load lifts are unknown, and the number of external load lifts does not include a high power lift event, increase the accumulated RIN by 10 for each hour TIS.

(4) For each hour TIS for which the numbers of takeoffs and external load lifts are unknown, but the number of external load lifts does include a high power lift event, increase the accumulated RIN by 20 for each hour TIS.

(5) For each hour TIS for which the numbers of takeoffs and external load lifts are unknown, and it is unknown whether the external load lifts include any high-power lift event, increase the accumulated RIN by 20 for each hour TIS.

(b) After compliance with paragraph (a) of this AD, during each operation thereafter, maintain a count of each lift or takeoff performed and at the end of each day's operations, increase the accumulated RIN on the component history card as follows:

(1) Increase the RIN by 1 for each takeoff.

(2) Increase the RIN by 1 for each external load lift, or increase the RIN by 2 for each external load operation in which the load is picked up at a higher elevation and released at a lower elevation, and the difference in elevation between the pickup point and the release point is 200 feet or greater.

(c) Retire the mast and spline plate in accordance with the following:

(1) For the mast, part number (P/N) 412–040–101–105, 109, –117, or –127, used on the Model 412 helicopter upon reaching 10,000 hours TIS or 80,000 maximum RIN, whichever occurs first.

(2) For the mast, P/N 412–040–101–121, –125, or –129, used on the Model 412EP helicopter, upon reaching 10,000 hours TIS or 60,000 maximum RIN, whichever occurs first.

(3) For the spline plate, P/N 412–010–167–105 or P/N 412–010–177–101, or –109, used on the Model 412 helicopter, at 10,000 hours TIS or 80,000 maximum RIN, whichever occurs first.

(4) For the spline plate, P/N 412–010–167–105 or P/N 412–010–177–101, –105, –113, or –117, used on the Model 412EP helicopter, at 10,000 hours TIS or 60,000 maximum RIN, whichever occurs first.

(d) For spline plate, P/N 412–010–167–105 or P/N 412–010–177–101, –105, –113, or –117, installed on Model 412EP helicopters, at the next scheduled teardown inspection, beside the P/N on the side of the spline plate, vibro-etch ''412HP'' and annotate in the component history card or equivalent record ''412HP/EP only'' to reflect that this spline plate can only be installed on the Model 412EP helicopter, and not on any other Model 412 helicopter. Retire the spline plates that have been vibro-etched with ''412HP'' on or before accumulating 10,000 hours TIS or 60,000 RIN, whichever occurs first.

Note 2: Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Alert Service Bulletin No. 412–94–81, Revision B, dated March 4, 1996, pertains to this subject.

(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, Rotorcraft Certification Office, Rotorcraft Directorate, FAA. Operators shall submit their requests through an FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may concur or comment and then send it to the Manager, Rotorcraft Certification Office.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Rotorcraft 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 helicopter to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, on November 6, 1996.

Eric Bries,

Acting Manager, Rotorcraft Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–29609 Filed 11–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–NM–218–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 and MD–11F 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 McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 and MD–11F series airplanes, that currently requires, among other things, repetitive visual inspections to detect discrepancies of the fuel pipe of the fuel transfer system of the tail tank and associated mounting bracket located in the aft fuselage compartment. That AD was prompted by reports of cracking or bending of the fuel pipe mounting support and/or attaching bracket in the aft fuselage compartment due to a fuel pressure surge that caused repetitive loading of this area. This action would add a requirement to install a restraint on the tail tank fuel pipe, which would terminate the repetitive visual inspections. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such cracking/bending, which could expose the fuel pipe coupling O-ring. An exposed O-ring could lose its sealing effect and could allow a fuel leak in the aft fuselage compartment, which would present a fire hazard.

DATES: Comments must be received by December 30, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 96–NM–218–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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ray Vakili, Aerospace Engineer, Propulsion Branch, ANM–140L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627–5262; 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 96–NM–218–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. 96–NM–218–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

On July 1, 1996, the FAA issued AD 96–14–07, amendment 39–9691 (61 FR 35946, July 9, 1996), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 and MD–11F series airplanes. That AD requires:

1. repetitive visual inspections to detect discrepancies (i.e., cracks or deformation) of the fuel pipe of the fuel transfer system of the tail tank and associated mounting bracket located in the aft fuselage compartment; and

2. repetitive inspections to verify the correct position of the fuel pipe flange, and various follow-on actions.

That action was prompted by reports of cracking or bending of the fuel pipe mounting support and/or attaching bracket in the aft fuselage compartment due to a fuel pressure surge that caused repetitive loading of this area. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent such cracking/bending, which could expose the fuel pipe coupling O-ring. An exposed O-ring could lose its sealing effect and could allow a fuel leak in the aft fuselage compartment, which may result in a possible in-flight or ground fire.

In the preamble to AD 96–14–07, the FAA specified that the actions required by that AD were considered ''interim action'' and that the manufacturer was developing a modification to positively address the unsafe condition. The FAA indicated that it may consider further rulemaking action once the modification was developed, approved, and available. The manufacturer now has developed such a modification, and the FAA has determined that further rulemaking action is indeed necessary; this proposed AD follows from that determination.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD11–28–082, dated July 29, 1996, which describes procedures for installation of a restraint on the tail tank fuel pipe. The restraint will minimize the migration of the fuel pipe and reduce the possibility of fuel leaks. Accomplishment of the installation would eliminate the need for the repetitive visual inspections.

The FAA finds that accomplishment of the installation described in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD11–28–082 will positively address the unsafe condition identified as possible in-flight or ground fire due to fuel leaking from the fuel pipe coupling.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

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 96–14–07 to continue to require repetitive visual inspections to detect discrepancies (i.e., cracks or deformation) of the fuel pipe of the fuel transfer system of the tail tank and associated mounting bracket located in the aft fuselage compartment and to verify the correct position of the fuel pipe flange, and various follow-on actions. The proposed AD also would require installation of a restraint on the tail tank fuel pipe, which would constitute terminating action for the repetitive visual inspections requirements. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously.

The FAA has determined that long term continued operational safety will be better assured by modifications or design changes to remove the source of the problem, rather than by repetitive inspection. Long term inspections may not be providing the degree of safety assurance necessary for the transport airplane fleet. This, coupled with a better understanding of the human factors associated with numerous repetitive inspections, has led the FAA to consider placing less emphasis on special procedures and more emphasis on design improvements. The proposed terminating modification requirement of this AD action is in consonance with these considerations.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 152 McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 and MD–11F series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 42 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

The actions that are currently required by AD 96–14–07, and retained in this proposed AD, take approximately 6 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the currently required actions on U.S. operators is estimated to be $15,120, or $360 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The new actions that are proposed in this AD action would take approximately 3 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts would be supplied by the manufacturer at no cost to the operators. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed requirements of this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $7,560, or $180 per airplane.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the current or 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 removing amendment 39–9691 (61 FR 35946, July 9, 1996), and by adding a

new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 96–NM–218–AD. Supersedes AD 96–14–07, Amendment 39–9691.

Applicability: Model MD–11 and MD–11F series airplanes, manufacturer's fuselage numbers 0447 through 0599 inclusive; 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 (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 the possibility of an in-flight or ground fire due to fuel leaking from the fuel pipe coupling, accomplish the following:

Restatement of Requirements of AD 96–14–07, Amendment 39–9691

(a) Perform a visual inspection to detect discrepancies (i.e., cracks or deformation) of the fuel pipe of the fuel transfer system of the tail tank and associated mounting bracket located in the aft fuselage compartment; and to verify the correct position of the fuel pipe flange, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD11–28A082, dated May 14, 1996; at the time specified in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For airplanes on which the modification specified in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin 28–22, dated September 24, 1991, has been accomplished; or that have been repaired in accordance with an FAA-approved repair procedure, as specified in paragraph (a)(3) of AD 91–24–09, amendment 39–8095; or on which the shroud assembly has been replaced with a serviceable part: Prior to the accumulation of 600 flight hours, or within 60 days after July 24, 1996 (the effective date AD 96–14–07, amendment 39–9691), whichever occurs later.

(2) For airplanes on which the modification specified in McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin 28–22, dated September 24, 1991, has not been accomplished: Prior to the accumulation of 600 flight hours, or within 60 days since accomplishment of the last visual inspection in accordance with AD 91–24–09, amendment 39–8095; whichever occurs first.

(b) Condition 1. No Discrepancy Found. If no discrepancy is detected during any visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, accomplish either paragraph (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this AD.

(1) Condition 1. Option 1. Repeat the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed 600 flight hours or 60 days, whichever occurs later. Or

(2) Condition 1. Option 2. Prior to further flight, install a temporary phenolic support block assembly, shim, clamp, and bracket between the tail tank fuel pipe and station Y=2033.750 bulkhead, in accordance with Condition 1, Option 2, of McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD11–28A082, dated May 14, 1996. Within 6 months after accomplishment of this installation, perform a one-time inspection to verify the correct position of the temporary support block assembly installation in accordance with Figure 2 (Sheet 2 of 3) of the alert service bulletin.

(i) If the assembly is found to be positioned properly, repeat the verification of the correct position of the fuel pipe flange, as specified in paragraph (a) of this AD, thereafter at intervals not to exceed 15 months.

(ii) If the assembly is found to be improperly positioned, prior to further flight, reposition the fuel pipe in accordance with Figure 2 (Sheet 2 of 3) of the alert service bulletin. Repeat the verification of the correct position of the fuel pipe flange, as specified in paragraph (a) of this AD, thereafter at intervals not to exceed 15 months.

(c) Condition 2. Discrepancy Found; O-Ring Not Exposed. If any discrepancy is detected, and the fuel pipe is found to be improperly positioned, but the O-ring is not exposed, during any visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, accomplish either paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) of this AD.

(1) Condition 2. Option 1. Repeat the visual inspection in paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed 600 flight hours or 60 days, whichever occurs later. Or

(2) Condition 2. Option 2. Prior to further flight, install a temporary phenolic support block assembly, shim, clamp, and bracket between the tail tank fuel pipe and station Y=2033.750 bulkhead; and reposition the fuel pipe assembly, as applicable; in accordance with Condition 2, Option 2, of McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD11–28A082, dated May 14, 1996. Within 6 months after accomplishment of this installation, perform a one-time inspection to verify the correct position of the temporary support block assembly installation in accordance with Figure 2 (Sheet 2 of 3) of the alert service bulletin.

(i) If the assembly is found to be positioned properly, repeat the verification of the correct position of the fuel pipe flange, as specified in paragraph (a) of this AD, thereafter at intervals not to exceed 15 months.

(ii) If the assembly is found to be improperly positioned, prior to further flight, reposition the fuel pipe in accordance with Figure 2 (Sheet 2 of 3) of the alert service bulletin. Repeat the verification of the correct position of the fuel pipe flange, as specified in paragraph (a) of this AD, thereafter at intervals not to exceed 15 months.

(d) Condition 3. Discrepancy Found; O-Ring Exposed. If any discrepancy is detected, and the fuel pipe is found to be improperly positioned, and the O-ring is exposed, during any visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, replace the O-ring with a new O-ring, and install a temporary phenolic support block assembly, shim, clamp, and bracket between the tail tank fuel pipe and station Y=2033.750 bulkhead, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD11–28A082, dated May 14, 1996. Within 6 months after accomplishment of the replacement and installation, perform a one-time inspection to verify the correct position of the temporary support block assembly installation in accordance with Figure 2 (Sheet 2 of 3) of the alert service bulletin.

(1) If the assembly is found to be positioned properly, repeat the verification of the correct position of the fuel pipe flange, as specified in paragraph (a) of this AD, thereafter at intervals not to exceed 15 months.

(2) If the assembly is found to be improperly positioned, prior to further flight, reposition the fuel pipe in accordance with Figure 2 (Sheet 2 of 3) of the alert service bulletin. Repeat the verification of the correct position of the fuel pipe flange, as specified in paragraph (a) of this AD, thereafter at intervals not to exceed 15 months.

New Requirements of This AD

(e) Within 24 months after the effective date of this AD, install a restraint on the tail tank fuel pipe in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD11–28–082, dated July 29, 1996. Accomplishment of the installation constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of 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, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), 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, 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.

(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.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 13, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–29607 Filed 11–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–NM–97–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Model 4101 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.