(d) For all airplanes: Within 5,000 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, accomplish the requirements of either paragraph (d)(1) or (d)(2) of this AD:

(1) Install a lever/lock cap on the flush/fill lines at each lavatory service panel. The cap must be either an FAA-approved lever/lock cap, or a cap installed in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Service Bulletin 38–47, dated April 17, 1992. Or

(2) Install a Monogram 4803–86 series check valve on the flush/fill lines for all lavatory service panels.

(e) For only those airplanes listed in McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Service Bulletin 38–41, Revision 3, dated July 5, 1994: Accomplish the procedures specified in paragraphs (e)(1) and (e)(2) of this AD:

(1) Conduct leak checks of the lavatory vent system at the same time as conducting the leak checks of the dump valve and flush/fill line required by this AD. If a leak is discovered, prior to further flight, accomplish the procedures specified in either paragraph (e)(1)(i), (e)(1)(ii), (e)(1)(iii), or (e)(1)(iv) of this AD:

Note 7: The leak check of the lavatory vent system should be performed with a minimum of 3 pounds per square inch differential pressure (PSID) across the vent system. This leak check may be performed by filling the toilet tank with water/rinsing fluid to a level at least 4 inches above the flapper in the bowl, and checking for leakage after a period of 5 minutes. (These are the same procedures to be used for performing the leak checks of the dump valve and flush/fill line.)

(i) Repair the leak and retest. Or

(ii) Drain the affected lavatory system and placard the lavatory inoperative until repairs can be accomplished. Or

(iii) Install an FAA-approved modification that deactivates the vent system. After accomplishment of this deactivation, the leak checks of the lavatory vent system may be discontinued. Or

(iv) Replace/modify the vent system in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Service Bulletin 38–41, Revision 3, dated July 5, 1994. After accomplishment of this replacement/modification, the leak checks of the lavatory vent system may be discontinued.

(2) Within 3 years after the effective date of this AD: Either replace/modify the vent system in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Service Bulletin 38–41, Revision 3, dated July 5, 1994; or install an FAA-approved modification that deactivates the vent system. Accomplishment of either of these actions constitutes terminating action for the leak checks of the lavatory vent system that are required by this AD.

(f) For any affected airplane acquired after the effective date of this AD: Before any operator places into service any airplane subject to the requirements of this AD, a schedule for the accomplishment of the leak checks required by this AD shall be established in accordance with either paragraph (f)(1) or (f)(2) of this AD, as applicable. After each leak check has been performed once, each subsequent leak check must be performed in accordance with the new operator's schedule, in accordance with either paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) For airplanes previously maintained in accordance with this AD: The first leak check to be performed by the new operator must be accomplished in accordance with either the previous operator's schedule or the new operator's schedule, whichever would result in the earlier accomplishment date for that leak check.

(2) For airplanes that have not been previously maintained in accordance with this AD: The first leak check to be performed by the new operator must be accomplished prior to further flight; or in accordance with a schedule approved by the FAA PMI, but within a period not to exceed 200 flight hours.

(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 ACO, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA PMI, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 8: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

Note 9: For any valve that is not eligible for the extended leak check intervals of this AD: To be eligible for the leak check interval specified in paragraph (a)(1), (a)(2), (b)(2)(i), or (b)(2)(ii), the service history data of the valve must be submitted to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, with a request for approval of an alternative method of compliance with this AD. The request should include an analysis of known failure modes for the valve, if it is an existing design, and known failure modes of similar valves. Additionally, the request should include an explanation of how design features will preclude these failure modes, results of qualification tests, and approximately 25,000 flight hours or 25,000 flight cycles of service history data, including a winter season, collected in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (c) of this AD or a similar program. The configuration of the entire drain system on the airplanes used in evaluating a drain valve leak check interval should be defined in the request so as to ensure that the drain system is representative of the applications where the valve will be used. As an example, data collected on a panel valve installed below a ball valve would not be acceptable for substantiating a leak check interval for the panel valve, since an installation below a ball valve would not be representative of the normal applications where it could be used.

(h) 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.

(i) The actions shall be done in accordance with McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Service Bulletin 38–47, dated April 17, 1992; and McDonnell Douglas DC–9 Service Bulletin 38–41, Revision 3, dated July 5, 1994. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Department C1–L51 (2–60). Copies may be inspected 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; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(j) This amendment becomes effective on December 11, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on October 18, 1996.

James V. Devany,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–27395 Filed 11–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–NM–09–AD; Amendment 39–9797; AD 96–22–09]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Shorts Model SD3–60 and SD3–SHERPA Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Shorts Model SD3–60 and SD3–SHERPA series airplanes, that requires a one-time inspection to detect cracks and/or corrosion of the gland nut on the shock absorber of the main landing gear (MLG), and follow-on actions. This amendment also requires repair or replacement of any cracked/corroded gland nut with a new nut. This amendment is prompted by a report indicating that, due to stress corrosion and cracking of the gland nut on the shock absorber, the MLG collapsed on an in-service airplane. The actions specified by this AD are intended to detect and correct such stress corrosion or cracking in a timely manner and consequent reduced structural integrity of the gland nut, which could result in separation of the shock absorber cylinder from the MLG shock absorber body and consequently, lead to the collapse of the MLG during landing.

DATES: Effective December 11, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 11, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Short Brothers PLC, 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 713, Arlington, Virginia 22202–3719. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Greg Dunn, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2799; fax (206) 227–1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Shorts Model SD3–60 and SD3–SHERPA series airplanes was published in the Federal Register on July 29, 1996 (61 FR 39364). That action proposed to require a one-time visual and fluorescent dye penetrant inspection to detect cracks and/or corrosion of the gland nut on the shock absorber of the main landing gear (MLG), and repair or replacement of the gland nut with a new nut, if necessary. That action also proposed to require, after the inspection is completed, the application of grease to the threads of the cylinder and the application of sealant to the inner radius of the gland nut.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the single comment received. The commenter supports the proposed rule.

Conclusion

After careful review of the available data, including the comment noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 88 airplanes (72 Model SD3–60 series airplanes and 16 Model SD3–SHERPA series airplanes) of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 5 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $26,400, or $300 per airplane.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the 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 adopted herein will 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 final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under 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. A final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 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 adding the following new airworthiness directive:

96–22–09 Short Brothers, PLC: Amendment 39–9797. Docket 96–NM–09–AD.

Applicability: Model SD3–-60 and Model SD3–SHERPA series airplanes, as listed in Shorts Service Bulletin SD360–32–34 (for Model SD3–60 series airplanes), and Shorts Service Bulletin SD3 SHERPA–32–2 (for Model SD3–SHERPA series airplanes), both dated September 22, 1995; 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 (c) 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 detect and correct stress corrosion or cracking of the gland nut on the shock absorber of the main landing gear (MLG) in a timely manner and consequent reduced structural integrity of the nut, which could result in separation of the shock absorber cylinder from the MLG shock absorber body and, consequently, lead to the collapse of the MLG during landing; accomplish the following:

(a) Within 90 days after the effective date of this AD, perform a one-time visual and fluorescent dye penetrant inspection to detect cracks and/or corrosion of the gland nut on the shock absorber of the MLG, in accordance with Shorts Service Bulletin SD360–32–34 (for Model SD3–60 series airplanes), and Shorts Service Bulletin SD3 SHERPA–32–2 (for Model SD3–SHERPA series airplanes), both dated September 22, 1995, as applicable.

Note 2: Short Service Bulletins SD360–32–34 and SD3 SHERPA–32–2 reference Messier-Dowty Service Bulletin 32–78SD, dated July 19, 1995, as an additional source of service information.

(1) If no crack and/or corrosion is detected, no further action is required by paragraph (a) of this AD.

(2) If no crack is detected, but corrosion is detected that is within the limits specified in the service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair the gland nut in accordance with the applicable service bulletin.

(3) If any crack is detected, or if any corrosion is detected that is outside the limits specified in the service bulletin, prior to further flight, replace the gland nut with a new gland nut, in accordance with the applicable service bulletin.

(b) Following accomplishment of paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, apply grease to the threads of the cylinder, and apply sealant to the inner radius of the gland nut, in accordance with Shorts Service Bulletin SD360–32–34 (for Model SD3–60 series airplanes), and Shorts Service Bulletin SD3 SHERPA–32–2 (for Model SD3–SHERPA series airplanes), both dated September 22, 1995, as applicable.

(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, 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 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, is any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM–113.

(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.

(e) The actions shall be done in accordance with Shorts Service Bulletin SD360–32–34, dated September 22, 1995, and Shorts Service Bulletin SD3 SHERPA–32–2, dated September 22, 1995, as applicable. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Short Brothers PLC, 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 713, Arlington, Virginia 22202–3719. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(f) This amendment becomes effective on December 11, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on October 18, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–27396 Filed 11–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–NM–36–AD; Amendment 39–9799; AD 96–22–11]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–100 and –200 Series Airplanes, and Model 747–100, –200, –300, and –SP Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 737 and 747 series airplanes, that requires replacement of Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies with modified assemblies. This amendment is prompted by reports of failure of hydraulic system A and the standby system, due to corrosion on the magnesium piston of the hydraulic fuse and consequent failure of the fuse to close sufficiently to prevent the loss of hydraulic fluid from the system. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent such failure of the fuse, which could result in the failure of one or more hydraulic systems and resultant reduced controllability of the airplane.

DATES: Effective December 11, 1996.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 11, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Washington 98124–2207. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kenneth W. Frey, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–130S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; telephone (206) 227–2673; fax (206) 227–1181.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Boeing Model 737 and 747 series airplanes was published in the Federal Register on April 30, 1996 (61 FR 18997). That action proposed to require replacement of Waterman hydraulic fuse assemblies with modified assemblies.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

Request To Extend Compliance Time

The Air Transport Association (ATA) of America, on behalf of several of its members, requests that the proposed compliance time be extended from 3,000 flight hours to 24 months. The commenter indicates that accomplishment of the modification is dependent upon the ability of an outside vendor to rework the fuse assemblies and return them to the operator. The commenter states that the proposed compliance time may be insufficient for the vendor to provide this service. Additionally, two ATA members indicate that no fuse failures have occurred within their fleets.

Another commenter suggests that, since the compliance time would be insufficient to send the assemblies to a vendor for modification, operators of affected Model 747 series airplanes should be required to perform an initial and periodic inspections of the Waterman hydraulic fuses having part number G905–120 in accordance with the Airplane Maintenance Manual to confirm the function of the fuses until they can be replaced with PneuDraulics fuses having part number 6105.

The FAA concurs that the compliance time may be extended. In developing an appropriate compliance time for this AD action, the FAA considered not only the degree of urgency associated with addressing the subject unsafe condition, but the practical aspect of sending the fuse assemblies to an outside vendor for accomplishment of the modification. The FAA has considered the information presented by the commenters as to the turnaround time for accomplishment of the modification. In light of this information and the number of fuses that may need to be modified, the FAA agrees that the compliance time should be extended. The FAA has determined that extending the compliance time from the proposed 3,000 flight hours to 24 months will provide an acceptable level of safety without the need for interim inspections (as suggested by one of the commenters). Paragraphs (a) and (b) of the final rule have been revised accordingly.

Request To Add a Note to the AD

One commenter requests that the FAA add a note to the proposal to specify that availability of replacement fuses should be considered when scheduling compliance with the AD, and to advise operators to begin accomplishing the requirements of the AD as soon as the final rule is issued. The commenter expresses concern that the lead time for obtaining replacement fuses may be inadequate and that the proposed compliance time may not be met unless operators place orders for these fuses during the early stages of the compliance period.

The FAA does not concur that a note should be added to the final rule. The FAA acknowledges that accomplishment of the replacement is dependent upon the ability of outside vendors to manufacture and rework rotable units within a certain time frame. However, as explained previously, the FAA has extended the compliance time for accomplishing the replacement from 3,000 flight hours to 24 months. The FAA finds that this extension should allow sufficient time