Mr. Satish K. Aggarwal, Senior Program Manager, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone: 301–415–6005.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 26th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Lawrence C. Shao,

Director, Division of Engineering Technology, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 95–10725 Filed 5–3–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–NM–04–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 and A300–600 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 all Airbus Model A300 and A300–600 series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive eddy current inspections to detect cracks at the aft spar web of the wings, and repair, if necessary. This proposal is prompted by reports indicating that cracks have been found in the rear spar web of the wings between ribs 1 and 2 of an in-service airplane and during testing on the fatigue test wing; the cracking occurred due to fatigue-related high shear stress. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent such fatigue-related cracking, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the wing.

DATES: Comments must be received by June 13, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–NM–04–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 Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Slotte, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2797; 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 95–NM–04–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. 95–NM–04–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, recently notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all Airbus Model A300 and A300–600 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that cracks have been found in the rear spar web of the wings between ribs 1 and 2 of an in-service airplane and during testing of the fatigue test wing. In both cases, the cracks spanned across the tip of the build slot and to the nearest adjacent fastener hole. Investigation revealed that such cracking was caused by fatigue-related high shear stress experienced during the landing cycle. Further investigation revealed that the earliest damage to an in-service airplane was found on a Model A300–B2 series airplane that had accumulated 21,500 flight cycles. The crack in the fatigue test wing was discovered at 50,000 simulated flight cycles, and, subsequently, was monitored for an additional 12,000 flight cycles with no evidence of continued crack growth from the hole. Such fatigue-related cracking, if not detected and corrected in a timely manner, could result in reduced structural integrity of the wing.

Airbus has issued Service Bulletin A300–57–0213, dated August 12, 1994, which is applicable to Model A300 series airplanes. This service bulletin describes procedures for repetitive high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspections to detect cracks at the aft spar web of the wings, and repair, if necesaary. The DGAC classified this service bulletin as manadatory and issued French airworthiness directive 94–207–168(B), dated September 14, 1994, in order to assure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

Airbus also has issued Service Bulletin A300–57–6059, dated August 12, 1994, which is applicable to Model A300–600 series airplanes. This service bulletin describes procedures for repetitive high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspections to detect cracks at the aft spar web of the wings, and repair, if necesaary. The DGAC plans to make this service bulletin mandatory when the Model A300–600 series airplane fleet leader approaches the accumulation of 21,600 total flight cycles, which is the recommended time for accomplishment of the initial inspection.

This airplane model is manufactured in France 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, the DGAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC, 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 repetitive eddy current inspections to detect cracks at the aft spar web of the wings, and repair, if necessary. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service bulletins described previously.

Operators should note the following differences between the procedures specified in the referenced Airbus service bulletins and the proposed requirements of this AD:

1. Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–0213, paragraph 1.B.(5)(c), Accomplishment Timescale, makes allowances for airplanes that are close to or have exceeded the specified inspection threshold to fly an additional 1,000 or 1,800 flight cyles prior to the initial inspection, depending upon the number of flight cycles accumulated at the time that the operator received the service bulletin. This proposed AD, however, would allow those airplanes to fly additional 1,400 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD. The FAA considers that this number of flight cycles is a reasonable number for all affected airplanes, regardless of when the service bulletin was received.

2. Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–0213, paragraph 1.B.(5)(d), Accomplishment Timescale; and Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–6059, paragraph 1.B.(5)(c), Accomplishment Timescale; provide for adjustments of the inspection threshold and intervals specified in the service bulletin, under certain criteria related to the number and types of touch-and-go flights that have been accumulated on the airplane. The FAA considers that this criteria for adjustments may cause undue confusion among affected operators in attempting to calculate and/or record allowable or ''non-allowable'' types of touch-and-go flights and, therefore, has not included those provisions of the service bulletin in this proposed rule.

As a result of recent communications with the Air Transport Association (ATA) of America, the FAA has learned that, in general, some operators may misunderstand the legal effect of AD's on airplanes that are identified in the applicability provision of the AD, but that have been altered or repaired in the area addressed by the AD. The FAA points out that all airplanes identified in the applicability provision of an AD are legally subject to the AD. If an airplane has been altered or repaired in the affected area in such a way as to affect compliance with the AD, the owner or operator is required to obtain FAA approval for an alternative method of compliance with the AD, in accordance with the paragraph of each AD that provides for such approvals. A note has been included in this notice to clarify this requirement.

The FAA estimates that 89 airplanes of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD, that it would take approximately 3 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 $16,020, or $180 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:

Airbus Industrie: Docket 95–NM–04–AD.

Applicability: All Model A300 and Model A300–600 series 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 (f) 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 fatigue-related cracking in the rear spar web of the wings, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the wing, accomplish the following:

(a) For Model A300 B2 series airplanes: Prior to the accumulation of 18,000 total flight cycles or within 1,400 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspection to detect cracks of at the aft spar web of the wings, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–0213, dated August 12, 1994. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 5,000 flight cycles.

(b) For Model A300 B4–103, and B4–2C series airplanes: Prior to the accumulation of 19,000 total flight cycles or within 1,400 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform an HFEC inspection to detect cracks at the aft spar web of the wings, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–0213, dated August 12, 1994. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 6,000 flight cycles.

(c) For Model A300 B4–200 series airplanes: Prior to the accumulation of 17,000 total flight cycles or within 1,400 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform an HFEC inspection to detect cracks at the aft spar web of the wings, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–0213, dated August 12, 1994. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 5,000 flight cycles.

(d) For Model A300–600 B4–601, B4–603, B4–620, B4–622, B4–605R, B4–622R, and F4–605R series airplanes: Prior to the

accumulation of 21,600 flight cycles, perform an HFEC inspection to detect cracks at the aft spar web of the wings, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–6059, dated August 12, 1994. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 5,700 flight cycles.

(e) If any crack is detected during any inspection required by this AD, prior to further flight, repair the crack in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–0213, dated August 12, 1994, or Airbus Service Bulletin A300–57–6059, dated August 12, 1994, as applicable; or in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(f) 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.

(g) 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 28, 1995.

James V. Devany,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–10988 Filed 5–3–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

---

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–NM–31–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Beech Model 400 and 400A 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 Beech Model 400 and 400A airplanes. This proposal would require modification of the autopilot and rudder boost interlock. This proposal is prompted by a report indicating that the rudder boost system installed on these airplanes does not operate correctly during deployment of a thrust reverser. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent incorrect operation of the rudder boost system during deployment of a thrust reverser and to prevent the autopilot from exceeding certain bank angle limits; these conditions could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by June 13, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–NM–31–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 Beech Aircraft Corporation, Commercial Service Department, P.O. Box 85, Wichita, Kansas 67201–0085. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dale Vassalli, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ACE–130W, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, Small Airplane Directorate, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone (316) 946–4132; fax (316) 946–4407.

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 95–NM–31–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. 95–NM–31–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

Discussion

The FAA received a report from the airplane manufacturer indicating that, during ground operation, the rudder boost system installed on Beech Model 400 and 400A airplanes is disabled only when the left thrust reverser is deployed. Operation of either the right or left thrust reverser during ground operation should disable the rudder boost system. Additionally, during flight, the rudder boost system on these airplanes is disabled when inadvertent deployment of the left thrust reverser occurs. However, inadvertent deployment of a thrust reverser should not disable the rudder boost system.

The FAA also discovered that, when landing the airplane with a failed left engine, use of the right thrust reverser will result in a rudder boost in the wrong direction. (When landing with a failed right engine, use of the left thrust reverser will disable the rudder boost system, as it should.) Further, inadvertent deployment of the left thrust reverser will result in disengagement of the rudder boost system. Should this condition occur during takeoff, rudder forces could exceed the limits specified in the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR).

These conditions, if not corrected, could result in reduced controllability of the airplane.

The FAA has reviewed and approved Beechcraft Service Bulletin No. 2533, dated October 1994, which describes procedures for modification of the autopilot and rudder boost interlock. The modification entails installing an autopilot and rudder boost improvement kit. Installation of the kit will disable the rudder boost feature during operation of the thrust reverser with only one engine operating in order to alleviate control input requirements. In addition, the service bulletin describes removal of a placard if one