

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (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. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39-13191 (68 FR 35152, June 12, 2003), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

Bombardier, Inc. (Formerly Canadair):
Docket 2003-NM-159-AD. Supersedes AD 2003-12-06, Amendment 39-13191.

Applicability: Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700 & 701) series airplanes, serial numbers 10004 through 10119 inclusive; certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent the wing anti-ice (WAI) ducts from collapsing, cracking, or rupturing, consequent leakage of hot air in the under-floor pressurized area of the fuselage when the anti-ice system is turned on, insufficient heat for the anti-ice system, and aerodynamic degradation, accomplish the following:

Referenced Service Information

(a) The term "service bulletin," as used in this AD, means the Accomplishment Instructions of CRJ 700/900 Series Regional Jet (Bombardier) Alert Service Bulletin A670BA-30-007, Revision A, dated April 15, 2003, including Appendices A and B, dated March 18, 2003.

Restatement of Requirements of AD 2003-12-06, Amendment 39-13191**Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) Revision**

(b) Within 48 hours after June 27, 2003 (the effective date of AD 2003-12-06, amendment 39-13191), revise the Limitations Section of the CRJ 700 AFM to include the following (this may be accomplished by inserting a copy of this AD into the AFM):

"1. Anti-Ice Bleed Leak Detection Controller (AILC) Channels (*see Note 1*):

Flight with "WING A/I FAULT" status message on the engine indication and crew alerting system (EICAS) is not authorized, except as follows:

One may be inoperative as indicated by "WING A/I FAULT" status message on EICAS provided:

(a) Wing Anti-Ice switch is selected OFF, and

(b) Operations are not conducted into known or forecast icing conditions.

2. Wing/Fuselage Anti-Ice Bleed Leak Detection Loops (*see Note 1*):

Flight with Wing/Fuselage Anti-Ice Bleed Leak Detection Loops inoperative is not authorized, except as follows:

One loop (A or B) may be inoperative provided:

(a) Wing Anti-Ice switch is selected OFF, and

(b) Operations are not conducted into known or forecast icing conditions.

Note 1: This limitation supersedes the Master Minimum Equipment List (M MEL)." "

Detailed Inspection and Corrective Actions if Necessary

(c) Within 150 flight hours after June 27, 2003, do a detailed inspection to detect damage of the four WAI ducts and to determine if the external shrouds of the WAI ducts are open or cracked, per the alert service bulletin.

(1) If no discrepancy is found, no further action is required by this paragraph.

(2) If any external shroud of a WAI duct is found open or cracked, before further flight, inspect the surrounding equipment and structure per a method approved by the Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, or Transport Canada Civil Aviation (TCCA) (or its delegated agent).

(3) If any damaged WAI duct is found, before further flight, replace the WAI duct with a new duct or a duct with the same part number (P/N) that is free of any dent, crease, or other handling damage, per the alert service bulletin.

Note 1: For the purposes of this AD, a detailed inspection is defined as: "An intensive visual examination of a specific structural area, system, installation, or assembly to detect damage, failure, or irregularity. Available lighting is normally supplemented with a direct source of good lighting at intensity deemed appropriate by the inspector. Inspection aids such as mirror, magnifying lenses, *etc.*, may be used. Surface cleaning and elaborate access procedures may be required."

Reporting Requirement

(d) Submit a report of the results of the inspection required by paragraph (c) of this AD per the alert service bulletin specified in paragraph (c) of this AD. Information collection requirements contained in this AD have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120-0056.

(1) If the inspection was done after June 27, 2003: Submit the report within 14 days after the inspection.

(2) If the inspection was accomplished prior to June 27, 2003: Submit the report within 14 days after June 27, 2003.

New Requirements of This AD**Terminating Action**

(e) Within 1,500 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, replace all four WAI

ducts with new ducts having P/N GG670-80504-5 or -6, or P/N GG670-80312-3 or -4, as applicable, per the service bulletin. Replacement of all four WAI ducts terminates the requirements of this AD. After doing the replacement, the AFM revision required by paragraph (b) of this AD may be removed.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(f) In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, the Manager, New York ACO, FAA, is authorized to approve alternative methods of compliance for this AD.

Note 2: The subject of this AD is addressed in Canadian airworthiness directive CF-2003-07, effective on March 25, 2003.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 18, 2003.

Kyle L. Olsen,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 03-21523 Filed 8-21-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**Federal Aviation Administration****14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 2003-SW-15-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS332C, C1, L, L1, AS350B, BA, B1, B2, B3 and D, and AS355E, F, F1, F2 and N Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the specified Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) model helicopters that have a Breeze 300-pound electric hoist (hoist) installed. This proposal would require modifying and re-identifying the hoist operator control unit and replacing certain fuses. This proposal is prompted by a test of a hoist that revealed an anomaly in the electrical control circuit. The actions specified by this proposed AD are intended to prevent failure of the hoist pyrotechnic squib electrical control unit, lack of adequate current to activate the hoist pyrotechnic squib, an inability of the pilot to cut the rescue hoist cable in the event of cable entanglement or other emergency, and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 21, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Office of the

Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2003–SW–15–AD, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Room 663, Fort Worth, Texas 76137. You may also send comments electronically to the Rules Docket at the following address: 9-asw-adcomments@faa.gov. Comments may be inspected at the Office of the Regional Counsel between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Carroll Wright, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, Rotorcraft Directorate, Regulations and Guidance Group, Fort Worth, Texas 76193–0111, telephone (817) 222–5120, fax (817) 222–5961.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this document may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their mailed comments submitted in response to this proposal must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: “Comments to Docket No. 2003–SW–15–AD.” The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Discussion

The Direction Generale De L’Aviation Civile (DGAC), the airworthiness authority for France, notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on Eurocopter Model AS332C, C1, L, L1, Model AS350B, BA, BB, B1, B2, B3 and D, and Model AS355E, F, F1, F2 and N helicopters. The DGAC advises of the discovery of a case of failure of a rescue hoist emergency release control system

to operate due to an anomaly in the electrical control circuit.

Eurocopter has issued Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. 25.00.71, for Model AS355E, F, F1, F2, and N helicopters; and ASB No. 25.00.79, for Model AS350B, BA, BB, B1, B2, B3, and D helicopters. Both ASBs are dated November 12, 2002, and specify embodiment of MOD 07 3190 on helicopters equipped with the fixed parts for the hoist. MOD 07 3190 consists of (1) eliminating resistor 27M in the hoist operator’s control unit 26M and (2) replacing the 25A quick-response fuses on the Honeywell unit at 31 alpha or 21 delta for the Model AS350 or on the distribution panel 10 alpha for the Model 355 helicopters. Eurocopter has also issued alert Service Bulletin No. 25.01.18, dated November 12, 2002, for Model AS332C, C1, L, and L1 helicopters. Modification 332PCS 78 288 consists of eliminating resistor 81M in hoist box 91M and re-identifying the hoist box as 332P67–2894–01, –02, –03, or –04, depending on which electrical wiring assembly is installed in the helicopter. The DGAC has classified these ASBs as mandatory and issued AD 2002–585(A) and AD 2002–584(A), both dated November 27, 2002, to ensure the continued airworthiness of these helicopters in France.

This AD would require correction of an anomaly between the Eurocopter hoist control box electrical circuits and the Breeze 300 lb. hoist. The Eurocopter hoist control box supplies 2 amperes to the hoist pyrotechnic squib, however the Breeze 300 lb. hoist requires 10 amperes to activate the pyrotechnic squib. The TRW (LUCAS and Air Equipment) hoists require only 1 ampere to activate their pyrotechnic squibs. Therefore, this AD would not apply to the TRW (LUCAS and Air Equipment) hoist installations even though DGAC AD 2002–585(A) applied to these hoists.

These helicopter models are manufactured in France and are type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.29 and the applicable bilateral agreement. Pursuant to the applicable bilateral agreement, the DGAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of these type designs that are certificated for operation in the United States.

This previously described unsafe condition is likely to exist or develop on other helicopters of these same type designs registered in the United States.

Therefore, the proposed AD would require, within 100 hours time-in-service (TIS) or 2 months, whichever comes first, modifying and re-identifying the hoist operator control unit and replacing certain fuses. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the ASBs described previously.

On July 10, 2002, the FAA issued a new version of 14 CFR part 39 (67 FR 47997, July 22, 2002), which governs the FAA’s AD system. The regulation now includes material that relates to altered products, special flight permits, and alternative methods of compliance. Because we have now included this material in part 39, we no longer need to include it in each individual AD.

The FAA estimates that this proposed AD would affect 58 helicopters of U.S. registry (50 Model AS350 helicopters and 8 Model AS355 helicopters, and no Model AS332 helicopters) and the proposed actions would take approximately 3.5 work hours per helicopter to accomplish at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately \$10 for a time-delay fuse for Model AS350 series helicopters, or \$20 for two time-delay fuses for Model AS355 series helicopters. Based on these figures, we estimate the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators would be \$12,840 to modify each hoist in the entire fleet.

The regulations proposed herein 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. Therefore, it is determined that this proposal would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that 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) if promulgated, 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. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (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. Section 39.13 is amended by adding a new airworthiness directive to read as follows:

Eurocopter France: Docket No. 2003–SW–15–AD.

Applicability: Model AS332C, C1, L, and L1, AS350B, BA, B1, B2, B3 and D, and AS355E, F, F1, F2 and N helicopters with a Breeze 300-pound electric hoist (hoist) and hoist operator control unit 26M, part number (P/N) 350A63–1136–00 or 350A63–1136–01, and hoist electric box 91M, P/N 332A67–2875–00, installed, certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required within 100 hours time-in-service or within 2 months, whichever occurs first, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent failure of the hoist pyrotechnic squib electrical control unit, lack of adequate current to activate the hoist pyrotechnic squib, an inability of the pilot to cut the rescue hoist cable in the event of cable entanglement or other emergency, and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter, accomplish the following:

(a) Modify and re-identify the hoist operator control unit; replace the fuses; and functionally test the hoist operation and the emergency jettison controls in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions, paragraph 2B, Operational Procedure, of Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. 25.00.71 for Model AS355E, F, F1, F2, and N helicopters; ASB No. 25.00.79 for Model AS350B, BA, B1, B2, B3, and D helicopters; and ASB No. 25.01.18 for Model AS332 C, C1, L, and L1 helicopters, all dated November 12, 2002, as applicable.

(b) To request a different method of compliance or a different compliance time for this AD, follow the procedures in 14 CFR 39.19. Contact the Safety Management Group, Rotorcraft Directorate, FAA, for information about previously approved alternative methods of compliance.

Note: The subject of this AD is addressed in Direction Generale De L'Aviation Civile (France) AD 2002–584(A) and AD 2002–585(A), both dated November 27, 2002.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, on August 8, 2003.

David A. Downey,

Manager, Rotorcraft Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 03–21522 Filed 8–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Bureau of Customs and Border Protection

19 CFR Part 141

RIN 1515–AC15

Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act: Entry Documentation

AGENCY: Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Notice of withdrawal of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document informs the public that the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has decided to withdraw the proposal to require importers to provide on the invoice a listing of all trademarks appearing on imported merchandise and its packaging. The proposal was intended to provide a means to determine whether imported merchandise bears an infringing trademark in violation of law. The authority for the proposal was section 12 of the Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act. Based on the comments received in response to the proposal and further evaluation of the proposal, CBP has determined that the proposed rule would not be an efficient and effective way to combat counterfeiting and is withdrawing the proposal.

DATES: As of August 22, 2003, the proposed rule published on September 13, 1999 (64 FR 49423) is withdrawn.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George F. McCray, Esq., Chief, Intellectual Property Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, Customs and Border Protection, (202) 572–8710.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 13, 1999, Customs (then exclusively under the Department of the Treasury; as of March 1, 2003, the U.S. Customs Service was transferred to the Department of Homeland Security, and became redesignated as the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (CBP)) published a document in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 49423) proposing to amend the Customs

Regulations to require all importers to provide on each invoice of imported merchandise a listing of any trademark information appearing on the imported merchandise, including packaging. The proposal was intended to provide a means to determine whether imported merchandise bears an infringing trademark in violation of law. The authority for the proposal was section 12 of the Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act of 1996 (ACPA)(19 U.S.C. 1484(d)).

Comments on the proposed amendment were solicited for 60 days.

The comment period closed November 13, 1999. Fifty-seven comments were received. Most were against the proposal. Among the reasons cited were that this requirement would present an overwhelming burden to importers, trademark owners, manufacturers and suppliers, and establish unrealistic recordkeeping requirements. Further, the requirement would likely not be complied with by counterfeiters. Additionally, it was stated that the proposal would not provide Customs with any new enforcement tools to combat the importation of infringing goods into the United States.

The following summarized comments supporting the withdrawal of the proposal are noted.

Costs of Compliance Would Be Enormous

The administrative costs associated with complying with this requirement would be enormous. The proposed amendment would cause severe and unreasonable burdens to trade and provide only minimal, if any, benefit to CBP enforcement.

The statement in the notice that the proposal would require importers to “identify information of a sort that is already maintained by the importer” is incorrect. The proposal would require importers to expend extraordinary efforts canvassing their suppliers—and their suppliers’ third-party suppliers—in order to develop required trademark lists. Additionally, even more effort would be required to ensure that the lists are up to date and accurately reflect the components contained in the merchandise covered by each specific invoice.

Creating and maintaining this database would force importers to create new administrative procedures devoted solely to tracking trademarks on components contained within final products. It would also force importers to devote resources to policing suppliers of such components.