actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. The required parts would be provided by the manufacturer at not cost to the operator. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $168,300, or $3,300 per airplane.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

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 proposed regulation (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under the 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 is contained 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 the following new airworthiness directive:

Aerospatiale: Docket 96–NM–140–AD.

Applicability: Model ATR72–101, –102, –201, –202, –211, and –212 series airplanes on which Modification 4495 or Aerospatiale Service Bulletin ATR 72–27–1044 has not been accomplished; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been otherwise 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 (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 as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent uncoupling of the elevators due to failure of the elevator coupling mechanism and resultant reduced controllability of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 12,000 total landings, or within 1,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later: Modify the elevator uncoupling mechanism in accordance with Aerospatiale Service Bulletin ATR72–27–1044, dated March 5, 1996.

(b) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install a pitch uncoupling mechanism of the elevator, having the following part numbers, on any airplane:

S2738194100800
S2738194102895
S2738194102200
S2738194102400
S2738194102800
S2738194103200

(c) 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, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, 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, Standardization Branch, ANM–113.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM–113.

(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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 12, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–21010 Filed 8–16–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Parts 201 and 331

[Docket No. 95N–0254]

RIN 0910–AA63

Labeling of Orally Ingested Over-the-Counter Drug Products Containing Calcium, Magnesium, and Potassium; Correction

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking; correction.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is correcting a notice of proposed rulemaking that appeared in the Federal Register of April 22, 1996 (61 FR 17807). The document proposed to amend the general labeling provisions for over-the-counter (OTC) drug products intended for oral ingestion to require the content per dosage unit and warning labeling when the product contains certain levels of calcium, magnesium, or potassium. The document was published with some errors. This document corrects those errors.

DATES: Written comments by July 22, 1996. Written comments on the agency's economic impact determination by July 22, 1996. The agency is proposing that any final rule based on this proposal be effective 12 months after the date of its publication in the Federal Register.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William E. Gilbertson, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (HFD–105), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, 301–827–2304.

In FR Doc. 96–9734, appearing on page 17807 in the Federal Register of Monday, April 22, 1996, the following corrections are made:

1. On page 17808, in the third column, in the third full paragraph, in the seventh line, ''vitamin E'' is corrected to read ''vitamin A.''

2. On page 17809, in the first column, in the first full paragraph, in the second line, ''vitamin E'' is corrected to read ''vitamin A,'' and in the same

paragraph, beginning in the twelfth line, the two last sentences are removed and a new sentence is added to read ''Thus, for foods containing less than 20 mg of calcium or less than 8 mg of magnesium per serving, the content may be declared as zero or as less than 2 percent of the Daily Value, except that magnesium need not be declared unless a claim is made about the nutrient.''

3. On page 17809, in the first column, in the third full paragraph, in the eleventh line, after the word ''amount.'', the following sentence is added: ''In the Federal Register of December 21, 1995 (60 FR 66206), FDA published a proposal entitled 'Food Labeling: Nutrient Content Claims, General Principles; Health Claims, General Requirements and Other Specific Requirements for Individual Health Claims' that would revise this requirement. (See 60 FR 66206 at 66225.) Comments on the revision will be addressed in that rulemaking proceeding.''

Dated: July 11, 1996.

William K. Hubbard,

Associate Commissioner for Policy Coordination.

[FR Doc. 96–21049 Filed 8–16–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 80

[FRL–5555–4]

State of Alaska Petition for Exemption from Diesel Fuel Sulfur Requirement

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of proposed decision.

SUMMARY: On March 14, 1994, EPA granted the State of Alaska a waiver from the requirements of EPA's low sulfur diesel fuel program, permanently exempting Alaska's remote areas and providing a temporary exemption for areas of Alaska served by the Federal Aid Highway System (FAHS). The exemption applied to certain requirments in setion 211 (i) and (g) of the Clean Air Act, as implemented in EPA's regulations. These exemptions were based on EPA's determination that it would be unreasonable to require persons in these areas to comply with the low sulfur diesel fuel requirements due to unique geographical, meteorological and economic factors for Alaska, as well as other significant local factors.

The temporary exemption for the areas of Alaska served by the FAHS will expire on October 1, 1996. On December 12, 1995, the Governor of Alaska petitioned EPA to permanently exempt the areas covered by the temporary exemption. In this action, EPA is proposing to extend the temporary exemption for an additional 24 months, but reserving a final decision on whether it should be permanent.

Based on the factors and conditions identified in Alaska's December 12, 1995 petition, a continuation of the exemption is warranted at least temporarily. However, EPA believes that recent comments submitted to the agency merit further investigation before making a final decision on a permanent exemption. EPA is therfore proposing to extend the temporary exemption unitl October 1, 1998, or until such time that a final decision is made on the permanent exemption, whichever is shorter.

In the final rules section of this Federal Register, EPA is issuing this exemption as a direct final decision without prior proposal, because EPA views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the proposed change is set forth in the direct final decision. If no adverse comments are received in response to the direct final decision, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed decision. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final decision will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final decision based on this proposed decision. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this notice should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed decision must be received by September 18, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this proposed action should be addressed to Public Docket No. A–96–26, Waterside Mall (Room M–1500), Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket Section, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. Documents related to this rule have been placed in the public docket and may be inspected between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying docket material. Those wishing to notify EPA of their intent to submit adverse comment or request an opportunity for a public hearing on this action should contact Paul N. Argyropoulos, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation, (202) 233–9004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Paul N. Argyropoulos, Environmental Protection Specialist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation, (202) 233–9004.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulated Entities

Entities potentially regulated by this action are refiners, marketers, distributors, retailers and wholesale purchaser-consumers of diesel fuel. Regulated entities would include the following:

Category	Examples of regulated entities
Industry	Petroleum refiners, distributors, marketers, retailers (service station owners and operators), wholesale purchaser-consumers (fleet managers who operate a refueling facility to refuel motor vehicles).
Citizens	Any owner or operator of a diesel motor vehicle.
Government	Federal facilities, including military bases, who operate a refueling facility to refuel motor vehicles.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by this action. This table lists the types of entities that EPA is now aware could be potentially regulated by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be regulated. To determine whether your entity is regulated by this action, you should carefully examine section 80.29 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

For additional information, see the direct final decision published in this Federal Register.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 80

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Diesel fuel, Motor vehicle pollution.

Dated: August 12, 1996.

Carol M. Browner,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–21079 Filed 8–16–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P