

able to power loads that are essential for continued safe flight and landing. Also, the availability of emergency electrical power sources, including any credit taken for APU start reliability, must be validated in a manner acceptable to the FAA.

The emergency electrical power system must be designed to supply:

- Electrical power required for immediate safety, which must continue to operate without the need for crew action following the loss of the normal electrical power system;
- Electrical power required for continued safe-flight and landing;
- Electrical power required to restart the engines.

For compliance purposes:

1. A test demonstration of the loss of normal engine generated power is to be established such that:

a. The failure condition should be assumed to occur during night instrument meteorological conditions (IMC) at the most critical phase of flight relative to the electrical power system design and distribution of equipment loads on the system.

b. After the unrestorable loss of the source of normal electrical power, the airplane engines must be capable of being restarted and operations continued in IMC until visual meteorological conditions (VMC) can be reached. (A reasonable assumption can be made that turbine engine driven transport category airplanes will not have to remain in IMC for more than 30 minutes after experiencing the loss of normal electrical power).

c. After 30 minutes of operation in IMC, the airplane should be demonstrated to be capable of continuous safe flight and landing in VMC conditions. The length of time in VMC conditions must be computed based on the maximum flight duration capability for which the airplane is being certified. Consideration for speed reductions resulting from the associated failure must be made.

2. Since the availability of the emergency electrical power system operation is necessary for safe-flight, this system must be available before each flight.

3. The emergency electrical power system must be shown to be satisfactorily operational in all flight regimes.

2. **Command Signal Integrity.** In addition to compliance with § 25.671 of the FAR, it must be shown that for the elevator Electronic Flight Control System (EFCS):

(a) Signals cannot be altered unintentionally, or that the altered signal characteristics are such that the control authority characteristics will not be degraded to a level that will prevent continued safe-flight and landing; and

(b) Routing of wire EFCS wires and wire bundles must provide separation and redundancy to ensure maximum protection from damage due to common cause.

Discussion: The Saab 2000 will be using fly-by-wire (FBW) as a means to command and control the elevator surface actuators. In the FBW design being presented, command and control of the control surfaces will be achieved by electronic (AC, DC, or digital) interfaces. These interfaces involve not only

the direct commands to the elevator control surfaces, but feedback and sensor signals as well.

Malfunctions could cause system instabilities, loss of function or freeze-up of the control actuator. It is imperative that after failure at least one path of the command signal, that is capable of providing safe flight and landing, remains continuous and unaltered.

The current regulations, which primarily address hydro-mechanical flight control systems, §§ 25.671 and 25.672, make no specific or implied reference that command and control signals remain unaltered from external interferences. Present designs feature steel cables and pushrods as a means to control hydraulic surface actuators. These designs are easily identifiable relative to the understanding that they are necessary for safe flight and landing and thus should be protected and continually inspected. However, the FBW designs are not easily discernible from non-essential electronics where placement of equipment and wire runs is not critical. Therefore, FBW requires additional attention when locating the equipment and wire runs.

It should be noted that:

—*The proposed wording "signals cannot be altered unintentionally" is used in the Special Condition to emphasize the need for design measures to protect the FBW control system from the effects of the fluctuations in electrical power, accidental damage, environmental factors such as temperature, local fires, exposure to reactive fluids, etc. and any disruptions that may affect the command signals as they are being transmitted from their source of origin to the Power Control Actuators.*

3. **Design Maneuver Requirements.** (a) In lieu of compliance with § 25.331(c)(1) of the FAR, the airplane is assumed to be flying in steady level flight (point A1 within the maneuvering envelope of § 25.333(b) and, except as limited by pilot effort in accordance with § 25.397(b), the cockpit pitching control device is suddenly moved to obtain extreme positive pitching acceleration (nose up). In defining the tail load condition, the response of the airplane must be taken into account. Airplane loads which occur subsequent to the point at which the normal acceleration at the center of gravity exceeds the maximum positive limit maneuvering factor, *n*, need not be considered.

(b) In addition to the requirements of § 25.331(c), it must be established that pitch maneuver loads induced by the system itself (e.g. abrupt changes in orders made possible by electrical rather than mechanical combination of different inputs) are acceptably accounted for.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on January 24, 1995.

Ronald T. Wojnar,

Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, ANM-100.

[FR Doc. 95-2565 Filed 2-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94-CE-29-AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Twin Commander Aircraft Corporation Models 690C and 695 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 Twin Commander Aircraft Corporation (Twin Commander) Models 690C and 695 airplanes. The proposed action would require initially inspecting the wing structure for cracks, modifying any cracked wing structure, and, if not cracked, either repetitively inspecting or modifying the wing structure. Results of full-scale fatigue testing that indicated areas in the wing that are subject to fatigue cracks prompted the proposed action. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent wing damage caused by fatigue cracking, which, if not detected and corrected, could progress to the point of structural failure.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 9, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94-CE-29-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 the Twin Commander Aircraft Corporation, 19010 59th Drive, NE, Arlington, Washington 98223. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Mike Pasion, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Northwest Mountain Region, 1601 Lind Avenue S.W., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (206) 227-2594; facsimile (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 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 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 that summarizes 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 No. 94-CE-29-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, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94-CE-29-AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Discussion

Recently, the FAA become aware of an unsafe condition that could exist on Twin Commander Models 690C and 695 airplanes. Full-scale fatigue testing of the wing and the wing carry-through and pressure vessel structures has revealed that these areas are susceptible to fatigue cracking.

Twin Commander has issued Service Bulletin (SB) No. 213, dated July 29, 1994, which specifies procedures for inspecting and modifying the wing structure.

After examining the circumstances and reviewing all available information related to the test results described above, including the referenced service information, the FAA has determined that AD action should be taken to prevent wing damage caused by fatigue cracking, which, if not detected and corrected, could progress to the point of structural failure.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop in other Twin Commander Models 690C and 695 airplanes, the proposed AD would require initially inspecting the wing structure for cracks, modifying any cracked wing structure,

and, if not cracked, either repetitively inspecting or modifying the wing structure. The proposed actions would be accomplished in accordance with Twin Commander SB No. 213, dated July 29, 1994.

The FAA is establishing the compliance time of the proposed initial and first repetitive inspection to coincide with the 6,000-hour Major Inspection Guide I and 7,500-hour Major Inspection Guide II inspections, respectively.

The FAA estimates that 86 airplanes in the U.S. registry would be affected by the proposed AD, that it would take approximately 66 workhours per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspection, and that the average labor rate is approximately \$60 an hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$320,560. This figure does not take into account the cost of repetitive inspections or the cost of any modifications that may be needed based on the inspection results. The FAA has no way of determining how many wing structures may be cracked and need modification, or how many repetitive inspections each owner/operator may incur over the life of the airplane.

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 action (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under 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 has been placed 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 a new AD to read as follows:

Twin Commander Aircraft Corporation:
Docket No. 94-CE-29-AD.

Applicability: The following airplane models and serial numbers, certificated in any category:

Model	Serial No.
690C	11600 through 11735.
695	95000 through 95084.

Compliance: Required upon the accumulation of 6,000 hours time-in-service (TIS) or within the next 50 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, unless already accomplished, and thereafter as indicated in the body of this AD.

To prevent wing damage caused by fatigue cracking, which, if not detected and corrected, could progress to the point of structural failure, accomplish the following:

(a) For all affected serial number Model 695 airplanes, and any Model 690C airplane incorporating a serial number in the 11600 through 11730 range, inspect the wing structure for cracks in accordance with the PART I ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS (INSPECTIONS) section of Twin Commander Service Bulletin (SB) No. 213, dated July 29, 1994.

(b) For any Model 690C airplane incorporating a serial number in the 11731 through 11735 range, inspect the wing structure for cracks in accordance with Item 10 of the PART I ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS (INSPECTIONS) section of Twin Commander SB No. 213, dated July 29, 1994.

(c) If, during the inspections required in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this AD, cracks are found in the areas referenced in Figures 1 through 5 and the instructions of the service information referenced above, prior to further flight, replace the damaged structure and modify the wing structure in accordance with the PART II ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS (MODIFICATIONS) section of Twin Commander SB No. 213, dated July 29, 1994.

(d) If no cracks are found, accomplish one of the following:

(1) For all airplanes, upon the accumulation of 7,500 hours TIS or within

1,000 hours TIS after the initial inspection, whichever occurs later, reinspect the structure in accordance with either paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD, as applicable, and reinspect thereafter at intervals not to exceed 1,000 hours TIS, and, if applicable, replace any damaged part or modify the wing structure as specified in paragraph (c) of this AD; or

(2) For Model 695 airplanes and any Model 690C airplane incorporating a serial number in the 11600 through 11730 range, prior to further flight, modify the wing structure in accordance with the PART II ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS (MODIFICATIONS) section of Twin Commander SB No. 213, dated July 29, 1994.

(e) For Model 695 airplanes and any Model 690C airplane incorporating a serial number in the 11600 through 11730 range, the modification referenced in paragraphs (c) and (d)(2) of this AD may be accomplished any time after the initial inspection as terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirement of this AD, except for the inspection of the doublers at the wing attach fittings located in the Fuselage Station 144 frame (Item 10 of PART I ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS (INSPECTIONS) section of the Twin Commander SB No. 213, dated July 29, 1994. All affected model and serial number airplanes must inspect in this area at every 1,000 hours TIS.

Note 1: For those airplanes that have not accumulated 6,000 hours TIS, the initial and first repetitive inspection required by this AD were established to coincide with the 6,000-hour Major Inspection Guide I and 7,500-hour Major Inspection Guide II inspections, respectively, so that the operator may schedule the required action in accordance with these major inspections.

(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 airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(g) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Northwest Mountain Region, 1601 Lind Avenue S.W., Renton, Washington 98055-4056. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Seattle ACO.

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

(h) All persons affected by this directive may obtain copies of the document referred to herein upon request to the Twin Commander Aircraft Corporation, 19010 59th Drive, NE, Arlington, Washington 98223; or may examine this document at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on January 26, 1995.

Michael K. Dahl,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95-2406 Filed 2-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 95-ASO-3]

Proposed Establishment of Class E Airspace; Blakely, GA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to establish Class E Airspace at Blakely, GA. A GPS RWY 23 Standard Instrument Approach Procedure (SIAP) has been developed for Early County Airport. Controlled airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface (AGL) is needed to accommodate this SIAP and for instrument flight rules (IFR) operations at the airport. If approved, the operating status of the airport will change from VFR to include IFR operations concurrent with publication of the SIAP.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 13, 1995.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Docket No. 95-ASO-3, Manager, System Management Branch, ASO-530, P.O. Box 20636, Atlanta, Georgia 30320.

The official docket may be examined in the Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel for Southern Region, Room 550, 1701 Columbia Avenue, College Park, Georgia 30337, telephone (404) 305-5586.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael J. Powderly, System Management Branch, Air Traffic Division, Federal Aviation Administration, P.O. Box 20636, Atlanta, Georgia 30320; telephone (404) 305-5570.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic,

environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal.

Communications should identify the airspace docket and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Airspace Docket No. 95-ASO-3." The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter. All communications received before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available for examination in the Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel for Southern Region, Room 550, 1701 Columbia Avenue, College Park, Georgia 30337, both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

Availability of NPRM'S

Any person may obtain a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Manager, System Management Branch, ASO-530, Air Traffic Division, P.O. Box 20636, Atlanta, Georgia 30320. Communications must identify the notice number of this NPRM. Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRM's should also request a copy of Advisory Circular No. 11-2A, which describes the application procedure.

The Proposal

The FAA is considering an amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) to establish Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet AGL at Blakely, GA, to accommodate a GPS RWY 23 SIAP and for IFR operations at the Early County Airport. If approved, the operating status of the airport would change from VFR to include IFR operations concurrent with publication of the SIAP. Designations for Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface are published in Paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9B dated July 18, 1994 and effective September 16, 1994, which is incorporated by reference in CFR 71.1. The Class E airspace designation listed in this document would be published subsequently in the Order.