

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

(d) Alternative methods of compliance approved in accordance with AD 93-25-08 (superseded by this action) are considered approved as alternative methods of compliance with this AD.

(e) 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.

(f) This amendment supersedes AD 93-25-08, Amendment 39-8774.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on April 26, 1996.

Michael Gallagher,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-11030 Filed 5-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95-CE-56-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. (Formerly Piper Aircraft Corporation) PA23, PA31, PA31P, PA31T, and PA42 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes to supersede AD 86-17-07, which currently requires replacing all hydraulic hoses with hydraulic hoses of an improved design on certain The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. (Piper) PA23, PA31, PA31P, PA31T, and PA42 series airplanes. The proposed action would require inspecting for improperly manufactured hydraulic hoses replaced during a specific time frame and replacing all affected hydraulic hoses. An incorrect designation of a Piper Model PA31-310 and a Piper Model

PA23-150 airplane prompted the proposed AD action. The action specified by the proposed AD is intended to prevent hydraulic hose failure which could cause loss of hydraulic capabilities resulting in a gear-up landing and possible loss of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 8, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95-CE-56-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 The New Piper Aircraft, Inc., Attn: Customer Service, 2926 Piper Dr., Vero Beach, Florida, 32960. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christina Marsh, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, suite 2-160, College Park, Georgia 30337-2748; telephone (404) 305-7362; facsimile (404) 305-7348.

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 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 notice

must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket No. 95-CE-56-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, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95-CE-56-AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Discussion

It has been brought to the attention of the FAA that AD 86-17-07, which is applicable to Piper PA31 and PA23 series airplanes, should not have listed a Piper Model PA31-310 and a Piper Model PA23-150 airplane, respectively. The Piper Model PA31-310 airplane is not a recognized model on the Type Certificate Data Sheet No. A20SO and the airplane's data plate will specify a Model PA31 not a Model PA31-310. Similarly, the Piper Model PA23-150 airplane is not a recognized model on the Aircraft Specification No. 1A10 and the airplane's data plate will specify a Model PA23, not a Model PA23-150. The concern was raised that some owners/operators of PA31 and PA23 series airplanes may not have complied with AD 86-17-07, since the AD currently specifies the airplanes as Piper Models PA31-310 or PA23-150, even though their serial number falls within the serial number range in the current AD. For this reason, the FAA is proposing to supersede the current AD to change the model designation from Piper Models PA31-310 and PA23-150 airplanes to Piper Models PA31 and PA23 airplanes, respectively.

Piper has issued service bulletin (SB), No. 822, dated April 2, 1986, which specifies procedures for inspecting for improperly manufactured hydraulic hoses, part number (P/N) 17766-02 or 465-138, and if found installed, installing hydraulic hoses (P/N 17766-02) to replace the improperly manufactured hydraulic hoses currently in place on the airplane.

After examining the circumstances and reviewing all available information related to the incidents described above, the FAA has determined that AD action should be taken to ensure that the correct hydraulic hoses are installed and if not installed, replacing the hydraulic hoses with the correct hoses to avoid a loss of hydraulic capabilities resulting in a gear-up landing and possible loss of the airplane.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop in other Piper PA23, PA31, PA31P, PA31T, and PA42 series airplanes of the same type design, the proposed AD would supersede AD 86-17-07 with a new AD that would retain the same requirements as AD 87-17-07 and change the model designation in the Applicability section from Piper Model PA31-310 and PA23-150 airplanes to Piper Model PA31 and PA23 airplanes, respectively.

The FAA estimates that 10,737 airplanes in the U.S. registry would be affected by the proposed AD, that it would take approximately 1 hour per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspection, and that the average labor rate is approximately \$60 an hour. The FAA is only using the inspection criteria (1 workhour) since there is no way to determine the number of these Piper airplanes already in compliance with AD 86-17-07. Based on the figures above, the initial cost of the proposed AD upon U.S. operators of the affected airplanes is estimated to be \$644,220. This figure only includes the cost for the initial inspection and does not include replacement costs of the hydraulic hoses. Parts cost approximately \$53 per hydraulic hose. Piper installed on newly manufactured aircraft and distributed approximately 93 defective hoses, which could affect 93 airplanes. The FAA has no way of determining which Piper airplanes may have these

improperly manufactured hydraulic hoses installed. Labor costs for the installation of one hose is estimated to be 2 hours at approximately \$60 per hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$660,309. The only difference between the proposed AD and AD 87-17-07 is the change in model designation from PA31-310 and PA23-150 airplanes to PA31 and PA23 airplanes, respectively. With this in mind, the proposed action would not provide any additional cost impact upon U.S. operators over that already required by AD 87-17-07.

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 14 CFR part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations 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 removing Airworthiness Directive (AD) 86-17-07, Amendment 39-5400, and by adding a new AD to read as follows:

The New Piper Aircraft, Inc.: Docket No. 95-CE-56-AD; Supersedes AD 86-17-07, Amendment 39-5400.

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

Models	Serial numbers
PA23 and PA23-160	23-1 through 23-2046.
PA23-235	27-505 through 27-622.
PA23-250	27-1 through 27-8154030.
PA31, PA31-300, and PA31-325	31-2 through 31-8312019.
PA31-350	31-5001 through 31-8553002.
PA31P	31P-1 through 31P-7730012.
PA31P-350	31P-8414001 through 31P-8414050.
PA31T	31T-7400002 through 31T-8120104.
PA31T1	31T-7804001 through 31T-8304003, and 31T-1104004 through 31T-1104017.
PA31T2	31T-8166001 through 31T-8166076 and, 31T-1166001 through 31T-1166008.
PA31T3	31T-8275001 through 31T-8475001 and, 31T-5575001.
PA42	42-7800001, 42-7800002, 42-7801003, 42-7801004, 42-8001001 through 42-8001106, 42-8301001, 42-8301002, 42-5501003 through 42-5501023, and 42-5501025.

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 within 25 hours time-in-service (TIS) after September 2, 1986 (the effective date of AD 86-17-07) or within 10 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, unless already accomplished.

To prevent hydraulic hose failure which could cause loss of hydraulic capabilities resulting in a gear-up landing and possible loss of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Inspect and replace all hydraulic hoses identified as Piper part number (P/N) 17766-

02 or 465-138 and having a smooth rubber surface and a blue colored end nut, with hoses of the same part number having a woven outer covering and black colored end nut, in accordance with the *INSTRUCTIONS* section of Piper Service Bulletin (SB) No. 822, dated April 2, 1986.

Note 2: These hoses were available for installation starting February 1, 1985, and may have been installed in newly manufactured airplanes or as spares at any subsequent time.

(b) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with 14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199 to operate the airplane to a location where

the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the initial compliance time 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.

(d) Alternative methods of compliance approved in accordance with AD 87-17-07 (superseded by this action) are considered approved as alternative methods of compliance with this AD.

(e) All persons affected by this directive may obtain a copy 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.

(f) This amendment supersedes AD 86-17-07, Amendment 39-5400.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on April 26, 1996.

Michael Gallagher,
Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-11027 Filed 5-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 254

Extension of Comment Period; Guides for Private Vocational Schools

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Extension of time for filing public comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission (the "Commission"), as part of a systematic review of all of its current regulations and guides, requested public comments on April 3, 1996 about its Guides for Private Vocational Schools. 61 FR 14685. The Commission solicited comments until May 3, 1996. In response to requests from interested parties, the Commission grants an extension of the time period to file written comments.

DATES: Written comments will be accepted until July 1, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph J. Koman, Jr., Federal Trade Commission, Bureau of Consumer

Protection, Division of Enforcement, Room S-4302, 601 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20580, (202) 326-3014, or Walter Gross III, Federal Trade Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Division of Service Industry Practices, Room H-200, Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20580, (202) 326-3319.

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 254

Advertising, Trade practices.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 41-58.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-11037 Filed 5-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

17 CFR Parts 1 and 156

Proposed Rulemaking Concerning Voting by Interested Members of Self-Regulatory Organization Governing Boards and Committees and Concerning the Publicizing of Broker Association Memberships

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("Commission") is proposing a rulemaking which would implement the statutory directives of Section 5a(a)(17) of the Commodity Exchange Act ("CEA") as it was amended by Section 217 of the Futures Trading Practices Act of 1992 ("FTPA").¹

The proposed rulemaking would establish a new Commission Regulation 1.69 which would require self-regulatory organizations ("SROs") to adopt rules prohibiting governing board, disciplinary committee and oversight panel members from deliberating and voting on certain matters where the member has either a relationship with the matter's named party in interest or a financial interest in the matter's outcome. The proposed rulemaking also would amend existing Commission Regulations 1.3, 1.41 and 1.63 to make modifications made necessary by new Commission Regulation 1.69. The Commission also is proposing to add a new Regulation 156.4 to require that contract markets make more readily available to the public the identity of

¹ Pub. L. No. 102-546, sec. 217, 106 Stat. 3590 (1992).

members of broker associations at their respective exchanges.

DATES: Comments on the proposed rules and proposed rule amendments must be received by July 2, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons should submit their views and comments to Jean A. Webb, Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20581. Telephone: (202) 418-5100.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David P. Van Wagner, Special Counsel, Division of Trading and Markets, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20581. Telephone: (202) 418-5481.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

Section 217 of the FTPA amended Section 5a(a)(17) of the CEA to provide that each contract market must "provide for the avoidance of conflict of interest in deliberations by [its] governing board and any disciplinary and oversight committees."² FTPA Section 217 further describes certain conflict situations where committee members must abstain from deliberations and voting, while also requiring that the Commission promulgate regulations in this regard.

Consistent with Section 217 of the FTPA, proposed Commission Regulation 1.69 would generally bar an SRO committee member from deliberations and voting on a committee decision where the member could potentially be unduly influenced, due to either financial or personal concerns, by the outcome of the decision. The Commission's proposed rulemaking is intended to ensure that SRO committee actions are not infected by any conflict of interest and are in the best interest of the entire SRO. By furthering the impartiality of the SRO decisionmaking process, the Commission believes that Regulation 1.69 should promote public confidence in the integrity of the self-regulatory process.³

² For the purposes of this release, the term "committee" will generally be used to include governing boards, disciplinary committees and oversight committees unless otherwise specified.

³ The Commission notes that proposed Regulation 1.69 would be the latest in an ongoing series of recent Commission rulemakings aimed at enhancing the fairness and impartiality of the SRO committee decisionmaking process. In 1990, the Commission adopted Regulation 1.63 prohibiting persons with histories of disciplinary violations from serving on various SRO committees. Prompted by the FTPA, in 1993, the Commission adopted three separate rulemakings dealing with SRO committee procedures and service. First, the