Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 120 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 8 work hours per airplane (including access and close) to accomplish the proposed inspection, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the inspection proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $57,600, or $480 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The cost impact figure discussed above is 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.

Should an operator elect to accomplish the optional terminating action that would be provided by this proposed AD action, it would take approximately 140 work hours to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. The cost of required parts would be approximately $10,103 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of that optional terminating action would be $18,503 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 adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Airbus Industrie: Docket 98–NM–77–AD.

Applicability: Model A320 series airplanes, as listed in Airbus Service Bulletin A320–57–1090, Revision 01, dated June 10, 1997; 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 (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 detect and correct cracking in the pressurized floor pick-up angles at the rear spar of the wing, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airframe, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 20,000 total flight cycles, or within 60 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later: Perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracking in the pressurized floor pick-up angles on the rear spar of the wing, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A320–57–1090, Revision 01, dated June 10, 1997.

(1) If no cracking is found, repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 10,000 flight cycles.

(2) If any cracking is found during any inspection required by this AD, prior to further flight, replace each cracked pick-up angle and its associated diaphragms with improved parts, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A320–57–1025, Revision 05, dated June 26, 1997. For all pick-up angles not replaced with improved angles, repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 10,000 flight cycles.

(b) Replacement of a pick-up angle and its associated diaphragms with improved parts, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A320–57–1025, Revision 05, dated June 26, 1997, constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements for that pick-up angle.

(c) If any crack is detected during any inspection required by this AD, and the applicable service bulletin specifies to contact Airbus for appropriate action: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by either the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate; or the Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (or its delegated agent).

(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, International Branch, ANM–116. Operators shall submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

(e) 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.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive CN 97–084–097 (B), dated March 12, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 21, 1998.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–11090 Filed 4–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–110–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 and C–9 (Military) 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 McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 and C–9 (military) series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive inspections to detect fatigue cracking of the fuselage frames and longerons 16R

and 17R above the forward lower cargo door; repair, if necessary; and modification of the fuselage frames and longerons, if necessary, and follow-on repetitive inspections to detect fatigue cracking of the skin adjacent to the modification. This proposal is prompted by numerous instances of fatigue cracking of the fuselage frames and longerons. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent fatigue cracking of the fuselage frames and longerons 16R and 17R, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by June 11, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–110–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 The Boeing Company, Douglas Products Division, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, ept. 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: Wahib Mina, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712–4137; telephone (562) 627–5324; 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–110–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–110–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

Operators have reported to the FAA numerous instances of fatigue cracks on in-service McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 series airplanes in the fuselage frames and longerons 16R and 17R above the forward lower cargo door. These cracks were discovered during inspections conducted as part of the Supplemental Structural Inspection Document (SSID) program, required by AD 96–13–03, amendment 39–9671 (61 FR 31009, June 19, 1996). Investigation has revealed that such cracking was caused by fatigue-related stress. Such fatigue cracking, if not corrected, could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

The subject area on certain Model C–9 (military) series airplanes is identical to that on the affected Model DC–9 series airplanes; therefore, both models may be subject to the same unsafe condition.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–267, dated October 20, 1997, which describes procedures for repetitive visual inspections to detect fatigue cracking of the fuselage frames and longerons 16R and 17R above the forward lower cargo door, and repair of any cracking of the fuselage frames and longerons 16R and 17R. The service bulletin also describes procedures for modification of the fuselage frames and longerons 16R and 17R, if necessary, and follow-on repetitive visual inspections to detect fatigue cracking of the skin adjacent to the modification. Accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition.

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 accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin described previously.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 887 airplanes of the affected designs in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 582 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD. It would take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspection, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on this figure, the cost impact of the proposed inspection on U.S. operators is estimated to be $34,920, or $60 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The cost impact figure discussed above is 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.

Should an operator be required to accomplish the proposed modification, it would take approximately 4 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $860 or $713 per airplane, depending on the service kit purchased. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed modification is estimated to be as high as $1,100 and as low as $953 per airplane.

Should an operator be required to accomplish the proposed follow-on inspection of the fuselage skin, it would take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspection, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on this figure, the cost impact of the proposed inspection on U.S. operators is estimated to be $60 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

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 adding the following new airworthiness directive:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 98–NM–110–AD.

Applicability: Model DC–9 and C–9 (military) series airplanes, as listed in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–267, dated October 20, 1997; 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 (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 fatigue cracking of the fuselage frames and longerons 16R and 17R, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane, accomplish the following:

Note 2: This AD will affect Principal Structural Element (PSE) 53.09.055A of the DC–9 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID).

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 30,000 total landings, or within 3,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a visual inspection to detect fatigue cracking of the fuselage frames and longerons 16R and 17R above the forward lower cargo door, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–267, dated October 20, 1997.

(b) *Condition 1.* If no cracking is detected during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, accomplish the requirements of either paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this AD, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–267, dated October 20, 1997.

(1) *Option 1.* Repeat the visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 19,000 landings. Or

(2) *Option 2.* Prior to further flight, modify the fuselage frames and longerons 16R and 17R. Prior to the accumulation of 19,000 landings after accomplishment of the modification, perform a visual inspection to detect fatigue cracking of the skin adjacent to the modification.

(i) If no cracking is detected, repeat the visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 19,000 landings.

(ii) If any cracking is detected, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(c) *Condition 2.* If any cracking is detected during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, repair the cracked area and modify the fuselage frames and longerons 16R and 17R; in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–53–267, dated October 20, 1997. Prior to the accumulation of 19,000 landings after accomplishment of the modification, perform a visual inspection to detect fatigue cracking of the skin adjacent to the modification; in accordance with the service bulletin.

(1) If no cracking is detected, repeat the visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 19,000 landings.

(2) If any cracking is detected, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

(d) Accomplishment of the actions required by this AD constitutes terminating action for the requirements of AD 96–13–03, amendment 39–9671, for PSE 53.09.055A only of the DC–9 SID.

(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 ACO. 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.

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

(f) 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 April 21, 1998.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–11089 Filed 4–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–NM–304–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–120 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 all EMBRAER Model EMB–120 series airplanes. This proposal would require revising the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) to modify the limitation that prohibits positioning the power levers below the flight idle stop during flight, and to provide a statement of the consequences of positioning the power levers below the flight idle stop during flight. This proposal is prompted by incidents and accidents involving airplanes equipped with turboprop engines in which the ground propeller beta range was used improperly during flight. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent loss of airplane controllability, or engine overspeed and consequent loss of engine power caused by the power levers being positioned below the flight idle stop while the airplane is in flight.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 27, 1998.