

could result in an uncontained engine failure, and damage to the airplane. Therefore, the preamble and text of this SNPRM has been changed to read that the AD is issued to prevent HPC impeller failure due to fatigue cracking.

Since these changes expand the scope and cost of the originally proposed rule, the FAA has determined that it is necessary to reopen the comment period to provide additional opportunity for public comment.

There are approximately 7510 engines of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 5482 engines installed on aircraft of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 3 work hours per engine to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. The FAA also estimates that some of the impellers will be replaced, and that the impeller will cost about \$45,000. Based on these figures, the FAA estimates the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators for the next four years to be \$2,201,760.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations adopted herein will 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 final rule does not have federalism implications under Executive Order (EO) 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 the following new airworthiness directive:

Honeywell International Inc. TFE731-2, -3, -4, and -5 Series Turbofan Engines:
Docket No. 99-ANE-10-AD.

Applicability: Honeywell International Inc. (formerly AlliedSignal Inc. and Garrett Turbine Engine Company) TFE731-2, -3, -4, and -5 series turbofan engines with high pressure compressor (HPC) impeller part numbers (P/N's) 3073393-1, 3073394-1, 3073433-1, 3073434-1, 3073398-All (where All denotes all dash numbers), 3073435-All, and 3075171-All, installed on, but not limited to, Avions Marcel Dassault—Breguet Aviation (AMD/BA) Falcon 10, Dassault Aviation Mystere—Falcon 50, and 900 series airplanes; Dassault Aviation Mystere—Falcon 20 series airplanes, Learjet Inc. Models 31, 35, 36, and 55 series airplanes; Lockheed-Georgia Corporation 1329-23 and -25 series airplanes; Israel Aircraft Industries Ltd. 1124 series and 1125 Westwind series airplanes; Cessna Aircraft Co. Model 650 Citation III, VI, and VII series airplanes; Raytheon Aircraft Co. HS-125 series airplanes; and Sabreliner Corporation NA-265-65 airplanes.

Note 1: This airworthiness directive (AD) applies to each engine identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For engines that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (e) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent failure of the high pressure compressor impeller due to fatigue cracking, accomplish the following:

(a) Remove and inspect the applicable HPC impeller in accordance with Section 2.A. of the Accomplishment Instructions of AlliedSignal Inc. Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) TFE731-A72-3641, Revision 1, dated October 20, 1999, or ASB TFE731-A72-3641 dated November 24, 1998, and if necessary, replace the impeller with a serviceable impeller, at the earlier of the following:

(1) At the next core zone inspection (CZI) after the effective date of this AD, or

(2) At the next access to the HPC module after the effective date of this AD.

(b) Thereafter, remove and inspect the applicable HPC impeller in accordance with Section 2.A. of the Accomplishment Instructions of ASB TFE731-A72-3641 dated November 24, 1998, or ASB TFE731-A72-3641, Revision 1, dated October 20, 1999, and if necessary, replace the impeller with a serviceable impeller, whenever either of the following conditions are met:

(1) At every CZI, or

(2) At access to the HPC module if the impeller has accumulated more than 1,000 cycles since the last Eddy Current Inspection (ECI).

(c) This AD defines access to the HPC module as whenever the low pressure compressor case is removed from the compressor interstage diffuser.

(d) For the purposes of this AD, a serviceable impeller is defined as an impeller which complies with all applicable visual, dimensional, and fluorescent penetrant inspections requirements for the level of maintenance being accomplished, as contained in the Heavy Maintenance Manual and is either an impeller with fewer than 1000 engine operation cycles since new or an impeller with less than 1000 engine operation cycles since last ECI.

(e) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (LAACO). Operators shall submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, LAACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the LAACO.

(f) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on March 1, 2000.

Diane S. Romanosky,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00-5460 Filed 3-6-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 307

Request for Comments Concerning Regulations Implementing the Comprehensive Smokeless Tobacco Health Education Act of 1986

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission (the "Commission") is

requesting public comment on its regulations (“smokeless tobacco regulations” or “the regulations”) implementing the Comprehensive Smokeless Tobacco Health Education Act of 1986 (“Smokeless Tobacco Act”). The regulations set forth the manner in which smokeless tobacco manufacturers, importers, and packagers must display and rotate the three health warnings mandated by the Smokeless Tobacco Act. As part of its systematic review of all current Commission regulations and guides, the Commission is requesting comments about the overall costs and benefits of the regulations and their overall regulatory and economic impact. The Commission is also requesting comment on whether the regulations adequately implement the format and display requirements of the Smokeless Tobacco Act and for comment on several other issues relating to specific provisions of the regulations. All interested parties are hereby given notice of the opportunity to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the rule.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before April 24, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be identified as “16 CFR Part 307” and sent to the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, Room H-159, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington DC 20680. The Commission requests that the original comment be filed with five copies, if feasible. The Commission also requests, if possible, that the comments be submitted in electronic form on a computer disc. (Programs based on DOS or Windows are preferred. Files from other operating system should be submitted in ASCII test format.) The disc label should identify the commenter’s name and the name and version of the word processing program used to create the document.

Alternatively, the Commission will accept comments submitted to the following E-Mail address: “SMOKELESS@ftc.gov”.

All comments will be placed on the public record and will be available for public inspection in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, and the Commission’s Rules of Practice, 16 CFR 4.11, during normal business days from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., at the Public Reference Room, Room H-130, Federal Trade Commission, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20580. In addition, comment will be placed on the Internet at the FTC web site: <http://www.ftc.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rosemary Rosso (202) 326-3076,

Division of Advertising Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC 20580, E-Mail (for questions or information only): rrosso@ftc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The current request for comments on the smokeless tobacco regulations is part of the Commission’s regulatory review program, which has been implemented to review regulations and guides periodically. The regulatory review program seeks information about the costs and benefits of the Commission’s rules and guides and their regulatory and economic impact. The information obtained will assist the Commission in identifying rules and guides that warrant modification or rescission.

Simultaneous with the regulatory review, the Commission is also seeking public comments on whether the regulations adequately implement the format and display requirements of the Smokeless Tobacco Act and for comment on several other issues relating to specific provisions of the regulations.

A. Background Information

The Smokeless Tobacco Act was promulgated by Congress on February 27, 1986. The Act requires manufacturers, importers and packagers of smokeless tobacco products to display on a rotating basis one of the following healthy warning labels on product packages and in most advertisements:

WARNING: THIS PRODUCT MAY CAUSE MOUTH CANCER
 WARNING: THIS PRODUCT MAY CAUSE GUM DISEASE AND TOOTH LOSS
 WARNING: THIS PRODUCT IS NOT A SAFE ALTERNATIVE TO CIGARETTES

For packaging, the Act directs that these health warnings appear in a conspicuous and prominent place on the package and in a conspicuous format that is in conspicuous and legible type in contrast with all other printed material. For advertising, the Act directs that the warnings be displayed in a circle-and-arrow format in a conspicuous and prominent place and in conspicuous, legible type in contrast to all other printed materials.

The Act also directs the Commission to issue implementing regulations governing the format and display of the statutory health warnings on packaging and in most advertising for smokeless tobacco products.

On November 4, 1986, the Commission promulgated regulations specifying requirements as to the size,

color, typeface, placement and rotation of those warnings, 51 FR 40015. For the most part, these provisions are set out as safe harbor provisions that state formats or displays that will be deemed to be in conformance with the Smokeless Tobacco Act rather than in terms of displays or formats that are required to conform. The Commission’s regulations require manufacturers, importers and packagers to submit to the Commission for approval their plans for complying with the requirements for the display and periodic rotation of the three warnings.

The Commission amended its smokeless tobacco regulations on March 20, 1991, 56 FR 11662.¹ The 1991 amendments added a requirement for display of the warnings on “utilitarian items,” that is items other than smokeless tobacco that are sold or given to consumers for their personal use that display the name, logo, or selling message of any smokeless tobacco product.²

B. Issues for Comment

The Commission is currently conducting a periodic review of the smokeless tobacco regulations as part of its periodic review of all current Commission rules and guides. Accordingly, the Commission is requesting comments about the overall costs and benefits of the regulations and their overall regulatory and economic impact.

In addition, the Commission is seeking public comment on the adequacy of the smokeless tobacco regulations in implementing the format and display provisions of the Smokeless Tobacco Act.

1. Effectiveness of the Warning Requirements

For labels, the regulations currently require that the warnings be displayed in a conspicuous and prominent place on the label and provide examples of

¹ The sections of the regulations that deal with technical requirements for rotation of the warnings also were amended several times, including on January 15, 1993, 58 FR 4874, and on August 30, 1996, 61 FR 45886.

In addition, the Commission currently has pending a rulemaking to determine whether it should amend its regulations to require rotational health warnings on sponsored racing vehicles and other event-related objects that display the brand name, logo or selling message of smokeless tobacco products. That rulemaking is on hold while Commission staff evaluate regulatory and industry changes that have taken place since this proceeding commenced.

² The regulations as originally promulgated by the Commission contained an exemption for utilitarian items. Subsequent litigation required the Commission to delete the exemption. *Public Citizen v. FTC*, 688 F. Supp. 667 (D.D.C. 1988), *aff’d*, 869 F.2d (D.C. Cir. 1989).

places on the label of different types of smokeless tobacco packages that will be deemed to be conspicuous and prominent. For advertising, the regulations currently require that the statutorily mandated circle-and-arrow warnings be in conspicuous and legible type in contrast with all other printed material and must appear in all capital letters in a circle-and-arrow format. The regulations provide examples of display formats that will be deemed to conform to these requirements.

The Commission is interested in public comment on the effectiveness of the existing regulations in meeting the statutory format and display requirements. In particular, the Commission would like to receive comment on any consumer research, studies or other data bearing on the effectiveness of the warning requirements.

2. Enforceability of the Warning Requirements

Many of the substantive provisions of the regulations are stated in terms of safe harbors, or displays that will be deemed to be in conformance with the Smokeless Tobacco Act, rather than as specific mandatory requirements. The Commission is seeking public comment on whether this safe harbor approach is sufficiently enforceable. In particular, the Commission is interested in public comment as to whether the safe harbor approach should be abandoned and if so, the costs and benefits of changing to an alternative approach.

3. Smokeless Tobacco Dispensers

Under the regulations as currently drafted, rectangular dispensers of individual packages of smokeless tobacco can display the label warning on any side of its packaging, provided that the dispenser can be sold in its entirety and the warning is the only printed or graphic matter on the side of the package where it appears. 16 CFR 307.6(a). It has recently come to the Commission's attention that this provision is being used to justify placement of the label warning on the back of dispensers commonly used as displays for the retail sale of individual packages of smokeless tobacco products. In this location, the warnings are not visible to the viewing public.

Accordingly, the Commission is seeking comment as to whether this provision of the Regulations should be revised to provide that any dispenser of individual smokeless tobacco packages that can be used as a retail display carry the label warning on its principal display panel.

4. Can Rolls

Section 307.6(b) of the regulations currently provides that can rolls wrapped for sale as a single unit display a warning in 12-point type if the warnings on the individual cans in the roll are not completely visible. The warnings on the individual cans typically would be in 7½ point type under the current regulations. One manufacturer has taken the position that the larger 12-point type requirement does not apply to can rolls consisting of only two cans. The Commission is interested in public comment on whether this provision should be amended to make it clear that the provision for a larger warning applies to any can roll consisting of two or more cans that are wrapped for sale as one unit if the warnings on the individual cans are not completely visible.

C. Request for Comments

At this time, the Commission is seeking comment on various aspects of the smokeless tobacco regulations in conjunction with its regulatory review. Without limiting the scope of issues it is seeking comment on, the Commission is particularly interested in receiving comments on the questions that follow. Where commenters advocate changes to the regulations, please be specific in describing suggested changes. With respect to suggested changes to the regulations, please describe any potential costs and benefits such changes might have on industry and consumers. The Commission would also be interested in commenters providing any consumer research, studies or data that exist on issues raised in the questions.

1. Is there a continuing need for the regulations as currently promulgated?

(a) Since the regulations were issued, have changes in technology, industry structure or economic conditions affected the need for or effectiveness of the regulations?

(b) Do the regulations include provisions that are unnecessary?

(c) What are the aggregate costs or benefits of the regulations?

(d) Have the costs or benefits of the regulations dissipated over time?

2. What effect, if any, have the regulations had on smokeless tobacco purchasers, potential purchasers or the general public?

(a) What benefits have the regulations provided to smokeless tobacco purchasers, potential purchasers or the general public?

(b) What economic or other costs have the regulations imposed on smokeless tobacco purchasers, potential purchasers or the general public?

(c) What changes, if any, should be made to the regulations to increase the benefits to smokeless tobacco purchasers, potential purchasers or the general public?

(d) How would these changes affect the compliance costs the regulations impose on industry?

3. What impact, if any, have the regulations had on firms that must comply with it?

(a) What economic or other costs have the regulations imposed on industry or individual firms?

(b) What benefits have the regulations provided to the industry or to individual firms?

(c) What changes, if any, should be made to the regulations to minimize any burden or cost imposed on industry or individual firms?

(d) How would the changes affect the benefits provided by the regulations to smokeless tobacco purchasers, potential purchasers, the general public or industry?

4. Do the regulations overlap or conflict with any federal, state or local laws or regulations?

5. What significant burdens or costs, including costs of compliance, have the regulations imposed on small firms subject to their requirements?

(a) How do these burdens or costs differ from those imposed on larger firms subject to the regulations' requirements?

(b) What changes, if any, should be made to the regulations to reduce the burdens or costs imposed on small firms?

(c) How would these changes affect the benefits of the regulations?

(d) Would such changes adversely affect the competitive position of larger firms?

Section 307.6 Requirements for Disclosure on the Label

6. If the regulations are retained, are the size, color, typeface, or placement requirements sufficiently conspicuous and prominent within the meaning of section 3(b)(1) of the Smokeless Tobacco Act, 15 USC 4402(b)(1)? What evidence is there to show that the existing label disclosure requirements are or are not conspicuous or prominent or otherwise effective or ineffective?

Sections 307.7, 307.8 and 307.9 Requirements for Disclosure in Advertising

7. If the regulations are retained, are the size, color, typeface, or placement requirements sufficiently conspicuous and prominent within the meaning of section 3(b)(2) of the Smokeless Tobacco Act, 15 USC 4402(b)(2)? What evidence

is there to show that the existing advertising disclosure requirements are or are not conspicuous or prominent or otherwise effective or ineffective?

Enforceability of the Regulations

8. Many of the substantive provisions of the regulations are stated in terms of safe harbors, or displays that will be deemed to be in conformance with the Smokeless Tobacco Act, rather than as specific mandatory requirements. Are the regulations in this form sufficiently enforceable? Does this make it more difficult to prove that displays that do not conform to the safe harbors are not sufficiently conspicuous to conform to the requirements of the Smokeless Tobacco Act? Should the safe harbor approach be abandoned?

Smokeless Tobacco Dispensers

9. Should the regulations be revised to provide that any dispenser of individual smokeless tobacco packages that can be used as a retail display carry the advertising warning on its principal display panel?

Can Rolls

10. Should the regulations be amended to provide that a can roll of individual smokeless tobacco packages can consist of as few as two cans?

11. Are there any other provisions of the regulations that need to be amended? If so, which provisions require change and how should they be changed?

12. What is the likely effect of any changes in the regulations suggested in response to questions 6 through 11 on costs, profitability, competitiveness, or employment in small business entities?

13. The Smokeless Tobacco Act requires that smokeless tobacco companies submit plans to the Commission specifying the method they will use to rotate, display, and distribute the required health warnings on their packaging and advertising. Making changes suggested in the regulations in response to questions 6 through 11 may require the smokeless tobacco companies to amend their plans for the display and rotation of the warning statements. What paperwork or other burdens would be imposed by any changes suggested in response to questions 6 through 11?

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 307

Health warnings, Smokeless tobacco, Trade practices.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 1401–1410.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–5506 Filed 3–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 312

Children's Online Privacy Protection Rule

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed "Safe Harbor" Guidelines and Request for Public Comment.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission publishes this notice and request for public comment concerning proposed self-regulatory guidelines under the safe harbor provision of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Rule, 16 CFR 312.10(a).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before April 6, 2000. Comments will be posted on the Commission's website: <http://www.ftc.gov>.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be submitted to: Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, Room H–159, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580. The Commission requests that commenters submit the original plus five copies, if feasible. To enable prompt review and public access, comments also should be submitted, if possible, in electronic form, on either a 5¼ or a 3½ inch computer disk, with a disk label stating the name of the commenter and the name and version of the word processing program used to create the document. (Programs based on DOS or Windows are preferred. Files from other operating systems should be submitted in ASCII text format.) Alternatively, the Commission will accept comments submitted to the following e-mail address, safeharbor@ftc.gov. Individual members of the public filing comments need not submit multiple copies or comments in electronic form. All submissions should be captioned: "PrivacyBot.com Safe Harbor Proposal—Comment, P004504."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Loren G. Thompson, (202) 326–2049, Abbe Goldstein, (202) 326–3423, or Elizabeth Delaney, (202) 326–2903, Division of Advertising Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, 601 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Section A. Background

On October 20, 1999, the Commission issued its final Rule pursuant to the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act, 15 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.¹ The Rule requires certain website operators to post privacy policies, provide notice, and obtain parental consent prior to collecting certain personal information from children. The Rule contains a "safe harbor" provision enabling industry groups or others to submit self-regulatory guidelines that would implement the protections of the Rule to the Commission for approval.²

Pursuant to § 312.10 of the Rule, PrivacyBot.com has submitted proposed self-regulatory guidelines to the Commission for approval. The full text of the proposed guidelines is available on the Commission's website, www.ftc.gov.

Section B. Questions on the Proposed Guidelines

The Commission is seeking comment on various aspects of the proposed guidelines, and is particularly interested in receiving comment on the questions that follow. These questions are designed to assist the public and should not be construed as a limitation on the issues on which public comment may be submitted. Responses to these questions should cite the numbers and subsection of the questions being answered. For all comments submitted, please provide any relevant data, statistics, or any other evidence, upon which those comments are based.

1. Please provide comment on any or all of the provisions in the proposed guidelines. For each provision commented on please describe (a) the impact of the provision(s) (including any benefits and costs), if any, and (b) what alternatives, if any, PrivacyBot.com should consider, as well as the costs and benefits of those alternatives.

2. Do the provisions of the proposed guidelines governing operators' information practices provide "the same or greater protection for children" as those contained in §§ 312.2–312.8 of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Rule? Where possible, please cite the relevant sections of both the Rule and the proposed guidelines.

3. Are the mechanisms used to assess operators' compliance with the guidelines effective? See Rule § 312.10(b)(2).³ If not, please describe (a) how the proposed guidelines could be

¹ 64 FR 59888 (Nov. 3, 1999).

² See 16 CFR 312.10; 64 FR at 59906–59908; 59915.

³ 64 FR at 59915.