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.

To prevent flaking of cadmium from certain oxygen system plumbing fittings and cone caps from blocking the valves and impairing the function of the oxygen system, which could deprive the crew and passengers of necessary oxygen during an emergency that requires oxygen, accomplish the following:

(a) For Model DH.125, HS.125, BH.125 series 1A, 1B, 3A, 3B, 400A, 400B, 401B, 403A, 403B, 600A, 600B, 700A and 700B airplanes: Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the cadmium plated cone caps in the oxygen system plumbing with improved cone caps, and perform a detailed visual inspection of the removed cone caps, tee-piece and sleeve for evidence of flaking or corrosion; in accordance with Raytheon Service Bulletin SB 35–3169, dated September 1998. If any flaking or corrosion is detected, prior to further flight, clean the tee-piece and sleeve, and perform an oxygen system flow check in accordance with the service bulletin. If any discrepancy is found during the flow check, prior to further flight, repair the oxygen system in accordance with the service bulletin, except as required by paragraph (e) of this AD.

Note 2: For the purposes of this AD, a detailed visual inspection is defined as: ''An intensive visual examination of a specific structural area, system, installation, or assembly to detect damage, failure, or irregularity. Available lighting is normally supplemented with a direct source of good lighting at intensity deemed appropriate by the inspector. Inspection aids such as mirror, magnifying lenses, etc., may be used. Surface cleaning and elaborate access procedures may be required.''

(b) For Model BAe.125 series 800A (C–29A) airplanes: Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the cadmium plated cone caps in the oxygen system plumbing with improved cone caps, and perform a detailed visual inspection of the removed cone caps, tee-piece and sleeve for evidence of flaking or corrosion; in accordance with Raytheon Service Bulletin SB 35–3171, dated September 1998. If any flaking or corrosion is detected, prior to further flight, clean the tee-piece and sleeve, and perform an oxygen system flow check in accordance with the service bulletin. If any discrepancy is found during the flow check, prior to further flight, repair the oxygen system in accordance with the service bulletin, except as required by paragraph (e) of this AD.

(c) For Model BAe.125 series 800A and 800B airplanes and Model Hawker 800 airplanes: Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the cadmium plated cone caps in the oxygen system plumbing with improved cone caps, and perform a detailed visual inspection of the removed cone caps, tee-piece and sleeve for evidence of flaking or corrosion; in accordance with Raytheon Service Bulletins SB35–3034 or SB 35–3170, both dated September 1998, as applicable. If any flaking or corrosion is detected, prior to further flight, clean the tee-piece and sleeve, and perform an oxygen system flow check in accordance with the service bulletin. If any discrepancy is found during the flow check, prior to further flight, repair the oxygen system in accordance with the service bulletin, except as required by paragraph (e) of this AD.

(d) For Model BAe.125 series 1000A and 1000B airplanes and Model Hawker 1000 series airplanes: Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the cadmium plated fittings in the oxygen system plumbing with improved fittings, and perform a detailed visual inspection of the removed fittings and the pipe connections for evidence of flaking or corrosion; in accordance with Raytheon Service Bulletin SB 35–3167 or SB 35–3168, both dated September 1998, as applicable. If any flaking or corrosion is detected, prior to further flight, clean the pipe connections, and perform an oxygen system flow check in accordance with the service bulletin. If any discrepancy is found during the flow check, prior to further flight, repair the oxygen system in accordance with the service bulletin, except as required by paragraph (e) of this AD.

(e) If any discrepancy is found during a flow check required by paragraph (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this AD and the applicable service bulletin specifies to contact the manufacturer for a repair disposition, prior to further flight, repair the oxygen system in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Small Airplane Directorate.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(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, Wichita ACO, FAA, Small 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, Wichita ACO.

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

Special Flight Permits

(g) 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 November 9, 1999.

D.L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–29828 Filed 11–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99–NM–24–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2–1A, B2–1C, B2–203, B2K–3C, B4–103, B4–2C, and B4–203 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 Airbus Model A300 B2–1A, B2–1C, B2–203, B2K–3C, B4–103, B4–2C, and B4–203 series airplanes. This proposal would require modification of the wire harness routing next to the pitch artificial feel unit, and removal of the green and yellow colors from various connectors. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent the electrical connections of the actuators of the green and yellow hydraulic systems for the pitch artificial feel unit from being cross connected due to the design of the wire harness routing, which could result in a stiff elevator control at takeoff, and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by December 16, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99–NM–24–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 Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington

98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2110; fax (425) 227–1149.

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 99–NM–24–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. 99–NM–24–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on certain Airbus Model A300 B2–1A, B2–1C, B2–203, B2K–3C, B4–103, B4–2C, and B4–203 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that, during maintenance, the electrical connectors of the green and yellow hydraulic systems for the pitch artificial feel unit may have been cross-connected due to the design of the wire harness routing (i.e., similar wire harness lengths leading to the actuator, equivalent electrical connectors, etc.). Cross-connecting these electrical wires could result in a stiff elevator control at takeoff. This condition, if not corrected, could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Airbus has issued Service Bulletin A300–27–0184, dated August 19, 1996, and Revision 01, dated December 4, 1998, which describes procedures for modification of the wire harness routing next to the pitch artificial feel unit, and removal of the green and yellow colors from various connectors. The modification involves replacing the inclusive fixing points on the wire harness routing next to the pitch artificial feel unit with a new, improved wire harness routing. Accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition. The DGAC classified this service bulletin as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 98–447–264(B), dated November 18, 1998, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

FAA's Conclusions

This airplane model is manufactured in France and is type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of § 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the DGAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would require accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin described previously.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 1 airplane of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 3 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed replacement, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $3,079 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $3,259, or $3,259 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:

Airbus Industrie: Docket 99–NM–24–AD.

Applicability: Model A300 B2–1A, B2–1C, B2–203, B2K–3C, B4–103, B4–2C, and B4–203 series airplanes; except those airplanes

on which Airbus Modification 10702S20752 (reference Airbus Service Bulletin A300–27–0184, dated August 19, 1996, or Revision 01, dated December 4, 1998) has been accomplished; 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 (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 the electrical connections of the actuators of the green and yellow hydraulic systems for the pitch artificial feel unit from being cross connected due to the design of the wire harness routing, which could result in a stiff elevator control at takeoff, and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane, accomplish the following:

Replacement and Removal

(a) Within 24 months after the effective date of this AD, perform the actions specified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–27–0184, Revision 01, dated December 4, 1998.

(1) Replace the wire harness routing with a new, improved wire harness routing.

(2) Remove the green and yellow colors from the connectors specified in the service bulletin.

Note 2: Accomplishment of the actions in paragraph (a) of this AD in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–27–0184, dated August 19, 1996, is considered acceptable for compliance with this AD.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(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, International Branch, ANM–116, 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, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

Special Flight Permits

(c) 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 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 98–447–264(B), dated November 18, 1998.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 9, 1999.

D.L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–29827 Filed 11–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 93

[Docket No. 28902; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking No. 97–6]

Establishing of Corridors in the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rules Area

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Disposition of comments.

SUMMARY: This document summarizes and disposes of comments to a notice of proposed rulemaking (Notice 97–6), published May 15, 1997, which proposed a National Canyon corridor for an air tour route through the central portion of Grand Canyon National Park (GCNP). The FAA withdrew Notice 97–6 because it was considering alternatives to this route. This action summarizes and responds to the comments concerning the National Canyon corridor.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alberta Brown, Air Transportation Division, Flight Standards Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–3724.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 15, 1997, the FAA issued Notice No. 97–6, which proposed a modification to the National Canyon corridor that was originally proposed in December 1996 in the Notice of Proposing Rulemaking (NPMR) addressing the use of quiet technology aircraft in GCNP (61 FR 69334; December 31, 1996). Notice No. 97–6 proposed two quiet technology corridors: (1) the National Canyon corridor through the central portion of the Park; and (2) the Bright Angel corridor in the eastern portion of the Park. The FAA received a total of 143 comments on this proposal from associations, the air tour industry, and individuals. A summary of comments and FAA's response to those comments follows:

Comments

Clark County comments that the proposed National Canyon route ''* * * still fails to provide a sufficient scenic view to support a viable air tour.'' Specifically, this commenter finds that air visitors would lose the extremely scenic views of the Grand Canyon, Havasu Canyon, and Mt. Sinyala that are seen on the current Blue 1. Further, the commenter claims that the lack of a viable Blue 1/1A will result in a dangerous diversion of traffic to the Blue 2 route, economic injury to the air tour industry, and a shift of noise to the Hualapai reservation. It also suggests that, given the lack of a scenic air tour, some visitors will opt for ground tours by bus, train or car. Clark County believes that the Blue 1 route, proposed in above-referenced December 1996 proposal for quiet technology aircraft, is the best option for viable air tour. Clark County continues to endorse the use of quiet technology as providing the best opportunity to promote long-term noise reduction at the least cost to the air tour industry.

In a related economic comment, Clark County notes that the current Blue 1 generates $97.5 million in operating revenues. This commenter finds the FAA's economic analysis flawed in that it assumes that all air visitors would take the 'unscenic' proposed route, and because it assumes that the only loss of revenue from the lose of the scenic portions of Blue 1 would be a tiny diminution in ticket prices. Finally, Clark County comments that, together, the proposed quiet technology route and quiet aircraft will more than meet the Overflight Act's mandate to substantially restore natural quiet in the Park. Clark County also raises a number of rulemaking issues for GCNP not directly related to this rulemaking proposal.

Lake Mead Air urges the FAA to retain the Blue 1 route as it is less offensive to the Native Americans than the proposed route. This commenter believes that the FAA should cease all rulemaking until an Environmental Impact Statement is completed.

Eagle Canyon Airlines believes that there is a potential for increasing unsafe operating conditions if there is no viable air tour route through the National Canyon area. Moreover, this commenter finds it appropriate to return to the route structure as it existed before December 31, 1996. Rather than change the structure of the National Canyon route to accommodate the Havasupai, Eagle Canyon Airlines finds that it