

## 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 USC 106(g), 40113, 44701.

#### § 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39-6611 (55 FR 21185, May 23, 1990), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

Airbus Industrie: Docket 95-NM-263-AD. Supersedes AD 90-11-09, Amendment 39-6611.

*Applicability:* Model A300 B2 and B4 series airplanes, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane 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 airplanes that have been otherwise 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 (f) 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.

Note 2: Airbus Model A300-600 series airplane are not subject to this AD.

To prevent fatigue cracking, which could result in rapid decompression of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) For airplanes on which Airbus All Operators Telex (AOT) 53/90/01, dated April 12, 1990 has been accomplished: Prior to the accumulation of 18,000 total landings or 24,000 total hours time-in-service, whichever occurs first, or within 100 landings after June 11, 1990 (the effective date of AD 90-11-09, amendment 39-6611), whichever occurs later, perform a detailed visual inspection to detect cracks of the forward intermediate section skin of the fuselage at the junction of frame 30A and stringer 30, in accordance with Airbus All Operators Telex 53/90/01, dated April 12, 1990.

(1) If no cracks are detected, repeat the detailed visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 2,000 landings until the requirements of paragraph (b) of this AD are accomplished.

(2) If any crack is detected, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with the AOT. After any crack is repaired, prior to the

accumulation of 15,000 total landings or 20,000 total hours time-in-service, whichever occurs first, repeat the detailed visual inspection until the requirements of paragraph (b) of this AD are accomplished.

(b) For all airplanes: Perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracks of the outer skin of the fuselage at frames 28A and 30A above stringer 30, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-283, Revision 2, dated March 17, 1994, at the time specified in either paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this AD, as applicable. Accomplishment of the eddy current inspection terminates the repetitive visual inspection requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD.

(1) For airplanes on which the requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD have been initiated: Perform the eddy current inspection prior to the accumulation of 2,000 landings since the last inspection performed in accordance with paragraph (a) of this AD, or within 100 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(2) For airplanes other than those identified in paragraph (b)(1) of this AD: Perform the eddy current inspection at the later of the times specified in paragraph (b)(2)(i) or (b)(2)(ii):

(i) Prior to the accumulation of 14,100 total landings or 22,000 total flight hours after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first; or

(ii) Within 100 landings after the effective date of this AD.

(c) If no crack is detected during the eddy current inspection required by paragraph (b) of this AD, repeat the eddy current inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3,000 landings.

(d) If any crack is detected during any eddy current inspection required by this AD, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with Airbus All Operators Telex 53/90/01, dated April 12, 1990, or Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-283, Revision 2, dated March 17, 1994. After accomplishing the repair, within 15,000 landings or 20,000 flight hours after repair, whichever occurs first, modify the structure at frames 28A and 30A between stringers 27 and 30 (left- and right-hand), in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-285, Revision 1, dated November 22, 1993. Accomplishment of this reinforcement constitutes terminating action for this AD.

(e) Except for airplanes on which the repair required by paragraph (d) of this AD has been accomplished: Modify the structure at frames 28A and 30A between stringers 27 and 30 (left- and right-hand), in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-285, Revision 1, dated November 22, 1993, at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (e)(1) or (e)(2) of this AD. Accomplishment of this modification constitutes terminating action for the eddy current inspection requirements of paragraph (c) of this AD.

(1) Prior to the accumulation of 25,000 total landings or 40,000 total flight hours, whichever occurs first.

(2) Within 1,000 landings after the effective date of this AD.

(f) 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, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

(g) 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 airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 24, 1996.

S.R. Miller,

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 96-10625 Filed 4-29-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

## 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96-NM-36-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

### Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100 and -200 Series Airplanes, and Model 747-100, -200, -300, and -SP Series Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Boeing Model 737 and 747 series airplanes. This proposal would require replacement of Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies with modified assemblies. This proposal is prompted by reports of failure of hydraulic system A and the standby system due to corrosion on the magnesium piston of the hydraulic fuse and consequent failure of the fuse to close sufficiently to prevent the loss of hydraulic fluid from the system. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such failure of the fuse, which could result in the failure of one or more hydraulic systems and resultant reduced controllability of the airplane.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by June 10, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96-NM-

36-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124-2207. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kenneth W. Frey, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM-130S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; telephone (206) 227-2673; fax (206) 227-1181.

#### **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 shall 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, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice 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 comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket Number 96-NM-36-AD." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

##### **Availability of NPRMs**

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96-NM-36-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

#### **Discussion**

The FAA received two reports indicating that the hydraulic system A and the standby hydraulic system have failed on Model 737 series airplanes during flight. During subsequent emergency landings, these airplanes departed the end of the runway and sustained severe damage. On one of these airplanes, both actuator attach lugs on the support fittings of the No. 1 Krueger flap actuator were severed completely. The actuator separated from the front spar, and the adjacent hydraulic lines were severed. On another airplane, the No. 3 Krueger flap actuator separated from the fitting, and the hydraulic lines to the actuator were severed. Subsequently, the hydraulic fuse did not close sufficiently to prevent the loss of hydraulic fluid from the system. Results of a laboratory examination of the fuse indicated that corrosion existed on the magnesium piston of the fuse, which contributed to the failure of the fuse. Failure of the hydraulic fuse, if not corrected, could result in the failure of one or more hydraulic systems and, consequently, could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.

Hydraulic fuses are installed to prevent failure of the hydraulic system in the event of breakage of the hydraulic lines to leading edge devices such as the actuators. These fuses also preserve the flight control systems following a major failure such as an uncontained engine failure, and minimize the fire hazard in the event of a hydraulic line failure in the brake system. The FAA has determined that hydraulic fuses having magnesium pistons are installed on Model 737-100 and -200 series airplanes as well as Model 747-100, -200, -300, and -SP series airplanes. Therefore, the FAA finds that all of these airplane models are subject to the unsafe condition identified in this proposal.

#### **Explanation of Relevant Service Information**

The FAA has reviewed and approved Boeing Service Letter 737-SL-29-21, dated December 16, 1982 (for Model 737 series airplanes). This service letter describes procedures for replacement of the existing Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies with modified assemblies having pistons made from aluminum. Accomplishment of this replacement will reduce the susceptibility of the piston to corrosion damage. The Boeing service letter references Imperial Clevite, Inc., Service Bulletins G838-80-4, G838-80-5, and G838-80-6, all dated April 15, 1982, as additional

sources of service information for accomplishment of the replacement.

The FAA also has reviewed and approved Boeing Service Letter 747-SL-32-19, dated January 16, 1980 (for Model 747 series airplanes). This service letter describes procedures for an inspection of the existing Waterman Type II hydraulic fuse assemblies for corrosion of the piston, and replacement of Type II hydraulic fuse assemblies with improved Type I fuse assemblies. Waterman Type II fuses require reverse flow to reset, while Type I fuses have a manual reset lever. The improved fuses are manufactured by Pneudraulics, Inc.

#### **Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule**

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would require replacement of Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies with modified assemblies. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service letters described previously.

Affected operators of Model 737 series airplanes should note that, although Boeing Service Letter 737-SL-29-21 recommends that subsequent periodic tests of the modified fuses be accomplished, the FAA has not included such a requirement in this proposed AD. The FAA has determined that procedures required by operators' individual maintenance programs will adequately address periodic inspections of the new fuse assemblies.

The FAA is considering the issuance of a separate rulemaking action to address fatigue and stress corrosion of the support fitting on the Krueger flap actuator for Model 737-100 and -200 series airplanes. (The Krueger flap actuator installed on Model 747 series airplanes has a different part number from that installed on Model 737 series airplanes.)

#### **Cost Impact**

There are approximately 1,145 Model 737 series airplanes and 727 Model 747 series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet.

The FAA estimates that 421 Model 737 series airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 16 work hours per airplane (8 fuses per airplane; 2 work hours per fuse) to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Required parts that are modified by the vendor would be provided at no cost to operators. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the

proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$404,160, or \$960 per airplane.

The FAA estimates that 208 Model 747 series airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 48 work hours per airplane (24 fuses per airplane; 2 work hours per fuse) to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Required parts that are modified by the vendor would be provided at no cost to operators. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$599,040, or \$2,880 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

#### Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects 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, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

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 USC 106(g), 40113, 44701.

#### § 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Boeing: Docket 96-NM-36-AD.

*Applicability:* Model 737-100 and -200 series airplanes, as identified in Boeing Service Letter 737-SL-29-21, dated December 16, 1982; and Model 747-100, -200, -300, and -SP series airplanes, as identified in Boeing Service Letter 747-SL-32-19, dated January 16, 1980; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been otherwise modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes 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 (d) 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 hydraulic fuse, which could result in the failure of one or more hydraulic systems and resultant reduced controllability of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) For Model 737-100 and -200 series airplanes: Within 3,000 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, replace Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies, having Waterman part number (P/N) G838-8-40, G838-8-60, or G838-8-160, with modified assemblies having P/N G8381-8-40, G8381-8-60, or G8381-8-160, respectively; or with a Pneudraulics fuse specified in Boeing Service Letter 737-SL-29-21, dated December 16, 1982. Accomplish the replacement in accordance with the service letter.

Note 2: The Boeing service letter references Imperial Clevite, Inc., Service Bulletins G838-80-4, G838-80-5, and G838-80-6, all dated April 15, 1982, as additional sources of service information for accomplishment of the replacement.

(b) For Model 747-100, -200, -300, and -SP series airplanes: Within 3,000 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, replace Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies, having Waterman P/N G905-120, with Pneudraulics assemblies having Pneudraulics P/N 6105, in accordance with Boeing Service Letter 747-SL-32-19, dated January 16, 1980.

(c) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install on any airplane Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies having

Waterman P/N G838-8-40, G838-8-60, G838-8-160, or G905-120 on any airplane.

(d) 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, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Seattle ACO.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Seattle ACO.

(e) 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 airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 24, 1996.

S.R. Miller,

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 96-10622 Filed 4-29-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

### 14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 96-AEA-04]

### Proposed Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mitchellville, MD

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This proposed rule would establish Class E Airspace at Mitchellville, MD. A Very High Frequency Omni-Directional Range (VOR) standard instrument approach procedure (SIAP) has been developed for Runway (RWY) 36 at Freeway Airport, Mitchellville, MD. The intended effect of this proposal is to provide adequate controlled airspace for Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) operations to the airport. The area would be depicted on aeronautical charts for pilot reference.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before May 30, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments on the proposed rule in triplicate to: Manager, System Management Branch, AEA-530, Docket No. 96-AEA-04 FAA Eastern Region, Federal Building #111 John F. Kennedy Int'l Airport, Jamaica, NY 11430.

The official docket may be examined in the Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, AEA-7, FAA Eastern Region, Federal Building #111, John F. Kennedy International Airport, Jamaica, NY 11430.