(i) Other FAA AD Provisions

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), ANE–170, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or local Flight Standards District Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the ACO send it to ATTN: Program Manager, Continuing Operational Safety, FAA, New York ACO, 1600 Stewart Avenue, Suite 410, Westbury, NY 11590; telephone 516–228–7300; fax 516–794–5531. Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the local flight standards district office/certificate holding district office.

(2) *Contacting the Manufacturer:* As of the effective date of this AD, for any requirement in this AD to obtain corrective actions from a manufacturer, the action must be accomplished using a method approved by the Manager, New York ACO, ANE–170, FAA; or Transport Canada Civil Aviation (TCCA); or Bombardier, Inc.'s TCCA Design Approval Organization (DAO). If approved by the DAO, the approval must include the DAO-authorized signature.

(j) Related Information

(1) Refer to Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Information (MCAI) Canadian Airworthiness Directive CF–2013–16R1, effective July 26, 2016, for related information. This MCAI may be found in the AD docket on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2016–9575.

(2) For service information identified in this AD, contact Bombardier, Inc., Q-Series Technical Help Desk, 123 Garratt Boulevard, Toronto, Ontario M3K 1Y5, Canada; telephone 416–375–4000; fax 416–375–4539; email *thd.qseries@aero.bombardier.com;* Internet *http://www.bombardier.com.* You may view this service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on February 3, 2017.

Michael Kaszycki,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2017–03262 Filed 2–21–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2016–9553; Directorate Identifier 2016–NE–29–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation Turbofan Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Rolls-Royce Corporation (RRC) AE 3007C and 3007C1 model turbofan engines. This proposed AD was prompted by analysis and by cracks found in the high-pressure turbine (HPT) wheel during an inspection. This proposed AD would require replacement of the affected HPT wheels at new, lower life limits. We are proposing this AD to correct the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by April 10, 2017.

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 Mail address above between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this NPRM, contact Rolls-Royce Corporation, 450 South Meridian Street, Mail Code NB–01–06, Indianapolis, IN 46225; phone: 317–230–3774; email: *indy.pubs.services@rolls-royce.com;* Internet: *www.rolls-royce.com.* You may view this service information at the FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 1200 District Avenue, Burlington, MA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 781–238–7125.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2016–9553; 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: Kyri Zaroyiannis, Aerospace Engineer, Chicago Aircraft Certification Office, Small Airplane Directorate, FAA, 2300 E. Devon Ave., Des Plaines, IL 60018; phone: 847–294–7836; fax: 847–294–7834; email: *kyri.zaroyiannis@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include ''Docket No. FAA–2016–9553; Directorate Identifier 2016–NE–29–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

We learned from RRC that cracks were found in the HPT wheel during an inspection. Investigation determined that, for certain part number (P/N) HPT wheels, incomplete shot peening in the internal shaft fillet resulted in reduced fatigue life. For other affected P/N HPT wheels, the polishing wheel used in the manufacturing process created an unfavorable surface finish, known as ''Black Wheel Polish,'' that could lead to crack initiation. We are, therefore, lowering the life limits for these affected HPT wheels. These conditions, if not corrected, could result in uncontained failure of the HPT wheels, damage to the engine, and damage to the airplane.

Related Service Information Under 1 CFR Part 51

We reviewed RRC Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) AE 3007C–A–72–318, Revision 2, dated September 23, 2016.

The ASB provides updated life limits for the affected HPT wheels. This service information is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section.

FAA's Determination

We are proposing this AD because we evaluated all the relevant information and determined the unsafe condition described previously is likely to exist or develop in other products of the same type design.

Proposed AD Requirements

This proposed AD would require replacement of the affected HPT wheels at new, lower life limits.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this proposed AD affects 307 engines installed on airplanes of U.S. registry.

We estimate the following costs to comply with this proposed AD:

ESTIMATED COSTS

Action	Labor cost	Parts cost	Cost per product	Cost on U.S. operators
Replacement of HPT wheel (P/N 23062373, 23065891, or 23070664) at reduced life.	0 work-hours × $85 per hour = $0	$39,171 (pro-rated cost of part).	$39,171	$3,838,758
Replacement of HPT wheel (P/N 23063462, 23065892, 23069116, 23069592, or 23074643) at reduced life.	0 work-hours × $85 per hour = $0	21,911 (pro-rated cost of part).	21,911	4,579,399

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),

(3) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska to the extent that it justifies making a regulatory distinction, 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 adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):

Roll-Royce Corporation (Type Certificate previously held by Allison Engine Company): Docket No. FAA–2016–9553; Directorate Identifier 2016–NE–29–AD.

(a) Comments Due Date

We must receive comments by April 10, 2017.

(b) Affected ADs

None.

(c) Applicability

(1) This AD applies to Rolls-Royce Corporation (RRC) AE 3007C and 3007C1 turbofan engines with 1st stage high-pressure turbine (HPT) wheels, part number (P/N) 23062373, 23065891, or 23070664; or with 2nd stage HPT wheels, P/N 23063462, 23065892, 23069116, 23069592 (except those serial numbers (S/Ns) noted in paragraph (c)(2) of this AD), or 23074643, installed.

(2) This AD does not apply to RRC AE 3007C and 3007C1 turbofan engines with 2nd stage HPT wheels, P/N 23069592, with S/Ns listed in Table 6 of RRC Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) AE 3007C–A–72–318, Revision 2, dated September 23, 2016, installed.

(d) Subject

Joint Aircraft System Component (JASC) Code 7250, Turbine/turboprop Engine, Turbine Section.

(e) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by analysis and by cracks found in the HPT wheel during an inspection. We are issuing this AD to prevent uncontained failure of the HPT wheels, damage to the engine, and damage to the airplane.

(f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(1) For all RRC AE 3007C or C1 engines with an installed 1st stage HPT wheel, P/N 23062373, 23065891, or 23070664, or 2nd stage HPT wheel, P/N 23063462, 23065892, 23069116, 23069592 (except those S/Ns excluded by paragraph (c)(2) of this AD) or 23074643, after the effective date of this AD, remove the affected wheels before exceeding the new life limits identified in paragraph C., Table 1 of RRC ASB AE 3007C–A–72–318, Revision 2, dated September 23, 2016.

(2) After the effective date of this AD, do not return to service any engine with an HPT turbine wheel, with an affected P/N and an S/N, with a wheel life that exceeds the new life limits identified in paragraph C., Table 1 of RRC ASB AE 3007C–A–72–318, Revision 2, dated September 23, 2016.

(g) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

The Manager, Chicago Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, may approve AMOCs for this AD. Use the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19 to make your request.

(h) Related Information

(1) For more information about this AD, contact Kyri Zaroyiannis, Aerospace Engineer, Chicago Aircraft Certification Office, Small Airplane Directorate, FAA, 2300 E. Devon Ave., Des Plaines, IL 60018; phone: 847–294–7836; fax: 847–294–7834; email: *kyri.zaroyiannis@faa.gov.*

(2) For RRC service information identified in this AD, contact Rolls-Royce Corporation, 450 South Meridian Street, Mail Code NB–01–06, Indianapolis, IN 46225; phone: 317–230–3774; email: *indy.pubs.services@rolls-royce.com;* Internet: *www.rolls-royce.com.*

(3) You may view this service information at FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 1200 District Avenue, Burlington, MA 01803. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 781–238–7125.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on January 27, 2017.

Colleen M. D'Alessandro,

Manager, Engine & Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2017–03283 Filed 2–21–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 110

[Docket Number USCG–2015–0729]

RIN 1625–AA01

Port of Miami Anchorage Area; Atlantic Ocean, Miami Beach, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to amend the Miami Anchorage. The Miami Anchorage would be divided into two separate anchorage areas. This action is necessary to reduce potential damage to threatened coral posed by anchoring vessels. We invite your comments on this supplemental proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before March 24, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2015–0729 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov.* See the ''Public Participation and Request for Comments'' portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for further instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this proposed rulemaking, call or email MST2 Benjamin R. Colbert, Sector Miami Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 305–535–4317, email *Benjamin.R.Colbert@uscg.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
SNPRM Supplemental notice of proposed rule making
§ Section
U.S.C. United States Code

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On December 1, 2015, the Coast Guard published a notice of study (80 FR 75020) that indicated we were evaluating amending the Miami Anchorage to divide the anchorage into two smaller anchorage areas. The proposed amendment was designed in coordination with a variety of local stakeholders, including the South East Florida Coral Reef Initiative (SEFCRI). Comments provided by these stakeholders, academic research, and environmental reports raised concerns with the Coast Guard about the potential for damage to the Florida Reef in the Miami Anchorage. Examples of the body of work that influenced the Coast Guard in proposing the amendment may be found in the docket.

In response to the notice of study, the Coast Guard received four comments. These comments were addressed in an NPRM published on May 10, 2016 (81 FR 28788). In response to the NPRM, we received four additional comments. Two of the comments, one by the local non-profit Miami Waterkeeper and the other by a private citizen, supported our planned modification of the Miami Anchorage. The third and fourth comments were submitted by the Biscayne Bay Pilots Association.

The Biscayne Bay Pilots Association (pilots) submitted a comment, through the Port of Miami, on May 17, 2016. This comment requested the Coast Guard to evaluate changes in the proposed anchorage, including shifting the outer anchorage west and shifting the southern boundary of the outer anchorage north. In response to these comments, the Coast Guard met with the Pilots to discuss the requests and the basis at which the Coast Guard arrived at the proposed anchorage configuration. During the meeting, the Coast Guard agreed that shifting the western boundary of the outer anchorage approximately 300 feet to the west would provide more room for large anchoring vessels. This change would not have any effect on coral or hardbottom as the sea floor in that area is sand.

On June 11, 2016, the Pilots submitted a follow up comment to the public docket expressing concern that the outer anchorage would expose vessels to increased current and waves and, they claim, could increase the chance a vessel would drag anchor. To properly assess environmental conditions and risk of an anchor drag, the Coast Guard consulted with the National Weather Service and Maersk Training Center. The National Weather Service conducted a study, analyzing the previous year's current in the vicinity of the anchorage. The Weather Service found that the average current in the area of the outer anchorage over the previous year was approximately 1.2 knots with current ranging plus or minus half a knot from the mean current 70 percent of the time. This information was provided to the Maersk Training Center in Svendborg, Denmark. Subject matter experts at the Training Center indicated that the conditions posed no significant hazard and that Masters would have the training and experience to set an anchor in the deeper waters of the outer anchorage.

In addition to consulting with experts, the Coast Guard has made minor changes to the proposed anchorage regulations that would further ensure the safety of all vessels anchoring in the outer anchorage. Vessels using the Miami Anchorage would be prohibited from anchoring with engines off or in a ''dead ship'' status and would be required to maintain a bridge watch with an English speaking deck officer. Finally, the Coast Guard will submit amendments to the local Coast Pilot to provide improved guidance to vessels planning to anchor in the outer anchorage.

In addition to the discussions with the Biscayne Bay Pilots Association and SEFCRI discussed above, the Coast Guard consulted with a number of other stakeholders and subject matter experts in the development of this Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (SNPRM). Several biologists from the University of Miami and Nova Southeastern University supported the proposed changes to the Miami Anchorage. The Florida State Historical Preservation Officer determined that there were no known cultural resources