northern Europe, is not available for each or any day of the 5-day period, the available quote will be used.

* * * * *

6. Section 1427.108 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(2), (c)(1), and (c)(2), and adding a new paragraph (c)(3) to read as follows:

§ 1427.108 Payment.

(a) * * *

(1) * * *

(2) The net weight (gross weight minus the weight of bagging and ties) as determined in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section, of eligible upland cotton as determined in accordance with paragraph (c) of this section.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(1) Purchased by the domestic users on the date the bale is opened in preparation for consumption;

(2) From August 1, 1991, through [date immediately following date on which the final rule is published in the Federal Register], sold by the exporter on the date the contract for sale is confirmed in writing; and

(3) Excluding cotton covered under paragraph (c)(2) of this section, through July 31, 1998, exported by the exporter on the date that CCC determines is the date on which the cotton is shipped.

* * * * *

7. Section 1427.109 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(1) through (a)(3) to read as follows:

§ 1427.109 Contract cancellations.

(a) * * *

(1) All undelivered (open) export contracts (including optional origin export contracts) outstanding as of the later of the date the Agreement (CCC–1045, 8–1–91) was executed by the exporter or August 29, 1991;

(2) Any export contracts that were canceled, or amended to reduce the contract quantity, between the later of June 18, 1991, or 75 days prior to the date the Agreement (CCC–1045, 8–1–91) was executed by the exporter and the later of the date the Agreement (CCC–1045, 8–1–91) was executed by the exporter, or August 29, 1991, which are not replaced by the later of the date the Agreement (CCC–1045, 8–1–91) was executed by the exporter or August 29, 1991; and

(3) All new export contracts entered into by the exporter on or after August 30, 1991, and on or before [date immediately following date on which the final rule is published in the Federal Register].

Signed at Washington, D.C., on March 6, 1996.

Grant Buntrock,

Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation.

[FR Doc. 96–5868 Filed 3–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–NM–256–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Piaggio Model P–180 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 certain Piaggio Model P–180 airplanes. This proposal would require replacement of outflow/safety valves with serviceable valves. This proposal is prompted by a report of cracking and subsequent failure of outflow safety valves in the pressurization system. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such cracking and subsequent failure of the outflow/safety valves, which could result in rapid decompression of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by April 22, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–NM–256–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 Allied Signal Aerospace, Technical Publications, Dept. 65–70, P.O. Box 52170, Phoenix, Arizona 85072–2170. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Walter Eierman, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–130L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627–5336; fax (310) 627–5210.

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 95–NM–256–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–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–NM–256–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The FAA has received a report of the failure of a safety valve in the pressurization system on a Learjet Model 31A airplane. Failure of the valve resulted in depressurization of the cabin. Investigation revealed that the poppets of certain outflow/safety valves were cracked. These discrepant valves, including the safety valve installed on the incident airplane, had been manufactured since January 1, 1989. Certain valves manufactured since that date have been found to be susceptible to cracking due to an improper molding process during their manufacture. Cracking in the poppets of the outflow/

safety valves in the pressurization system can result in an open valve with an effective flow area of 4.4 square inches; additionally, the valve may close and remain closed. This condition, if not corrected, could result in cracking and subsequent failure of the airflow/safety valves, which could lead to rapid decompression of the airplane.

On September 20, 1995, the FAA issued AD 95–20–03, amendment 39–9381 (60 FR 51709, October 3, 1995), to address this unsafe condition on certain Learjet Model 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, 35, 36, and 55 series airplanes. Subsequently, on December 5, 1995, the FAA issued AD 95–25–10, amendment 39–9456, (60 FR 66484, December 22, 1995), to address the unsafe condition on certain Cessna Model 441, 500, 550, and 560 series airplanes. The outflow/safety valves installed on these Cessna and Learjet airplane models are similar to the valves installed on Piaggio Model P–180 series airplanes. Therefore, the FAA has determined that the latter airplane model also is subject to the unsafe condition described previously.

The FAA has reviewed and approved Allied Signal Aerospace Service Bulletins 103742–21–4059 (for airplanes equipped with valves having part number 103742) and 103744–21–4060 (for airplanes equipped with valves having part number 103744), both dated March 31, 1995, which describe procedures for replacement of certain discrepant outflow/safety valves with serviceable valves.

This airplane model is manufactured in Italy 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.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design, the proposed AD would require replacement of certain discrepant outflow/safety valves with serviceable valves. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously.

Operators should note that, although the service bulletins recommend accomplishing the replacement within 300 flight hours or six months (after the release of the service bulletins), whichever occurs first, the FAA has determined that an interval of 18 months will address the identified unsafe condition in a timely manner. This proposed compliance time of 18 months was determined to be appropriate in consideration of the safety implications, the average utilization rate of the affected fleet, the practical aspects of accomplishment of the replacement during regular maintenance periods, and the availability of required replacement parts.

The FAA estimates that 10 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 12 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. The parts manufacturer has advised that it will provide replacement parts at no cost to operators. Based on these figures, the cost impact of this proposal on U.S. operators is estimated to be $7,200, or $720 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.

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 USC 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13—[Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

I.A.M. Rinaldo Piaggio S.P.A.: Docket 95–NM–256–AD.

Applicability: Model P–180 airplanes equipped with Allied Signal outflow/safety valves, as identified in Allied Signal Aerospace Service Bulletins 103742–21–4059 and 103744–21–4060, both dated March 31, 1995, 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 (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 cracking and subsequent failure of the outflow/safety valves, which would result in rapid decompression of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 18 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the outflow/safety valve in accordance with Allied Signal Aerospace Service Bulletin 103742–21–4059 (for airplanes equipped with valves having part number 103742), or 103744–21–4060 (for airplanes equipped with valves having part number 103744), both dated March 31, 1995, as applicable.

(b) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install an outflow/safety valve, having a part number and serial number identified in Allied Signal Aerospace Service Bulletin 103742–21–4059 (for airplanes equipped with valves having part number 103742) or 103744–21–4060 (for airplanes equipped with valves having part number 103744), both dated March 31, 1995, on any airplane unless that valve is considered to be serviceable in accordance with the applicable service bulletin.

(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, Los Angeles 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, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of

compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(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 March 7, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–5944 Filed 3–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–NM–04–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–100 and –200 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 certain Boeing Model 737–100 and –200 series airplanes. This proposal would require inspections to detect cracking of the support fittings of the Krueger flap actuator; and replacement of existing fittings with new steel fittings and modification of the aft attachment of the actuator, if necessary. This proposal is prompted by reports of cracking due to fatigue and stress corrosion of the support fittings of the Krueger flap actuator. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such cracking, which could result in fracturing of the actuator attach lugs, separation of the actuator from the support fitting, severing of the hydraulic lines, and resultant loss of hydraulic fluids. These conditions, if not corrected, could result in possible failure of one or more hydraulic systems, and subsequent reduced controllability of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 6, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96–NM–04–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 Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124–2207. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Della Swartz, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; telephone (206) 227–2785; fax (206) 227–1181.

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 96–NM–04–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–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96–NM–04–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The FAA received several reports indicating that cracking was found on Model 737 series airplanes in the support fittings that attach the Krueger flap actuator to the front spar. This cracking was found in the actuator attach lugs of the support fittings on a number of airplanes, and in the fillet radius between the actuator attach lug and the vertical flanges of the fitting on one airplane. The cause of the cracking has been attributed to fatigue and stress corrosion. Complete fracture of both actuator attach lugs could allow the actuator to separate from the support fitting, which could sever the hydraulic lines and result in the loss of hydraulic fluids. This condition, if not corrected, could result in possible failure of one or more hydraulic systems, and subsequent reduced controllability of the airplane.

The FAA also received two reports indicating that hydraulic system A and the standby hydraulic system failed during flight on Model 737 series airplanes. During subsequent emergency landings, these airplanes departed the end of the runway and sustained severe damage. On one of these airplanes, both actuator attach lugs on the support fittings of the No. 1 Krueger flap actuator were severed completely. The actuator separated from the front spar and the adjacent hydraulic lines were severed. On the other airplane, the No. 3 Krueger flap actuator separated from the fitting and the hydraulic lines to the actuator were severed. Subsequently, the hydraulic fuse did not close sufficiently to prevent the loss of hydraulic fluid from the system. Results of a laboratory examination of the fuse indicated that corrosion existed on the magnesium piston of the fuse.

The FAA has reviewed and approved Boeing Service Bulletin 737–57–1129, Revision 1, dated October 30, 1981, as revised by Notices of Status Change 737–57–1129NSC1, dated July 23, 1982; 737–57–1129 NSC2, dated April 14, 1983; and 737–57–1129 NSC 3, dated May 18, 1995. This service bulletin describes procedures for an initial visual inspection and repetitive eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the support fittings of the Krueger flap actuator; and replacement of existing fittings with new steel fittings and modification of the aft attachment of the actuator, if necessary. Such replacement and modification eliminates the need for repetitive eddy current inspections of the fittings.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would require repetitive eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the support fittings of the Krueger flap actuator; and replacement of existing fittings with new steel fittings and modification of the aft attachment of the actuator, if necessary. Such replacement