

Appendix C to Subpart B of Part 532— Appropriated Fund Wage and Survey Areas

* * * * *

Colorado

Denver

Survey Area

Colorado:

Adams
Arapahoe
Boulder
Denver
Douglas
Gilpin
Jefferson

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Colorado:

Clear Creek
Eagle
Elbert
Garfield
Grand
Jackson
Lake
Larimer
Logan
Morgan
Park
Phillips
Pitkin
Rio Blanco
Routt
Sedgwick
Summit
Washington
Weld
Yuma

Southern Colorado

Survey Area

Colorado:

El Paso
Pueblo
Teller

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Colorado:

Alamosa
Archuleta
Baca
Bent
Chaffee
Cheyenne
Conejos
Costilla
Crowley
Custer
Delta
Dolores
Fremont
Gunnison
Hinsdale
Huerfano
Kiowa
Kit Carson
Las Animas
Lincoln
Mineral
Montrose
Otero
Ouray
Pitkin
Prowers

Rio Grande
Saguache
San Juan
San Miguel

* * * * *

Utah

Survey Area

Utah:

Box Elder
Davis
Salt Lake
Tooele
Utah
Weber

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Utah:

Beaver
Cache
Carbon
Daggett
Duchesne
Emery
Garfield
Grand
Iron
Juab
Millard
Morgan
Piute
Rich
San Juan (Only includes the Canyonlands
National Park portion.)
Sanpete
Sevier
Summit
Uintah
Wasatch
Washington
Wayne
Colorado:
Mesa
Moffat

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 00-11199 Filed 5-4-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

5 CFR Part 532

RIN 3206-AI86

Prevailing Rate Systems; Definition of Napa County, CA, to a Nonappropriated Fund Wage Area

AGENCY: Office of Personnel
Management.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Office of Personnel Management is issuing a final rule to add Napa County, California, as an area of application to the Solano, CA, nonappropriated fund (NAF) Federal Wage System (FWS) wage area. This change is necessary because NAF FWS employees will have work stations in Napa County, and Napa County was not previously an NAF wage area.

DATES: *Effective Date:* This regulation is effective on June 5, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jennifer Hopkins, (202) 606-2848, FAX: (202) 606-0824, or email jdhopkin@opm.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 15, 1999, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) published an interim rule (64 FR 61769) to redefine the Solano, California, nonappropriated fund (NAF) Federal Wage System (FWS) wage area by adding Napa County, CA, as an area of application. Under section 5343 of title 5, United States Code, OPM is responsible for defining FWS wage areas. For this purpose, we follow the regulatory criteria in section 532.219(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Solano wage area presently has one survey county, Solano County, and two area of application counties, Marin and Sonoma Counties, CA. The Army and Air Force Exchange Service acquired the Yountville Retail Facility located in Napa County and staffed the new activity with approximately eight employees, two of whom are FWS employees. Under 5 CFR 532.219, each NAF wage area "shall consist of one or more survey areas, along with nonsurvey areas, having nonappropriated fund employees."

Napa County does not meet the regulatory criteria under 5 CFR 532.219 to be a separate NAF wage area; however, OPM may combine nonsurvey counties with a survey area to form a wage area. Therefore, OPM defined Napa County as an area of application to an existing NAF wage area. The Solano wage survey consists of one survey county, Solano County, and three area of application counties, Marin, Napa, and Sonoma Counties, CA.

The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, the national labor-management committee responsible for advising OPM on matters concerning the pay of FWS employees, reviewed and concurred by consensus with this change. The interim rule had a 30-day public comment period, during which OPM did not receive any comments.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

I certify that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because it will affect only Federal agencies and employees.

List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 532

Administrative practice and procedure, Freedom of information, Government employees, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wages.

Accordingly, under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 5343, the interim rule (64 FR 61769) amending 5 CFR part 532 published on November 15, 1999, is adopted as final with no changes.

Office of Personnel Management.

Janice R. Lachance,

Director.

[FR Doc. 00-11198 Filed 5-4-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99-NE-46-AD; Amendment 39-11714; AD 2000-09-05]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Allison Engine Company AE 3007 Series Turbofan Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Allison Engine Company AE 3007 series turbofan engines. This AD would require removal of certain cone shafts from service before exceeding new cyclic life limits and replacement with serviceable parts. This amendment is prompted by additional testing and low cycle fatigue (LCF) life analysis that substantiate lower cyclic lives than originally determined. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent LCF failure of cone shafts, which could result in an uncontained engine failure and damage to the aircraft.

DATES: Effective date July 5, 2000.

ADDRESSES: This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Tallarovic, Aerospace Engineer, Chicago Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, IL 60018; telephone (847) 294-8180, fax (847) 294-7834.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to Allison Engine Company AE 3007A, AE 3007A1, AE 3007A1/1, AE 3007A1/2, AE 3007A1/3,

AE 3007A1P, and AE 3007C turbofan engines was published in the **Federal Register** on October 12, 1999 (64 FR 55196). That action proposed to require the removal of certain cone shafts, P/Ns 23050728 and 23070729, from service prior to the accumulation of new cyclic life limits, depending on engine model.

Comments Received

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

Increase Cone Shaft Life Limits for AE 3007A and AE 3007C Engines

The manufacturer requests that the FAA increase the cone shaft life limits for the AE 3007A and AE 3007C engines from 7,500 cycles each to 9,500 cycles and 14,500 cycles respectively. At the time the NPRM was issued, the cone shaft low cycle fatigue analysis for these engines was not available, and the FAA proposed lower, more conservative shaft life limits. The analysis has since been completed and the manufacturer requests that the life limits be increased.

The FAA agrees. The methodology used to determine the lives for these engine models has been approved by the FAA and is consistent with that used to determine critical part lives for other engines already in service (AE 3007A1, AE 3007A1/1, and AE 3007A1/2). Therefore, the cone shaft life limits for the AE 3007A and AE3007C engines should be increased to 9,500 cycles for the AE 3007A engine and to 14,500 cycles for the AE 3007C engine. Accordingly, new paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) in the final rule are substituted for proposed paragraph (a), and the proposed paragraphs (b) through (g) become paragraphs (d) through (i) in the final rule.

Increase Cone Shaft Life Limits for AE 3007A1/3 and AE 3007A1P Engines

One commenter requests that the FAA increase the cone shaft life limits for the AE 3007A1/3 and AE 3007A1P engines from 3,500 cycles and 2,400 cycles, respectively, to 7,500 cycles each. The commenter suggests that the cone shaft life of the AE 3007A1/3 and AE 3007A1P engines should be increased to match those of the AE 3007A1, AE 3007A1/1, and AE 3007A1/2 engines for two reasons:

- The turbomachinery hardware is the same for all the engine models referenced above. The primary difference between the models is the engine control software.
- A significant operational aspect of this group of engines is the ability to

easily maintain fleet readiness by changing the engine model with an engine control software change.

The FAA does not agree. When new data from tests or analysis suggests that component low cycle fatigue lives need to be reduced, different approaches may be taken, depending on the circumstances. If there are significant numbers of affected engines in the field (e.g. AE 3007A, AE 3007A1, AE 3007A1/1, AE 3007A1/2, and AE 3007C models), a life management program is developed that allows the users some operational flexibility while maintaining an acceptable level of risk for the fleet. If there is a very small number of affected engines in the field, the FAA prefers a life management program structured on the lifing methodology intended for original certification of the engine design. For the AE 3007A1/3 and AE 3007A1P engines, therefore, the FAA has determined to use the original FAA approved lifing methodology.

Increase Cone Shaft Life Limits for AE 3007A3 Engines

One commenter requests that the FAA increase the cone shaft life limits for the AE 3007A3 engines.

The FAA does not agree. This engine model was not included in the NPRM and is beyond the scope of this AD.

Incorrect Model Designation

The NPRM incorrectly specifies the AE 3007A1/P engine. This designation should read "AE 3007A1P." This has been corrected in the final rule.

Conclusion

After careful review of the available data, including the comments noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule with the changes described previously. The FAA has determined that these changes will neither increase the economic burden on any operator nor increase the scope of the AD.

Economic Analysis

There are approximately 598 engines of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 364 engines installed on aircraft of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 150 work hours per engine to accomplish the required actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Required parts will cost approximately \$3,921 per engine. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$4,703,244.