

feedstocks using the Fischer-Tropsch process. The three petitioners proposed that their FTD fuels be designated as "alternative fuels" because the fuels conform to the EPA requirement (in title III, section 301(2)) of being substantially not petroleum and yielding substantial energy security and environmental benefits. In September of 2002, the Department announced a public workshop and opportunity for public comment on FTD fuels, 67 FR 57347, September 10, 2002.

On October 16, 2002, the Department's Office of FreedomCAR and Vehicle Technologies Program held a public workshop to discuss the benefits and detriments of designating natural gas-based non-domestic FTD as an alternative fuel under the program. The Department made available an initial analytical paper for public comment on this topic. A transcript from the workshop is available in the docket. Four organizations presented prepared statements at the workshop, including the three petitioners. Eleven sets of written comments were also received from other organizations. All of the statements and comments can also be found in the docket.

II. Department of Energy's Determination

After a technical review of relevant data and information, including data and information collected after and during the workshop, the Department prepared a status review of its evaluation of the issues surrounding designation of FTD as an alternative fuel. In today's document, the Department is announcing availability of that document. As stated in the status review document:

"After collecting and evaluating pertinent data and conducting a workshop, DOE is unable to make a finding at this time that FTD yields "substantial environmental benefits" within the meaning of section 301(2) of the Energy Policy Act. A finding that a candidate fuel offers "substantial environmental benefits" is a necessary finding to designate a fuel as an alternative fuel under section 301(2). DOE will keep its FTD rulemaking docket active so that stakeholders desiring to submit new data and information relevant to FTD may do so. DOE will evaluate the data periodically to make future decisions with regard to FTD designation as an alternative fuel" (footnote omitted).

The Department believes that FTD offers a combination of potential environmental benefits and detriments. Data are currently unavailable or inadequate on a number of FTD-related environmental issues. For example, the Department's analysis shows that FTD would most likely increase greenhouse gas emissions, but is unclear as

to how much the likely increase would be. On the other hand, DOE continues to believe that FTD is likely to reduce emissions of particulate matter and nitrous oxides in pre-model year 2007 engines, particularly in pre-model year 1998 engines, but the existing data do not provide for reliable quantification of those emission reductions. With respect to fuels that result in any significant potential environmental detriment, it is very difficult to make designations based on judgments that other environmental benefits outweigh the significant potential detriments. At the current time, the Department is unable to find that FTD is likely to yield net environmental benefits, and does not plan to initiate a rulemaking concerning whether FTD fuels should be considered "alternative fuels" under EPA section 301(2). Any interested party, however, is invited to submit comments, data or information to DOE on this issue and, if warranted at some future time, DOE may take further action on this issue.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 28, 2005.

David K. Garman,

Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 05-2779 Filed 2-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2004-19959; Directorate Identifier 2004-CE-46-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG-500MB Sailplanes and Glaser-Dirks Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG-800B Sailplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for all DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG-500MB sailplanes equipped with a Solo engine and Glaser-Dirks Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG-800B sailplanes equipped with a Solo engine. This proposed AD would require you to inspect the propeller for damage, specifically foam core separation, and replace any damaged propeller. This proposed AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Germany. We are issuing this proposed AD to detect and correct damage to the propeller, which could

result in failure of the propeller to perform properly. This failure could lead to reduced or loss of control of the sailplane.

DATES: We must receive any comments on this proposed AD by March 31, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following to submit comments on this proposed AD:

- **DOT Docket Web site:** Go to <http://dms.dot.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- **Government-wide rulemaking Web site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- **Mail:** Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590-001.

- **Fax:** 1-202-493-2251.

- **Hand Delivery:** Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

To get the service information identified in this proposed AD, contact DG Flugzeugbau, Postbox 41 20, 76625 Bruchsal, Germany; telephone, 49 7257 890; fax, 49 7257 8922.

To view the comments to this proposed AD, go to <http://dms.dot.gov>. This is docket number FAA-2004-19959.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Gregory Davison, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, ACE-112, Room 301, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: 816-329-4130; facsimile: 816-329-4090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

How do I comment on this proposed AD? We invite you to submit any written relevant data, views, or arguments regarding this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under **ADDRESSES**. Include the docket number, "FAA-2004-19959; Directorate Identifier 2004-CE-46-AD" at the beginning of your comments. We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://dms.dot.gov>, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact with FAA personnel concerning this proposed rulemaking. Using the search function of our docket Web site, anyone can find and read the comments received into any of our dockets, including the name of the individual who sent the comment (or signed the comment on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). This is

docket number FAA–2004–19959. You may review the DOT’s complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477–78) or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Are there any specific portions of this proposed AD I should pay attention to? We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. If you contact us through a nonwritten communication and that contact relates to a substantive part of this proposed AD, we will summarize the contact and place the summary in the docket. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD in light of those comments and contacts.

Docket Information

Where can I go to view the docket information? You may view the AD docket that contains the proposal, any comments received, and any final disposition in person at the DMS Docket Offices between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. (eastern standard time), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Docket Office (telephone 1–800–647–5227) is located on the plaza level of the Department of Transportation NASSIF Building at the street address stated in **ADDRESSES**. You may also view the AD docket on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>. The comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after the DMS receives them.

Discussion

What events have caused this proposed AD? The Luftfahrt-Bundesamt (LBA), which is the airworthiness authority for Germany, recently notified FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG–500MB sailplanes equipped with a Solo engine and all Glaser-Dirks Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG–800B sailplanes equipped with a Solo engine. The LBA reports that a damaged propeller was found on a Model DG–800B sailplane.

The foam core inside the propeller separated and caused one blade to be thicker than the other. The propeller became overheated after the engine was retracted. This was possibly due to limited ventilation. The LBA reports three occurrences of this condition.

The propeller on Model DG–500MB sailplanes equipped with a Solo engine is of a similar design to Model DG–800B sailplanes equipped with a Solo engine.

What is the potential impact if FAA took no action? If not detected and corrected, damage to the propeller, specifically foam core separation, could cause the propeller to fail to perform properly. This failure could lead to reduced or loss of control of the sailplane.

Is there service information that applies to this subject? DG Flugzeugbau GmbH has issued Technical Note No. 843/19 (LBA approved on April 7, 2004; EASA approved on April 26, 2004); and Technical Note 873/29 (LBA approved on April 7, 2004; EASA approved April 26, 2004).

What are the provisions of this service information? The service information includes procedures for:

- Inspecting the propeller for damage; and
- Replacing any damaged propeller found.

What action did the LBA take? The LBA classified these technical notes as mandatory and issued German AD Number D–2004–195 and AD Number D–2004–196, both dated April 23, 2004, to ensure the continued airworthiness of these sailplanes in Germany.

Did the LBA inform the United States under the bilateral airworthiness agreement? These DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG–500MB sailplanes and Glaser-Dirks Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG–800B sailplanes are manufactured in Germany and are type-certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement.

Under this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the LBA has kept us

informed of the situation described above.

FAA’s Determination and Requirements of This Proposed AD

What has FAA decided? We have examined the LBA’s findings, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Since the unsafe condition described previously is likely to exist or develop on other DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG–500MB sailplanes and other Glaser-Dirks Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG–800B sailplanes of the same type design that are registered in the United States, we are proposing AD action to detect and correct damage to the propeller, which could result in failure of the propeller to operate properly. This failure could lead to reduced or loss of control of the sailplane.

What would this proposed AD require? This proposed AD would require you to incorporate the actions in the previously-referenced service information.

How does the revision to 14 CFR part 39 affect this proposed AD? On July 10, 2002, we published a new version of 14 CFR part 39 (67 FR 47997, July 22, 2002), which governs FAA’s AD system. This regulation now includes material that relates to altered products, special flight permits, and alternative methods of compliance. This material previously was included in each individual AD. Since this material is included in 14 CFR part 39, we will not include it in future AD actions.

Costs of Compliance

How many sailplanes would this proposed AD impact? We estimate that this proposed AD affects 31 sailplanes in the U.S. registry.

What would be the cost impact of this proposed AD on owners/operators of the affected sailplanes? We estimate the following costs to do this proposed inspection:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per sailplane	Total cost on U.S. operators
1 work hour × \$65 per hour = \$65	Not applicable	\$65	\$65 × 31 = \$2,015.

We estimate the following costs to do any necessary replacements that would be required based on the results of this proposed inspection. We have no way of determining the number of sailplanes that may need this replacement:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per sailplane
1 work hour × \$65 per hour = \$65	\$4,000	\$4,065.

Authority for This Rulemaking

What authority does FAA have for issuing this rulemaking action? 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 AD.

Regulatory Findings

Would this proposed AD impact various entities? 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.

Would this proposed AD involve a significant rule or regulatory action? For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed AD:

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 summary of the costs to comply with this proposed AD and placed it in the AD Docket. You may get a copy of this summary by sending a request to us at the address listed under **ADDRESSES**. Include "AD Docket FAA-2004-19959; Directorate Identifier 2004-CE-46-AD" in your request.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration 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):

DG Flugzeugbau GMBH and Glaser-Dirks Flugzeugbau GMBH: Docket No. FAA-2004-19959; Directorate Identifier 2004-CE-46-AD

When Is the Last Date I Can Submit Comments on This Proposed AD?

(a) We must receive comments on this proposed airworthiness directive (AD) by March 31, 2005.

What Other ADs Are Affected By This Action?

(b) None.

What Sailplanes Are Affected by This AD?

(c) This AD affects all Model DG-500MB and DG-800B sailplanes that are:

- (1) certificated in any category; and
- (2) equipped with a Solo engine

What Is the Unsafe Condition Presented in This AD?

(d) This AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Germany. The actions specified in this AD are intended to detect and correct damage to the propeller, which could result in failure of the propeller to perform properly. This failure could lead to reduced or loss of control of the sailplane.

What Must I do To Address This Problem?

(e) To address this problem, you must do the following:

Actions	Compliance	Procedures
(1) Inspect the propeller for any signs of damage	Within 25 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of AD.	Follow DG Flugzeugbau Technical Note No. 843/19 (LBA this AD. approved on April 7, 2004; EASA approved on April 26, 2004); and DG Flugzeugbau Technical Note 873/29 (LBA approved on April 7, 2004; EASA approved April 26, 2004), as applicable.
(2) If any damage is found during the inspection required in paragraph (e)(1) of this AD, replace the propeller.	Before further flight after the inspection required in paragraph (e)(1) of this AD.	Follow DG Flugzeugbau Technical Note No. 843/19 (LBA paragraph (e)(1) approved on April 7, 2004; EASA approved on April 26, 2004); and DG Flugzeugbau Technical Note 873/29 (LBA approved on April 7, 2004; EASA approved April 26, 2004), as applicable.
(3) Insert the following language in the Limitations Section of the AFM: "Caution: With high temperatures (temperature on ground above 25°C/77°F) there is the risk of authorized by overheating the propeller after engine retraction. To avoid damage extend the engine again via manual switch (approx. 1 second) to open the engine doors, retract again 5 minutes"	Within 25 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD.	The owner/operator holding at least a private pilot certificate as authorized by section 43.7 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7) may do the flight manual changes requirement of this AD. Make an entry in the aircraft records showing compliance with this portion of the AD following section 43.9 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.9).

Note: For Model DG-500MB sailplanes, FAA recommends you install a polyurethane shock absorber at the retaining cable

mounting in the fuselage. This is specified in DG Flugzeugbau Technical Note No. 843/19 (LBA approved on April 7, 2004; EASA

approved on April 26, 2004). The approximate cost to install the shock

absorber is \$520 (4 work hours × \$65 per hour for labor = \$260 + \$260 for parts).

Starting with serial number 5E243B20 and on, this shock absorber is being installed at production.

May I Request an Alternative Method of Compliance?

(f) You may request a different method of compliance or a different compliance time for this AD by following the procedures in 14 CFR 39.19. Unless FAA authorizes otherwise, send your request to your principal inspector. The principal inspector may add comments and will send your request to the Manager, Standards Office, Small Airplane Directorate, FAA. For information on any already approved alternative methods of compliance, contact Gregory Davison, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, ACE-112, Room 301, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: 816-329-4130; facsimile: 816-329-4090.

Is There Other Information That Relates to This Subject?

(g) German AD Number D-2004-195 and AD Number D-2004-196, both dated April 23, 2004, also address the subject of this AD.

May I Get Copies of the Documents Referenced in This AD?

(h) To get copies of the documents referenced in this AD, contact DG Flugzeugbau, Postbox 41 20, 76625 Bruchsal, Germany; telephone, 49 7257 890; fax, 49 7257 8922. To view the AD docket, go to the Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL-401, Washington, DC, or on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>. This is docket number FAA-2004-19959.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on February 7, 2005.

David R. Showers,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 05-2765 Filed 2-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2005-20364; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-186-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Airplanes

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

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Boeing Model 747 airplanes.

This proposed AD would require repetitive inspections of the dual side braces (DSBs), underwing midspar fittings, and associated parts; other specified actions; and corrective actions if necessary. This proposed AD also provides an optional terminating action for the inspections and other specified actions. This proposed AD is prompted by reports of corroded, migrated, and rotated bearings for the DSBs in the inboard and outboard struts, a report of a fractured retainer for the eccentric bushing for one of the side links of a DSB, and reports of wear and damage to the underwing midspar fitting on the outboard strut. We are proposing this AD to prevent the loss of a DSB or underwing midspar fitting load path, which could result in the transfer of loads and motion to other areas of a strut, and possible separation of a strut and engine from the airplane during flight.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by March 31, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following addresses to submit comments on this proposed AD.

- DOT Docket Web site: Go to <http://dms.dot.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- Government-wide rulemaking Web site: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW, Nassif Building, room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590.

- By fax: (202) 493-2251.

- Hand Delivery: Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, 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, PO Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124-2207.

You can examine the contents of this AD docket on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>, or in person at the Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., room PL-401, on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, Washington, DC. This docket number is FAA-2005-20364; the directorate identifier for this docket is 2004-NM-186-AD.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ivan Li, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM-120S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (425) 917-6437; fax (425) 917-6590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to submit any relevant written data, views, or arguments regarding this proposed AD. Send your comments to an address listed under **ADDRESSES**. Include "Docket No. FAA-2005-20364; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-186-AD" in the subject line of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed AD. We will consider all comments submitted by the closing date and may amend the proposed AD in light of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://dms.dot.gov>, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact with FAA personnel concerning this proposed AD. Using the search function of that Web site, anyone can find and read the comments in any of our dockets, including the name of the individual who sent the comment (or signed the comment on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You can review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477-78), or you can visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Examining the Docket

You can examine the AD docket on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>, or in person at the Docket Management Facility office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Docket Management Facility office (telephone (800) 647-5227) is located on the plaza level of the Nassif Building at the DOT street address stated in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after the DMS receives them.

Discussion

We have received reports of corroded, migrated, and rotated bearings for the dual side braces (DSBs) in the inboard and outboard struts, a report of a fractured retainer for the eccentric bushing for one of the side links of a DSB, and reports of wear and damage to the underwing midspar fitting on the outboard strut on Boeing Model 747-400 and Model 747SP series airplanes. These conditions, if not corrected, could result in the loss of the DSB or underwing midspar fitting load path, which could result in the transfer of loads and motion to other areas of a