

Frequency	Field Strength (volts per meter)	
	Peak	Average
1 GHz–2 GHz	2000	200
2 GHz–4 GHz	3000	200
4 GHz–6 GHz	3000	200
6 GHz–8 GHz	1000	200
8 GHz–12 GHz	3000	300
12 GHz–18 GHz	2000	200
18 GHz–40 GHz	600	200

The field strengths are expressed in terms of peak root-mean-square (rms) values.

The threat levels identified above differ from those used in previous special conditions and are the result of an FAA review of existing studies on the subject of HIRF, in light of the ongoing work of the Electromagnetic Effects Harmonization Working Group of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee. In general, these standards are less critical than the threat level that was previously used as the basis for earlier special conditions.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions would be applicable initially to the Model 767–400ER airplane. Should Boeing apply at a later date for change to the type certificate to include another model incorporating the same novel or unusual design feature, these special conditions would apply to that model as well under the provisions of § 21.101(a)(1).

Conclusion

This action affects certain design features only on the Model 767–400ER. It is not a rule of general applicability and affects only the manufacturer who applied to the FAA For Approval of these features on the airplane.

List of Subjects In 14 CFR Part 25

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

The authority citation for these proposed special conditions is as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701, 44702, 44704.

The Proposed Special Conditions

Accordingly, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposes the following special conditions as part of the type certification basis for the Boeing 767–400ER series airplanes.

1. *Protection from Unwanted Effects of High-Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF).* Each electrical and electronic system that performs critical functions must be designed and installed to ensure that the operation and operational capability of these systems

to perform critical functions are not adversely affected when the airplane is exposed to high-intensity radiated fields.

For the purpose of this special condition, the following definition applies:

Critical Functions. Functions whose failure would contribute to or cause a failure condition that would prevent the continued safe flight and landing of the airplane.

Issued In Renton, Washington, on July 13, 1999.

Donald L. Riggan,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, ANM–100.

[FR Doc. 99–18564 Filed 7–20–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–267–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–81, –82, –83, and –87 Series Airplanes (MD–81, –82, –83, and –87), and Model MD–88 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the superseding of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to all McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–81, –82, –83, and –87 series airplanes (MD–81, –82, –83, and –87), and Model MD–88 airplanes, that currently requires visual or eddy current inspections to detect cracks of the actuator cylinder support brackets of the slat drive mechanism assembly, and replacement of any cracked brackets. This action would continue to require repetitive eddy current inspections, would add an inspection requirement, and would expand the area of inspection. This action also would provide terminating action for the repetitive inspections. This proposal is prompted by reports indicating that additional cracking was found outside the original inspection area. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent inadvertent slat retraction in flight.

DATES: Comments must be received by September 7, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation

Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–267–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 Aircraft Group, Long Beach Division, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Dept. C1–L51 (2–60). This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Brent Bandle, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712–4137; telephone (562) 627–5237; fax (562) 627–5210.

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 98–NM–267–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-114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98-NM-267-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

On September 27, 1991, the FAA issued AD 91-21-11, amendment 39-8058 (56 FR 51645, October 15, 1991), applicable to all McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81, -82, -83, and -87 series airplanes (MD-81, -82, -83, and -87), and Model MD-88 airplanes, to require visual or eddy current inspections to detect cracks of the actuator cylinder support brackets of the slat drive mechanism assembly, and replacement of any cracked brackets. That action was prompted by reports of failures of the slat drive mechanism. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent inadvertent slat retraction in flight.

Actions Since Issuance of Previous Rule

In the preamble to AD 91-21-11, the FAA specified that the actions required by that AD were considered to be interim action. The FAA indicated that it may consider further rulemaking action to require only repetitive eddy current inspections for airplanes that have accumulated 10,000 or more landings. The FAA has determined that further rulemaking action is indeed necessary; this proposed AD follows from that determination.

Since the issuance of AD 91-21-11, the FAA has received a report indicating that additional cracking was found outside the original inspection area. The cracking was found on a McDonnell Douglas Model MD-83 series airplane that had accumulated 32,478 total flight hours. The repetitive inspections in AD 91-21-11 were required to be performed on the top of the clevis lug (a U-shaped fitting that has matching holes in the arms of the U) of the actuator cylinder support brackets. The additional cracking was found within the clevis lug in the transition radius between the body of the actuator cylinder support bracket and the clevis lug.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin

MD80-27-A322, Revision 03, dated August 4, 1998, which, among other things, describes procedures for a one-

time, visual inspection and repetitive eddy current inspections to detect cracks of the actuator cylinder support brackets of the slat drive mechanism assembly. For certain airplanes, this would involve a one-time, visual and eddy current inspections, followed by repetitive eddy current inspections. For certain other airplanes this would involve repetitive eddy current inspections.

The FAA also has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD80-27-322, Revision 02, dated February 11, 1998, which, among other things, describes procedures for modification of the actuator cylinder support bracket of the slat drive mechanism assembly. This modification involves replacing the actuator cylinder support bracket with a new, improved bracket and installing new associated components.

The specific modification of the actuator cylinder support bracket is predicated on whether a previous modification has been installed in accordance with a prior issue of McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD80-27-322. For those airplanes on which a previous modification has been installed, operators would have the option of choosing one of the following:

- Option 1: Replacement and reidentification of the actuator cylinder support bracket assemblies, hydraulic pipe assemblies, and clamp assemblies with new components; or replacement of the hydraulic pipe clamp assemblies with new clamp assemblies; or
- Option 2: Removal and return of the slat drive mechanism to the manufacturer for modification and reidentification; installation of the modified and reidentified slat drive mechanism assembly, replacement of the hydraulic pipe assemblies with new pipe assemblies; or replacement of the hydraulic pipe clamp assemblies with new clamp assemblies.

For those airplanes on which no previous modification has been installed, operators would have the option of the choosing one of the following:

- Option 1: Replacement of the actuator cylinder support bracket assemblies, and hydraulic pipe assemblies and clamp assemblies with new components; and reidentification of the slat drive mechanism.
- Option 2: Removal and return of the slat drive mechanism to the manufacturer for modification and reidentification; installation of the modified and reidentified slat drive mechanism, and replacement of the hydraulic pipe clamp assemblies with new clamp assemblies.

Accomplishment of the modification for both actuator cylinder support brackets would eliminate the need for the repetitive inspections.

Accomplishment of the action specified in the service bulletins is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition.

FAA's Determination

The FAA has examined the circumstances and reviewed all the available information related to the additional cracking that was reported. Additionally, the FAA reviewed the requirements of AD 91-21-11, which required that either a visual or an eddy current inspection be performed to detect cracking of the slat drive mechanism. In light of the criticality of the unsafe condition (inadvertent retraction of the slats during flight), the FAA has determined that visual inspection methods may not be as effective in detecting the types of cracks associated the slat drive mechanism. This proposed AD would require a one-time visual inspection and an eddy current inspection be performed on all airplanes on which no previous inspection has been performed in accordance with AD 91-21-11. For airplanes on which the last inspection performed in accordance with AD 91-21-11 was a visual inspection, this proposed AD would require a visual inspection within 1,000 landings and an eddy current inspection within 6 months. All airplanes would be required to repeat the eddy current inspection at intervals not exceeding 3,000 landings, or until the terminating modification is accomplished, which would eliminate the need for the repetitive inspections.

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 supersede AD 91-21-11 to continue to require eddy current inspections for cracks of the actuator cylinder support brackets of the slat drive mechanism assembly, and replacement of any cracked brackets. This action also would add an inspection requirement and expand the area of inspection. This action also would provide terminating action for the repetitive inspections. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously, except as discussed below.

Differences Between Proposed Rule and Service Information

Operators should note that, although McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD80-27-322, Revision 02, provides service information for performing repetitive visual and eddy current inspections, this proposed AD would require an initial visual inspection and repetitive eddy current inspections be performed in accordance with Revision 03 of the McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80-27-A322. The FAA has determined that Revision 03 of the McDonnell Douglas alert service bulletin provides complete inspection instructions for the expanded inspection area that would be required by this proposed AD.

Additionally, operators should note that, although the McDonnell Douglas alert service bulletin (previously described), recommends that the initial visual inspection be performed within 60 days and that the eddy current inspection be performed within 6 months after receipt of the service bulletin, this proposed AD would require that the initial inspection be performed as described below, as applicable:

- For airplanes on which no inspection has been performed in accordance with AD 91-21-11: Perform visual and eddy current inspections prior to the accumulation of 10,000 total landings or within 30 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.
- For airplanes on which the last inspection that was performed in accordance with AD 91-21-11 was a visual inspection: Perform visual inspection within 1,000 landings after the last visual inspection, followed by an eddy current inspection within 6 months.
- For airplanes on which the last inspection that was performed in accordance with AD 91-21-11 was an eddy current inspection: Perform eddy current inspection within 3,000 landings after the last eddy current inspection.

In developing the appropriate compliance time, the FAA considered the manufacturer's recommendation and the degree of urgency associated with addressing the subject unsafe condition. In light of these factors, the FAA finds that the compliance time specified by this proposed AD to be appropriate.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 1,180 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 787 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

The inspections that are currently required by AD 91-21-11 take approximately 3 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the currently required actions on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$141,660, or \$180 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The one-time visual inspection that is proposed in this AD action would take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed requirements of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$47,220, or \$60 per airplane.

The inspections of the expanded area that are proposed in this AD action would take approximately 2 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed requirements of this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$94,440, or \$120 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

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

Should an operator be required or elect to accomplish the terminating modification that is provided by this AD action, it would take between 130 and 162 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Required parts would cost \$22,574 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the optional terminating modification, is estimated to be between \$30,374 and \$32,294 per airplane.

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 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39-8058 (56 FR 51645, October 15, 1991), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 98-NM-267-AD. Supersedes AD 91-21-11, Amendment 39-8058.

Applicability: All Model DC-9-81, -82, -83, and -87 series airplanes (MD-81, -82, -83, and -87); and Model MD-88 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 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 (h)(1) 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 inadvertent slat retraction in flight, accomplish the following:

Restatement of Certain Requirements of AD 91-21-11, Amendment 39-8058

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 10,000 total landings or within 30 days after October 30, 1991 (the effective date of AD 91-21-11), whichever occurs later, perform a visual or eddy current inspection to detect cracks of

the actuator cylinder support brackets of the slat drive mechanism assembly, part numbers 5938886—(any configuration) and 5938887—(any configuration), in accordance with the instructions in McDonnell Douglas MD-80 Alert Service Bulletin A27-322, dated August 22, 1991 (hereinafter referred to as "A27-322").

(b) If no crack is found during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, repeat the inspection at the following intervals:

(1) If the immediately preceding inspection was accomplished using visual means, conduct the next inspection within 1,000 landings.

(2) If the immediately preceding inspection was accomplished using eddy current means, conduct the next inspection within 3,000 landings.

(c) If any crack is found during any inspection required by paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD, prior to further flight, remove and replace the slat drive mechanism with a new part, part numbers 5938887—(any configuration) and 5938886—(any configuration), in accordance with A27-322.

New Requirements of This AD

Initial and Repetitive Inspections

(d) Perform visual and/or eddy current inspections, as applicable, to detect cracks of the actuator cylinder support brackets of the slat drive mechanism assembly, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80-27-A322, Revision 03, dated August 4, 1998, at the time specified in paragraph (d)(1), (d)(2), or (d)(3), as applicable, of this AD.

(1) For airplanes on which no inspection has been performed in accordance with AD 91-21-11: Perform both visual and eddy current inspections prior to the accumulation of 10,000 total landings or within 30 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later.

(2) For airplanes on which the immediately preceding inspection was performed using visual means in accordance with AD 91-21-11, accomplish the requirements of paragraphs (d)(2)(i) and (d)(2)(ii) of this AD.

(i) Within 1,000 landings after the immediately preceding visual inspection, perform a visual inspection; and

(ii) Within 6 months after the last visual inspection required by paragraph (d)(2)(i) of this AD, perform an eddy current inspection.

(3) For airplanes on which the immediately preceding inspection was performed using eddy current means in accordance with AD 91-21-11: Perform an eddy current inspection within 3,000 landings after the last eddy current inspection.

(e) If no crack is found during any inspection required by paragraph (d) of this AD, repeat the eddy current inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3,000 landings until the actions specified in paragraph (g) of this AD are accomplished for both actuator cylinder support brackets of the slat drive mechanism assembly.

Corrective/Terminating Action

(f) If any cracking is found during any inspection required by paragraph (d) or (e) of this AD, prior to further flight, modify the

actuator cylinder support bracket of the slat drive mechanism assembly (Option 1 or 2 for Group 1 or 2 airplanes, as applicable) in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD80-27-322, Revision 02, dated February 11, 1998, as specified in paragraph (f)(1) or (f)(2), as applicable, of this AD.

(1) For airplanes identified as Group 1 in the service bulletin: Accomplish the actions as identified in the service bulletin as Group 1 Option 1 or Group 1 Option 2.

(2) For airplanes identified as Group 2 in the service bulletin: Accomplish the actions as identified in the service bulletin as Group 2 Option 1 or Group 2 Option 2.

(g) Accomplishment of the modification of the actuator cylinder support bracket specified in paragraph (f) of this AD constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspections required by this AD, provided that both actuator cylinder support brackets are modified.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(h)(1) 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 (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, Los Angeles ACO.

(2) Alternative methods of compliance, approved previously in accordance with AD 91-21-11, amendment 39-8058, are approved as alternative methods of compliance for this AD.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

Special Flight Permits

(i) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 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 July 15, 1999.

D.L. Riggins,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99-18626 Filed 7-20-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99-CE-25-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Stemme GmbH & Co. KG Models S10-V and S10-VT Sailplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) that would apply to all Stemme GmbH & Co. KG (Stemme) Models S10-V and S10-VT sailplanes that incorporate a certain propeller blade suspension fork. The proposed AD would require repetitively exchanging (through the manufacturer) the propeller blade suspension fork for a propeller blade suspension fork that has passed X-ray crack testing requirements. The proposed AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Germany. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to detect and correct fractured propeller blade suspension forks, which could result in the loss of a propeller blade during flight with possible lateral imbalance and loss of thrust.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 30, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99-CE-25-AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted.

Service information that applies to the proposed AD may be obtained from Stemme GmbH & Co. KG, Gustav-Meyer-Allee 25, D-13355 Berlin, Germany; telephone: 49.33.41.31.11.70; facsimile: 49.33.41.31.11.73. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Mike Kiesov, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 1201 Walnut, suite 900, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 426-6934; facsimile: (816) 426-2169.

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, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may