List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 745

Administrative practice and procedure, Bank deposit insurance, Claims, Credit unions.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board on July 9, 1996.

Becky Baker,
Secretary of the Board.

Accordingly, NCUA proposes to amend its regulation as follows:

PART 745—SHARE INSURANCE AND APPENDIX

§ 745.200 General.

1. The authority citation for part 745 continues to read as follows:


2. Section 745.200 is amended by revising paragraphs (b) and (d) to read as follows:

§ 745.200 General.

(b) Amount of insurance. The amount of insurance on an insured account shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subpart A of this part and the Federal Credit Union Act. For the purpose of determining insurance coverage, dividends earned in the ordinary course of business and posted to share accounts for any prior accounting or dividend period shall be deemed to be principal under this rule. Dividends earned or accrued in the ordinary course of business, but not posted to share accounts, may be paid at the discretion of the liquidating agent. In making such determination, the liquidating agent will take into consideration whether the failure to post dividends earned or accrued was due to the fraud, embezzlement or accounting errors of credit union personnel. The liquidating agent may require an account holder to submit documentation supporting any claim for unposted dividends not otherwise evidenced in the credit union records. However, in no event will dividend amounts be considered as principal for insurance purposes pursuant to this section if not consistent with the amounts paid on similar classes of shares.

(d) Computing time. In computing any period of time prescribed by this subpart, the provisions of § 747.12(a) shall apply.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Aviation Administration
14 CFR Part 39
[Docket No. 94–NM–222–AD]
RIN 2120–AA64
Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 and A300–600 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: This document revises an earlier proposed airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Airbus Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes, that would have required repetitive Tap Test inspections to detect debonding of the elevator skins, and corrective actions, if necessary. That proposal was prompted by a report that a debonded area of the upper skin of an elevator had been discovered during a visual inspection. This action revises the proposed rule by replacing the Tap Test inspections with inspections using a thermographic technique. This action also provides for replacement of the elevators with new or modified elevators, which, if accomplished, terminates the requirements of the AD. The actions specified by this proposed AD are intended to prevent the presence of water in the elevator, which could cause debonding of the elevator skins and, consequently, could adversely affect the structural integrity of the elevator.

DATES: Comments must be received by August 14, 1996.


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 proposal 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–222–AD." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs


Discussion

A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to add an airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Airbus Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes, was published as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the Federal Register on February 8, 1995 (60 FR 7485). That NPRM would have required repetitive Tap Test inspections to detect debonding of the elevator skins, and corrective actions, if necessary. Additionally, that NPRM would have required repetitive thermographic inspections of the elevator to detect trapped water if certain amounts of debonding are detected. That NPRM was prompted by
a report that a debonded area of the upper skin of an elevator had been discovered during a visual inspection. That condition, if not corrected, could result in the presence of water in the elevator, which could cause debonding of the elevator skins and, consequently, could adversely affect the structural integrity of the elevator.

**Actions Since Issuance of Previous Proposal**

Since the issuance of that NPRM, Airbus has issued Revision 1 of Service Bulletins A310–55–2016 (for Model A310 series airplanes) and A300–55–6014 (for Model A300–600 series airplanes), both dated August 8, 1995. The original issues of these service bulletins were cited in the NPRM as the appropriate sources of service information for accomplishment of repetitive thermographic inspections to detect water in the elevator, and protection and repair of debonded areas of the elevator. Revision 1 of the service bulletins is essentially the same as the original issues, however, Revision 1 specifies an increased allowable cosmetic repair area and introduces new repair criteria. Additionally, Revision 1 provides a threshold and repeat intervals for the thermographic inspections based on the specific types of elevators that are installed.

The Direction Générale de l’Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, classified these service bulletins as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive (CN) 95–206–189(B), dated October 25, 1995, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France. That French CN supersedes the previously-issued French CN 94–184–157(B), dated August 17, 1994. The new French CN removes a previous requirement for repetitive Tap Test inspections and, instead, it requires thermographic inspections to detect water trapped in the elevator. In addition, the new French CN indicates that it applies to Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes that are equipped with certain carbon fiber elevators on which Airbus Modifications 10489 and 10533 have not been accomplished.

Additionally, since the issuance of the NPRM, Airbus also has issued Service Bulletins A310–55–2019 (for Model A310 series airplanes) and A300–55–6016 (for Model A300–600 series airplanes), both Revision 1, both dated December 18, 1995. These service bulletins describe procedures for replacement of existing elevators with new or modified elevators. Installation of the new or modified elevators will prevent water ingress by adding a second external layer of adhesive and using a different type of Tedlar film. Such installation, if accomplished, will eliminate the need for the repetitive thermographic inspections.

**FAA’s Conclusions**

The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC and has reviewed the revised service information. The FAA finds that inspections using thermographic techniques are a more reliable method of detecting water trapped in the elevators. Therefore, the FAA has determined that the NPRM must be revised to remove the requirement for repetitive Tap Test inspections and to require, instead, the accomplishment of repetitive thermographic inspections in accordance with the latest service bulletin revisions.

Additionally, the FAA finds that the NPRM must be revised to specify that the inspection threshold and repetitive inspection intervals are based on the specific types of elevators that are installed.

The FAA also finds that the NPRM must be revised to provide for replacement of the elevators with new or modified elevators, which, if accomplished, would terminate the repetitive thermographic inspections. In addition, the applicability of the NPRM has been revised to coincide with the applicability of French CN 95–206–189(B).

Since these changes expand the scope of the originally proposed rule, the FAA has determined that it is necessary to reopen the comment period to provide additional opportunity for public comment.

**Type Certification of Affected Airplanes**

These airplane models are manufactured in France and are type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of section 221.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement.

**Disposition of Comments to the NPRM**

Interested persons were afforded an opportunity to respond to the NPRM. Due consideration has been given to pertinent comments that were submitted, as described below.

**Request to Require Pulse-Echo Ultrasound Inspections**

One commenter requests that the proposed Tap Tests, be replaced with pulse-echo ultrasound (A-scan) inspections. The commenter states that the pulse-echo ultrasound inspection is much more accurate than a Tap Test.

The FAA concurs partially. The FAA acknowledges that more accurate inspections for debonding may exist; however, the FAA does not agree that pulse-echo ultrasound inspections are the type of inspections that should be required in this case. In developing this AD, the FAA considered the fact that pulse-echo ultrasound equipment and procedures are not readily available to all operators. Additionally, the FAA considered the accuracy of thermographic inspections, as well as the accessibility of thermographic inspections to all operators. In consideration of these items, the FAA finds that thermographic inspections are most appropriate to address the unsafe condition. However, under the provisions of paragraph (f) of the final rule, the FAA may approve alternative methods of compliance with this AD if data are submitted to substantiate that such a method would provide an acceptable level of safety.

**Request to Update Cost Impact Information**

One commenter requests that the estimated number of affected U.S.-registered airplanes specified in the cost impact information of the proposed rule be revised from 15 to 35, since that is the number of Model A300–600 series airplanes in its fleet. The FAA concurs and has revised the cost impact information, below, to reflect this change.

**Cost Impact**

There are approximately 137 Model A310 and A300–600 series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 35 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 34 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 $71,400, or $2,040 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

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.

Should an operator elect to accomplish the optional replacement of the elevators, it would take approximately 14 work hours per airplane to accomplish the replacement, at an average labor rate of $60 per work
Airbus Modifications 10489 and 10533 have elevators having part number (P/N) series airplanes equipped with carbon fiber.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

Airbus: directive:
continues to read as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS

39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations

Administrator, the Federal Aviation

Authority delegated to me by the

The Proposed Amendment

safety, Safety.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

ADDRESSES

location provided under the caption

contacting the Rules Docket at the

regulatory evaluation prepared for this

under the criteria of the Regulatory

on a substantial number of small entities

impact, positive or negative,

(1) For airplanes on which COM elevators are installed: Perform the inspection at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) and (a)(1)(ii) of this AD.

(ii) Prior to the accumulation of 4,500 total landings on the elevator, or within 5 years after the first landing on the elevator, whichever occurs later; or

(ii) Within 3 months after the effective date of this AD.

For airplanes on which CASA elevators are installed: Perform the inspection at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(2)(i) and (a)(2)(ii) of this AD.

(i) Prior to the accumulation of 5,000 total landings on the elevator, or within 6 years after the first landing on the elevator, whichever occurs later.

(ii) Within 3 months after the effective date of this AD.

(b) If no water is detected, repeat the thermographic inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at the time specified in paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For airplanes on which CARCOM elevators are installed: Perform the inspection at intervals not to exceed 4,500 landings or 5 years, whichever occurs first.

(2) For airplanes on which CASA elevators are installed: Repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 5,000 landings or 6 years, whichever occurs first.

(c) If any water is detected in the elevator, which could cause debonding of the elevator skins and, consequently, could affect the structural integrity of the elevator, accomplish the following:

(i) If the damage is within the limits of the Structural Repair Manual (SRM) (Ref. SRM 55–20–00), accomplish the repair in accordance with the SRM.


No further action is required by this AD.

(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, 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.

(g) 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.
Those actions were prompted by results of a review of the requirements for certification of the airplane in icing conditions, new information on the icing environment, and icing data provided currently to the flight crews.