Regulation (FAR) Part 121 or 129, and complying with paragraph (b) of this AD, ''the FAA'' is defined as ''the cognizant Principal Maintenance Inspector (PMI).'' For those operators operating under FAR Part 91 or 125, and complying with paragraph (b) of this AD, ''the FAA'' is defined as ''the cognizant Maintenance Inspector at the appropriate FAA Flight Standards office.''

To preclude degradation of the structural capabilities of the airplane due to the problems associated with corrosion, accomplish the following:

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this AD, within a date two years after the effective date of this AD, complete each of the basic tasks specified in Section 4.3 of the Document in accordance with the procedures specified in the Document and the schedule specified in Figure 5 of the Document. Thereafter, repeat each basic task at a time interval not to exceed the repeat interval specified in Section 4 of the Document for that task.

Note 4: A ''basic task,'' as defined in Section 4 of the Document, includes inspections; procedures for a corrective action, including repairs, under identified circumstances; application of sealants or corrosion inhibitors; and other follow-on actions.

Note 5: Basic tasks completed in accordance with the Document before the effective date of this AD may be credited for compliance with the initial basic task requirements of this paragraph.

Note 6: Where non-destructive inspection (NDI) methods are employed, in accordance with Section 4 of the Document, the standards and procedures used must be acceptable to the Administrator in accordance with FAR Section 43.13.

(b) As an alternative to the requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD: Within one year after the effective date of this AD, revise the FAA-approved maintenance/inspection program to include the corrosion control program specified in the Document; or to include an equivalent program that is approved by the FAA.

(1) Any operator complying with paragraph (b) of this AD may use an alternative recordkeeping method to that otherwise required by FAR § 91.417 or § 121.380 for the actions required by this AD, provided it is approved by the FAA and is included in a revision to the FAA-approved maintenance/inspection program.

(2) Subsequent to the accomplishment of the initial basic task, any extensions of repeat intervals specified in the Document must be approved by the FAA.

(c) To accommodate unanticipated scheduling requirements, it is acceptable for a repeat interval to be increased by up to 10%, but not to exceed 6 months. The FAA must be informed, in writing, of any such extension within 30 days after such adjustment of the schedule.

(d)(1) If, as a result of any inspection conducted in accordance with paragraphs (a) or (b) of this AD, Level 3 corrosion is determined to exist in any airplane area, accomplish either paragraph (d)(1)(i) or (d)(1)(ii) within 7 days after such determination:

(i) Submit a report of that determination to the FAA and complete the basic task in the affected aircraft zones on all Model YS–11/–11A series airplanes in the operator's fleet; or

(ii) Submit to the FAA for approval one of the following:

(A) A proposed schedule for performing the basic tasks in the affected aircraft zones on the remaining Model YS–11/–11A series airplanes in the operator's fleet, which is adequate to ensure that any other Level 3 corrosion is detected in a timely manner, along with substantiating data for that schedule; or

(B) Data substantiating that the Level 3 corrosion found is an isolated occurrence.

Note 7: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1.3 of the Document, which would permit corrosion that otherwise meets the definition of Level 3 corrosion (i.e., which is determined to be a potentially urgent airworthiness concern requiring expeditious action) to be treated as Level 1 if the operator finds that it ''can be attributed to an event not typical of the operator's usage of other airplanes in the same fleet,'' this paragraph requires that data substantiating any such finding be submitted to the FAA for approval.

(2) The FAA may impose schedules other than those proposed, upon finding that such changes are necessary to ensure that any other Level 3 corrosion is detected in a timely manner.

(3) Within the time schedule approved under paragraph (d)(1) or (d)(2) of this AD, accomplish the basic tasks in the affected aircraft zones of the remaining Model YS–11/–11A series airplanes in the operator's fleet.

(e) If, as a result of any inspection after the initial inspection conducted in accordance with paragraphs (a) or (b) of this AD, it is determined that corrosion findings exceed Level 1 in any area, within 60 days after such determination, implement a means, approved by the FAA, to reduce future findings of corrosion in that area to Level 1 or better.

(f) Before any operator places into service any airplane subject to the requirements of this AD, a schedule for the accomplishment of basic tasks required by this AD must be established in accordance with paragraph (f)(1) or (f)(2) of this AD, as applicable:

(1) For airplanes previously maintained in accordance with this AD, the first basic task in each aircraft zone to be performed by the new operator must be accomplished in accordance with the previous operator's schedule or with the new operator's schedule, whichever would result in the earlier accomplishment date for that task. After each basic task has been performed once, each subsequent task must be performed in accordance with the new operator's schedule.

(2) For airplanes that have not been previously maintained in accordance with this AD, the first basic task for each aircraft zone to be performed by the new operator must be accomplished prior to further flight or in accordance with a schedule approved by the FAA.

(g) Reports of Level 2 and Level 3 corrosion must be submitted at least every three months to Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., in accordance with Section 3 of the Document.

Note 8: Reporting of Level 2 and Level 3 corrosion found as a result of any opportunity inspections is highly desirable.

(h) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time, which provides an acceptable level of safety, may be used when approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through the cognizant Maintenance Inspector at the appropriate FAA Flight Standards office, who may concur or comment and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 9: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(i) 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.

(j) Reports of inspection results required by this AD have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120–0056.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 10, 1995.

S.R. Miller,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–9352 Filed 4–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94–NM–166–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model Viscount 744, 745D, and 810 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 all British Aerospace Model Viscount 744, 754D, and 810 airplanes. This proposal would require an inspection to detect corrosion of the tailplane assemblies, and correction of discrepancies. This proposal is prompted by a report of corrosion on the main spar top and bottom forward boom of the tailplane assemblies and reports of cracking in the upper root joint attachment fitting. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such cracking or corrosion of the main spar forward booms or the upper root joint attachment fitting, which consequently

could lead to the failure of the tailplane assemblies; this condition could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94–NM–166–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 94–NM–166–AD. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Schroeder, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2148; fax (206) 227–1320.

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 94–NM–166–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. 94–NM–166–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The Civil Aviation Authority, which is the airworthiness authority for the United Kingdom, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all British Aerospace Model Viscount 744, 754D, and 810 airplanes. The CAA advises that it has received a report of corrosion on the main spar top and bottom forward boom of the tailplane assemblies. Several incidents of cracking have also been discovered in the upper root joint attachment fitting. The effects of such cracking or corrosion could lead to the failure of the main spar forward booms or the upper root joint attachment fitting, which consequently could lead to the failure of the tailplane assemblies. This condition, if not corrected, could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.

British Aerospace has issued Viscount Alert Preliminary Technical Leaflet (PTL) 182, Issue 2, dated August 7, 1992 (for Model Viscount 810 airplanes); and Viscount PTL 313, Issue 2, dated February 1, 1993 (for Model Viscount 744, 754D, airplanes), which describe procedures for performing an inspection to detect corrosion of the tailplane assemblies, and correction of discrepancies. The CAA classified these PTL's as mandatory.

These airplane models are manufactured in the United Kingdom 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. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the CAA has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the CAA, 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.

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 require an inspection to detect corrosion of the tailplane assemblies, and correction of discrepancies. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the PTL's described previously.

The FAA estimates that 29 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 160 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed actions, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $278,400, or $9,600 per airplane.

The total 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.

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. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

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

British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Limited (Formerly British Aerospace Commercial Aircraft Limited, Vickers-Armstrongs Aircraft Limited): Docket 94–NM–166–AD.

Applicability: All Model Viscount 744, 754D, and 810 airplanes, 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 use the authority provided in paragraph (b) to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent cracking or corrosion of the main spar forward booms or the upper root joint attachment fitting, which consequently could lead to the failure of the tailplane assemblies and reduce the controllability of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 8 years of service since date of manufacture of this airplane, or within 18 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform an inspection to detect corrosion of the tailplane assemblies, in accordance with British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Limited Viscount Alert Preliminary Technical Leaflet (PTL) 182, Issue 2, dated August 7, 1992 (for Model Viscount 810 airplanes), or Viscount PTL 313, Issue 2, dated February 1, 1993 (for Model Viscount 744, 754D, airplanes), as applicable. If corrosion is detected during the inspection, prior to further flight, correct the discrepancies in accordance with the service bulletin. Thereafter, repeat the inspection at intervals not to exceed 8 years.

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

(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 airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 13, 1995.

John J. Hickey,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–9624 Filed 4–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94–NM–112–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model Viscount 744, 745D, and 810 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 all British Aerospace Model Viscount 744, 745D, and 810 airplanes. This proposal would require an inspection of certain fittings of the engine mount structure to determine whether fasteners have been installed in inspection holes and to determine whether those holes are oversized. It would also require various follow-on actions, depending upon the results of the inspection. This proposal is prompted by reports indicating that fasteners were installed in the inspection hole of the engine ''W'' frame socket fittings and the inspection hole was oversized due to fatigue cracking. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such fatigue cracking, which could lead to failure of the fasteners and consequent separation of the engine from the airframe.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94–NM–112–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 British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Ltd., Engineering Support Manager, Military Business Unit, Chadderton Works, Greengate, Middleton, Manchester M24 1SA, England. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Schroeder, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2148; fax (206) 227–1320.

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 94–NM–112–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. 94–NM–112–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), which is the airworthiness authority for the United Kingdom, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on certain British Aerospace