

substantial number of U.S. entities, large or small, because the volume of currently prohibited/restricted animals and animal products imported into the United States from the Republic of Korea is likely to be very small relative to overall U.S. supply of those commodities (production and net imports from all foreign sources). There are several reasons for this. First, the volume of U.S. imports from the Republic of Korea prior to March 20, 2000, when that country was considered to be free of FMD and rinderpest, was negligible.³ During the 3-year period from 1997 to 1999, the United States did not import any reportable amounts of ruminants or fresh (chilled or frozen) meat or other products of ruminants from the Republic of Korea, other than 1.3 metric tons of dairy products in 1998.

Second, the Republic of Korea produces less beef, milk, and pork than it consumes, and is therefore a net importer of these commodities. Given this fact, there would not be a significant volume of exports of those commodities to the United States.

Finally, APHIS' staff expects that Hanwoo beef, a premium-priced specialty meat produced from Korean native cattle, is likely to be the Republic of Korea's primary export to the United States if the proposed rule becomes effective. Because of its premium price, the market for Hanwoo beef would be limited; it is likely to be sold to a niche market, such as Korean restaurants in the United States.

Importers, brokers, and others that would import Hanwoo beef, and restaurants that would serve that product, are the U.S. entities most likely to be affected by the rule. They stand to benefit from the increased business activity. The number of these entities is unknown but it is likely to be very small, given the expected limited market for Hanwoo beef in the United States. The size of these entities is also unknown, although it is reasonable to assume that, as with U.S. businesses in general, most are small under the standards of the U.S. Small Business Administration. The proposed action should have no noticeable effect on U.S. beef producers, given the expected limited demand for Hanwoo beef.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

³ Effective March 20, 2000, APHIS removed the Republic of Korea from the list of regions considered to be free of both rinderpest and FMD.

Executive Order 12988

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. If this proposed rule is adopted: (1) All State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule will be preempted; (2) no retroactive effect will be given to this rule; and (3) administrative proceedings will not be required before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 94

Animal diseases, Imports, Livestock, Meat and meat products, Milk, Poultry and poultry products, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, we propose to amend 9 CFR part 94 as follows:

PART 94—RINDERPEST, FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, FOWL PEST (FOWL PLAGUE), EXOTIC NEWCASTLE DISEASE, AFRICAN SWINE FEVER, CLASSICAL SWINE FEVER, AND BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY: PROHIBITED AND RESTRICTED IMPORTATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 94 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 450, 7701–7772, 7781–7786, and 8301–8317; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

§ 94.1 [Amended]

2. In § 94.1, paragraph (a)(2) is amended by adding the words “Republic of Korea,” after the word “Japan,”.

§ 94.11 [Amended]

3. In § 94.11, paragraph (a) is amended by adding the words “Republic of Korea,” after the word “Japan,”.

Done in Washington, DC, this 25th day of March 2009.

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. E9–7013 Filed 3–27–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2009–0284; Directorate Identifier 2009–CE–016–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 that would supersede an existing AD. 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:

The manufacturer reported findings of missing primer on the internal of the elevator and rudder of aircraft S/N 8200. The aircraft S/N 8200 was with RUAG for maintenance purposes. Investigation performed by RUAG showed that the paint removal procedure for the rudder and elevator was changed from a paint stripping with brush and scraper to a procedure where the parts were submerged in a tank filled with hot liquid stripper. The stripper is called TURCO 5669 from Henkel Surface Technologies. The stripping process is described in the Technical Process Bulletin No. 238799 dated 09/01/1999. This paint stripping process change was not communicated to and not approved by the TC-Holder.

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 29, 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 <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 (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–2009–0284; Directorate Identifier 2009–CE–016–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 April 4, 2008, we issued AD 2008–08–15, Amendment 39–15467 (73 FR 21220; April 21, 2008). That AD required actions intended to address an unsafe condition on the products listed above.

Since we issued AD 2008–08–15, we have received new MCAI that changes the applicability and accomplishment instructions.

The Luftfahrt-Bundesamt (LBA), which is the airworthiness authority for Germany, has issued AD D–2007–350R1, dated January 30, 2009 (referred to after this as “the MCAI”), to correct

an unsafe condition for the specified products. The MCAI states:

The manufacturer reported findings of missing primer on the internal of the elevator and rudder of aircraft S/N 8200. The aircraft S/N 8200 was with RUAG for maintenance purposes. Investigation performed by RUAG showed that the paint removal procedure for the rudder and elevator was changed from a paint stripping with brush and scraper to a procedure where the parts were submerged in a tank filled with hot liquid stripper. The stripper is called TURCO 5669 from Henkel Surface Technologies. The stripping process is described in the Technical Process Bulletin No. 238799 dated 09/01/1999. This paint stripping process change was not communicated to and not approved by the TC-Holder.

The MCAI requires a detailed visual inspection of the inner structure of the rudder and elevator for signs of corrosion, de-bonded primer (yellow-green), and any deviation of surface protection. If the inspection results show corrosion beyond the acceptable level or areas with de-bonded primer, the inspection results have to be reported to RUAG Aerospace Services GmbH for further decisions. If necessary, repair the affected parts in accordance with the applicable repair instruction obtained from RUAG Aerospace Services GmbH. You may obtain further information by examining the MCAI in the AD docket.

Relevant Service Information

RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Service Bulletin No. SB–228–270, Rev. No. 1, dated November 28, 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

Based on the service information, we estimate that this proposed AD will affect 17 products of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it would take about 3 work-hours per product to comply with the basic requirements of this proposed AD. The average labor rate is \$80 per work-hour.

Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of the proposed AD on U.S. operators to be \$4,080, or \$240 per product.

We have no way of determining the number of airplanes or the associated costs of any follow-on repairs or replacements that might be required by this proposed AD.

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:

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. 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 removing Amendment 39–15467 (73 FR 21220; April 21, 2008), and adding the following new AD:

DORNIER LUFTFAHRT GmbH: Docket No. FAA–2009–0284; Directorate Identifier 2009–CE–016–AD.

Comments Due Date

- (a) We must receive comments by April 29, 2009.

Affected ADs

- (b) This AD supersedes AD 2008–08–15, Amendment 39–15467 (73 FR 21220; April 21, 2008).

Applicability

- (c) This AD applies to Dornier 228–100, Dornier 228–101, Dornier 228–200, Dornier 228–201, Dornier 228–202, and Dornier 228–212 airplanes, all serial numbers, that:

- (1) Are certificated in any category; and
- (2) Have had the rudder and/or elevator replaced or repaired at Fairchild Dornier or RUAG between the year 2000 and 2005. The concerned rudder and elevator part numbers and serial numbers are listed on page 7 of RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Service Bulletin No. SB–228–270, Rev. No. 1, dated November 28, 2008.

Subject

- (d) Air Transport Association of America (ATA) Code 51: Standard Practices/Structures.

Reason

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

The manufacturer reported findings of missing primer on the internal of the elevator and rudder of aircraft S/N 8200. The aircraft S/N 8200 was with RUAG for maintenance purposes. Investigation performed by RUAG showed that the paint removal procedure for the rudder and elevator was changed from a paint stripping with brush and scraper to a procedure where the parts were submerged in a tank filled with hot liquid stripper. The stripper is called TURCO 5669 from Henkel Surface Technologies. The stripping process is described in the Technical Process Bulletin No. 238799 dated 09/01/1999. This paint stripping process change was not communicated to and not approved by the TC-Holder.

Corrosion damage can occur through insufficient surface protection. Consequently, the MCAI requires a detailed visual inspection of the inner structure of the rudder and elevator for signs of corrosion, de-bonded primer (yellow-green), and any deviation of surface protection. If the inspection results show corrosion beyond the acceptable level or areas with de-bonded primer, the inspection results have to be reported to RUAG Aerospace Services GmbH for further decisions. If necessary, repair the affected parts in accordance with the applicable repair instruction obtained from RUAG Aerospace Services GmbH.

Actions and Compliance

- (f) Unless already done, do the following actions:

- (1) Within 2 months after the effective date of this AD, do a detailed visual inspection on the inner structure of the rudder and elevator for signs of corrosion, debonded primer (yellow-green), and any other deviation of surface protection following RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Service Bulletin No. SB–228–270, Rev. No. 1, dated November 28, 2008.

- (2) If you find corrosion or areas with debonded primer as a result of the inspection required by paragraph (f)(1) of this AD, before further flight, do the following:

- (i) Report the inspection results to RUAG Aerospace Services GmbH, Dornier 228 Customer Support, P.O. Box 1253, 82231 Wessling, Federal Republic of Germany, telephone: +49 (0) 8153–30–2280; fax: +49 (0) 8153–30–3030 and request FAA-approved repair instructions following RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Service Bulletin No. SB–228–270, Rev. No. 1, dated November 28, 2008.

- (ii) Repair corrosion following FAA-approved repair instructions obtained from RUAG Aerospace Services GmbH.

FAA AD Differences

Note: 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 German AD D–2007–350R1, dated January 30, 2009; and RUAG Aerospace Defence Technology Dornier 228 Service Bulletin No. SB–228–270, Rev. No. 1, dated November 28, 2008, for related information.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on March 24, 2009.

John Colomy,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E9–6984 Filed 3–27–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Bureau of Customs and Border Protection

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

19 CFR Part 10

[USCBP–2008–0105]

RIN 1505–AC07

Cost or Value of Foreign Repairs, Alterations, or Processing

AGENCIES: Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Withdrawal of notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking, published in the **Federal Register** on March 13, 2009 (74 FR 10849), that