division, (202) 267–1386.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Requests 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 this rulemaking (CGD 95–052) and the specific section of this proposal to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit two copies of all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose stamped, self-addressed postcards or envelopes.

The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comments period. It may change this proposal in view of the comments.

The Coast Guard plans no public hearing. Persons may request a public hearing by writing to the Marine Safety Council at the address under **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