Actions Addressing the Main Deck Cargo Door Systems

(c) Within 18 months after the effective date of this AD, accomplish the actions specified in paragraphs (c)(1), (c)(2), (c)(3), (c)(4), and (c)(5) of this AD in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

(1) Modify the indication system of the main deck cargo door to indicate to the pilots whether the main deck cargo door is fully closed, latched, and locked;

(2) Modify the mechanical and hydraulic systems of the main deck cargo door to eliminate detrimental deformation of elements of the door latching and locking mechanism;

(3) Install a means to visually inspect the locking mechanism of the main deck cargo door;

(4) Install a means to remove power to the door while the airplane is in flight; and

(5) Install a means to prevent pressurization to an unsafe level if the main deck cargo door is not fully closed, latched, and locked.

(d) Compliance with paragraphs (c)(1), (c)(2), (c)(3), (c)(4), and (c)(5) of this AD constitutes terminating action for the requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this AD, and the AFMS revision and placards may be removed.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(e) 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, Los Angeles ACO. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

Special Flight Permit

(f) 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.

Appendix 1

Excerpt from an FAA Memorandum to Director—Airworthiness and Technical Standards of ATA, dated March 20, 1992

''(1) *Indication System:*

(a) The indication system must monitor the closed, latched, and locked positions, directly.

(b) The indicator should be *amber* unless it concerns an outward opening door whose opening during takeoff could present an immediate hazard to the airplane. In that case the indicator must be *red* and located in plain view in front of the pilots. An aural warning is also advisable. A display on the master caution/warning system is also acceptable as an indicator. For the purpose of complying with this paragraph, an immediate hazard is defined as significant reduction in controllability, structural damage, or impact with other structures, engines, or controls.

(c) Loss of indication or a false indication of a closed, latched, and locked condition must be improbable.

(d) A warning indication must be provided at the door operators station that monitors the door latched and locked conditions directly, unless the operator has a visual indication that the door is fully closed and locked. For example, a vent door that monitors the door locks and can be seen from the operators station would meet this requirement.

(2) *Means to Visually Inspect the Locking Mechanism:*

There must be a visual means of directly inspecting the locks. Where all locks are tied to a common lock shaft, a means of inspecting the locks at each end may be sufficient to meet this requirement provided no failure condition in the lock shaft would go undetected when viewing the end locks. Viewing latches may be used as an alternate to viewing locks on some installations where there are other compensating features.

(3) *Means to Prevent Pressurization:*

All doors must have provisions to prevent initiation of pressurization of the airplane to an unsafe level, if the door is not fully closed, latched and locked.

(4) *Lock Strength:*

Locks must be designed to withstand the maximum output power of the actuators and maximum expected manual operating forces treated as a limit load. Under these conditions, the door must remain closed, latched and locked.

(5) *Power Availability:*

All power to the door must be removed in flight and it must not be possible for the flight crew to restore power to the door while in flight.

(6) *Powered Lock Systems:*

For doors that have powered lock systems, it must be shown by safety analysis that inadvertent opening of the door after it is fully closed, latched and locked, is extremely improbable.''

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 10, 2000.

Vi L. Lipski,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00–12249 Filed 5–15–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2000–NM–105–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300–600 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to all Airbus Model A300–600 series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive high frequency eddy current (HFEC) or rototest inspections to detect cracking in the area surrounding the frame feet attachment holes between fuselage frames (FR) 41 and FR46; installation of new fasteners for certain airplanes; and follow-on corrective actions, if necessary. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent cracking of the center section of the fuselage, which could result in rupture of the frame foot and reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by June 15, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2000–NM–105–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2110; fax (425) 227–1149.

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 shall 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 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 summarizing 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 notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 2000–NM–105–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2000–NM–105–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all Airbus Model A300–600 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that, during an inspection performed in accordance with Structure Significant Item (SSI) Task 53–15–54, cracking was detected in the area surrounding the frame feet attachment holes at fuselage frames (FR) 43 through FR46 between stringers 24 and 30 on the right-hand side, and at FR45 on the left-hand side. The cracking occurred on an airplane that had accumulated 26,100 total flight cycles and 32,160 total flight hours. Such cracking of the center section of the fuselage, if not detected and corrected, could result in rupture of the frame foot and reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The manufacturer has issued Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6122, dated February 9, 2000, which describes procedures for repetitive high frequency eddy current (HFEC) or rototest inspections to detect cracking of the frame feet attachment holes between FR41 and FR46; installation of new fasteners for certain airplanes; and follow-on corrective actions, if necessary. The follow-on corrective actions involve subsequent performing rotating probe inspections and repairing certain cracking conditions. The repair involves reaming out cracks, cold working fastener holes, and installing oversized fasteners. The DGAC classified this service bulletin as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 2000–060–303(B), dated February 9, 2000, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

FAA's Conclusions

This airplane model is manufactured in France and is type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the DGAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would require repetitive HFEC or rototest inspections to detect cracking in the area surrounding the frame feet attachment holes between FR41 and FR46; installation of new fasteners for certain airplanes; and follow-on corrective actions, if necessary. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously, except as discussed below.

Differences Between Proposed Rule and Service Bulletin

Operators should note that, although the service bulletin specifies that the manufacturer may be contacted for disposition of certain conditions, this proposal would require the repair of those conditions to be accomplished in accordance with a method approved by the FAA or the DGAC (or its delegated agent). In light of the type of repair that would be required to address the identified unsafe condition, and in consonance with existing bilateral airworthiness agreements, the FAA has determined that, for the proposed AD, a repair approved by either the FAA or the DGAC would be acceptable for compliance with this proposed AD.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 75 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 6 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspections, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $27,000, or $360 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

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 a substantial direct effect 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, it is determined that this proposal would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

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:

Airbus Industrie: Docket 2000–NM–105–AD.

Applicability: All Model A300–600 series airplanes, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane 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 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 (e) 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 cracking of the center section of the fuselage, which could result in rupture of the frame foot and reduced structural integrity of the airplane, accomplish the following:

High Frequency Eddy Current (HFEC) or Rototest Inspection

(a) Perform a HFEC or rototest inspection to detect cracking in the area surrounding the frame feet attachment holes between fuselage frames (FR) 41 and FR46 from stringers 24 to 28, left- and right-hand sides, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6122, dated February 9, 2000, at the time specified in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2), as applicable.

(1) For airplanes on which Task 53–15–54 in Maintenance Review Board Document (MRBD), Revision 3, dated April 1998, has NOT been accomplished as of the effective date of this AD: Perform the inspection at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) and (a)(1)(ii) of this AD.

(i) Prior to the accumulation of the total flight-cycle or flight-hour threshold, whichever occurs first, specified in paragraph 1.E. (''Compliance'') of the service bulletin; or

(ii) Within the applicable grace period specified in paragraph 1.E. (''Compliance'') of the service bulletin.

(2) For airplanes on which Task 53–15–54 in Maintenance Review Board Document (MRBD), Revision 3, dated April 1998, has been accomplished as of the effective date of this AD: Perform the next repetitive inspection at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(2)(i) and (a)(2)(ii) of this AD.

(i) Within the flight-cycle or flight-hour interval, whichever occurs first, specified in paragraph 1.E. (''Compliance'') of the service bulletin, following the latest inspection accomplished in accordance with the MRBD; or

(ii) Within the grace period specified in paragraph 1.E. (''Compliance'') of the service bulletin.

(b) For airplanes on which no cracking is detected during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, install new fasteners as applicable, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6122, dated February 9, 2000; and repeat the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed the applicable intervals specified in paragraph 1.E. (''Compliance'') of the service bulletin.

Corrective Actions

(c) For airplanes on which cracking is detected during any inspection required by this AD: Prior to further flight, except as required by paragraph (d) of this AD, accomplish corrective actions (e.g., performing rotating probe inspections, reaming out cracks, cold working fastener holes, and installing oversized fasteners) in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6122, dated February 9, 2000. Repeat the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed the applicable intervals specified in paragraph 1.E. (''Compliance'') of the service bulletin.

(d) If cracking is detected during any inspection required by this AD, and the service bulletin specifies to contact the manufacturer for an appropriate corrective action: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate; or the Direction Generale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC) (or it's delegated agent).

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(e) 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, International Branch, ANM–116. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

Special Flight Permits

(f) 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.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 2000–060–303(B), dated February 9, 2000.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 10, 2000.

Donald L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00–12248 Filed 5–15–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

26 CFR Part 1

[REG–106186–98]

RIN 1545–AW36

Certain Corporate Reorganizations Involving Disregarded Entities

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing.

SUMMARY: This document contains proposed regulations that provide guidance to corporations and their shareholders about whether certain transactions qualify as corporate reorganizations. The proposed regulations apply to certain mergers under state or Federal law between two entities, one of which is a corporation and the other of which, for Federal tax purposes, is disregarded as an entity separate from its owner (for example, a qualified REIT subsidiary, a qualified subchapter S subsidiary, or a limited liability company with a single corporate owner that does not elect to be treated as a separate corporation). This document also provides a notice of public hearing on these proposed regulations.

DATES: Written or electronic comments must be received by August 14, 2000. Requests to speak (with outlines of oral comments to be discussed) at the public hearing scheduled for August 8, 2000, must be received by July 18, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Send submissions to CC:DOM:CORP:R (REG–106186–98), room 5226, Internal Revenue Service, P.O. Box 7604, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044. Submissions may be hand delivered Monday through Friday between the hours of 8 am and 5 pm to: CC:DOM:CORP:R (REG–106186–98), Courier's desk, Internal Revenue Service, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20044. Alternatively, taxpayers may submit comments electronically via the Internet by selecting the ''Tax Regs'' option on the IRS Home Page, or by submitting comments directly to the IRS Internet site at http://www.irs.gov/tax__regs/reglist.html. The public hearing will be held in room 4718, Internal Revenue Building, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Concerning the proposed regulations, Reginald Mombrun, (202) 622–7750, concerning submissions of comments,