TABLE 2.—AIRBUS SERVICE BULLETIN A300–57–204 (MODEL A300 B4–100) FATIGUE INSPECTION—Continued

Area	Threshold (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)	Detailed visual interval (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)	NDT (HFEC) interval (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)
3b, 4a	6,700 FC or 12,000 FH	2,000 FC or 3,300 FH	5,000 FC or 8,200 FH.
4b	9,500 FC or 15,600 FH	8,600 FC or 14,200 FH	9,500 FC or 15,600 FH.
5, 6	8,200 FC or 13,400 FH	7,200 FC or 11,900 FH	8,200 FC or 13,400 FH.
7, 8	4,600 FC or 7,600 FH	3,600 FC or 5,900 FH	4,500 FC or 7,400 FH

TABLE 3.—AIRBUS SERVICE BULLETIN A300–57–204 (MODEL A300B4–200) FATIGUE INSPECTION

Area	Threshold (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)	Detailed visual interval (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)	NDT (HFEC) interval (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)
1, 2, 3a	9,900 FC or 21,100 FH	9,000 FC or 19,200 FH	9,900 FC or 12,100 FH.
3b, 4a	7,000 FC or 14,900 FH	2,100 FC or 4,500 FH	5,200 FC or 11,100 FH.
4b	9,900 FC or 21,100 FH	9,000 FC or 19,200 FH	9,900 FC or 21,100 FH.
5, 6	8,500 FC or 18,100 FH	7,500 FC or 16,000 FH	8,500 FC or 18,100 FH.
7, 8	4,800 FC or 10,200 FH	3,700 FC or 7,900 FH	4,700 FC or 10,000 FH.

TABLE 4.—AIRBUS SERVICE BULLETIN A310–57–2061 (MODEL A310–200 AND A310–300) FATIGUE INSPECTION

Area	Threshold (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)	Detailed visual interval (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)	NDT (HFEC) interval (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)
1	12,800 FC or 36,600 FH	10,500 FC or 29,900 FH	12,800 FC or 36,600 FH.
2	5,700 FC or 16,300 FH	4,600 FC or 13,100 FH	5,700 FC or 16,300 FH.
3, 5	5,100 FC or 14,700 FH	4,100 FC or 11,800 FH	5,100 FC or 14,700 FH.
4	4,500 FC or 12,800 FH	1,800 FC or 5,100 FH	4,500 FC or 12,800 FH.
6	19,400 FC or 55,300 FH	16,500 FC or 47,000 FH	19,400 FC or 55,300 FH.
7	16,300 FC or 46,500 FH	13,800 FC or 39,500 FH	16,300 FC or 46,500 FH.

TABLE 5.—AIRBUS SERVICE BULLETIN A300–57–6047 (MODEL A300–600) FATIGUE INSPECTION

Area	Threshold (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)	Detailed visual interval (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)	NDT (HFEC) interval (FC or FH, whichever occurs first)
1, 2	13,600 FC or 42,900 FH	11,800 FC or 37,000 FH	15,500 FC or 48,800 FH.
3	6,500 FC or 20,400 FH	5,800 FC or 18,400 FH	6,900 FC or 21,600 FH.
4, 6	4,800 FC or 15,100 FH	4,500 FC or 14,200 FH	5,000 FC or 15,700 FH.
5	2,100 FC or 6,500 FH	900 FC or 3,000 FH	2,100 FC or 6,500 FH.
7	5,700 FC or 18,100 FH	5,500 FC or 17,200 FH	6,300 FC or 19,800 FH.
8	2,400 FC or 7,400 FH	2,100 FC or 6,500 FH	2,400 FC or 7,400 FH.

(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 requests 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 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.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 97–006–210(B), dated January 2, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on March 17, 1998.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–7525 Filed 3–23–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–NM–21–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 and DC–9–80 Series Airplanes, Model MD–88 Airplanes, 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 DC–9–80 series airplanes, Model MD–88 airplanes, and C–9 (military) series airplanes. This proposal would require a one-time visual inspection to detect fatigue cracking of the lower left nose of certain longerons and the attaching frames; repair, if necessary; and installation of a preventive modification. The proposal also would require installation of a preventive modification. This proposal is prompted by several reports of fatigue cracking of certain longerons and the attaching frames. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such fatigue cracking, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the fuselage, and consequent loss of pressurization of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 8, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97–NM–21–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, 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 Bandley, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L; FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; 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 97–NM–21–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. 97–NM–21–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The FAA has received reports indicating that cracking of the fuselage longerons-to-frame attachment holes occurred on three McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 series airplanes. The cracking of the longeron segments has been attributed to fatigue. The fatigue cracking was found between longerons 22 though 26 on the left side at stations Y=160.000 and Y=200.000. These airplanes had accumulated between 59,110 and 74,445 total flight cycles. Such fatigue cracking, if not corrected, could result in reduced structural integrity of the fuselage, and consequent loss of pressurization of the airplane.

Similar Airplanes

The fuselage longerons-to-frame attachments of Model DC–9 series airplanes are similar to those of McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 series airplanes, Model MD–88 airplanes, and C–9 (military) series airplanes; therefore, these models also may be subject to this same unsafe condition.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Service Bulletin 53–256, dated August 12, 1993, and Revision 1, dated November 29, 1994 (for Model DC–9 series airplanes), and MD–80 Service Bulletin 53–265, dated June 13, 1994 (for Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and MD–88 airplanes). These service bulletins describe procedures for a one-time visual inspection to detect cracking of the lower left nose of longerons 22 through 26 and the attaching frames at stations Y=160.000 and Y=200.000. The service bulletins also provide procedures for a preventive modification (installation of clips and doublers under longeron flanges and shims longeron) to relieve preloads. Additionally, the service bulletins reference the applicable Structural Repair Manual for repairs, if necessary.

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 a one-time visual inspection to detect cracking of the lower left nose of longerons 22 through 26 and the attaching frames at stations Y=160.000 and Y=200.000. The proposed rule also would require accomplishment of a preventive modification, and repair of any cracking detected. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the applicable service bulletin described previously.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 2,000 Model DC–9, Model DC–9–80, and C–9 (military) series airplanes, and Model MD–88 airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 1,200 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 25 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $1,800,000, or $1,500 per airplane.

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.

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 97–NM–21–AD.

Applicability: Model DC–9–10, –20, –30, –40, –50 and C–9 (military) series airplanes, as listed in McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Service Bulletin 53–256, Revision 1, dated November 29, 1994; Model DC–9–81 (MD–81), DC–9–82 (MD–82), DC–9–83 (MD–83), and DC–9–87 (MD–87) series airplanes and MD–88 airplanes, as listed in McDonnell Douglas MD–80 Service Bulletin 53–265, dated June 13, 1994; 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 (b) 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 longerons 22 through 26 and the attaching frames, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the fuselage, and consequent loss of pressurization of the airplane; accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 40,000 total landings, or within 6,000 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later: Perform a visual inspection to detect cracking of the left lower nose of longerons 22 through 26 (inclusive) and the respective attaching frames at station frames Y=160.000 and Y=200.000; in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Service Bulletin 53–256, dated August 12, 1993, or Revision 1, dated November 29, 1994 [for Models DC–9, –10, –20, –30, –40, –50, and C–9 (military) series airplanes]; or McDonnell Douglas MD–80 Service Bulletin 53–265, dated June 13, 1994 (for Model DC–9–81, –82, –83, and –87 series airplanes, and MD–88 airplanes); as applicable.

(1) If no cracking is detected: Prior to further flight, install clips and doublers under the longeron flanges and shim the longerons in accordance with the applicable service bulletin.

(2) If any cracking is detected: Prior to further flight, repair the cracks and install clips and doublers under the longeron flanges and shim the longerons in accordance with the applicable service bulletin.

(b) 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.

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

(c) 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 March 17, 1998.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–7524 Filed 3–23–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–CE–121–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Industrie Aeronautiche e Meccaniche Model Piaggio P–180 Airplanes

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 certain Industrie Aeronautiche e Meccaniche (I.A.M.) Model Piaggio P–180 airplanes. The proposed AD would require accomplishing a leakage check of all lavatory water tube/hose connections, and correcting the installation of these connections if leakage is found. The proposed AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Italy. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent water leakage from the lavatory water duct system, which could collect in the fuselage, freeze in cold weather conditions, and cause the rudder control system to jam.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 28, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–CE–121–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 I.A. M. Rinaldo Piaggio S.p.A., Via Cibrario, 4 16154 Genoa, Italy.This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David O. Keenan, Project Officer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, 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