group of individuals for each independent 7 day period the individual or group works not more than 48 hours during the outage or increased threat condition.

Implementation Details

For purposes of compliance with the minimum 24-hour break requirements:

- Because work schedules may contain shifts of more than one length (e.g., combinations of 8 and 12-hour shifts), shift schedules would be defined as follows:
  - 8-hour shift schedules average not more than 9 hours per day.
  - 10-hour shift schedule average not more than 11 hours per day.
  - 12-hour shift schedule average not more than 12 hours per day.
- Only break periods of 24 consecutive hours or more would count towards the break requirements.
- Breaks would be counted in 24-hour increments. For example, a 36 hour break would count as one 24-hour break. A break of 48 consecutive hours would count as two 24-hour breaks.
- The maximum duration of a shift cycle over which a licensee would be able to average breaks would be limited to six weeks.
- Any portion of a plant outage, security outage, or increased threat condition that does not comprise a complete 15 day period would be subject to the individual work hour limits in proposed § 26.199(d)(1), § 26.199(d)(1)(I), and the requirement described above for a minimum 36-hour break in any 9-day period.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of March, 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Eileen McKenna,

Chief, Financial, Policy and Rulemaking Program, Division of Policy and Rulemaking, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E6–3922 Filed 3–16–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2004–19930; Directorate Identifier 2004–NE–33–AD]

Airworthiness Directives: Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 800 Series Turbofan Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: This action withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM). That NPRM proposed a new airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to Rolls-Royce plc (RR) RB211 Trent 800 series turbofan engines. That proposed action would have required initial and repetitive borescope inspections of the high pressure-and-intermediate pressure (HP–IP) turbine internal and external oil vent tubes for coking and carbon buildup, and cleaning or replacing the vent tubes if necessary. Since we issued that NPRM, RR notified us that the RB211 Trent 800 series turbofan engines are significantly less susceptible to vent tube carbon build-up than the RB211 Trent 700 series turbofan engines. Repeat on-wing inspections therefore, are not required to maintain fleet safety. Accordingly, we withdraw the proposed rule.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ian Dargin, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299; telephone (781) 238–7178; fax (781) 238–7199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposed to amend 14 CFR part 39 with a proposed airworthiness directive (AD). The proposed AD applies to Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 800 series turbofan engines. We published the proposed AD in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 2004 (69 FR 77144). That proposed action would have required initial and repetitive borescope inspections of the HP–IP turbine internal and external oil vent tubes for coking and carbon buildup, and cleaning or replacing the vent tubes if necessary. That proposed action resulted from a report of an RB211 Trent 700 series engine experiencing a disk shaft separation, overspeed of the intermediate pressure (IP) turbine rotor, and multiple blade release of IP turbine blades.

Since we issued that NPRM, RR notified us that data collected from a onetime inspection of 200 RB211 Trent 800 series turbofan engines shows that these engines are significantly less susceptible to vent tube carbon build-up than the RB211 Trent 700 series turbofan engines. The RB211 Trent 800 series engines had no evidence of significant accumulation. RR's analysis concluded that repeat on-wing inspections are not required to maintain fleet safety. The vent tube inspection and cleaning can be done at each shop visit. This will ensure that the probability of carbon blockage and spontaneous ignition will be negligible. Based on this analysis, RR has stated they will cancel Alert Service Bulletin RB.211–72–AE362, dated May 7, 2004.

Upon further consideration, we hereby withdraw the proposed rule based on RR's analysis and conclusion stated above.

Withdrawal of this notice of proposed rulemaking constitutes only such action, and does not preclude the agency from issuing another notice in the future, nor does it commit the agency to any course of action in the future.

Since this action only withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking, it is neither a proposed nor a final rule. Executive Order 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, or DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979) do not cover this withdrawal.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Withdrawal

Accordingly, we withdraw the notice of proposed rulemaking, FAA–2004–19930; Directorate Identifier 2004–NE–33–AD, published in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 2004 (69 FR 77144).

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on March 13, 2006.

Peter A. White,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E6–3907 Filed 3–16–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2006–24036; Directorate Identifier 2006–NE–04–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Sicma Aero Seat, Passenger Seat Assemblies

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Sicma Aero Seat, passenger seat assemblies. This proposed AD would require modifying the aft track fittings on these passenger seat assemblies by installing new tab locks, and then torquing the aft track fitting locking bolts. This proposed AD results from

reports of loose and unlocked aft track fittings on Sicma Aero Seat, passenger seat assemblies. We are proposing this AD to prevent detachment of passenger seat assemblies, especially during emergency conditions, leading to occupant injury.

DATES: We must receive any comments on this proposed AD by May 16, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following addresses to comment on this proposed AD.

- DOT Docket Web site: Go to *http://dms.dot.gov* and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.
- Government-wide rulemaking Web site: Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.
- Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–001.
- Fax: (202) 493–2251.
- Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Contact Sicma Aero Seat, 7 Rue Lucien Coupet, 36100 Issoudun, France, telephone: (33) 54 03 39 39; fax: (33) 54 03 15 16, for the service information identified in this proposed AD.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeffrey Lee, Aerospace Engineer, Boston Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, FAA, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5213; telephone (781) 238–7161; fax (781) 238–7170.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to send us any written relevant data, views, or arguments regarding this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under **ADDRESSES.** Include ''Docket No. FAA–2006–24036; Directorate Identifier 2006–NE–04–AD'' in the subject line of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend the proposed AD in light of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to *http://dms.dot.gov*, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact with FAA personnel concerning this proposed AD. Using the search function of the DMS Web site, anyone can find and read the comments in any of our dockets, including the name of the individual who sent the comment (or signed the comment on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review the DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477–78) or you may visit *http://dms.dot.gov.*

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the docket that contains the proposal, any comments received, and any final disposition in person at the DMS Docket Office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Docket Office (telephone (800) 647–5227) is on the plaza level of the Department of Transportation Nassif Building at the street address stated in **ADDRESSES.** Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after the DMS receives them.

Discussion

The Direction Generale de L'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, notified us that an unsafe condition might exist on Sicma Aero Seat, passenger seat assemblies, part numbers (P/Ns) 42XX series, 50XX series, 63XX series, 65XX series, 71XX series, 78XX series, 83XX series, 85XX series, 90XX series, 91XX series, and 92XX series, with aft track fittings, P/N 90–000120–790–0, installed. The DGAC advises that reports have been received of aft track fittings, P/N 90–000120–790–0, becoming loose in service. Loose aft track fittings can lead to detachment of passenger seat assemblies, especially during emergency conditions, leading to occupant injury.

Relevant Service Information

We have reviewed and approved the technical contents of Sicma Aero Seat Service Bulletin (SB) No. 90–25–005, Issue 2, dated March 31, 1999, that describes procedures for modifying the aft track fittings, P/N 90–000120–790–0, by installing new tab locks, P/N 00–4399, and torquing the aft track locking bolts. The tab lock prevents the locking bolt from loosening. The DGAC classified this SB as mandatory and issued airworthiness directive 1994–085(AB) R2, dated July 13, 1999, in order to ensure the airworthiness of these passenger seat assemblies in France.

Differences Between the Proposed AD and the Manufacturer's Service Information

Although the SB allows repetitive checking for proper engagement and proper locking bolt torque of aft track fittings as an alternative method to installing the new tab locks, this proposed AD would not allow that alternative method.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of the Proposed AD

These Sicma Aero Seat, passenger seat assemblies, manufactured in France, are installed in airplanes 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. In keeping with this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the DGAC kept us informed of the situation described above. We have examined the DGAC's findings, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for passenger seat assemblies of this type design that are installed in airplanes certificated for operation in the United States. For this reason, we are proposing this AD, which would require modifying the aft track fittings, P/N 90–000120–790–0, by installing new tab locks, P/N 00–4399, and torquing the aft track fitting locking bolts. The proposed AD would require you to use the service information described previously to perform these actions.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this proposed AD would affect 239,209 Sicma Aero Seat, passenger seat assemblies, installed on 1,016 airplanes of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it would take about 4 work hours per airplane to perform the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $80 per work hour. Required parts would cost about $235 per airplane. Based on these figures, we estimate the total cost of the proposed AD to U.S. operators to be $563,880. The manufacturer has indicated they might provide the parts at no cost to the operators.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, Section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII, Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII,

Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701, ''General requirements.'' Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We have determined that this proposed AD would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This proposed AD 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.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that the 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. Would not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with this proposed AD. See the **ADDRESSES** section for a location to examine the regulatory evaluation.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 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. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Sicma Aero Seat: Docket No. FAA–2006–24036; Directorate Identifier 2006–NE–04–AD.

Comments Due Date

(a) The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must receive comments on this airworthiness directive (AD) action by May 16, 2006.

Affected ADs

(b) None.

Applicability

(c) This AD applies to Sicma Aero Seat, passenger seat assemblies, part numbers (P/Ns) 42XX series, 50XX series, 63XX series, 65XX series, 71XX series, 78XX series, 83XX series, 85XX series, 90XX series, 91XX series, and 92XX series, with aft track fittings, P/N 90–000120–790–0, installed. Refer to Annex 1 of Sicma Aero Seat Service Bulletin No. 90–25–005, Issue 2, dated March 31, 1999, for the full part numbers. These seat assemblies are installed on, but not limited to, Airbus A300, A310, A318, A319, A320, A321, and A330 series airplanes.

Unsafe Condition

(d) This AD results from reports of loose and unlocked aft track fittings on Sicma Aero Seat, passenger seat assemblies. We are issuing this AD to prevent detachment of passenger seat assemblies, especially during emergency conditions, leading to occupant injury.

Compliance

(e) You are responsible for having the actions required by this AD performed within 600 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, unless the actions have already been done.

Aft Track Fitting Modification

(f) Modify aft track fittings, P/N 90–000120–790–0, by installing new tab locks, P/N 00–4399, under the locking bolts.

(g) Torque locking bolts to 17.4-to-34.7 inch pounds.

(h) Stamp amendment ''Z'' on the seat assembly identification plate.

(i) Use the Accomplishment Instructions of Sicma Aero Seat Service Bulletin No. 90–25–005, Issue 2, dated March 31, 1999, to do these actions.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(j) The Manager, Boston Aircraft Certification Office, has the authority to approve alternative methods of compliance for this AD if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

Related Information

(k) Direction Generale de L'Aviation Civile, AD 1994–085(AB) R2, dated July 13, 1999, also addresses the subject of this AD.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on March 13, 2006.

Peter A. White,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E6–3908 Filed 3–16–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA–2006–24027; Airspace Docket No. 06–ASO–1]

RIN 2120–AA66

Proposed Modification of VOR Federal Airways; and Establishment of Area Navigation Route; NC

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This action proposes to modify Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range (VOR) Federal Airways V–56 and V–290, NC; and Colored Federal Airway G–13, NC; to remove unusable airway segments. The affected airway segments are unusable because they are based on nondirectional beacon (NDB) navigation aids that have been permanently decommissioned. In addition, the FAA proposes to establish a new low altitude area navigation (RNAV) route, designated T–243, to enhance instrument flight rules (IFR) access to the Outer Banks area of North Carolina.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 1, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on this proposal to the Docket Management System, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room Plaza 401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You must identify FAA Docket No. FAA–2006–24027 and Airspace Docket No. 06–ASO–1, at the beginning of your comments. You may also submit comments through the Internet at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Gallant, Airspace and Rules, Office of System Operations Airspace and AIM, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–8783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments, as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic,