For the purpose of this review, administrative regulations are those that impose recordkeeping or reporting requirements or address areas of agency organization, procedure, or practice. Consistent with Step 1 of the strategy, the NRC developed the draft criteria and goals listed below to evaluate potential regulatory changes of this nature. The evaluation criteria would serve as factors of consideration to guide the staff's decisionmaking. The staff is not proposing to use the criteria to make stand-alone determinations. Instead, the criteria will be weighed against other activities outlined in the strategy, such as staff programmatic experience and, comments received, and the correspondence review. Draft criteria 1–3 are intended to ''screen-in'' regulations for inquiry for potential elimination or modification, as they address whether a regulation is outdated or duplicative. These screening-in criteria are not intended to be mutually exclusive. A given regulation may satisfy one or more of the criteria. Draft criterion 4 is intended to ''screen-out'' regulations from further inquiry or for potential elimination or modification so as to avoid unintended consequences. Specific points about which the NRC seeks public comment are described in the Section IV, ''Specific Questions,'' of this document.

Draft Criteria for Selecting Changes to Administrative Requirements

1. Routine and periodic recordkeeping and reporting requirements, such as directives to submit recurring reports, which the NRC has not consulted or referenced in programmatic operations or policy development in the last 3 years.

The goal of this criterion is to identify outdated requirements for information collection.

2. Reports or records that contain information reasonably accessible to the agency from alternative resources or routine reporting requirements where less frequent reporting would meet programmatic needs.

The goal of this criterion is to identify duplicative information or overused collection requirements.

3. Recordkeeping and reporting requirements that result in significant burden. For example, more than $100,000 overall per potential regulatory change; or over 1,000 reporting hours for each affected individual or entity over a 3-year period; or 10 hours for each affected individual or entity each calendar year or per application.

The goal of this criterion is to ensure that elimination or modification of outdated or duplicative recordkeeping and reporting requirements could result in appreciable reductions in burden for the NRC, licensees, or both. The criterion is not intended to be used as a stand-alone consideration, but rather as a tool to ensure that the retrospective review is focused on efforts that will in fact result in a reduction in burden.

4. Reports or records that contain information used by other Federal agencies, State and local governments, or Federally-recognized Tribes will be eliminated from the review.

The goal of this criterion is to decrease the potential for unintended consequences. For example, the NRC collects certain information on behalf of other government agencies. It is not the intent of this effort to change that practice.

IV. Specific Questions

The NRC is providing an opportunity for the public to submit information and comments on the criteria that the NRC proposes to use to identify administrative requirements for potential modification or elimination. You may suggest other criteria; please provide supporting rationale for any alternative criteria you recommend that the NRC use in conducting its review. The NRC is particularly interested in gathering input in the following areas:

1. Do the proposed evaluation criteria serve the purposes described in this notice? Why or why not?

2. The NRC is considering whether the burden reduction minimum is appropriate. Is ''significant burden'' the appropriate measure? Are the examples given for Criterion 3 appropriate or useful? Should the NRC use different bases for measuring ''significant burden,'' and if so, what are these measures and how would they result in a more accurate or complete measurement of burden?

3. The NRC is considering multiple thresholds for different classes of regulated entities, as a single threshold might not be useful to identify burden reductions for all licensee types. What is the appropriate threshold for your entity class (*e.g.,* operating reactor, industrial radiographer, fuel cycle facility)?

4. Are there other evaluation criteria the NRC should consider using in its retrospective review of administrative regulations? What are those criteria and why?

V. Public Meetings

Public input will be critical to identifying potential regulatory changes as well as to provide data on the benefits and costs of existing NRC regulations. The NRC will conduct two public meetings to discuss the Retrospective Review process and recommendations.

The NRC will publish a notice of the location, time, and agenda of any meetings in the **Federal Register**, on *www.Regulations.gov,* and on the NRC's public meeting website at least 10 calendar days before the meeting. Stakeholders should monitor the NRC's public meeting website for information about the public meeting at: *http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/public-meetings/index.cfm*.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of April, 2018.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018–09359 Filed 5–2–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2018–0361; Product Identifier 2017–NM–160–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Airbus Model A318, A319, and A320 series airplanes, and Model A321–111, –112, –131, –211, –212, –213, –231, –232, –251N, –253N, and –271N airplanes. This proposed AD was prompted by a determination that more restrictive maintenance requirements and airworthiness limitations are necessary. This proposed AD would require revising the maintenance or inspection program, as applicable, to incorporate the specified maintenance requirements and airworthiness limitations. We are proposing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by June 18, 2018.

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 Airbus, Airworthiness Office—EIAS, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France; telephone +33 5 61 93 36 96; fax +33 5 61 93 44 51; email *account.airworth-eas@airbus.com;* internet *http://www.airbus.com*. You may view this service information at the FAA, Transport Standards Branch, 2200 South 216th Street, Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195.

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–2018–0361; 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 NPRM, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Operations 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: Sanjay Ralhan, Aerospace Engineer, International Section, Transport Standards Branch, FAA, 2200 South 216th Street, Des Moines, WA 98198; telephone and fax 206–231–3223.

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–2018–0361; Product Identifier 2017–NM–160–AD'' at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this NPRM. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this NPRM based on 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 NPRM.

Discussion

The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Union, has issued EASA Airworthiness Directive 2017–0215, dated October 24, 2017 (referred to after this as the Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Information, or ''the MCAI''), to correct an unsafe condition for all Airbus Model A318, A319, and A320 series airplanes, and Model A321–111, –112, –131, –211, –212, –213, –231, –232, –251N, –253N, and –271N airplanes. The MCAI states:

> The airworthiness limitations for Airbus A320 family aeroplanes, which are approved by EASA, are currently defined and published in the A318, A319, A320 and A321 Airworthiness Limitations Section (ALS) document(s). The Safe Life Airworthiness Limitation Items are specified in ALS Part 1. These instructions have been identified as mandatory for continued airworthiness.
>
> Failure to accomplish these instructions could result in an unsafe condition.
>
> Previously, EASA issued AD 2012–0008 [which corresponds to FAA AD 2015–05–02, Amendment 39–18112 (80 FR 15152, March 23, 2015) (''AD 2015–05–02'')] to require the implementation of the airworthiness limitations as specified in Airbus A318/A319/A320/A321 ALS Part 1 Revision 02, and EASA AD 2014–0141 [which corresponds to FAA AD 2015–22–08, Amendment 39–18313 (80 FR 68434, November 5, 2015) (''AD 2015–22–08'')] to require the implementation of specific life limits for the main landing gear (MLG) upper cardan pin Part Number (P/N) 201163620.
>
> Since those ADs were issued, studies were conducted in the frame of in-service events or during life extension campaigns, the results of which prompted revision of the life limits of several components installed on A320 family aeroplanes. Consequently, Airbus successively issued Revision 03, Revision 04 and Revision 05 of the A318/A319/A320/A321 ALS Part 1. ALS Part 1 Revision 05 also includes the life limits required by EASA AD 2014–0141. A318/A319//A321 ALS Part 1 Revision 05 issue 02 was issued to provide clarifications.
>
> For the reason described above, this [EASA] AD retains the requirements of EASA AD 2012–0008 and EASA AD 2014–0141, which are superseded, and requires accomplishment of the actions specified in A318/A319/A320/A321 ALS Part 1 Revision 05.

You may examine the MCAI in the AD docket on the internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2018–0361.

Relationship of Proposed AD to AD 2015–05–02 and AD 2015–22–08

This NPRM would not supersede AD 2015–05–02 or AD 2015–22–08. Rather, we have determined that a stand-alone AD would be more appropriate to address the changes in the MCAI. This NPRM would require revising the maintenance or inspection program to incorporate the new maintenance requirements and airworthiness limitations. Accomplishment of the proposed actions would then terminate all requirements of AD 2015–05–02 and AD 2015–22–08.

Related Service Information Under 1 CFR Part 51

Airbus has issued Airbus A318/A319/A320/A321 Airworthiness Limitations Section (ALS) Part 1 Safe Life Airworthiness Limitations (SL–ALI), Revision 05, Issue 02, dated April 19, 2017. This service information describes new maintenance requirements and airworthiness limitations. 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 and Requirements of This 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 the State of Design Authority, we have been notified of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI and service information referenced above. We are proposing this AD because we evaluated all pertinent information and determined an unsafe condition exists and is likely to exist or develop on other products of these same type designs.

This proposed AD would require revisions to certain operator maintenance documents to include new actions (*e.g.,* inspections). Compliance with these actions is required by 14 CFR 91.403(c). For airplanes that have been previously modified, altered, or repaired in the areas addressed by this proposed AD, the operator may not be able to accomplish the actions described in the revisions. In this situation, to comply with 14 CFR 91.403(c), the operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance according to paragraph (j)(1) of this proposed AD. The request should include a description of changes to the required inspections that will ensure the continued operational safety of the airplane.

Differences Between This Proposed AD and the MCAI or Service Information

The MCAI specifies that if there are findings from the ALS inspection tasks, corrective actions must be accomplished in accordance with Airbus maintenance documentation. However, this proposed AD does not include that requirement. Operators of U.S.-registered airplanes are required by general airworthiness and operational regulations to perform maintenance using methods that are acceptable to the FAA. We consider those methods to be adequate to address any corrective actions necessitated by the findings of ALS inspections required by this proposed AD.

Airworthiness Limitations Based on Type Design

The FAA recently became aware of an issue related to the applicability of ADs that require incorporation of an ALS revision into an operator's maintenance or inspection program.

Typically, when these types of ADs are issued by civil aviation authorities of other countries, they apply to all airplanes covered under an identified type certificate (TC). The corresponding FAA AD typically retains applicability to all of those airplanes.

In addition, U.S. operators must operate their airplanes in an airworthy condition, in accordance with 14 CFR 91.7(a). Included in this obligation is the requirement to perform any maintenance or inspections specified in the ALS, and in accordance with the ALS as specified in 14 CFR 43.16 and 91.403(c), unless an alternative has been approved by the FAA.

When a type certificate is issued for a type design, the specific ALS, including revisions, is a part of that type design, as specified in 14 CFR 21.31(c).

The sum effect of these operational and maintenance requirements is an obligation to comply with the ALS defined in the type design referenced in the manufacturer's conformity statement. This obligation may introduce a conflict with an AD that requires a specific ALS revision if new airplanes are delivered with a later revision as part of their type design.

To address this conflict, the FAA has approved alternative methods of compliance (AMOCs) that allow operators to incorporate the most recent ALS revision into their maintenance/inspection programs, in lieu of the ALS revision required by the AD. This eliminates the conflict and enables the operator to comply with both the AD and the type design.

However, compliance with AMOCs is normally optional, and we recently became aware that some operators choose to retain the AD-mandated ALS revision in their fleet-wide maintenance/inspection programs, including those for new airplanes delivered with later ALS revisions, to help standardize the maintenance of the fleet. To ensure that operators comply with the applicable ALS revision for newly delivered airplanes containing a later revision than that specified in an AD, we plan to limit the applicability of ADs that mandate ALS revisions to those airplanes that are subject to an earlier revision of the ALS, either as part of the type design or as mandated by an earlier AD. This proposed AD therefore would apply to Airbus Model A318, A319, and A320 series airplanes, and Model A321–111, –112, –131, –211, –212, –213, –231, –232, –251N, –253N, and –271N airplanes with an original certificate of airworthiness or original export certificate of airworthiness that was issued on or before the date of approval of the ALS revision identified in this proposed AD. Operators of airplanes with an original certificate of airworthiness or original export certificate of airworthiness issued after that date must comply with the airworthiness limitations specified as part of the approved type design and referenced on the type certificate data sheet.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this proposed AD affects 1,250 airplanes of U.S. registry.

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

We have determined that revising the maintenance or inspection program takes an average of 90 work-hours per operator, although we recognize that this number may vary from operator to operator. In the past, we have estimated that this action takes 1 work-hour per airplane. Since operators incorporate maintenance or inspection program changes for their affected fleet(s), we have determined that a per-operator estimate is more accurate than a per-airplane estimate. Therefore, we estimate the total cost per operator to be $7,650 (90 work-hours × $85 per work-hour).

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.

This proposed AD is issued in accordance with authority delegated by the Executive Director, Aircraft Certification Service, as authorized by FAA Order 8000.51C. In accordance with that order, issuance of ADs is normally a function of the Compliance and Airworthiness Division, but during this transition period, the Executive Director has delegated the authority to issue ADs applicable to transport category airplanes to the Director of the System Oversight Division.

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; 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):

Airbus: Docket No. FAA–2018–0361; Product Identifier 2017–NM–160–AD.

(a) Comments Due Date

We must receive comments by June 18, 2018.

(b) Affected ADs

This AD affects AD 2015–05–02, Amendment 39–18112 (80 FR 15152, March 23, 2015) (''AD 2015–05–02'') and AD 2015–22–08, Amendment 39–18313 (80 FR 68434, November 5, 2015) (''AD 2015–22–08'').

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to the Airbus airplanes identified in paragraphs (c)(1) through (c)(4) of this AD, certificated in any category, with an original certificate of airworthiness or original export certificate of airworthiness issued on or before April 19, 2017.

(1) Model A318–111, –112, –121, and –122 airplanes.

(2) Model A319–111, –112, –113, –114, –115, –131, –132, and –133 airplanes.

(3) Model A320–211, –212, –214, –216, –231, –232, –233, –251N, and –271N airplanes.

(4) Model A321–111, –112, –131, –211, –212, –213, –231, –232, –251N, –253N, and –271N airplanes.

(d) Subject

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 05, Time Limits/Maintenance Checks.

(e) Reason

This AD was prompted by a determination that more restrictive maintenance requirements and airworthiness limitations are necessary. We are issuing this AD to prevent the failure of certain life-limited parts, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

(f) Compliance

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

(g) Revision of Maintenance or Inspection Program

Within 90 days after the effective date of this AD, revise the maintenance or inspection program, as applicable, to incorporate Airbus A318/A319/A320/A321 Airworthiness Limitations Section (ALS) Part 1 Safe Life Airworthiness Limitations (SL–ALI), Revision 05, Issue 02, dated April 19, 2017. The initial compliance times for new or revised tasks are at the applicable times specified in Airbus A318/A319/A320/A321 ALS Part 1 Safe Life Airworthiness Limitations (SL–ALI), Revision 05, Issue 02, dated April 19, 2017, or within 90 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(h) No Alternative Actions and Intervals

After the maintenance or inspection program has been revised as required by paragraph (g) of this AD, no alternative actions (*e.g.,* inspections) or intervals may be used unless the actions and intervals are approved as an alternative method of compliance (AMOC) in accordance with the procedures specified in paragraph (j)(1) of this AD.

(i) Terminating Action for AD 2015–05–02 and AD 2015–22–08

Accomplishing the actions required by this AD terminates all requirements of AD 2015–05–02 and AD 2015–22–08.

(j) Other FAA AD Provisions

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, International Section, Transport Standards Branch, 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 International Section, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (k)(2) of this AD. Information may be emailed to: *9-ANM-116-AMOC-REQUESTS@faa.gov*. 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:* 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, International Section, Transport Standards Branch, FAA; or the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA); or Airbus's EASA Design Organization Approval (DOA). If approved by the DOA, the approval must include the DOA-authorized signature.

(k) Related Information

(1) Refer to Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Information (MCAI) EASA AD 2017–0215, dated October 24, 2017, 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–2018–0361.

(2) For more information about this AD, contact Sanjay Ralhan, Aerospace Engineer, International Section, Transport Standards Branch, FAA, 2200 South 216th Street, Des Moines, WA 98198; telephone and fax 206–231–3223.

(3) For service information identified in this AD, contact Airbus, Airworthiness Office—EIAS, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France; telephone +33 5 61 93 36 96; fax +33 5 61 93 44 51; email *account.airworth-eas@airbus.com;* internet *http://www.airbus.com*. You may view this service information at the FAA, Transport Standards Branch, 2200 South 216th Street, Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195.

Issued in Des Moines, Washington, on April 20, 2018.

Michael Kaszycki,

Acting Director, System Oversight Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2018–09070 Filed 5–2–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA–2018–0127; Airspace Docket No. 18–AAL–7]

RIN 2120–AA66

Proposed Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gustavus, AK

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This action proposes to amend Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface at Gustavus Airport, Gustavus, AK. Airspace redesign is necessary as the FAA transitions from ground-based to satellite-based navigation for the safety and management of instrument flight rules (IFR) operations at this airport.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 18, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on this proposal to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590; telephone: 1 (800) 647–5527, or (202) 366–9826. You must identify FAA Docket No. FAA–2018–0127; Airspace Docket No. 18–AAL–7, at the beginning of your comments. You may also submit comments through the internet at *http://www.regulations.gov*.

FAA Order 7400.11B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, and subsequent amendments can be viewed online at *http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/publications/*. For further information, you can contact the Airspace Policy Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–8783. The Order is also available for inspection at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of FAA Order 7400.11B at NARA, call (202) 741–6030, or go to *https://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html*.