§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

General Electric Aircraft Engines: Docket No. 98–ANE–62–AD.

Applicability: General Electric Aircraft Engines (GEAE) Models CF34–1A, –3A, –3A1, and –3A2 turbofan engines, installed on but not limited to Canadair aircraft models CL–600–2A12, –2B16, and –2B19.

Note 1: This airworthiness directive (AD) applies to each engine 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 engines 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 prevent high pressure compressor (HPC) spool and disk cracking, which could result in an uncontained engine failure and damage to the aircraft, accomplish the following:

(a) Remove from service the following HPC spools and disks prior to accumulating cycles in service beyond new, reduced cyclic life limits, and replace with a serviceable part, as follows:

(1) For forward HPC spools, Part Number (P/N) 6078T56P01, which have accumulated fewer than 6,000 cycles since new (CSN) on the effective date of this AD, remove prior to accumulating 6,000 CSN.

(2) For forward HPC spools, P/N 6078T56P01, which have accumulated 6,000 or more CSN on the effective date of this AD, remove at the next shop visit after the effective date of this AD, but prior to accumulating 12,000 CSN.

(3) For the purpose of this AD, engine shop visit is defined as engine disassembly that includes separation of the compressor section from the fan section front frame and from the combustion section combustion chamber frame.

(4) For stage 9 HPC disks, P/N 6087T01P03 or 6087T01P04, remove prior to accumulating 20,000 CSN.

(5) For rear HPC spools, P/N 5087T46P01 or 5087T46P02, remove prior to accumulating 17,000 CSN.

(b) 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, Engine Certification Office. Operators shall submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Engine Certification Office.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Engine Certification Office.

(c) 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 aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on March 30, 1999.

David A. Downey,

Assistant Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–8307 Filed 4–2–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–370–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–215–1A10 and CL–215–6B11 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the supersedure of an existing amendment, applicable to certain Bombardier Model CL–215–1A10 and CL–215–6B11 series airplanes, that currently requires repetitive inspections to detect cracking on certain wing to fuselage frame-angles, and repair, if necessary. This action would continue to require the same inspections. This proposal is prompted by an adverse comment received in response to the existing amendment. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to detect and correct cracking in the wing to fuselage frame-angles, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airframe.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 5, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–NM–370–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 Bombardier, Inc., Canadair, Aerospace Group, P.O. Box 6087, Station Centre-ville, Montreal, Quebec H3C 3G9, Canada. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, New York Aircraft Certification Office, 10 Fifth Street, Third Floor, Valley Stream, New York.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Franco Pieri, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe and Propulsion Branch, ANE–171, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, New York Aircraft Certification Office, 10 Fifth Street, Third Floor, Valley Stream, New York 11581; telephone (516) 256–7526; fax (516) 256–2716.

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 98–NM–370–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. 98–NM–370–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

On April 3, 1998, the FAA issued amendment 39–10458 (issued as a direct final rule), which was published in the **Federal Register** on April 10, 1998 (63 FR 17672). [A correction of the direct final rule was published in the **Federal Register** on May 4, 1998 (63 FR 24389).] That amendment is applicable to certain Bombardier Model CL–215–1A10 and CL–215–6B11 series airplanes. It requires repetitive inspections to detect cracking on certain wing to fuselage frame-angles, and repair, if necessary. That action was prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The requirements of that action are intended to detect and correct cracking in the wing to fuselage frame-angles, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airframe.

Comments Received in Response to Direct Final Rule

In response to the direct final rule, the FAA has received adverse comments. As specified in the preamble of the direct final rule, the FAA uses the direct final rule procedure for non-controversial rules for which the FAA anticipates that it will receive no adverse public comments. The direct final rule advised the public that unless a written adverse comment, or a written notice of intent to submit such an adverse comment, was received within the comment period, the regulation would become effective on July 9, 1998.

Disposition of Comments

The commenter states that a reference (found in the ''Supplementary Information'' section of the preamble of the direct final rule) to cracking on Model CL–215T airplanes is incorrect, and that the correct reference is Model CL–215–6B11 series airplanes. The FAA acknowledges that cracking was found on three Model CL–215–6B11 (CL–215T Variant) series airplanes. However, the ''Supplementary Information'' section of the direct final rule does not reappear in this proposed rule; therefore, no change to this proposed rule is necessary in this regard.

The commenter also points out that the parallel Canadian airworthiness directive (CF–97–07) does not permit further flight after cracking has been found. The ''Differences Between This Rule and the Foreign AD'' section of the direct final rule implies that the referenced Canadian airworthiness directive does allow further flight following a finding of cracking. The FAA concurs that this section need not have appeared in the direct final rule. Canadian airworthiness directive CF–97–07, dated May 28, 1997, indicates that if inspection results exceed the acceptance criteria in paragraph 2.D(7) of the referenced alert service bulletin, the manufacturer should be contacted for disposition before further flight.

Relevant Service Information

The manufacturer has issued Bombardier Alert Service Bulletin 215–A476, Revision 3, dated August 21, 1998, which describes procedures for an eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the fuselage frame angles at the wing front and rear spar attachment to the fuselage. Transport Canada Aviation (TCA), which is the airworthiness authority for Canada, classified this alert service bulletin as mandatory and issued Canadian airworthiness directive CF–97–07R1, dated September 30, 1998, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in Canada.

FAA's Conclusions

This airplane model is manufactured in Canada and is 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. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, TCA has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the TCA, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would supersede amendment 39–10458, described previously, to continue to require repetitive inspections to detect cracking on certain wing to fuselage frame-angles, and repair, if necessary. The inspections would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the alert service bulletin described previously. The repair would be required to be accomplished in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 1 airplane of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD. It would take approximately 2 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of this proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $120 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.

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 39–10458 (63 FR 17672, April 10, 1998), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

Bombardier Inc. (Formerly Canadair): Docket 98–NM–370–AD.

Applicability: Model CL–215–1A10 and CL–215–6B11 series airplanes, serial numbers 1001 through 1125 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 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 cracking in the wing to fuselage frame-angles, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the airframe, accomplish the following:

(a) Perform an eddy current inspection to detect cracking of the fuselage frame angles at the wing front and rear spar attachment to the fuselage at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD; in accordance with Bombardier Alert Service Bulletin 215-A476, Revision 3, dated August 21, 1998. Thereafter, repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 415 flight hours.

(1) Prior to the accumulation of 2,300 total flight hours.

(2) Within 150 flight hours or 4 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first.

Note 2: Accomplishment of the eddy current inspections of the lower surfaces of the frame angles conducted in accordance with Bombardier Alert Service Bulletin ASB 215–A476, Revision 1, dated January 14, 1997, or ASB 215–A476, Revision 2, dated June 15, 1998, prior to the effective date of this AD is considered to be acceptable for compliance with the requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD for that area only.

(b) If the results of any inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD are outside the limits specified in paragraph 2.C.(7) of Bombardier Alert Service Bulletin ASB 215–A476, Revision 3, dated August 21, 1998: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, New York Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate.

(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, New York ACO. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, New York ACO.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the New York ACO.

(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.

Note 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in Canadian airworthiness directive CF–97–07R1, dated September 30, 1998.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on March 30, 1999.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–8330 Filed 4–2–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–17]

Proposed Modification of Class E Airspace; Willmar, MN

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to modify Class E airspace at Willmar, MN. A VHF Omnidirectional Range (VOR) or Global Positioning System (GPS) Standard Instrument Approach Procedure (SIAP) to Runway (Rwy) 28, Amendment (Amdt) 2, and a VOR SIAP Rwy 10, Amdt 2, have been developed for Willmar Municipal-John L. Rice Field Airport. Controlled airspace extending upward from 700 to 1200 feet above ground level (AGL) is needed to contain aircraft executing the approaches. This action proposes to add a northwest extension and a southeast extension to the existing controlled airspace for this airport.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 20, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, AGL–7, Rules Docket No. 99–AGL–17, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018.

The official docket may be examined in the Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois. An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the Air Traffic Division, Airspace Branch, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michelle M. Behm, Air Traffic Division, Airspace Branch, AGL–520, Federal Aviation Administration, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018, telephone (847) 294–7568.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interesed parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal. Communications should identify the airspace docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–17.'' The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter. All communications received on or before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available for examination in the Rules Docket, FAA, Great Lakes Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois, both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

Availability of NPRM's

Any person may obtain a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) by submitting a request to the federal Aviation Administration, Office of Public Affairs, Attention: Public Inquiry Center, APA–230, 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591, or