Restatment of Requirements of AD 97–02–05

Repetitive Inspections and Replacement, If Necessary

(a) For airplanes listed in McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin A27–325, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992: Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 landings or within 270 days after January 22, 1993 (the effective date of AD 92–27–07, amendment 39–8441), whichever occurs later, conduct a visual and eddy current inspection to detect cracks of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, part number 4616066, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Alert Service Bulletin A27–325, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992, or Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995.

(1) If no cracks are detected as a result of the inspections required by this paragraph, repeat the inspections at intervals not to exceed 3,500 landings.

(2) If cracks are detected as a result of the inspections required by this paragraph, prior to further flight, replace the rudder pedal adjuster hub assembly, part number 4616066, with a new assembly having the same part number, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Alert Service Bulletin A27–325, Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995. Thereafter, conduct visual and eddy current inspections of the replacement rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly in accordance with this paragraph.

(b) For airplanes listed in McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Alert Service Bulletin A27–325, Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995, and not subject to paragraph (a) of this AD: Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 landings or within 270 days after March 25, 1996 (the effective date of AD 96–02–05, amendment 39–9493), whichever occurs later, conduct a visual and eddy current inspection to detect cracks of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, part number 4616066, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Alert Service Bulletin A27–325, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992, or Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995.

(1) If no cracks are detected as a result of the inspections required by this paragraph, repeat the inspections at intervals not to exceed 3,500 landings.

(2) If cracks are detected as a result of the inspections required by this paragraph, prior to further flight, replace the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, part number 4616066, with a new assembly having the same part number, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Alert Service Bulletin A27–325, Revision 2, dated January 27, 1995. Thereafter, conduct visual and eddy current inspections of the replacement rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly in accordance with this paragraph.

New Actions Required By This Proposed AD

Replacement and Reidentification

(c) Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 total landings, or within 18 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, do the actions specified in paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this AD in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–27–325, Revision 02, dated December 12, 1995. Accomplishment of the these actions constitutes terminating action for the requirements of this AD.

(1) Replace the existing magnesium casting hub assembly of the rudder pedal adjuster, part number (P/N) 4616066–3, and bearing, P/N AN201KP4A, in the rudder pedal mechanism between stations X=69.000 and X=120.000 in the flight compartment with a new aluminum assembly, part number (P/N) 5965435–3, and new bearing, P/N MS27641–4; and

(2) Reidentify rudder pedal adjuster, P/N 5641294–501 or –503, as P/N 5641294–507.

Note 2: Installation of the aluminum rudder pedal adjuster hub assembly per McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9–27–325, Revision 1, dated November 30, 1994, before the effective date of this AD, is considered acceptable for the requirements of paragraph (c) of this AD.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(d) 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. 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 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

Special Flight Permits

(e) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 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 9, 2001.

Vi L. Lipski,

Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–17599 Filed 7–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2001–NM–210–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–8 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 DC–8 series airplanes, that currently requires repetitive visual and eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, and replacement of the assembly with a new assembly, if necessary. This action would require accomplishment of a terminating action for the repetitive inspections. This action also adds airplanes to the applicability of the existing AD. This proposal is prompted by the FAA's determination that further rulemaking is necessary. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent loss of rudder pedals control and reduction of braking capability.

DATES: Comments must be received by September 6, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2001–NM–210–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. Comments may be submitted via fax to (425) 227–1232. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: 9-anm-nprmcomment@faa.gov. Comments sent via fax or the Internet must contain ''Docket No. 2001–NM–210–AD'' in the subject line and need not be submitted in triplicate. Comments sent via the Internet as attached electronic files must be formatted in Microsoft Word 97 for Windows or ASCII text.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Aircraft Group, Long Beach Division, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Data and Service Management, Dept. C1–L5A (D800–0024). This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the the FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Greg Diliberio, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (562) 627–5231; fax (562) 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 action may be changed in light of the comments received.

Submit comments using the following format:

- Organize comments issue-by-issue. For example, discuss a request to change the compliance time and a request to change the service bulletin reference as two separate issues.
- For each issue, state what specific change to the proposed AD is being requested.
- Include justification (e.g., reasons or data) for each request.

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 action must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 2001–NM–210–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–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2001–NM–210–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Background

In July 1996, a Boeing Model 747 series airplane was involved in an accident. As part of re-examining all aspects of the service experience of the airplane involved in the accident, the FAA participated in design review and testing to determine possible sources of ignition in center fuel tanks. As part of the review, we examined fuel system wiring with regard to the possible effects that wire degradation may have on arc propagation.

In 1997 in a parallel preceding, at the recommendation of the White House Commission on Aviation Safety and Security, the FAA expanded its Aging Transport Program to include non-structural systems and assembled a team for evaluating these systems. This team performed visual inspections of certain transport category airplanes for which 20 years or more had passed since date of manufacture. In addition, the team gathered information from interviews with FAA Principal Maintenance Inspectors and meetings with representatives of airplane manufacturers. This evaluation revealed that the length of time in service is not the only cause of wire degradation; inadequate maintenance, contamination, improper repair, and mechanical damage are all contributing factors. From the compilation of this comprehensive information, we developed the Aging Transport Non-Structural Systems Plan to increase airplane safety by increasing knowledge of how non-structural systems degrade and how causes of degradation can be reduced.

In 1998, an accident occurred off the coast of Nova Scotia involving a McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 series airplane. Investigation indicates that a fire broke out in the cockpit and first class overhead area. Although the ignition source of the fire has not been determined, the FAA, in conjunction with Boeing and operators of Model MD–11, DC–8, DC–9, DC–10, and DC–9–80 series airplanes, is reviewing all aspects of the service history of those airplanes to identify potential unsafe conditions associated with wire degradation due to various contributing factors (e.g., inadequate maintenance, contamination, improper repair, and mechanical damage) and to take appropriate corrective actions. We have issued a series of airworthiness directives (AD) that address unsafe conditions identified during that process. This process is continuing and we may consider additional rulemaking actions as further results of the review become available. The cause of the Nova Scotia MD–11 accident has not yet been determined.

In 1999, the FAA Administrator established a formal advisory committee to facilitate the implementation of the Aging Transport Non-Structural Systems Plan. This committee, the Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC), is made up of representatives of airplane manufacturers, operators, user groups, aerospace and industry associations, and government agencies. As part of its mandate, ATSRAC will recommend rulemaking to increase transport category airplane safety in cases where solutions to safety problems connected to aging systems have been found and must be applied. Detailed analyses of certain transport category airplanes that have been removed from service, studies of service bulletins pertaining to certain wiring systems, and reviews of previously issued ADs requiring repetitive inspections of certain flight control systems, have resulted in valuable information on the cause and prevention of wire degradation due to various contributing factors (e.g., inadequate maintenance, contamination, improper repair, and mechanical damage).

In summary, as a result of the investigations described above, the FAA has determined that corrective action may be necessary to minimize the potential hazards associated with wire and mechanical flight control systems degradation and related causal factors (e.g., inadequate maintenance, contamination, improper repair, and mechanical damage).

Previously Issued AD 92–27–06

On December 9, 1992, the FAA issued AD 92–27–06, amendment 39–8440 (57 FR 60115, December 18, 1992), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC–8 series airplanes, to require repetitive visual and eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, and replacement of the assembly with a new assembly, if necessary. That action was prompted by several occurrences of failure of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly due to broken detent lugs. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent loss of rudder pedals control and reduction of braking capability.

Actions Since Issuance of AD 92–27–06

Since the issuance of AD 92–27–06, the FAA has determined that long-term continued operational safety will be better assured by design changes to remove the source of the problem, rather than by repetitive inspections. 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 continual inspections, has led us to consider placing less emphasis on inspections and more emphasis on design improvements. Therefore, we now have determined that further rulemaking action is necessary to require a terminating action for the

repetitive inspection requirements of AD 96–02–05.

Other Related Rulemaking

This proposed AD is one of a series of actions identified as part of the ATSRAC program initiative to maintain continued operational safety of aging non-structural systems and structural components related to the mechanical flight control systems in transport category airplanes. The program is continuing and the FAA may consider additional rulemaking actions as further results of the review become available.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC8–27A275, Revision 03, dated April 5, 1996, which describes procedures for repetitive visual and eddy current inspections to detect cracks of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, and replacement of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly with a new assembly having the same part number (P/N), if necessary. The service bulletin also describes procedures for eventual replacement of the adjuster hub assembly with a new adjuster hub assembly, P/N 5965435–1, which eliminates the need for the repetitive inspections. Accomplishment of the actions specified in the service bulletin is intended to adequately address the identified unsafe condition.

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 92–27–06 to continue to require repetitive visual and eddy current inspections to detect cracking of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly. The proposed AD would require eventual and on-condition (i.e., any crack finding) replacement of the adjuster hub assembly with a new assembly, P/N 5965435–1, which would constitute terminating action for the repetitive inspections. The proposed AD also adds airplanes to the applicability of the existing AD. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletin described previously, except as described below.

Differences Between the Service Bulletin and the Proposed AD

The referenced service bulletin allows replacement of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly with a new assembly having the same P/N, if any crack is detected, and follow-on repetitive inspections for an interim period. As discussed previously, the FAA has determined that long-term continued operational safety will be better assured by design changes to remove the source of the problem, rather than by repetitive inspections. Therefore, this proposed AD requires replacement of the adjuster hub assembly with a new assembly, P/N 5965435–1.

Explanation of Change to Applicability of AD 92–27–06

The effectivity listing of McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC8–27A275, Revision 03, dated April 5, 1996, has been revised to include two additional serial numbers (i.e., 45646 and 45928) of the affected airplanes. The FAA finds that these airplanes also are subject to the identified unsafe condition of this proposed AD. Therefore, the applicability of this proposed AD includes serial numbers 45646 and 45928.

Cost Impact

There are approximately 264 Model DC–8 series airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 245 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD.

The inspection that is currently required by AD 92–27–06 takes approximately 3 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 $44,100, or $180 per airplane, per inspection cycle.

The new actions that are proposed in this AD action would take approximately 8 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately $4,296 per airplane. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the proposed requirements of this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $1,170,120, or $4,776 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. The cost impact figures discussed in AD rulemaking actions represent only the time necessary to perform the specific actions actually required by the AD. These figures typically do not include incidental costs, such as the time required to gain access and close up, planning time, or time necessitated by other administrative actions.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would not have a substantial direct effect 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, it is determined that this proposal would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

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 39–8440 (57 FR 60115, December 18, 1992), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 2001–NM–210–AD. Supersedes AD 92–27–06, Amendment 39–8440.

Applicability: Model DC–8 series airplanes, serial numbers 45646 and 45928, and as listed in McDonnell Douglas DC–8 Alert Service Bulletin A27–275, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992; 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 request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (g) 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 loss of rudder pedals control and reduction of braking capability, accomplish the following:

Inspection

(a) For airplanes listed in McDonnell Douglas DC–8 Alert Service Bulletin A27–275, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992: Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 landings or within 270 days after January 22, 1993 (the effective date of AD 92–27–06, amendment 39–8440), whichever occurs later, conduct a visual and eddy current inspection to detect cracks of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, part number (P/N) 4616066, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–8 Alert Service Bulletin A27–275, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992, or Revision 2, dated August 5, 1992; or McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC8–27A275, Revision 03, dated April 5, 1996. As of the effective date of this AD only McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC8–27A275, Revision 03, dated April 5, 1996, shall be used.

(b) For airplanes having serial numbers 45646 and 45928: Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 total landings, or within 270 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, conduct a visual and eddy current inspection to detect cracks of the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, P/N 4616066, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–8 Alert Service Bulletin A27–275, Revision 1, dated February 3, 1992, or Revision 2, dated August 5, 1992; or McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC8–27A275, Revision 03, dated April 5, 1996. As of the effective date of this AD, only McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC8–27A275, Revision 03, dated April 5, 1996, shall be used.

No Crack Found During Inspection Required By Paragraph (a) of This AD: Repetitive Inspections

(c) If no crack is detected as a result of the inspections required by paragraph (a) of this AD, repeat the inspections at intervals not to exceed 3,500 landings.

Any Crack Found: Replacement and Repetitive Inspections

(d) If any crack is detected as a result of the inspections required by paragraph (a), (b), or (c) of this AD, prior to further flight, replace the rudder pedals adjuster hub assembly, P/N 4616066, with a new assembly, P/N 5965435–1, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC8–27A275, Revision 03, dated April 5, 1996. Accomplishment of the replacement constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspection requirements of this AD.

Terminating Action

(e) Prior to the accumulation of 15,000 total landings, or within 3,500 landings after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, replace the existing adjuster hub assembly with a new assembly, P/N 5965435–1, per McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin DC8–27A275, Revision 03, dated April 5, 1996. Accomplishment of the replacement constitutes terminating action for the requirements of this AD.

Spares

(f) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install an adjuster hub assembly, P/N 4616066, on any airplane.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(g) 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. 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.

Special Flight Permits

(h) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 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 9, 2001.

Vi L. Lipski,

Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–17600 Filed 7–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2001–NM–217–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 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 certain Boeing Model 747 series airplanes. This proposal would require a one-time inspection for chafing between the hose for the passenger oxygen system (hereinafter called the ''oxygen hose'') and adjacent electrical wire bundles at certain passenger service units, and corrective actions, if necessary. This proposal also would require rerouting or reorienting the oxygen hose to ensure sufficient clearance between the hose and electrical wire bundles. This action is necessary to prevent chafing between the oxygen hose and adjacent electrical wire bundles, which could result in arcing of a chafed electrical wire bundle and consequent burn-through of the oxygen hose. If this occurs when the oxygen system is pressurized, such arcing could represent a potential ignition source in an oxygen-enriched environment. This action is intended to address the identified unsafe condition.

DATES: Comments must be received by September 6, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2001–NM–217–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. Comments may be submitted via fax to (425) 227–1232. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: 9-anm-nprmcomment@faa.gov. Comments sent via fax or the Internet must contain ''Docket No. 2001–NM–217–AD'' in the subject line and need not be submitted in triplicate. Comments sent via the Internet as attached electronic files must be formatted in Microsoft Word 97 for Windows or ASCII text.

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: Stephen Oshiro, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–130S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2793; fax (425) 227–1181.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the