considerations in establishing such a fee structure?

Q.6. Are there other factors that should be considered in determining the annual fee for power reactors?

There will be another opportunity for additional public comment in connection with any proposed rule that may be developed by the Commission.

## List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 171

Annual charges, Byproduct material, Holders of certificates, Registrations, Approvals, Intergovernmental relations, Non-payment penalties, Nuclear materials, Nuclear power plants and reactors, Source material, Special nuclear material.

The authority citation for this document is: 42 U.S.C. 2201; 42 U.S.C. 5841.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of March, 2009.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **J.E. Dyer**,

Chief Financial Officer.

[FR Doc. E9–6554 Filed 3–24–09; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

## **Federal Aviation Administration**

## 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2009-0261; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-017-AD]

## RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH Models Dornier 228– 100, Dornier 228–101, Dornier 228–200, Dornier 228–201, Dornier 228–202, and Dornier 228–212 Airplanes

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above. This proposed AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) originated by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as:

Excessive wear on a guide pin of a power lever has been detected during inspections. The total loss of the pin could cause loss of the flight idle stop and lead to inadvertent activation of the beta mode in flight. The inadvertent activation of beta mode in flight can result in loss of control of the airplane.

The proposed AD would require actions that are intended to address the unsafe condition described in the MCAI.

**DATES:** We must receive comments on this proposed AD by April 24, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** You may send comments by any of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
  - Fax: (202) 493-2251.
- *Mail*: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M– 30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.
- Hand Delivery: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M—30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

## **Examining the AD Docket**

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at <a href="http://www.regulations.gov">http://www.regulations.gov</a>; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this proposed AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Office (telephone (800) 647–5527) is in the ADDRESSES section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Greg Davison, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4130; fax: (816) 329–4090.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

## **Comments Invited**

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposed AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the ADDRESSES section. Include "Docket No. FAA-2009-0261; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-017-AD" at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD because of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each

substantive verbal contact we receive about this proposed AD.

## Discussion

The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Community, has issued AD No.: 2009–0031, dated February 18, 2009 (referred to after this as "the MCAI"), to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

Excessive wear on a guide pin of a power lever has been detected during inspections. The total loss of the pin could cause loss of the flight idle stop and lead to inadvertent activation of the beta mode in flight. The inadvertent activation of beta mode in flight can result in loss of control of the airplane.

For the reasons described above, this new EASA Airworthiness Directive (AD) introduces a repetitive detailed inspection of the guide pins of the power and condition levers and requires the replacement of the pins that exceed the allowable wear-limits.

You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the AD docket.

## **Relevant Service Information**

RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology has issued Dornier 228 Alert Service Bulletin ASB–228–279, dated December 19, 2008. The actions described in this service information are intended to correct the unsafe condition identified in the MCAI.

# FAA's Determination and Requirements of the Proposed AD

This product has been approved by the aviation authority of another country, and is approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to our bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, they have notified us of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI and service information referenced above. We are proposing this AD because we evaluated all information and determined the unsafe condition exists and is likely to exist or develop on other products of the same type design.

# Differences Between This Proposed AD and the MCAI or Service Information

We have reviewed the MCAI and related service information and, in general, agree with their substance. But we might have found it necessary to use different words from those in the MCAI to ensure the AD is clear for U.S. operators and is enforceable. In making these changes, we do not intend to differ substantively from the information provided in the MCAI and related service information.

We might also have proposed different actions in this AD from those in the MCAI in order to follow FAA policies. Any such differences are highlighted in a NOTE within the proposed AD.

## **Costs of Compliance**

We estimate that this proposed AD will affect 17 products of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it would take about 20 work-hours per product to comply with the basic requirements of this proposed AD. The average labor rate is \$80 per work-hour. Required parts would cost about \$10 per product.

Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of the proposed AD on U.S. operators to be \$27,370, or \$1,610 per product.

## **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 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 this proposed regulation:

- 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. 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.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with

this proposed AD and placed it in the AD docket.

## List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

## The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA 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 AD:

Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH: Docket No. FAA–2009–0261; Directorate Identifier 2009–CE–017–AD.

#### **Comments Due Date**

(a) We must receive comments by April 24, 2009.

## Affected ADs

(b) None.

## **Applicability**

(c) This AD applies to Models Dornier 228–100, Dornier 228–101, Dornier 228–200, Dornier 228–201, Dornier 228–202, and Dornier 228–212 airplanes, all serial numbers, certificated in any category.

## Subjec

(d) Air Transport Association of America (ATA) Code 76: Engine Controls.

## Reason

(e) The mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) states:

Excessive wear on a guide pin of a power lever has been detected during inspections. The total loss of the pin could cause loss of the flight idle stop and lead to inadvertent activation of the beta mode in flight. The inadvertent activation of beta mode in flight can result in loss of control of the airplane.

For the reasons described above, this new EASA Airworthiness Directive (AD) introduces a repetitive detailed inspection of the guide pins of the power and condition levers and requires the replacement of the pins that exceed the allowable wear-limits.

## **Actions and Compliance**

- (f) Unless already done, do the following actions:
- (1) For throttle box assemblies with less than 12,000 hours time-in-service (TIS) since new as of the effective date of this AD: inspect the guide pins of the power and condition levers following RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Alert Service Bulletin ASB–228–279, dated December 19, 2008, at the following times:

- (i) Initially within 9,600 hours TIS since new or within the next 1,200 hours TIS, whichever occurs later; and
- (ii) Repetitively thereafter within 1,200 hours TIS since any previous inspection in which the power and condition levers guide pins were not replaced or within 9,600 hours TIS since the previous inspection in which the power and condition levers guide pins were replaced.

**Note 1:** If the hours TIS of the throttle box assembly is unknown, use the hours TIS of the airplane to determine the compliance time for the inspection.

- (2) For throttle box assemblies with 12,000 hours TIS or more and less than 13,200 hours TIS since new as of the effective date of this AD: inspect the guide pins of the power and condition levers following RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Alert Service Bulletin ASB-228-279, dated December 19, 2008, at the following times:
- (i) Initially within 13,200 hours TIS since new or within the next 100 hours TIS, whichever occurs later; and
- (ii) Repetitively thereafter within 1,200 hours TIS since any previous inspection in which the power and condition levers guide pins were not replaced or within 9,600 hours TIS since the previous inspection in which the power and condition levers guide pins were replaced.
- (3) For throttle box assemblies with 13,200 hours TIS or more since new as of the effective date of this AD: inspect the guide pins of the power and condition levers following RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Alert Service Bulletin ASB–228–279, dated December 19, 2008, at the following times:
- (i) Initially within the next 100 hours TIS; and
- (ii) Repetitively thereafter within 1,200 hours TIS since any previous inspection in which the power and condition levers guide pins were not replaced or within 9,600 hours TIS since the previous inspection in which the power and condition levers guide pins were replaced.
- (4) For all throttle box assemblies: before further flight after any inspection required in paragraph (f)(1), (f)(2), or (f)(3) of this AD, replace any guide pin that exceeds the acceptable wear-limits as defined in RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Alert Service Bulletin ASB-228-279, dated December 19, 2008.

## **FAA AD Differences**

**Note 2:** This AD differs from the MCAI and/or service information as follows: No differences.

## Other FAA AD Provisions

- (g) The following provisions also apply to this AD:
- (1) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs): The Manager, Standards Office, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. Send information to ATTN: Greg Davison, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4130; fax: (816) 329–4090. Before using any approved AMOC on

any airplane to which the AMOC applies, notify your appropriate principal inspector (PI) in the FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO), or lacking a PI, your local FSDO.

- (2) Airworthy Product: For any requirement in this AD to obtain corrective actions from a manufacturer or other source, use these actions if they are FAA-approved. Corrective actions are considered FAA-approved if they are approved by the State of Design Authority (or their delegated agent). You are required to assure the product is airworthy before it is returned to service.
- (3) Reporting Requirements: For any reporting requirement in this AD, under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved the information collection requirements and has assigned OMB Control Number 2120–0056.

### **Related Information**

(h) Refer to MCAI EASA AD No.: 2009–0031, dated February 18, 2009; and RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Alert Service Bulletin ASB–228–279, dated December 19, 2008, for related information.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on March 19, 2009.

## John R. Colomy,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E9–6558 Filed 3–24–09; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

## **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

# 18 CFR Part 38

[Docket No. RM05-5-013]

# Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities

March 19, 2009.

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory

Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Federal Energy
Regulatory Commission (Commission)
proposes to incorporate by reference in
its regulations the latest version
(Version 002.1) of certain business
practice standards adopted by the
Wholesale Electric Quadrant of the
North American Energy Standards
Board (NAESB). NAESB's Version 002.1
Standards mainly modify NAESB's
Version 001 Standards in response to
Order Nos. 890, 890–A, and 890–B.

**DATES:** Comments on the proposed rule are due April 24, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by Docket No. RM05–5–013, by one of the following methods:

- Agency Web Site: http://ferc.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments via the eFiling link found in the Comment Procedures Section of the preamble.
- Mail: Commenters unable to file comments electronically must mail or hand deliver an original and 14 copies of their comments to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. Please refer to the Comment Procedures Section of the preamble for additional information on how to file paper comments.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Ryan M. Irwin (technical issues), Office of Energy Market Regulation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–6454.

Valerie Roth (technical issues), Office of Energy Market Regulation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–8538.

Gary D. Cohen (legal issues), Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–8321.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. In this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) proposes to amend its regulations at 18 CFR 38.2 under the Federal Power Act 1 to incorporate by reference the latest version (Version 002.1) of certain business practice standards adopted by the Wholesale Electric Quadrant (WEQ) of the North American Energy Standards Board (NAESB). These revised standards update earlier versions that the Commission previously incorporated by reference into its regulations at 18 CFR 38.2 in Order Nos. 676, 676-B, 698, and 676-C,<sup>2</sup> as well as the Version 002.0 standards that NAESB filed with the Commission on

September 2, 2008. The new and revised standards that NAESB adopted in its Version 002.0 and 002.1 standards implement requirements of Order Nos. 890, 890-A, and 890-B.3 In addition, NAESB developed standards to support the Commission's eTariff program, modified the Commercial Timing Table (WEQ-004 Appendix D) and Transmission Loading Relief Standards (WEQ-008) to provide clarity and align NAESB's business practice standards with the reliability standards adopted by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC), revised the Manual Time Error Correction Standards (WEQ-006) to maintain consistency with revised NERC Standard BAL-004, and amended certain ancillary services definitions appearing in the Open Access Same-Time Information Systems (OASIS) Standards (WEQ-001) relating to the inclusion of demand resources as part of ancillary services.

# I. Background

- 2. NAESB is a non-profit standards development organization established in January 2002 that serves as an industry forum for the development of business practice standards. These standards promote a seamless marketplace for wholesale and retail natural gas and electricity. Since 1995, NAESB and its predecessor, the Gas Industry Standards Board, have been accredited members of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), complying with ANSI's requirements that its standards reflect a consensus of the affected industries.
- 3. NAESB's standards include business practices that streamline the transactional processes of the natural gas and electric industries, as well as communication protocols and related standards designed to improve the efficiency of communication within each industry. NAESB supports all four quadrants of the gas and electric industries—wholesale gas, wholesale electric, retail gas, and retail electric. All participants in the gas and electric industries are eligible to join NAESB

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 16 U.S.C. 791a, et seq.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities, Order No. 676, 71 FR 26,199 (May 4, 2006), FERC Stats. & Regs., Regulations Preambles ¶ 31,216 (Apr. 25, 2006), reh'g denied, Order No. 676-A, 116 FERC ¶ 61,255 (2006), Order No. 676–B, 72 FR 21,095 (Apr. 30, 2007), FERC Stats. & Regs., Regulations Preambles ¶ 31,246 (Apr. 19, 2007), Order No. 676-C, 73 FR 43,848 (July 29, 2008), FERC Stats. & Regs., Regulations Preambles ¶ 31,274 (July 21, 2008) Order No. 676–D, granting clarification and denying reh'g, 124 FERC ¶ 61,317 (2008); Standards for Business Practices for Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines, Order No. 698, 72 FR 38,757 (July 16, 2007), FERC Stats. & Regs., Regulations Preambles ¶ 31,251 (June 25, 2007), order on clarification and reh'g, Order No. 698-A, 121 FERC ¶ 61,264 (2007).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Preventing Undue Discrimination and Preference in Transmission Service, Order No. 890, 72 FR 12,266 (March 15 2007), FERC Stats. & Regs., Regulations Preambles ¶ 31,241 (2007) (Order No. 890); order on reh'g, Order No. 890–A, 73 FR 2984 (Jan. 16, 2008), FERC Stats. & Regs., Regulations Preambles ¶ 31,261 (2007) (Order No. 890–A); order on reh'g and clarification, Order No. 890–B, 123 FERC ¶ 61,299 (2008).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 72 FR 8318 (Feb. 27, 2007), FERC Stats. & Regs., Proposed Regs. ¶ 32,612 at P 3 (Feb. 20, 2007).

<sup>5</sup> Id.