

landings after the effective date of the AD, whichever occurs later.

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 long-standing requirement.

The FAA estimates that 50 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 11 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately \$5,000 per airplane. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$283,000, or \$5,660 per airplane.

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 95-NM-92-AD.

Applicability: All Model 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) of this AD 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 ensure replacement of certain universal joints and bearings of the flap transmission that have reached their maximum life limit, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 16,000 total landings on the universal joints and bearings of the flap transmission system, or within 500 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later: Replace the universal joints and bearings of the flap transmission system with new parts, in accordance with Airbus All Operator Telex (AOT) 27-17, Revision 1, dated July 11, 1994, or Airbus Service Bulletin A300-27-6028, dated December 19, 1994. Thereafter, prior to the accumulation of 16,000 landings on the

universal joints and bearings, replace them with new parts, in accordance with the AOT or the 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, 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 July 12, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95-17551 Filed 7-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95-NM-48-AD]

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, -15, -30, and -40 Series Airplanes, and KC-10A (Military) 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-10 series airplanes and KC-10A (military) airplanes. This proposal would require visual inspections to detect failure of the attachments located in the banjo No. 4 fitting of the vertical stabilizer. This proposal also would require an eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the flanges and bolt holes of that fitting, and repair or replacement of attachments. This proposal is prompted by reports of failed attachments of the vertical stabilizer; the failures are attributed to stress corrosion fatigue. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent loss of the fail safe capability of the vertical stabilizer due to cracking of its attachments.

DATES: Comments must be received by September 11, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95-NM-48-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 McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Department 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: John Cecil, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM-120L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627-5322; fax (310) 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 95-NM-48-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. 95-NM-48-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

The FAA has received reports from operators of Model DC-10 series airplanes of failed attachments on the lower vertical stabilizer. These attachments were located on the forward and aft flanges of the banjo No. 4 fitting and the pylon carry-through cap. Additionally, one operator reported finding cracks in the forward flange of banjo No. 4 at the pylon carry-through cap. The attachments on the aft flange of these airplanes also had failed. Lengths of the cracks varied from 1.0 inch to 3.75 inches on airplanes that had accumulated between 20,903 and 32,313 landings. Investigation revealed that the broken steel attachments failed due to cracking, which was caused by stress corrosion fatigue. Such cracking, if not detected and corrected in a timely manner, could result in loss of fail safe capability of the vertical stabilizer.

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas DC-10 Service Bulletin 55-23, Revision 1, dated December 17, 1993, which describes procedures for accomplishing an eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the forward and aft flanges and bolt holes of the banjo No. 4 fitting, and pylon carry-through cap of the lower vertical stabilizer. The service bulletin also describes procedures for replacement of 12 attachments located on the banjo No. 4 fitting and pylon carry-through cap with new attachments for airplanes on which no cracking is found. The new attachments are made from a higher strength and more corrosion resistant material. Accomplishment of the replacement will minimize the possibility of cracking and failure of the attachments. The manufacturer recommends that these actions be accomplished within 2,200 landings (approximately 5 years).

Although the FAA has approved the technical content as well as the intent of the McDonnell Douglas service bulletin, it has determined that, prior to the time that the eddy current inspection (recommended by the manufacturer) is accomplished, visual inspections also must be accomplished to detect cracking of the 12 attachments

located in the banjo No. 4 fitting. In order to ensure that any cracking is detected and corrected in a timely manner, the FAA finds that such visual inspections should be conducted annually.

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, initially, repetitive visual inspections to detect failures of the 12 attachments located in the banjo No. 4 fittings. These visual inspections would be required to be accomplished in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Nondestructive Testing Manual Chapter 20-10-00 or McDonnell Douglas Nondestructive Testing Standard Practice Manual, Part 09.

Additionally, this proposed AD would require an eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the forward and aft flanges and bolt holes of the fitting of the vertical stabilizer and pylon carry-through cap; replacement of the attachments with new attachments if no cracking is found; and repair if cracking is found. The eddy current inspection and replacement procedures would be required to be accomplished in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC-10 Service Bulletin 55-23, described previously. Repair procedures would be required to be accomplished in accordance with a method approved by the FAA. Accomplishment of the replacement would constitute terminating action for the proposed inspections.

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 long-standing requirement.

There are approximately 420 Model DC-10-10, -15, -30, -40 series airplanes and KC-10A (military) airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 237 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

The FAA estimates that it would take approximately 1 work hour per airplane to accomplish the proposed visual inspections, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed visual inspections on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$14,220, or \$60 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The FAA estimates that it would take approximately 2 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed eddy current inspection, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed eddy current inspection on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$28,440, or \$120 per airplane.

The FAA estimates that it would take approximately 6 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed replacement of the 12 attachments located at the banjo No. 4 fitting, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately \$250 per airplane. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed replacement on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$144,570, or \$610 per airplane.

The total cost impact figures discussed above are 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:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 95-NM-48-AD.

Applicability: Model DC-10-10, -15, -30, -40 series airplanes and KC-10A (military) airplanes; as listed in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin 55-23, Revision 1, dated December 17, 1993; 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 (c) of this AD 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 loss of fail safe capability of the vertical stabilizer due to cracking of its attachments, accomplish the following:

(a) Within one year after the effective date of this AD, perform a visual inspection, using a minimum 5X power magnifying glass, to detect failure of the 12 attachments located in the banjo No. 4 fitting of the vertical stabilizer (as depicted in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin 55-23, Revision 1, dated December 17, 1993). Perform this inspection in accordance with procedures specified in McDonnell Douglas Nondestructive Testing Manual Chapter 20-10-00 or McDonnell Douglas Nondestructive Testing Standard Practice Manual, Part 09.

(1) If no failure is detected, repeat the visual inspection thereafter at intervals not to

exceed one year until the requirements of paragraph (b) of this AD are accomplished.

(2) If any failure is detected, prior to further flight, accomplish the requirements of paragraph (b) of this AD.

(b) Except as required by paragraph (a)(2) of this AD: Within 5 years after the effective date of this AD, perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the forward and aft flanges and bolt holes of the banjo No. 4 fitting and the pylon carry-through cap, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin 55-23, Revision 1, dated December 17, 1993.

(1) If no cracking is detected, prior to further flight, replace the 12 attachments located on the banjo No. 4 fitting in accordance with the service bulletin. Accomplishment of this replacement terminates the requirements of this AD.

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

(d) 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 July 12, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95-17550 Filed 7-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 95-AWP-6]

Proposed Realignment of V-485; CA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would alter VOR Federal Airway V-485 from the Priest, CA, Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range/Tactical Air Navigation (VORTAC) to the San Jose, CA, Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range/Distance Measuring Equipment (VOR/DME). This action would collocate V-485 with the San Jose VOR/DME Runway 30L approach and utilize the San Jose VOR/