This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39


RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Glasflugel—
Ing. E. Hanle Model GLASFLUGEL
Kestrel Sailplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation
Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking
(NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to adopt a
new airworthiness directive (AD) for all
Glasflugel—Ing. E. Hanle (Glasflugel)
Model GLASFLUGEL Kestrel sailplanes.
This proposed AD would require you to
inspect the airbrake actuating shaft for
deforamation and cracks (hereon referred
to as damage). If any damage is found,
this proposed AD would also require you
to repair or replace the airbrake
actuation shaft. This proposed AD is the
result of mandatory continuing
airworthiness information (MCAI)
issued by the airworthiness authority for
Germany. We are issuing this proposed
AD to detect and correct damage to the
airbrake actuation shaft, which could
result in failure of the airbrake control.
This failure could lead to loss of control
of the sailplane.

DATES: We must receive any comments
on this proposed AD by March 4, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following to
submit comments on this proposed AD:
• By mail: FAA, Central Region,
Office of the Regional Counsel,
60–AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas
City, Missouri 64106; Office
hours are 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday
through Friday, except Federal holidays.
For further information contact:
Greg Davison, Aerospace Engineer, FAA,
Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust,
Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106;
telephone: (816) 329–4130; facsimile:
(816) 329–4090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

How do I comment on this proposed
AD? We invite you to submit any
written relevant data, views, or
arguments regarding this proposal. Send
your comments to an address listed
under ADDRESSES. Include “AD Docket
No. 2003–CE–60–AD” in the subject
line of your comments. If you want us
to acknowledge receipt of your mailed
comments, send us a self-addressed,
stamped postcard with the docket
number written on it. We will
date-stamp your postcard and mail it back
to you.

Are there any specific portions of this
proposed AD I should pay attention to?
We specifically invite comments on the
overall regulatory, economic,
environmental, and energy aspects of
this proposed AD. If you contact us
through a nonwritten communication
and that contact relates to a
substantive part of this proposed AD, we
will summarize the contact and place the
summary in the docket. We will
consider all comments received by the
closing date and may amend this
proposed AD in light of those comments
and contacts.

Discussion

What events have caused this
proposed AD? The Lutfahrt-Bundesamt
(LBA), which is the airworthiness
authority for Germany, recently notified
FAA that an unsafe condition may exist
on all Glasflugel Model GLASFLUGEL
Kestrel sailplanes. The LBA reports that,
on one of the affected sailplanes, the
airbrakes would not completely open or
close.

A visual inspection of that sailplane
revealed cracks and deformity (damage)
on the airbrake actuating shaft. Incorrect
locking forces of the airbrace control
caused the damage.

What are the consequences if the
condition is not corrected? If not
detected and corrected, damage to the
airbrake actuating shaft could result in
failure of airbrake control. This failure
could lead to loss of control of the
sailplane.

Is there service information that
applies to this subject? H. Streifeneder
has issued Technical Note TN 401–26,

What are the provisions of this service
information? The service bulletin
includes procedures for:
• Inspecting the airbrake actuation shaft
for damage; and
• Repairing or replacing any damaged
airbrake actuation shaft.

What action did the LBA take? The
LBA classified this technical note as
mandatory and issued German AD
Number 2002–051, dated March 7, 2002,
to ensure the continued airworthiness of
these sailplanes in Germany.

Did the LBA inform the United States
under the bilateral airworthiness
agreement? These Glasflugel Model
GLASFLUGEL Kestrel sailplanes are
manufactured in Germany and are
type-certificated for operation in the United
States under the provisions of section
21.29 of the Federal Aviation
Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the
applicable bilateral airworthiness
agreement.

Under this bilateral airworthiness
agreement, the LBA has kept us
informed of the situation described
above.

FAA’s Determination and Requirements
of This Proposed AD

What has FAA decided? We have
examined the LBA’s findings, reviewed
all available information, and
determined that AD action is necessary
for products of this type design that are
certified for operation in the United
States.

Since the unsafe condition described
previously is likely to exist or develop
on other Glasflugel Model
GLASFLUGEL Kestrel sailplanes of the
same type design that are registered in the United States, we are proposing AD action to detect and correct damage to the airbrake actuating shaft, which could result in failure of airbrake control. This failure could lead to loss of control of the sailplane.

What would this proposed AD require? This proposed AD would require you to incorporate the actions in the previously-referenced service bulletin.

How does the revision to 14 CFR part 39 affect this proposed AD? On July 10, 2002, we published a new version of 14 CFR part 39 (67 FR 47997, July 22, 2002), which governs FAA’s AD system. This regulation now includes material that relates to altered products, special flight permits, and alternative methods of compliance. This material previously was included in each individual AD. Since this material is included in 14 CFR part 39, we will not include it in future AD actions.

Costs of Compliance

How many sailplanes would this proposed AD impact? We estimate that this proposed AD affects 16 sailplanes in the U.S. registry.

What would be the cost impact of this proposed AD on owners/operators of the affected sailplanes? We estimate the following costs to accomplish this proposed inspection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor cost</th>
<th>Parts cost</th>
<th>Total cost per airplane</th>
<th>Total cost on U.S. operators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 workhour × $65 per hour = $65</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$65 × 16 = $1,040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We estimate the following costs to accomplish any necessary repairs or replacements that would be required based on the results of this proposed inspection. We have no way of determining the number of sailplanes that may need this repair or replacement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor cost</th>
<th>Parts cost</th>
<th>Total cost per airplane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 workhours × $65 per hour = $325</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$325 + $40 = $365.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regulatory Findings

Would this proposed AD impact various entities? We have determined that this proposed AD would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This proposed AD would not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

Would this proposed AD involve a significant rule or regulatory action? For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed AD:

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. 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.

We prepared a summary of the costs to comply with this proposed AD and placed it in the AD Docket. You may get a copy of this summary by sending a request to us at the address listed under ADDRESSES. Include “AD Docket No. 2003–CE–60–AD” in your request.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 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. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):


When Is the Last Date I Can Submit Comments on This Proposed AD?

(a) We must receive comments on this proposed airworthiness directive (AD) by March 4, 2004.

What Other ADs Are Affected by This Action?

(b) None.

What Sailplanes Are Affected by This AD?

(c) This AD affects Model GLASFLUGEL Kestrel sailplanes, all serial numbers, that are certificated in any category.

What Is the Unsafe Condition Presented in This AD?

(d) This AD is the result of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by the airworthiness authority for Germany. The actions specified in this AD are intended to detect and correct damage to the airbrake actuation shaft, which could result in failure of the airbrake control. This failure could lead to loss of control of the sailplane.

What Must I Do To Address This Problem?

(e) To address this problem, you must do the following:
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Establishment of a Class E airspace area

ACTION: Proposed Establishment of Class E Airspace; Manchester, NH

May I Request an Alternative Method of Compliance?
(f) You may request a different method of compliance or a different compliance time for this AD by following the procedures in 14 CFR Part 39.13. Send your request to the Manager, Standards Office, Small Airplane Directorate, FAA. For information on any already approved alternative methods of compliance, contact Greg Davison, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4130; facsimile: (816) 329–4090.

May I Get Copies of the Documents Referenced in This AD?
g) You may get copies of the documents referenced in this AD from Hansjorg Streifeneder, Glasfaser-Flugzeug-Service GmbH, Hofener Weg, D–72582 Grabenstetten, Germany; telephone: 07382 1032; facsimile: 07382 1629; e-mail: streif@iol.com. You may view these documents at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Is There Other Information That Relates to This Subject?
h) Germany AD Number 2002–4130.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

Proposed Establishment of Class E Airspace; Manchester, NH

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes the Establishment of a Class E airspace area at Manchester, NH (KMHT) to provide for controlled airspace upward from the surface during the times when the air traffic controller tower at Manchester will be closed.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 5, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal to the Docket Management System, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room Plaza 401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20500–0001. You must identify the docket number at the beginning of your comments, FAA–2003–16707/Airspace Docket 2003–ANE–104–1. You may also submit comments using the Internet at: http://dms.dot.gov. You may review the public docket in person in the Dockets Office between 9 a.m., and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The docket contains the proposal, any comments received, and any final disposition. The Docket Office (telephone 1–800–647–5527) is located on the plaza level of the Department of Transportation NASSIF Building at the same address.

You may examine an informal docket by appointment at the New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Angel Cases, Air Traffic Division, ANE–520, Federal Aviation Administration, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299; telephone (781) 238–7520;


Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on January 26, 2004.

Dorenda D. Baker,
Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 04–2484 Filed 2–4–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P
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BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

Availability of NRPM’s

In addition, any person may obtain a copy of this NRPM by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Air Traffic Services, Manager, Rulemaking Distribution System, which describes the application procedures.

The Proposal
The FAA is proposing to establish a Class E airspace area extending upward from the surface at Manchester Airport,

__________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Inspect the airbrake actuation shaft for cracks and deformation (damage).</td>
<td>Within the next 25 hours time-in-service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD. Repetitively inspect thereafter at intervals not to exceed 12 calendar months.</td>
<td>Follow H. Streifeneder Technical Note TN 401–26, dated November 22, 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Repair or replace any cracked or deformed airbrake actuation shaft found during any inspection required in paragraph (e)(1) of the AD</td>
<td>Before further flight after any inspection required in paragraph (e)(1) of this AD in which damage is found. Continue with repetitive inspections after repairs or replacements are made.</td>
<td>Follow H. Streifeneder Technical Note TN 401–26, dated November 22, 2001.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>