

comments and not to restrict the issues that may be addressed. In addressing these questions or others, DOE requests that commenters identify with specificity the regulation or reporting requirement at issue, providing legal citation where available. The Department also requests that the submitter provide, in as much detail as possible, an explanation why a regulation or reporting requirement should be modified, streamlined, expanded, or repealed, as well as specific suggestions of ways the Department can better achieve its regulatory objectives.

(1) How can the Department best promote meaningful periodic reviews of its existing rules and how can it best identify those rules that might be modified, streamlined, expanded, or repealed?

(2) What factors should the agency consider in selecting and prioritizing rules and reporting requirements for review?

(3) Are there regulations that are or have become unnecessary, ineffective, or ill advised and, if so, what are they? Are there rules that can simply be repealed without impairing the Department's regulatory programs and, if so, what are they?

(4) Are there rules or reporting requirements that have become outdated and, if so, how can they be modernized to accomplish their regulatory objectives better?

(5) Are there rules that are still necessary, but have not operated as well as expected such that a modified, stronger, or slightly different approach is justified?

(6) Does the Department currently collect information that it does not need or use effectively to achieve regulatory objectives?

(7) Are there regulations, reporting requirements, or regulatory processes that are unnecessarily complicated or could be streamlined to achieve regulatory objectives in more efficient ways?

(8) Are there rules or reporting requirements that have been overtaken by technological developments? Can new technologies be leveraged to modify, streamline, or do away with existing regulatory or reporting requirements?

(9) How can the Department best obtain and consider accurate, objective information and data about the costs, burdens, and benefits of existing regulations? Are there existing sources of data the Department can use to evaluate the post-promulgation effects of regulations over time? We invite interested parties to provide data that

may be in their possession that documents the costs, burdens, and benefits of existing requirements.

(10) Are there regulations that are working well that can be expanded or used as a model to fill gaps in other DOE regulatory programs?

The Department notes that this RFI is issued solely for information and program-planning purposes. Responses to this RFI do not bind DOE to any further actions related to the response. All submissions will be made publically available on <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Issued in Washington, DC on August 2, 2012.

**Gregory H. Woods,**  
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2012-19392 Filed 8-7-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2012-0805; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-117-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; rescission.

**SUMMARY:** We propose to rescind an existing airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to certain The Boeing Company Model 767-200, -300, -300F, and -400ER series airplanes. The existing AD currently requires an inspection to determine if certain motor operated valve actuators for the fuel tanks are installed, and related investigative and corrective actions if necessary. We issued that AD to prevent an ignition source inside the fuel tanks, which, in combination with flammable fuel vapors, could result in a fuel tank explosion and consequent loss of the airplane. Since we issued that AD, we have received new data indicating that the existing AD addresses that safety concern, but also introduces a different unsafe condition.

**DATES:** We must receive comments on this proposed AD by September 24, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** You may send comments, using the procedures found in 14 CFR 11.43 and 11.45, 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:** Deliver to the Mail address above between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this proposed AD, contact Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Attention: Data & Services Management, P.O. Box 3707, MC 2H-65, Seattle, WA 98124-2207; telephone 206-544-5000, extension 1; fax 206-766-5680; Internet <https://www.myboeingfleet.com>. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425-227-1221.

#### Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>; 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 (phone: 800-647-5527) is in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rebel Nichols, Aerospace Engineer, Propulsion Branch, ANM-140S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA 98057-3356; phone: (425) 917-6509; fax: (425) 917-6590; email: [Rebel.Nichols@faa.gov](mailto:Rebel.Nichols@faa.gov).

#### 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-2012-0805; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-117-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

On October 19, 2009, we issued AD 2009–22–13, Amendment 39–16066 (74 FR 55755, October 29, 2009), for certain The Boeing Company Model 767–200, –300, –300F, and –400ER series airplanes. That AD requires an inspection to determine if certain motor operated valve actuators for the fuel tanks are installed, and related investigative and corrective actions if necessary. That AD resulted from fuel system reviews conducted by the manufacturer. We issued that AD to prevent an ignition source inside the fuel tanks, which, in combination with flammable fuel vapors, could result in a fuel tank explosion and consequent loss of the airplane.

### Actions Since Existing AD (74 FR 55755, October 29, 2009) Was Issued

Since we issued AD 2009–22–13, Amendment 39–16066 (74 FR 55755, October 29, 2009), we discovered that the corrective action addresses that safety concern, but also introduces a different unsafe condition. The manufacturer is developing a more complete solution to address both unsafe conditions. We will consider additional rulemaking to require a new solution once that solution is developed, approved, and available for accomplishment.

### FAA's Conclusions

Upon further consideration, we have determined that existing AD 2009–22–13, Amendment 39–16066 (74 FR 55755, October 29, 2009), must be rescinded. Accordingly, this proposed AD would rescind AD 2009–22–13. Rescission of AD 2009–22–13 would not preclude the FAA from issuing another related action or commit the FAA to any course of action in the future.

### Related Costs

AD 2009–22–13, Amendment 39–16066 (74 FR 55755, October 29, 2009), affects about 397 airplanes of U.S. registry. The estimated cost of the currently required actions for U.S. operators is between \$67,490 and \$134,980, or between \$170 and \$340 per airplane. Rescinding AD 2009–22–13 would eliminate those costs.

### 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);
- (3) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska; and
- (4) 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.

### 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 removing airworthiness directive (AD) 2009–22–13, Amendment 39–16066 (74 FR 55755, October 29, 2009), and adding the following new AD:

**The Boeing Company:** Docket No. FAA–2012–0805; Directorate Identifier 2012–NM–117–AD.

### Comments Due Date

(a) The FAA must receive comments on this AD action by September 24, 2012.

### Affected ADs

(b) This action rescinds AD 2009–22–13, Amendment 39–16066 (74 FR 55755, October 29, 2009).

### Applicability

(c) This action applies to The Boeing Company Model 767–200, –300, –300F, and –400ER series airplanes, certificated in any category; as identified in Boeing Alert Service Bulletin 767–28A0090, dated July 3, 2008.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on July 31, 2012.

**Michael Kaszycki,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 2012–19238 Filed 8–7–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2011–0158; Directorate Identifier 2010–NM–118–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

### Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that proposed to supersede an existing airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to certain The Boeing Company Model 767–200, –300, –300F, and –400ER series airplanes. The proposed AD would have continued to require an inspection to determine if certain motor operated valve actuators for the fuel tanks are installed, and related investigative and corrective actions if necessary. That proposed AD would have added airplanes and, for certain airplanes, required additional inspections to determine if certain motor operated valve actuators for the fuel tanks are installed, and related