the inspections required by paragraph (b) of this AD. These actions are optional:

(1) Remove power units, P/N TR–991 or AL–0546, and replace with protected power units, P/N AL–5117, in accordance with ALC Installation Instruction (II) No. AL–11025M, dated March 15, 1992.

(2) Remove power units, P/N TR–992 or AL–0514, and replace with protected power unit, P/N AL–5112, in accordance with ALC II No. AL–11024M, dated March 15, 1992.

(3) Remove power supplies, P/N 18–95D, and dimmer, P/N 22–311, and replace with protected power supply, P/N AL–5118, in accordance with ALC II No. AL–11023M, Revision A, dated May 20, 1994.

(4) Remove power supplies, P/N AL–0598, and dimmer, P/N AL–0542, and replace with protected power supply, P/N AL–5130, in accordance with ALC II No. AL–11023M, Revision A, dated May 20, 1994.

(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, New York Aircraft Certification Office. The request should be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office.

**Note:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the New York Aircraft Certification Office.

(f) 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 aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on December 27, 1994.

**Jay J. Pardee,**

*Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 95–58 Filed 1–3–95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

---

## 14 CFR Part 39

**[Docket No. 94–NM–193–AD]**

## Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300–600 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 Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300–600 series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive mechanical and electrical inspections to detect chafing of electrical wiring; and repair or replacement of discrepant parts, and repositioning the looms. This proposal is prompted by reports of wire chafing in the forward avionic compartment. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such chafing, which may lead to a short in the electrical circuits at the 104VU panel; this condition could result in unwanted depressurization, loss of wing de-icing, and loss of in-flight engine restart capability.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by February 13, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94–NM–193–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9 a.m. and 3 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:** Stephen Slotte, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2797; fax (206) 227–1320.

**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 94–NM–193–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. 94–NM–193–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, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300–600 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that it has received several reports of wire chafing in the forward avionic compartment. Investigation revealed that the chafing occurred at the top of the 104VU panel between the extending ladder in the avionic compartment (in the stowed position) and the 104VU wire bundles through the brown plastic cover; this cover protects the upper part of the 103VU/104VU/105VU panels. Investigation revealed that this chafing occurs when some of the attachment rivets of the ladder support shaft are sheared due to mishandling of the ladder. Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes have significantly more wires in the subject area than Model A300 series airplanes. These wire bundles are sometimes positioned very close to the ladder. As a result, if the protective cover is damaged or torn, there is a risk of the cable chafing, even without rivet damage, for Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes. This risk is greater in a case of cable bundle ballooning or when tie-wraps are loose or missing.

Chafing of the electrical wire cables between the upper part of the 104VU panel and the extending ladder in the avionic compartment, if not corrected, may lead to a short in the electrical circuits at the 104VU panel, which could result in unwanted depressurization, loss of wing de-icing, and loss of in-flight engine restart capability.

Airbus has issued All Operators Telex AOT 24–05, Revision 1, dated June 7, 1994, which describes procedures for repetitive mechanical and electrical inspections to detect discrepancies, repair or replacement of discrepant

parts, and repositioning the looms. The mechanical inspections include an inspection of the protective cover, ladder support shaft, and attaching rivets. The electrical inspection includes an inspection of the electrical bundles, and an inspection to determine adequacy of clearance between the looms and the ladder. The DGAC classified this all operators telex as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 94–187–163(B), dated August 17, 1994, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

This airplane model is manufactured in France and is type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 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.

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 repetitive mechanical and electrical inspections to detect discrepancies; and repair or replacement of discrepant parts, and repositioning the looms. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the all operators telex described previously.

This is considered to be interim action. The manufacturer has advised that it currently is developing a modification that will positively address the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. Once this modification is developed, approved, and available, the FAA may consider additional rulemaking.

As a result of recent communications with the Air Transport Association (ATA) of America, the FAA has learned that, in general, some operators may misunderstand the legal effect of AD's on airplanes that are identified in the applicability provision of the AD, but that have been altered or repaired in the area addressed by the AD. The FAA points out that all airplanes identified in the applicability provision of an AD are legally subject to the AD. If an airplane has been altered or repaired in the affected area in such a way as to affect compliance with the AD, the owner or operator is required to obtain FAA approval for an alternative method of compliance with the AD, in accordance with the paragraph of each AD that provides for such approvals. A note has been included in this notice to clarify this requirement.

The FAA estimates that 69 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $4,140, or $60 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The total 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.

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. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

### § 39.13 [Amended]

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

**Airbus Industrie:** Docket 94–NM–193–AD.

Applicability: All Model A300, A310, and A300–600 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 modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (b) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

*Compliance:* Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent unwanted depressurization, loss of wing de-icing, and loss of in-flight engine restart capability, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 600 flight hours or 6 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, accomplish paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD.

(1) Perform mechanical inspections to detect discrepancies, in accordance with paragraph 4.2.1. of Airbus All Operators Telex AOT 24–05, Revision 1, dated June 7, 1994. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 1,050 flight hours. If any discrepancy is detected, prior to further flight, repair or replace discrepant parts, and perform an electrical inspection in accordance with the AOT.

(2) Perform an electrical inspection to detect discrepancies, in accordance with paragraph 4.2.2. of Airbus All Operators Telex AOT 24–05, Revision 1, dated June 7, 1994. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 18 months. If any discrepancy is detected, prior to further flight, repair or replace discrepant parts, and reposition the looms, in accordance with the AOT.

(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, 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 2:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM–113.

(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 December 28, 1994.

**S.R. Miller,**

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

[FR Doc. 95–59 Filed 1–3–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

---

## 14 CFR Part 39

**[Docket No. 94–NM–197–AD]**

## Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Series Airplanes

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

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

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes the supersedure of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 727 series airplanes, that currently requires repetitive visual inspections to detect cracking in the elevator rear spar and repair, if necessary. It also provides for an optional terminating action for the repetitive inspections. This action would add an additional one-time inspection of certain airplanes for clearance between the shear plate and the radii of the rear spar; and would provide additional instructions for the terminating action. This proposal is prompted by reports of cracking in the rear spar of the elevator at the hinge fitting attachment of the control tab and reports of loose hinge fittings at the crack locations. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent cracking of the elevator rear spar, which could cause excessive free play of the elevator control tab and possible tab flutter, and could result in loss of controllability of the airplane.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by March 1, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No.94–NM–197–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:** Walter Sippel, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–121S, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2774; 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 94–NM–197–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. 94–NM–197–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

### Discussion

On October 30, 1987, the FAA issued AD 87–24–03, amendment 39–5769 (52 FR 43742, November 16, 1987), applicable to certain Boeing Model 727 series airplanes, to require repetitive visual inspection to detect cracking of the elevator rear spar, and repair, if necessary. That action was prompted by reports of cracking in the elevator rear spar at the control tab hinge fitting attachment, and loose hinge fittings at the crack locations. The requirements of that AD are intended to detect cracking in the elevator rear spar which, if not corrected, could lead to loss of controllability of the airplane. –

Since the issuance of that AD, there have been several reports of cracking in the radii at the tab hinge fitting of the rear spar, and reports of loose hinge fittings at the crack locations on airplanes that were modified in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin 727–55–0087, dated June 20, 1986. The modification described in that Boeing service bulletin was considered to be terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of AD 87–24–03. The manufacturer has advised that the cause of this cracking is attributable to continued contact between the shear plate and the radii of the elevator rear spar. Cracking in this area, if not corrected, could cause excessive free play of the elevator control tab and possible tab flutter, and could result in loss of controllability of the airplane.–

The FAA has reviewed and approved Boeing Service Bulletin 727–55–0087, Revision 1, dated March 31, 1994, which describes procedures for continued repetitive visual inspections to detect cracking of the elevator rear spar, and repair, if necessary. For airplanes that have been modified in accordance with Boeing Service Bulletin727–55–0087, dated June 20, 1986, the service bulletin describes procedures for an additional one-time inspection to ensure clearance between the shear plate and the rear spar radii. Additionally, for all other airplanes, Revision 1 of this service bulletin provides instructions for accomplishing an improved modification or repair that would eliminate the need for repetitive inspections.

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 87–24–03 to require continued repetitive visual inspections to detect cracking of the elevator rear spar, and repair, if necessary. However,